

Apropos the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*:  
Some historical problems and  
the manuscript transmission of the *Nyāyasūtra* \*  
Yasutaka Muroya (Vienna)

0. In his introduction to the critical edition of the NS, Walter Ruben presents three characteristics of the NSN whose authorship he ascribes to Vācaspati Miśra I, the author of the NVTṬ: (1) Vācaspatimiśra interpreted the NS by “structuring”<sup>1</sup> the *sūtra*-s in a penetrating manner, (2) text-critically examined them by separating them from the *grahanakavākya*-s, and (3) he determined their individual wording by numerically indicating the words and syllables at the end of the books.<sup>2</sup> Ruben’s description of the NSN contains general and abstract formulations, some of which are in need of concretization. As regards the first

---

\* The present article is a revised and enlarged version of a part of my final report submitted to the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (dated April 30, 2004). It was subsequently improved with the financial support of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna (April to July 2004), and finalized in the frame of FWF project P 17244-G03 (Austrian Science Fund). On this occasion I would like to express my gratitude to the organizations and institutions mentioned above for their support of my work, and to Prof. Karin Preisendanz, director of the FWF project, and Prof. Ernst Steinkellner, director of the Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia, Austrian Academy of Sciences, for their understanding and assistance. I must also acknowledge with sincere gratitude my indebtedness to the following institutions and individuals for permitting the use of manuscripts of the NS and for assistance in gaining access to them: Adyar Library (Chennai), Bhogilal Leherchand Institute (Alipur, Delhi), Digambara Jain Mandir Sanghiji (Jaipur), Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum (Jaipur), National Archives (Kathmandu), Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (Hamburg), Oriental Institute (Vadodara), Oriental Research Institute & Manuscripts Library (Thiruvananthapuram), Prājña Pāṭhaśālā Maṇḍala (Wai), Punjab University Library (Lahore), and Sarasvati Bhavana Library (Varanasi); Dr. Sung Yong Kang, Dr. Philipp Maas, Prof. Karin Preisendanz, Dr. Ernst Prets, Mr. P.L. Shaji, and Dr. Dominik Wujastyk. I further wish to thank Dr. Goparaju Rama for his invitation to contribute to this volume of the present Journal. My special thanks are also due to Prof. Preisendanz for reading through this paper and providing a number of critical remarks and valuable suggestions.

<sup>1</sup> I have understood the German verb “disponieren” (transitive) as synonymous with “anordnen, gliedern” which can be rendered by English equivalents such as “allot” (Langenscheidt’s Encyclopaedic Dictionary, Part II, German-English, ed. by Otto Springer, Berlin-Munich-Vienna-Zurich-New York, 1997<sup>7</sup>), “structure, structurize,” which I have chosen here, or “arrange, place in order.”

<sup>2</sup> For the German original, cf. Ruben 1928: XVIII: “[D]abei leistete er dreierlei: er deutete die NS, indem er sie eingehend disponierte, er betrachtete sie textkritisch, indem er sie von den *grahanakavākya*’s sonderte, und er legte ihren Wortlaut im Einzelnen fest, indem er die Worte und Silben zahlenmäßig am Ende der Bücher angab.”

characteristic, (1-a) the author of the NSN divides the *sūtra*-s in accordance with “individual topics” (*prakaraṇa*), and assigns to each topic a definite designation which is part of a compound containing *-prakaraṇa* as its final member; (1-b) he occasionally makes explicit mention of the mutual relationship (*saṅgati*) of two *prakaraṇa*-s.<sup>3</sup> Going beyond the third feature adduced by Ruben, Vācaspati counts the number of *sūtra*-s and *prakaraṇa*-s at the end of *āhnikā*-s, *adhyāya*-s and the whole work.

1. It is generally accepted that the NSN is the work of Vācaspati, the author of the NVTṬ.<sup>4</sup> However, his authorship is also questioned by some scholars.<sup>5</sup> Especially the first feature adduced by Ruben (1928), or more specifically (1-a) in my above concretization, has played a crucial role in estimating the authorship of the NSN.

1.1.1 Attention has been called to the discrepancy between the NSN and the NVTṬ regarding the structural disposition of some *sūtra*-s. Preisendanz (1994: 216) pointed out that the intention of NS 3.1.4 as presented in the NVTṬ lies in proving that the *ātman* is not cognition (*buddhi*), whereas the NSN puts the *sūtra* into the section on the distinction of the soul from the body (*śārīravyatiriktātmaprakaraṇa*).<sup>6</sup> Marui (2001: 451-454) also adduced some arguments against the authenticity of the work. The evidence he provided is concerned with the treatment of NS (Ruben) 2.1.30 (*na caikadeśopalabdhir avayavisadbhāvāt*).<sup>7</sup> Mentioning the divergent divisions of the *sūtra*-s (Ruben) 2.1.20-34<sup>8</sup> into

<sup>3</sup> The term *saṅgati* (“connection, relation”) has been understood in various ways: Sen (2003: xi, et passim) and Vattanky (2003: 3, 69, et passim): “relevance”; Preisendanz 2005: 81: “sequence and coherence as regards content” between *prakaraṇa*-s; Preisendanz 2005: 85: “mutual relationship and pertinence” of *prakaraṇa*-s.

<sup>4</sup> For a recent study, cf. Aklujkar 1999: 122, n. 34: “I think the work [i.e., the NSN; YM] can be and should be ascribed to Vācaspati even if a difference of readings was discovered between its *sūtra*-pāṭha and the *sūtras* cited in the Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā.” Aklujkar (1999: 122) also maintains that “we can adjust our chronology of Vācaspati’s works to reflect the more plausible ‘Nyāya-vārttika-tātparya-ṭīkā → Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha’ order.” Cf. also footnote 25 below.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. NV(BI) bhūmikā 40-42, n. 1 = NV(KSS) bhūmikā 38-40, n. 2; Srinivasan 1967: 61-63, § 1.5.19-21; Preisendanz 1994: 29, n. 94; Marui 2001: 446-447, 451-454.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Preisendanz 1994: 216: “Die Einleitung in der NVTṬ, besonders der die primäre Intention von III.1.4 zusammenfassende Satz *na buddhir ātmā*, macht es übrigens fraglich, ob der NSN mit seiner Bezeichnung des zweiten Abschnittes als *śārīravyatiriktātmaprakaraṇa* tatsächlich vom gleichen Autor stammt.” Cf. also Preisendanz 1994: 29, n. 94; Marui 2001: 452.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. NBh(KSS) 2.1.32 = NBh(BhC) 2.1.33 = NBh(P) 2.1.33 = ND(C) 470,2; the first three editions take this sentence as a *sūtra*.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. NBh(KSS) 2.1.20-36 = NBh(BhC) 2.1.21-37 = NBh(P) 2.1.21-37 = ND(C) 2.1.21-36.

*prakaraṇa*-s in the printed editions of the NSN, he pointed out that (Ruben) 2.1.30 is lacking in NSN(KSS) and NSN(BhC), but present in NSN(P). Marui's argument depends upon the explicit statement of Vācaspati in his NVTṬ that (part of) the phrase pertains to the text of the NBh, as already remarked by other scholars. Its inclusion in NSN(P) evidently contradicts Vācaspati's statement, if the NSN was written by him.<sup>9</sup> Marui (2001: 454) states that the disagreement between the NVTṬ and the printed NSN, except for the version of NSN(P), can serve as evidence for the fact that these works were composed by different authors.

1.1.2 On the other hand, taking into account the confusing diversity of the printed text of the NSN, Marui points out the unsatisfactory state of the text of this work. He emphasizes the necessity of text-critical work and the estab-

---

<sup>9</sup> Cf. NVTṬ 335,19-20: *na caikadeśopalabdhir iti. tad etad bhāṣyam anubhāṣya vārttikakāro vyācāṣṭe – na ceti*. In connection with this passage, scholars have discussed the selection of the relevant phrase as a *sūtra* as opposed to the "NSN": cf. NSV 99, n. 2; Jha 1917: 113, n. \*; Ruben 1928: 29 and 187, n. 122; ND(C) 470, n. (ka); Marui 2001: 453-454, 461, n. 39. As for NS (Ruben) 2.1.30, when Ganganatha Jha, the editor of NBh(P) and NBh(BhC), mentions his selection of the phrase as a *sūtra*, he points out its absence in the "NSN" (cf. NBh(P) 97, n. 5 = BhC 270,6-7): *na caiketyādi sūtram. tātparyakārās tv etat sūtratvena na pariḡrṇanti. nyāyasūcī-nibandhe 'syānupalambhaḥ'*.<sup>a</sup> (<sup>a</sup> *'syānupalambhaḥ* NBh(P); *'syānupalambhāt* BhC.) This observation is confusing: To which NSN exactly did Jha make reference? NSN(P) cannot be the one to which he refers as "NSN" in both cases, since it does contain the phrase as a *sūtra* and was published later than NSN(BhC). (Needless to say, it is somewhat unnatural that Jha does not refer to his own edition of the NSN contained in the same book.) Thus he may refer to NSN(BhC) that does not contain the phrase or some other earlier edition. Furthermore, in his English translation of the NBh, Jha (1917: 113, n. \*) justifies his selection of the *sūtra*, adducing some evidence, and states that "[t]hough we have all along followed the Nyāyasūcīnibandha, yet in the present instance [i.e., NS (Ruben) 2.1.30; YM], in view of the consensus of all available manuscripts of the Sūtra text, we accept this as a Sūtra." As evidence supporting his decision, he adduces the "Puri Ms." (which may be no. "III" denoting a "Palm-leaf Ms. of the Sūtra only") and "Sūtra MS. C" (which I fail to identify in the list of abbreviations for manuscripts in Jha (1915: i) and BhC Preface, 1). From the chronological point of view, the year of publication of his translation of the second *adhyāya*, i.e., 1917, makes it more likely that the NSN mentioned by him is not one of his own editions of the work that were published in 1920-1925 and 1939, but rather some previous edition(s), such as the NSN(BI) published during the years 1887-1914. No matter which NSN Jha may refer to, it is evident that his selection of the phrase in question as a *sūtra* was corroborated by some *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts. This suggests that they may strongly have influenced Jha's judgement, which, as a result, necessitated the addition of two *sūtra*-s, i.e., (Ruben) 2.1.30 and 4.1.41-a, in NSN(P); if so, NSN(P) would turn out to be an improved version by virtue of Jha's editorial evaluation of the evidence provided by some *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts. For the evidence for another additional selection, namely, of (Ruben) 4.1.41-a = NBh(P) 4.1.45, as a *sūtra* by Jha, cf. Jha 1919: 102, n. †. Cf. also footnotes 59 and 69 below.

lishment of a philologically reliable edition of the NSN (and the NVTṬ), to deal with such dubious disagreements among the printed editions with more certainty.<sup>10</sup> The necessity of a critical edition of the NSN or the *sūtrapāṭha* of the NS in general cannot be underestimated. At the same time, I would suggest a fresh examination of the original manuscript(s) that Mm. Vindhyesvari Prasad Dvivedin consulted for the first edition of the NSN, or other *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts showing the features typical of the NSN (cf. § 0 above).<sup>11</sup> It should also be examined whether any manuscripts of the “NSN” (not of the *sūtrapāṭha* in general) were utilized for the subsequently printed editions; on this point no reliable information is presently available.

1.2 Haraprasād Śāstrī, who emphasized the importance of a careful study of the NS text, informs us that his “friend Paṇḍit Vindhyesvarīprasāda Duve got one [manuscript ‘giving the Sūtras only’; YM] at Benares, and he published it in the Bibliotheca Indica as an appendix to his edition of the Nyāyavārtika. This is known as Nyāyasūci[!]nibandha.”<sup>12</sup> This indicates that the *editio princeps* of the NSN published by Dvivedin was based on a single manuscript, and that it was available in Varanasi. Whether we can still get access to that manuscript is uncertain. However, the necessity of examining the original material is especially felt when we take into account a highly pregnant editorial statement by Dvivedin. He indicates that there is no discordance between the NSN and the NVTṬ with regard to the number of books, daily lessons, sections, and *sūtra*-s because those given in the NSN were made to conform to those of the NVTṬ (*asya [nyāyasūcīnibandhasya] vācaspatimiśrakṛtanyāyavārttikatātparyāṭikayā saṃvāde kṛte*). He further remarks that if there is some discordance with regard to the text of the *sūtra*-s, it is due to the negligence of the scribe or corrector (probably including the editor himself).<sup>13</sup> This editorial policy adopted for

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Marui 2001: 454. Preisdanz (2005: 71, n. 50) has announced a “comparative study of the *sūtrapāṭha*-mss. which bear the title *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* and other titles and in which the respective compilation of the *sūtra*-s is ascribed to Vācaspati Miśra II.”

<sup>11</sup> Srinivasan (1967: 61 and n. 110) rightly points out that manuscripts of the NSN have hardly been disseminated in South Asia; he further remarks that they are not available except for one manuscript preserved in the Library of the University Bombay which is not available to me. *The New Catalogus Catalogorum* does not have an independent entry for the NSN; cf. Kunjnni Raja 1978.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Śāstrī 1905: 245. He refers to NV(BI) and NSN(BI). For a further remark by D.C. Bhattacharya concerning Dvivedin’s exemplar, cf. Preisdanz 1994: 4-5.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. NSN(BI) 1, n. (1): *asya vācaspatimiśrakṛtanyāyavārttikatātparyāṭikayā saṃvāde kṛte ’dhyāyāhnikaprakaraṇasūtrasaṃkhyāyām vaiśamyam nopalabhyate, yadi ca sūtrapadapāṭheṣu vaiśamyopalabdhis tadā lekhakaśodhakapramādāt tad bodhyam*.

NSN(BI) seems problematic, because it can hardly be discerned to which extent and how the editor has harmonized the original text and *sūtra* selections of the NS as found in his NSN manuscript with the evidence presented in the NVTṬ; it is impossible to distinguish *sūtra*-s recorded in the manuscript from those which may have been added in the published edition, or to know which *sūtra*-s of the manuscript may have been omitted, inasmuch as the edition is not accompanied by critical notes with regard to the addition and omission of *sūtra*-s, or the correction of the text.

1.3 The present article, although not a full-fledged study of the NSN, aims at analyzing a peculiar aspect of the NSN in the history of the commentarial tradition of the NS. For this purpose, I will take up the section NS (Ruben) 3.2.10-17<sup>14</sup> (hereafter the abbreviation “NS” as well as “NS (Ruben)” for the indication of *sūtra*-s will be omitted) and its relationship to the preceding section 3.2.1-9. At the same time, it will be questioned whether Udayana was aware of the NSN when he wrote his NVTP, a voluminous commentary on the NVTṬ, since it is possible that he utilized Vācaspati’s compact manual besides his *magnum opus* in the field of the Nyāya tradition.

2. According to the NSN, 3.2.10-17 form an independent *prakaraṇa* under the title *kṣaṇabhaṅgaprakaraṇa* (“the section which deals with the momentary annihilation [of entities]”). The title suggests that it examines the Buddhist theory of the universal momentariness of entities.<sup>15</sup> In 3.2.10, the Buddhist argues against the Sāṃkhya in relation to the controversial example of a crystal. Before that, in 3.2.9, the Sāṃkhya opponent has maintained the ontological distinction between the eternal intellect (*buddhi*) and mental phenomena, turning to the instance of a transparent crystal that does not change its identity even though its colour appears differently because of the contact with coloured things. The Buddhist reproaches the Sāṃkhya, arguing that every entity, including the

---

<sup>14</sup> This section corresponds to 3.2.11-18 in the NTĀ because of the additional selection of NS (NTĀ) 3.2.10 = (Ruben) 3.2.9-a as a *sūtra*. On this *sūtra*, cf. § 4.3 below.

<sup>15</sup> Ruben (1928: 77) regards 3.2.9 as the beginning of a second section, which is also reasonable, since 3.2.9 and 3.2.10 treat the same example of a crystal, and 3.2.9 is considered to provide the motive for a further discussion or *prakaraṇa* as reflected in the explanation by Vācaspati and Udayana. Yet, as Udayana evidently differentiates 3.2.10 from the first section which includes 3.2.9 (cf. § 2.2 and 2.3 below), the second *prakaraṇa* turns out to be mainly intended to refute the Buddhist position and corroborate the *ātman* theory on the whole. In this sense, Udayana appears to have a different criterion for dividing the present *sūtra*-s into sections than Ruben.

crystal, comes into being anew at every moment since all things are momentary and their momentariness is causeless. In 3.2.11, the Naiyāyika rejects the Buddhist argument on the ground that the generalization based on the theory of universal momentariness is not justified because of the lack of a reason invariably supporting the Buddhist position.

2.1 In the NSN, the sequence 3.2.10-17 is concluded with the following words: “Thus the section regarding momentary annihilation, [which follows] by way of [the relationship consisting in its] supplementary corroboration of [the previous section 3.2.1-9, has been presented] with [these] eight *sūtra*-s” (*ity aṣṭabhiḥ sūtrair aupodghātikam kṣaṇabhaṅgaprakaraṇam*).<sup>16</sup> This statement subsequent to the text of the *sūtra*-s indicates that the author of the NSN regards the relationship between the two *prakaraṇa*-s, i.e., the sections 3.2.1-9 and 3.2.10-17, as *upodghāta*. What, then, is this relationship?<sup>17</sup> According to the general characterization of the term by Preisendanz (1994), “the relationship ‘additional securing’ (*upodghāta*) consists in the fact that something is an additional, supplementary factor of proof, or such a factor that makes the topic at issue logically possible. For example, when the means of valid cognition is to be determined as an instrument for valid cognition, the instrument as such is supplementarily determined in this connection.”<sup>18</sup> This pertinent definition suggests that the discussion in the section 3.2.10-17 supplementarily safeguards and verifies the knowledge acquired in the *buddhyanityatāprakaraṇa*, i.e., section 3.2.1-9; this implies that what is still principally discussed (*prakṛta*) is the non-eternity of cognition, the subject-matter treated in the section 3.2.1-9.

2.2 In his NVTP, on the other hand, Udayana refers to the above-mentioned unit as follows: “The section which deals with the demolition of [the theory of] momentary annihilation [follows] through [the relationship of its] necessarily following upon / connecting with that [previous section]” (*tatprasaṅgena kṣaṇabhaṅgabhaṅgaprakaraṇam*).<sup>19</sup> This statement clearly shows that in con-

<sup>16</sup> Cf. NSN(BI) 14,11-12 = NSN(KSS) 13,21 = NSN(BhC) 10,27 = NSN(P) 18,5.

<sup>17</sup> Vattanky (2003: 3 and 69) renders *upodghāta* as “Introduction,” but this translation hardly delivers the highly technical implication of the term in the current context.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Preisendanz 1994: 593-594, n. 201: “Der Zusammenhang ‘zusätzliche Sicherung’ (*upodghāta*) besteht darin, dass etwas ein zusätzlicher, ergänzender Beweisfaktor oder logisch möglich machender Faktor für das in Rede Stehende ist (*prakṛtopasādhaka, prakṛtopapādaka*). Wenn z. B. das Mittel gültiger Erkenntnis als Instrument für eine gültige Erkenntnis bestimmt werden soll, wird in diesem Zusammenhang ergänzend das Instrument als solches bestimmt.” Cf. also Nkoš 182, [ka] and [kha]; Vattanky 2003: 69-70.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. NVTP 462,6 on 3.2.1. I construe the pronoun *tat* as referring to the section on the non-eternity of cognition (*buddhyanityatāprakaraṇa*), which covers 3.2.1-9.

tradistinction to the NSN Udayana regards the relationship between the two *prakaraṇa*-s as *prasaṅga*. To understand Udayana's usage of this term and to clarify the underlying contextual relationship as presupposed by him, the general characterization of *prasaṅga* by Preisendanz (1994) is of high relevance. Preisendanz presents the term as a technical term in Navya-Nyāya literature: "In Navya-Nyāya, the relationship 'necessarily following [upon what precedes]' is determined as the fact that something, when it is recollected in the context, must not be passed over / overlooked and must immediately be mentioned, provided that there is no aversion (that generally excludes the treatment) against this matter, but eagerness for knowledge."<sup>20</sup>

Given that the technical usage as developed in Navya-Nyāya applies to Udayana's above case, it is to be assumed that Udayana regards the section 3.2.10-17 as treating something that is recollected from the outcome of the previous section, and that for him the discussion on the Buddhists' theory of momentariness cannot be disregarded because they inappropriately criticize the Sāṃkhya theory of *buddhi* on the basis of their own doctrine. Therefore the *sūtrakāra* must immediately address this issue and refute the Buddhists' theory. This is merely a tentative explanation reconstructed on the basis of the above-mentioned definition of *prasaṅga*; however, it is supported by Udayana's casual mention of the term in his commentary on 1.2.15 which shows that he practically relates the applicability of *prasaṅga* to contextual recollection (cf. *smāraka*) or the polemical association of one discussion with another.<sup>21</sup>

2.3 In the introductory part of his commentary on 3.2.10, Udayana further states: "Therefore [Vācaspati], having completed the section on the non-eternity of cognition in this way, introduces the section [which deals with] the demolition of [the theory of] momentary annihilation [and which] has come [forth] due to [the relationship consisting in its] necessarily following upon that [previous section], saying 'therefore in this way' (NVT 502,4; cf. footnote 24 below). And the purpose of this [section] is principally the establishment of the [eternal] soul even though [the refutation of universal momentariness] is generally conducive to the purpose of the whole scientific treatise. For, when [things are]

---

<sup>20</sup> Preisendanz 1994: 242, n. 43: "Der Zusammenhang 'sich [notwendigerweise an das Vorangegangene] Anschliessen' wird im Navya-Nyāya als die Tatsache bestimmt, dass etwas, wenn man sich seiner im Kontext erinnert, nicht übergangen/missachtet werden darf und sofort vorgebracht werden muss, vorausgesetzt, dass keine (die Behandlung generell ausschliessende) Abneigung gegenüber dieser Sache besteht, sondern Wissbegierde." For further materials on the definition of *prasaṅga*, cf. also NKoś 582 and Vattanky (2003: 69).

<sup>21</sup> NVT 330,14 on 1.2.15: *smārakābhāvena prasaṅgābhāvāt*.

stable, the reasons [for the establishment of the eternal soul] consisting in the identificatory linkage<sup>22</sup> [of cognitions], such as [the reason adduced in NS 3.1.1: ‘Because an object is perceived as one and the same] by means of sight and touch’ and other [reasons adduced in further relevant *sūtra*-s], cannot be refuted.”<sup>23</sup>

It is not obvious from this passage, however, what Udayana intended by the relationship *prasaṅga* inasmuch as he only made reference to the coherent relationship with the preceding section in a even more laconic manner than Vācaspati did. However, his mention of the *pratīka*, a part of the phrase(s) to be commented on, in the NVTṬ suggests that Udayana’s basic understanding of the role of the subsequent section 3.2.10-17 conforms to Vācaspati’s. In fact, Vācaspati’s introductory words in the NVTṬ on 3.2.10 can be adapted to the technical usage of *prasaṅga* referring to a specific relationship. He states that Uddyotakara has finished censuring the position of the Sāṃkhya by means of the Naiyāyikas’ view and now presents the Buddhists’ view in order to censure their untenable refutation of the Sāṃkhya theory.<sup>24</sup> This remark by Vācaspati seems to entail that the following section connects to the previous section, unavoidably prompted by the unsatisfactory Buddhist argumentation directed against the Sāṃkhya. Under this understanding of the context, there is little room for attributing a supplementary corroboration of the preceding section 3.2.1-9 to section 3.2.10-17 as stated in the NSN. Furthermore, Vācaspati and Udayana do not appear to presuppose that the main subject treated in section 3.2.1-9 is also the subject of section 3.2.10-17. As Udayana presents, section 3.2.10-17 practically contributes to the establishment of the eternal *ātman*.

2.4 Besides the fact that the authors of the NSN and NVTP regard the section in question as covering 3.2.10-17, it has been noted that they diverge in their designation of the section and, in particular, in their understanding of the type of relationship between the two *prakaraṇa*-s (cf. § 2.1 and 2.2 above). The latter discordance is, in my opinion, crucial. If the NSN were written by Vācaspati

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Preisendanz 1994: 39,1, et passim: “identifizierende Verknüpfung.”

<sup>23</sup> NVTP 466,7-11 on 3.2.10: *tad evaṃ buddhyanityatāprakaraṇaṃ samāpya tatprasaṅgā-gataṃ kṣaṇabhaṅgabhaṅgaprakaraṇaṃ avatārayati “tad evaṃ” iti. prayojanaṃ cāsyā sarva-śāstrārthopakārāviśeṣe ‘pī prādhānyata ātmasiddhiḥ. sthairyē hi sati “darśanasparśanābhyām” ityevamādayaḥ pratisandhānahetavo niṣpratyūhā bhavanti.* For a free translation, cf. Jha 1919: 227, n. \*. I have rendered *niṣpratyūha* (literally: “free from an obstacle”) as synonymous with *apratyūha* which may be understood as derived from the verb *praty-ūh* “to ward off, refute.” For the latter’s usage by Vācaspati Miśra II, cf. Preisendanz 1994: 80,4 = NTĀ 313,11.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. NVTṬ 502,4-5: *tad evaṃ svamatena sāmkyapakṣaṃ dūṣayitvā bauddhais tu yat sāmkyāye rāddhānte dūṣaṇaṃ abhihitam tad dūṣayitum bauddhamatam upanyasyati.*



Miśra I and Udayana knew his predecessor's understanding as presented in the NSN, he could have incorporated it in his work, or otherwise may have made implicit or explicit mention of Vācaspati's fundamentally divergent standpoint. However, neither Vācaspati's understanding nor some critical discussion manifests itself in the NVTP. Udayana's stylized presentation of the *prakaraṇa* does not reflect the NSN in two respects, i.e., the wording of the section title and the determination of the type of relationship between the two *prakaraṇa*-s. On the contrary, Udayana summarizes the statement as found in the NVTṬ in his own compressed terms, i.e., *tatprasaṅgena / tatprasaṅgāgatam kṣaṇabhāṅgabhaṅga-prakaraṇam* (cf. § 2.2-3 above). Furthermore, he throws light on a wider doxographical dimension of the refutation of the Buddhist theory of momentariness, declaring its main purpose to be the establishment of the *ātman* theory. How can we then explain Udayana's obvious deviation from the NSN? Does it suggest that Udayana was unaware of this succinct work and that the NSN, although written by Vācaspati, his predecessor, had escaped the attention of Naiyāyika-s as early as in his time?

2.5 In the NVTP, Udayana makes mention of *prakaraṇa*-s, giving their respective titles that denote their purpose or subject. He also expounds on their relationship and the purpose and relationships of *adhyāya*-s and *āhnika*-s. The titles of the *prakaraṇa*-s are normally enumerated together in the beginning of his commentary on each "daily lesson" (*āhnika*), occasionally accompanied by reference to the two types of *saṅgati*, namely, *prasaṅga* or *upodghāta*. This scholastic practice and structural consideration present a striking contrast to the preceding commentaries, where the presentation of *prakaraṇa*-s and *saṅgati*-s is mostly more concrete and explanatory, though never redundant. Udayana's structural concern is at first sight extremely similar to that evidenced by the NSN. But if Vācaspati, the author of the NVTṬ, did not show such a concern in his major work, it has to be asked when and in view of which necessity Vācaspati, as the author of the NSN, commenced to develop it.<sup>25</sup> If he had been the author of the NSN, he would have introduced or invented the above-mentioned practice for some reason in the subsequent period. In that case, we may assume that Udayana's concern about the structure of the basis work was taken over from,

---

<sup>25</sup> It seems less plausible that Vācaspati wrote the NVTṬ after the NSN, since, if this were the case, it would be expected that as in the NSN he effected the structural presentation in his NVTṬ with compressed and technical terms. For Dvivedin's explanation as regards the sequence of Vācaspati's composition of these two Nyāya works (i.e., the composition of the NSN after that of the NVTṬ), cf. NSN(BI) bhūmikā 39,17-42,1 = NSN(KSS) bhūmikā 38,6-40,1. Cf. also footnote 4 above.

and developed under the influence of, Vācaspati. However, we are faced with the fact that Vācaspati did not provide an exhaustive enumeration and designation of *prakaraṇa*-s, and did not employ *upodghāta* as a fixed term to denote a *saṅgati* in his NVTṬ. His presentation of *prakaraṇa*-s and *saṅgati*-s therein certainly makes the gap — in terms of the application of condensed terms — between the NSN and the NVTṬ difficult to bridge.<sup>26</sup>

2.6 A brief survey of the later commentaries on the NS shows that *prasaṅga* is generally accepted as the relationship of unit 3.2.10-17 to the preceding unit. In his *Nyāyatattvāloka*, Vācaspati Miśra II (15th century)<sup>27</sup> regards the relationship as *prasaṅga* and gives the same designation to the section as Udayana; so does Keśavamiśra (16th century)<sup>28</sup> in his *Gautamīyasūtraprakāśa*.<sup>29</sup> In his *Nyāyatattvaparikṣā*, Vamśadhara (ca. 1735?)<sup>30</sup> follows his predecessors, but with a modified title of the section.<sup>31</sup> This agreement suggests that they acknowledged Udayana's analysis. In contrast to their evident reliance upon Udayana, Rāma-bhadra Sārvabhauma (end of the 16th / beginning of the 17th century)<sup>32</sup> and Viśvanātha Pañcānana (ca. 1634)<sup>33</sup> are silent about the issue of *saṅgati* and do not even allude to a controversy regarding the relationship. This change in the later commentators' approach to the issue may have occurred slightly later than the time of Keśavamiśra who evidently still assured the applicability of the relationship *prasaṅga* to *prakaraṇa* 3.2.10-17. At the same time, the lack of reference to a controversy about the type of *saṅgati* in Navya-Nyāya com-

<sup>26</sup> In the introductory part of his commentary on NS 1.1.1 Vācaspati announces that he will indicate the “relationships” (*saṅgati*) and purposes or subject-matters (*artha*) of *prakaraṇa*-s, *āhnikā*-s and *adhyāya*-s very briefly (*leśataḥ*) at the respective, appropriate places. Cf. NVTṬ 5,18-19: *etāś ca prakaraṇāhnikādhyaīrthasaṅgatīs tatra tatra leśato darśayisyāmaḥ*. For an English translation, cf. Perry 1995: 263-264. According to Vācaspati, *prakaraṇa* means a collective of “*sūtra*-sentences” or statements inasmuch as they constitute a single statement (*ekavākyatva*) in terms of a single purpose to be achieved with regard to a certain topic or subject-matter. Cf. NVTṬ 5,16-17: *evaṃ ca kvacit kenacid arthenaikena sūtravākyānām ekavākyatvaṃ samūhaḥ prakaraṇam*; cf. Perry 1995: 263. On *ekavākyatva* in the Nyāya tradition, see Preisendanz 1994: 204-206, n. 25.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Preisendanz 1994: 1-2: “1410 / 1420-1490.” Cf. also Jha 1987: 183-184; Preisendanz 2005: 70-75.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Jha 1978: [2]-[3]; Preisendanz 2005: 76-77.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. NTĀ 335,4-5: *sampratī saugatair yat samādhānābhāsam uktaṃ tannirāsāya prasaṅgāt kṣaṇabhaṅgabhaṅgaprakaraṇam*. Cf. also GSP 57,3-4: *sampratī sāṅkhyamate saugatair yat sādharmaṃ uktaṃ tannirāsāya prasaṅgikam kṣaṇabhaṅgabhaṅgaprakaraṇam*.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Sen 1980: 103-105; Preisendanz 2005: 81.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Sen 1980: 123: *prasaṅgāt kṣaṇabhaṅganirākaraṇaprakaraṇam ārabhate*.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Preisendanz 2005: 87. Cf. also Sen 2003: lxx: “circa 1525-1575 A.C.”

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Preisendanz 2005: 87.

mentaries remains to be understood.<sup>34</sup> The gap may be explained by related developments in presumably lost commentaries on the NS after the time of Keśavamiśra or at some place outside Mithilā.

2.7 Among the extant commentaries on the NS in the Navya-Nyāya period, only Raghūttama's *Bhāṣyacandra*<sup>35</sup> introduces the section 3.2.10-17 by referring to a "supplementary corroboration"; Raghūttama even gives the same designation to this section as the author of the NSN. He introduces the section with

<sup>34</sup> According to Jha (1919: 227, n.), Vardhamāna makes mention of a controversy as to whether the section 3.2.10-17 is to be regarded as an independent section or subsumed under the previous one. This controversy is presented as the opinion of anonymous opponents ("kecit"), who reject the independent status of section 3.2.10-17. The concerned portion given as Vardhamāna's exposition in Jha (1919) coincides for the most part with the Sanskrit text given in Jha's corresponding footnotes in his two editions of the NBh (cf. NBh(BhC) = *Khadyota* 556,11-15 and NBh(P) 200,25-28): *etat prakaraṇam kecit pūrvaprakaraṇāṅgatvenaiva vyāc-khyuḥ. tatsādhakatvena caitat prakaraṇopasaṃhāravākyaṃ saptadaśasūtrabhāṣyastham "ity upapannam anityā buddhiḥ" ity upanyastavantaḥ. tattvatas tv etatprakaraṇaviśayo nītāntaṃ bhinna eva. uktam bhāṣyavākyaṃ ca kevalam ubhayoḥ prakaraṇayoḥ sambandhapradarśanā-rtham ity avadheyam.* ("Some [commentators of the NS] explained this [new] section [3.2.10-17] merely as part of the preceding section [3.2.1-9]. And as [evidence] proving this [subsumption of 3.2.10-17 under 3.2.1-9], they quoted [Vātsyāyana's] statement of a concluding summary of the section which is found in the [concluding part of the] *Bhāṣya* on the seventeenth *sūtra*, [namely,] 'Thus it is established that cognition is non-eternal.' In reality, however, the topic of this section [3.2.10-17] is indeed considerably distinct [from that of section 3.2.1-9]. And it should be understood that the [already-]mentioned statement in the *Bhāṣya* [has] merely [been presented] for the purpose of indicating the relation between both sections.") It remains to be determined in a future study whether and how exactly the above text is found in Vardhamāna's *Nyāyanibandhaprakāśa*. The controversy adduced above is furthermore referred to by Keśavamiśra in his GSP; cf. GSP 57,4-7 on 3.2.11 = (Ruben) 3.2.10: *na ca "sā nityānityā vā" ity upakramya "upapannam anityā buddhiḥ" iti bhāṣyopasaṃhārāt pūrvaprakaraṇaikaśā evāyam, na tu prakaraṇāntaram iti vācyam. yatprasaṅgena kṣaṇabhaṅgabhaṅgaprakaraṇam tasyaiva prakaraṇasya bhāṣyānta upasaṃhārād avirodhāt.* ("But [the following] should not be maintained [as some commentators do:] This [section 3.2.10-17] is only part of the preceding section [3.2.1-9], but not a distinct section [by itself], because of the concluding summary 'It is established that cognition is non-eternal,' [which is presented in] the *Bhāṣya* [on (Ruben) 3.2.17] after [Vātsyāyana] has set out [to discuss, in section 3.2.1-9, the question] whether that [cognition] is eternal or non-eternal. [Why should this view of some opponents not be maintained?] Because merely section [3.2.1-9 upon which] the [posterior] section [3.2.10-17], which deals with the demolition of momentary annihilation, [follows] through [the relationship of its] necessarily following, is summarized at the end of the *Bhāṣya* [on 3.2.17 and] a contradiction [of the independent status of section 3.2.10-17 which deals with a distinct subject-matter] does not [arise] from this [fact].") Cf. Sen 2003: 628-629, n. 282. Cf. further footnote 38 below.

<sup>35</sup> Potter (1995: 746, no. 1538) dates Raghūttama to "1850," the source of which is unknown to me.

the sentence *upodghātikam kṣaṇabhaṅgaprakaraṇam ārabhyate*,<sup>36</sup> and concludes it with *iti śrībhāṣyacandra upodghātikakṣaṇabhaṅgaprakaraṇabhāṣyacandrikā*.<sup>37</sup> However, he does not explain why the section is connected to the previous one by way of *upodghāta*,<sup>38</sup> which is in effect irreconcilable with the position of his Nyāya predecessors, and does not introduce any discussion of the topic.

3. There is another usage of the term *upodghāta* established in Mīmāṃsā literature.<sup>39</sup> Śābarasvāmin mentions the term in the introductory part of his commentary on *Jaiminisūtra* 2.1.1 after stating the connection between the first two *adhyāya*-s (*adhyāyasambandha*).<sup>40</sup> He presents the subject-matter of the second *adhyāya*, namely, “six kinds of differentiation among ritual actions” (*ṣaḍvidhaḥ karmabhedah*), on the basis of 1) different words (*śabdāntara*), 2) repetition (*abhyāsa*), 3) number (*saṃkhyā*), 4) accessory details (*guṇa*), 5) context (*prakriyā*) and 6) name (*nāmadheya*).<sup>41</sup> In addition to enumerating these

<sup>36</sup> Cf. BhC 556,19.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. BhC 567,22.

<sup>38</sup> Raghūttama’s concluding remark in his commentary on the NBh on 3.2.17 appears to throw some light on his conception of *upodghāta*: *prāsaṅgikam upapādyā prakṛtam upasaṃharati “anityā buddhiḥ” iti* (“[Vātsyāyana] summarizes the [principal] subject at issue, saying ‘Cognition is non-eternal’ (cf. NBh(BhC) 567,9-10), after having justified [in section 3.2.10-17] something which is closely connected [with the topic of section 3.2.1-9].”); cf. BhC 567,20-21. Raghūttama obviously refers to the theme of the non-eternity of cognition as a subject-matter shared by the two *prakaraṇa*-s. He appears to conceive the significance of section 3.2.10-17 following Vātsyāyana’s concluding remark. The fact that Raghūttama regards the subject-matter of section 3.2.10-17 as identical with that of 3.2.1-9 may afford a good reason for his adoption of the relationship *upodghāta* for section 3.2.10-17, provided that he would further hold that the posterior section supplementarily corroborates the preceding section; however, this is not evident from his statement. Raghūttama’s association of section 3.2.10-17 with 3.2.1-9 at the end of his commentary on the NBh on 3.2.17 should be compared with the similar reference by anonymous opponents who deny an independent status as a *prakaraṇa* to 3.2.10-17 and advocate the subsumption of these *sūtra*-s under the preceding section; cf. footnote 34 above; Raghūttama’s position agrees with theirs in assigning the same subject-matter to 3.2.1-9 and 3.2.10-17. It may be assumed that the adoption of *upodghāta* as a relationship between the two *prakaraṇa*-s is related to the commentarial tradition of these anonymous opponents and their response, or alternative proposal, to the dominant position as enjoyed by Udayana and his followers.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Ruben 1928: 188-189, n. 128. Ruben understands *prasaṅga* and *upodghāta* adduced in the NSN differently from their treatment in the present article.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. ŚBh 372,1 = Kataoka 2004: 46,7.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. ŚBh 372,1-2 = Kataoka 2004: 46,7-47,1: *tad iha ṣaḍvidhaḥ karmabhedo vakṣyate – śabdāntaram abhyāsaḥ saṃkhyā guṇaḥ prakriyā nāmadheyam iti*. Cf. also Jha (1973: 167-168) and Kataoka (2004: 101, 130-135). I have basically adopted the English translations in Jha (1973).

concrete main subjects, Śābarasvāmin states that other subject-matters are understood, according to Jha's translation, as "what is introductory [to the main subject]" (*upodghāta*) or as "[what is] connected, either directly or indirectly, with the said main subject" (*prasakta-anuprasakta*).<sup>42</sup> In his corresponding gloss in the *Tantravārttika*, Kumārila determines the term *upodghāta* as referring to a consideration (*cintā*) whose purpose is to establish the thing at issue.<sup>43</sup> It is worthy of note that Kumārila's definition is referred to by Abhayatilaka in his *Nyāyālankāra* when he glosses Udayana's usage of the term.<sup>44</sup>

3.1 It is open to question to what extent we can apply the Mīmāṃsā usage of *upodghāta* to a relationship between two *prakaraṇa*-s as adopted in the NS commentaries. Can we reconcile the apparent conflict of the understanding and translation "what is introductory to, or presupposed by, the main theme" with "supplementary / additional corroboration of the main theme"? It is also unclear from the available commentaries by Udayana and others whether they would suppose that section 3.2.10-17 discusses an issue that is presupposed by the preceding section of 3.2.1-9 or a subject-matter introduced by it. Section 3.2.10-17 does not appear preparatory vis-à-vis the preceding section and is rather characterized by its polemical character, presupposing the issues treated in

<sup>42</sup> Cf. ŚBh 372,4-5 = Kataoka 2004: 47,3-4: *tad etan nānākarmalakṣaṇam ity adhyāyam ācakṣate. etattātparyeṇāto 'nyad upodghātāt<sup>a</sup> prasaktānuprasaktaṃ ca<sup>b</sup>*. (<sup>a</sup> *upodghātāt* Kataoka; *upodghāta* ŚBh. <sup>b</sup> *ca* Kataoka; *ceti* ŚBh.) For a translation of this passage, cf. Jha 1973: 168: "Thus then, it is the treatment of the means of distinguishing the various acts that constitutes this, the *second discourse*; whatever else happens to be dealt with here is only what is introductory to, or connected, either directly or indirectly, with the said main theme"; cf. also Kataoka 2004: 101. Śālikanātha's gloss suggests that the subject-matter treated in JS 2.1.1-4 is that which is intended as *upodghāta*, and that the subject-matter (cf. *mantra*) treated in JS 2.1.32, those (cf. *tadbheda*, i.e., *mantrabheda*) treated in JS 2.1.35-37 and others are what has been characterized as *prasakta* and *anuprasakta* respectively; cf. Kataoka 2004: 101, n. 36; cf. ṚV 279,17-19: *yad api pratijñātāc chāstrabhedād anyac cintyate tad upodghātātvena, yathedam evādyam* (scil. *adhikaraṇam*); *prasaktānuprasaktaṃ ca, yathā mantratadbhedalakṣaṇādī*. Kataoka (2004: 101, n. 36) also remarks that the subject-matter of the second *adhyāya* begins only with the second *pāda* of the second *adhyāya*, i.e., JS 2.2. The rendering of *upodghāta* as presented by Jha (1973) and Kataoka (2004: 101: "the matter that is presupposed") makes sense in this framework of the second *adhyāya* of the JS.

<sup>43</sup> TV 372,21 = Kataoka 2004: 63,3: *cintāṃ prakṛtasiddhyartham upodghātāṃ pracakṣate*. Cf. also Jha 1924: 469: "that discussion which helps the accomplishment of the main discussion is said to be 'Introductory'."

<sup>44</sup> Cf. NA 333,12: *upodghāte. cintāṃ prakṛtasiddhyartham upodghātāṃ pracakṣate*; *-siddhyartham* is to be corrected to *-siddhyartham* as attested in Kumārila's text. For a further allusion to Kumārila's verse, cf. TCDG 19,8-9: *tad uktam: cintāṃ prakṛtasiddhyartham upodghātāṃ vidur budhā iti*. The verse "*cintāṃ ... budhā[h]*" is quoted in NKOś 182,8-10, [ga].

the preceding section, especially the theme of recognition (*pratyabhijñāna*) and identificatory linkage (*pratisandhāna*) effected by the *ātman* (cf. § 2.3 above). Unfortunately, a detailed treatment of these issues is beyond the scope of the present paper.

3.2 Elsewhere in the NVTP, Udayana determines the relationship of the eight sections of NS (Ruben) 4.1.14-40<sup>45</sup> with the preceding section 4.1.10-13 concerning “rebirth” (*pretyabhāva*) as *upodghāta*: “So many [subjects] as have been scrutinized here [in the preceding eight sections] are subservient to the [principal] subject at issue, [namely,] rebirth, even though they are not [themselves] the [principal] subject at issue. Thus [these eight sections] are [pertinently] connected to that [section 4.1.10-13] by way of [their] additionally corroborating [it].”<sup>46</sup> Udayana’s usage of *upodghāta* in this context is worthy of note and suggestive. It indicates the two crucial aspects of the term: First, the subjects that are introduced by way of the relationship *upodghāta* are not the main subject-matter, and secondly, they are conducive to (the establishment of) the main subject-matter. This supplementary character of *upodghāta* makes a sharp contrast with the consequential and derivative nature of the relationship *prasaṅga*, which applies to a new section resulting from some inevitability, such as of an extensive argumentation. In the present context of 3.2.10-17, an inconclusive argument by the Buddhists against the Sāṃkhya inevitably asks for the Naiyāyika-s’ own argumentation to reject the Buddhist thesis. The presence of these two aspects, in fact, may confirm the appropriateness of Abhayatilaka’s reference to Kumārila’s formulation (cf. § 3 above). A more definite clarification of Udayana’s usage of *upodghāta* and the determination of its semantic and pragmatic relation to Kumārila’s characterization of *upodghāta* require the examination of all other occurrences of the term in the NVTP; however, this is beyond the scope of the present article.

4. Let us now turn our attention to manuscripts of the NS which chiefly contain the *sūtrapāṭha*. Some merely contain the individual *sūtra*-s, in others the *sūtra*-s are serially numbered and/or their added-up numbers provided, and some even

<sup>45</sup> Cf. NBh(KSS) 4.1.14-43 = NBh(BhC) 4.1.14-43 = NBh(P) 4.1.14-43 = ND(C) 4.1.14-43. Cf. also NVTP 499,10-14 on 4.1.1, esp. 499,14: *ity aṣṭāv aupodghātikāni prakaraṇāni*.

<sup>46</sup> NVTP 529,7-8 on 4.1.44 = (Ruben) 4.1.41: *yāvad atra vicāritaṃ tāvad aprakṛtaṃ api prakṛtaṃ pretyabhāvaṃ upakaroṭīty upodghātena tatsaṅgataṃ*. This is stated in Udayana’s introductory commentary on (Ruben) 4.1.41, a beginning of a new section called *phalaparīkṣā-prakaraṇa* (“the section which includes the examination of result (lit.: ‘fruit’)”); cf. NVTP 499,14 (cf. footnote 45 above).

contain the titles of *prakaraṇa*-s and occasional information on the relationship between *prakaraṇa*-s. Of the last type of *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts, which is of concern in the present context, as many as fourteen manuscripts could be utilized for this article and examined with the aim of assessing their relation to the NSN; they have been singled out because they share the two characteristics of the NSN, namely, the explicit indication of section titles and *saṅgati*-s. Concerning section 3.2.10-17, it is remarkable that none of these fourteen manuscripts determines its relationship to the previous section as a *prasaṅga*, as Udayana, Vācaspati Miśra II, Keśavamiśra and Vaṁśadhara (cf. § 2.2 and 2.6 above) did.

4.1 Among the selected fourteen manuscripts, however, there is only a single one which provides the titles of *prakaraṇa*-s and the total number of *sūtra*-s after the end of each section exactly as the NSN does. This paper manuscript is preserved at the Sarasvati Bhavana Library, Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, Varanasi (ms. no. 33378), and written in Bengali script (hereafter abbreviated as SBL(5)).<sup>47</sup> The title given on the label affixed to the manuscript is “*Nyāyasūtroddhāraḥ*,” the author’s name “Vācaspatiḥ,” replacing an earlier “Gautamaḥ” canceled by another hand; the title “*Nyāyasūtroddhāra*” is found only in the margin (cf. f. 15v), clearly written by a second hand, but not in the body of the text. The earlier name “Gautamaḥ” appears in the colophon (cf. f. 15v 1): *iti śrīgautamapraṇītanyāyadarśanasūtrāṇi*. In spite of the title on the label which was most probably modified secondarily, the work may have to be differentiated from the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* composed by Vācaspati Miśra II, at least if one considers the issue under examination.<sup>48</sup> That is to say, according to ms. SBL(5), the concerned portion reads as follows (cf. f. 8v 1): *ity aṣṭabhiḥ sūtrair aupot\*-ghātikam kṣaṇabhaṅgaprakaraṇam\**.<sup>49</sup> It should be noted that this perfectly corresponds to the text as found in the printed NSN (cf. § 2.1), but not to the text as presented in the NTĀ (cf. footnote 29 above).

4.1.1 There is another feature that indicates a peculiar relation of this manuscript to the exemplar utilized by Dvivedin, the editor of the first printed

<sup>47</sup> In addition to its xerox copies available to me, I have consulted the ms. description of the original provided by Prof. Karin Preisendanz.

<sup>48</sup> For a discussion relating to the printed varieties of the *Nyāyasūtroddhāra* and its probably original text, cf. Preisendanz 1994: 2-5; cf. also Preisendanz 2005: 71, n. 50. For doubts concerning the authorship of Vācaspati Miśra II with regard to the printed NSU, cf. also Jha (1987: 188) and Jha (1995: 494, 18-23). Cf. also footnote 65 below.

<sup>49</sup> In the following, I report the readings of manuscripts diplomatically; the asterisk “\*” stands for a *virāma* or the *halanta* form of the concerned *akṣara*.

NSN.<sup>50</sup> What characterizes it, or the *sūtrapāṭha* transmission to which it belongs, is a probable scribal error. Dvivedin remarks that his copy of the NSN wrongly counts the number of *sūtra*-s of 2.2.1-12 as thirteen (*trayodaśabhiḥ*), although there are not more than twelve *sūtra*-s in this section,<sup>51</sup> and rightly corrects the number to twelve (*dvādaśabhiḥ*).<sup>52</sup> This information strikingly agrees with the evidence of SBL(5), which reads (cf. f. 5r 3) *iti trayodaśabhiś catuṣṭvaprakaraṇam*\* and has only twelve *sūtra*-s in the counted section. However, the section titles do not completely agree with each other; in NSN(BI), the title *catuṣṭvaparīkṣāprakaraṇam* is given to the section in question, with the insertion of *-parīkṣā*.<sup>53</sup> The title *catuṣṭvaprakaraṇam* found in SBL(5) is the one adopted by Udayana<sup>54</sup> and generally attested in the *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts of the type of SBL(5), whereas *catuṣṭvaparīkṣāprakaraṇam* is the title adopted by Vācaspati Miśra II.<sup>55</sup> In any case, the partial, but remarkable coincidence of a probable

<sup>50</sup> It should be pointed out that no information about Dvivedin's exemplar, e.g., its provenance, script and colophon, or about any other descriptive feature, is at our disposal except for some indirect information provided by Haraprasād Śāstrī (cf. § 1.2 above). This is in clear contrast to Dvivedin's usual practice. Furthermore, it is difficult to see why in the prefatory remarks on his edition of the NSN he provides no information on the manuscript of the NSN, but introduces four manuscripts of the NVTṬ in his note on the conformity (*saṃvāda*) of the NSN with the NVTṬ; cf. NSN(BI) 1, n. \*, and § 1.2 above. Of these manuscripts of the NVTṬ, three are already described by him in the preface to his edition of the NV which contains the NSN edition as an appendix, and most of the later description is a mere repetition. Cf. NV(BI) bhūmikā, 6, n. 3 = NV(KSS) bhūmikā, 6, n. 3.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. NV(BI) 282, n. 1 = NV(KSS) 280, n. 1: *nyāyasūcīgrāthe tu "trayodaśabhiḥ sūtraiḥ" pramāṇacatuṣṭvaprakaraṇam ity uktam, kintv idaṃ sūtram na dṛśyate, tatra 12 sūtrāṇi vartante.*

<sup>52</sup> Cf. NSN(BI) 8, n. 1: *ādarśapustake "trayodaśabhiḥ sūtraiḥ" iti vartate, kiṃ tu 13 sūtrādarśanād antimasamastasūtrasaṃkhyāvaiṣamyād dvādaśabhir iti śodhitam*; cf. also footnote 54 below.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. NSN(BI) 8,14-15 = NSN(KSS) 8,3 (without the critical note) = NSN(BhC) 6,18 (without the critical note): *iti dvādaśabhiḥ sūtraiś catuṣṭvaparīkṣāprakaraṇam*. It is extremely confusing that Dvivedin here reports, as the section name presumably found in his copy of the NSN, a title that is substantially different from the one he mentions in his edition of the NV (cf. footnote 51 above), namely, *pramāṇacatuṣṭvaprakaraṇam*. Cf. also NV(KSS) 280,6: *"(pramāṇacatuṣṭvaparīkṣā)"*, which has no correspondence in NV(BI). In NSN(BhC) there is agreement of the concerned title with that given in NSN(BI), but in his second edition of the NSN Jha modifies it to *pramāṇacatuṣṭvaparīkṣāprakaraṇam*; cf. NSN(P) 14,3. This second title is already adopted by him as an inserted heading in his previous edition of the NBh (cf. NBh(BhC) 348,2) and actually identical with the one adopted by Raghūttama; cf. BhC 348,17: *atha pramāṇacatuṣṭvaparīkṣāprakaraṇam*. For another title adopted by Raghūttama, cf. BhC 359,22: *iti śrīvātsyānīya[sic]bhāṣyacandre pramāṇavibhāṣaparīkṣāprakaraṇacandrikā*.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. NVTP 390,6 and 395,6.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. NTĀ 23,10-11.



scribal error suggests that Dvivedin's exemplar was substantially close to SBL(5).

4.1.2 However, there are also some notable features that decisively distinguish Dvivedin's exemplar from SBL(5). First, SBL(5) does not show the worm-hole that Dvivedin reports as present in the text of the *maṅgala* verses and compelled him to "restore" a few *akṣara*-s.<sup>56</sup> In fact, the beginning of SBL(5) before NS 1.1.1, including an invocation, is illegible (at least on the photocopy available to me) because it seems to be blotted out.<sup>57</sup> It thereby remains undetermined whether SBL(5) has the same introductory verses. Besides, SBL(5) and Dvivedin's exemplar cannot be regarded as identical because the former does not have the famous concluding verses and the colophon containing the text title *nyāyasūcīnibandh[ah]* and the year of the composition ("*vasv-aṅkavasuvatsare*," i.e., "in the year 898")<sup>58</sup>; furthermore, SBL(5) does not contain the calculation of the total number of words and *akṣara*-s.

4.1.3 Another notable difference between SBL(5) and the printed NSN lies in the fact that at the end the former counts the *sūtra*-s as amounting to 523, not to 528, which number is commonly appearing in the printed NSN.<sup>59</sup> How can the total number of 523 *sūtra*-s in the NS be verified in the tradition of the commentarial works on the NS? At present, this question has to be left open because its answer will obviously require much more time and a comprehensive

---

<sup>56</sup> Cf. NSN(BI) 1, n. (2): *ādarśapustakasyātra kṛmibhakṣitatvān "mayā" iti pūritam*. This information is lacking in all later editions of the NSN, and only a single edition, NSN(KSS), documents the lacuna with a question mark ("*mayā* (?)"); cf. NSN(KSS) 1,6. This small lacuna in Dvivedin's exemplar makes it highly doubtful or implausible that the later editions of the NSN are based on this very manuscript. Needless to say, the possibility that their editors consulted additional manuscripts of the same (or similar) type cannot be ruled out. However, I cannot offer any information on the primary witnesses they utilized because of the lack of relevant notes in their prefaces to these editions.

<sup>57</sup> The illegible text amounts to roughly 40 *akṣara*-s. Since my collation was undertaken on the basis of a weak black-and-white photocopy, I cannot provide any information on the state of the material. According to the description of the original by Preisendanz (cf. footnote 47 above), "benedictory or introductory words (about half a line) [are; YM] blackened."

<sup>58</sup> Cf. NSN(BI) 26,16-17 = NSN(KSS) 26,19-20 = NSN(BhC) 20,24-25 = NSN(P) 27,18-19.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. NSN(BI) 26,10 = NSN(KSS) 26,13 = NSN(BhC) 20,19. Compared to NSN(BhC), Jha's NSN(P) counts two more *sūtra*-s, although Jha was also involved as one of the editors of NSN(BhC); cf. NSN(P) 27,13: *sūtrāṇi 530*. Jha (1995: 493,16-19) remarks on this fact, most probably referring to NSN(P) and comparing it with the NSN utilized by Phaṇibhūṣaṇa Tarkavāgīśa, the renowned editor of an edition of the NBh: "*iti sūtradvayaṃ* (i.e., NS 2.1.33 and NS 4.1.45 in the NTĀ; YM) *Jhā-mahābhāgena pariṅghītaṃ nāyam* (i.e., Phaṇibhūṣaṇa; YM) *aṅgīkaroti*"; cf. also Marui 2001: 451.

comparative study of the *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts, including a survey of the peculiar selection or omission of *sūtra*-s and an analysis of their correlation with each other and with the extant commentaries on the NS. Furthermore, the calculation of the total number of *sūtra*-s may also depend on the judgment of a scribe (or reader) as to whether to combine two or more phrases into a single *sūtra* or to divide longer phrases into more than one *sūtra*. Thus, correspondences may only be incidental, as, for example, the total number 523 associated with Viśvanātha's *Nyāyasūtravṛtti*, which, according to Kishore Nath Jha (1992: 495,16-17), also counts 523 *sūtra*-s: “*vṛttau trayaviṃśatyadhikāni pañcaśatāni sūtrāṇi svīkṛtāni santi*.”<sup>60</sup>

However, it is questionable in the first place to assume a direct relation of SBL(5) and the NV<sub>r</sub>, since the NV<sub>r</sub>, despite sharing the title for section 3.2.10-17 (“*kṣaṇabhaṅgaprakaraṇam*”) with the printed NSN and SBL(5),<sup>61</sup> lacks an indication of the section's relationship to the previous section. The coincidence of the total number 523 is more likely to be traced to other grounds that are completely open to future study and discussion. Next to searching for a justification of the total number of 523 *sūtra*-s in any NS commentary or other *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts, one should make a comprehensive survey of SBL(5), especially in relation to the printed NSN, because of its various comparable features, such as (1) structuring *sūtra*-s by the explicit indication of *prakaraṇa*-s and *saṅgati*-s, (2) counting the total number of *sūtra*-s in a *prakaraṇa* by spelling out the number, (3) assigning *upodghāta* to section 3.2.10-17, (4) giving the same title to the section and (5) having a peculiar scribal error in common (cf. § 4.1 and 4.1.1). One should also explore the question how the practice of counting the *sūtra*-s and fixing their total number was developed from a historical point of view.<sup>62</sup> How much attention and deliberation were given to this practice by the

<sup>60</sup> It should be noted that the total number of *sūtra*-s of the NS as assumed by Viśvanātha is in itself a controversial matter. Paranjpe (1941: 299) counts them as 524 according to “the Vṛtti of Viśvanātha in the Āna. S. S.,” which may be the text edited by Digambara Sastri Joshi in the Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series. Sen (2003: liii) counts 525 *sūtra*-s, although it is not clear on which edition this number is based because he utilized at least three different editions of the *Nyāyasūtravṛtti*: “Vedānanda Svāmin's edition” (Sen 2003: lviii), which is not available to me, the “Chowkhamba edition,” which may be the one contained in NBh(KSS), and the “Metropolitan edition,” which is in all probability the one contained in ND(C). Cf., e.g., NR 527, n. 187.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. ND(C) 850,29: *samāptaṃ kṣaṇabhaṅgaprakaraṇam*.

<sup>62</sup> Dvivedin, the editor of the first edition of the NSN, maintains the possibility that Vācaspati Miśra I introduced the practice of counting the *sūtra*-s; cf. NV(BI) bhūmikā 40-42, n. 1 = NV(KSS) bhūmikā 38-40, n. 2. Cf. also footnote 5 above.

Naiyāyika-s in the history of commentarial literature on the NS, supplementing their great efforts to determine the precise text and the selection of *sūtra*-s? If Vācaspati Miśra I was the author of the NSN, the practice must have current already in his time, and the fact that Udayana only counted the *sūtra*-s of the fifth *adhyāya* would therefore appear incongruous; if he was not, Udayana may have been the first innovative commentator who put counting *sūtra*-s into practice, even though in a limited way. At the same time, it has to be borne in mind that only on the basis of the “orthodox” commentaries by Vācaspati Miśra I and Udayana one cannot determine how many *sūtra*-s the NS contained in the version(s) they knew, because both scholars do not always quote the *sūtra*-s they comment upon and sometimes do not refer to them at all.<sup>63</sup> Furthermore, it should be noted that Keśavamīśra, the commentator from Mithilā who shows a keen concern about calculating the total number of *sūtra*-, counts 522 *sūtra*-s,<sup>64</sup> a number remarkably close to that of SBL(5) and NV<sub>r</sub>, but definitely less than that of the printed NSN and NSU.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>63</sup> In the NVT<sub>r</sub>, there are basically four ways in which the author refers to *sūtra*-s: 1) explicit reference to a *sūtra* by quoting its first two syllables and its last single syllable, e.g., *sphaṭi tuḥ* for (Ruben) 3.2.10 *sphaṭike 'py aparāparotpateḥ kṣaṇikatvād vyaktīnām ahetuḥ*; 2) explicit reference to a *sūtra* in the same way as the first, accompanied by introductory words without any further commentary, e.g., 3.2.27 and 3.2.28; 3) no explicit reference, but a commentary, e.g., 3.2.15, 3.2.16 and 3.2.17; 4) no reference and no commentary, e.g., 3.2.5, 3.2.6 and 3.2.7 (Reference to these three *sūtra*-s made in ND(C) 816,15-16 and 817,17 and NVT<sub>r</sub> 498,14-16 should be considered editorial additions); this is a tentative division of the relevant cases. ND(C), which contains an edition of the NVT<sub>r</sub>, appropriately notes the second and fourth way by remarking “27-28-śa-sūtrayor avataraṇikātiriktā ṭikā nopalabhyate” in the case of 3.2.27 and 3.2.28 (cf. ND(C) 859, n. ka-kha), and “7ma-sūtre tātparyatīkā nopalabhyate” in the case of 3.2.7 (cf. ND(C) 817, n. (kha)). In his edition of the NSU, Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī, using various NS commentaries beginning with the NV, also mentions the absence of evidence for certain *sūtra*-s; cf., e.g., NSU 6, n. 18.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Jha 1978: [6]; Bhattacharya 1987: 186-187; Jha 1995: 495,11-15. According to Bhattacharya (1987: 187), this total number is recorded in a paper manuscript “belonging to one Gopī Bhaṭṭa,” which is currently preserved at the Asiatic Society, Calcutta. This manuscript is mentioned as the fourth source in Jha’s preface (“*avataraṇam*”) to his edition of the GSP; cf. Jha 1978: [2]. For a positive assessment of Keśavamīśra’s philological orientation, cf. Preisendanz 2005: 80-81; for an elaborate and annotated explanation of his peculiar way of presenting the numbers of *sūtra*-s and *prakaraṇa*-s, cf. Preisendanz 2005: 80-81, n. 100 and 101.

<sup>65</sup> According to Jha (1995: 495,5-6), Vācaspati Miśra II acknowledges 515 *sūtra*-s in his NTĀ: *dvitīyavācaspatimiśro nyāyatattvāloke pañcadaśādhikapañcaśatamitāni sūtrāṇi svīkaroti*. This obviously contradicts the total number of *sūtra*-s acknowledged in the printed NSU ascribed to him, namely, 531; cf., e.g., Sen 2003: liii. Sen counts 511 *sūtra*-s in the NTĀ, which disagrees with Jha’s calculation. Furthermore, it has to be noted that Jha (1995: 494,10-11) maintains that Vācaspati Miśra II is not the author of the (printed) NSU: *asmākaṃ mate tu vācaspatināmā kaścid*

4.2 Now let us turn our attention to the remainder of the relevant group of *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts, namely, the thirteen manuscripts that constitute the majority of the manuscripts containing the descriptive specification of the type of *saṅgati* between sections. They are stylistically distinguished from SBL(5) in placing the designation of *prakaraṇa*-s and the indication of the type of their relationship with the introductory word “*atha*” *before* groups of *sūtra*-s concerned. They are all of one accord in the determination of the relationship of section 3.2.10-17 to the preceding section, but more or less divergent as regards its title. A rough classification of them is given in the following:<sup>66</sup>

- 1) *athaupodghātikam kṣaṇabhaṅgaprakaraṇam*: BLI (f. 2v 3), DJMS (f. 6r 6), SBL(4) (f. 10v 9-10).
- 2) *athaupodghātikakṣaṇabhaṅgaprakaraṇam*: PPM (f. 5r 8), SBL(2) (f. 6r 8), SBL(3) (f. 7v 3).
- 3) *athopodghātikam kṣaṇabhaṅgabhaṅga[sic]prakaraṇam\**: OI (f. 7r 2).
- 4) *athaupodghātikakṣaṇabhaṅgabhaṅgaprakaraṇam*: MSMSM (f. 27v 1-2), NAK (f. 8r(?) 11-12), PUL (f. 7r 5).
- 5) Others:
  - a) *athaupodghātikam kṣaṇikatvaparakaraṇa[sic]*: AL (f. 9r 7).
  - b) *athopot\*ghātiprakaraṇam*: ORIML (f. 9r 2).
  - c) *athopodghātikam prakaraṇam*: SBL(1) (f. 7r 7).

Since a comprehensive analysis of the mutual relations between these manuscripts remains to be undertaken, it is not possible to reconstruct any “original” reading to which all or some of these should be reduced. The various texts adduced above merely serve to present the textual variety found in the manuscripts accessible to me. However, as already remarked above, one common feature can be confirmed, namely, that without exception the manuscripts do not specify the type of relationship to the preceding section as *prasaṅga*, but as *upodghāta*. This suggests that the prototype of these *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts was probably not established under the influence of Udayana, Vācaspati Miśra II and others (cf. § 2.5 above) and relatively closely related to the printed NSN and SBL(5).

---

*anya eva nyāyasūtroddhārapraṇetā, na tu dvitīyavācaspatimiśro nyāyatattvālokaḥ itī*. Cf. also footnote 48 above.

<sup>66</sup> I do not report *sandhi* variants, minor deviations, scribal errors or corrections, if a version is found in more than one manuscript; thus the text of the version is standardized. Diplomatic presentations of the readings of each manuscript will be done at another occasion.

4.3 As for another notable feature unanimously shared by SBL(5) and the thirteen manuscripts under discussion, the distinctive selection of a *sūtra* should be noted: The phrase *na hetvabhāvāt*, which is normally considered part of the text of the NBh on 3.2.9,<sup>67</sup> is accepted as the tenth *sūtra* in the second *āhnika* of the third *adhyāya*. This selection disagrees with the printed NSN and NSU, which lack the *sūtra* in question. It also contradicts Vācaspati's statement in the NVTṬ where the phrase is said to pertain to the NBh. However, the additional selection of this *sūtra* agrees with the NTĀ of Vācaspati Miśra II.<sup>68</sup> Accordingly, it cannot be ascribed to the influence of Vācaspati Miśra I, or the NSN, at least under the assumption that the printed editions of this work faithfully document the evidence of the original(s) utilized by their editors. On the contrary, as pointed out by Sen (2003: lxi-lxii) and others,<sup>69</sup> the phrase obviously raised a controversy among the commentators regarding the acceptability of its selection as a *sūtra*. The controversy has been explicitly documented by Keśavamiśra, Rāmabhadra Sārvabhauma, Viśvanātha Pañcānana, Vaṃśadhara and Radha

<sup>67</sup> ND(C) 821,2. For its exclusion from the NS, cf. footnote 69 below.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. NTĀ 334,21. Jha (1995: 513,26-27) rightly points out that Vācaspati Miśra II did not discuss the status of this *sūtra*: “*nyāyatattvāloke sūtram idaṃ svīkṛtaṃ vyākhyātā ca, kintu sūtratvasamarthanā nātra kim apy abhihitam.*”

<sup>69</sup> For Sen's detailed discussion, cf. Sen 2003: 626-628, n. 281. Cf. also BhC 555, (Ṭi) 1; Ruben 1928: 78; NVṛ 821, n. (kha); Jha 1978: 135; Jha 1995: 513. As for Vardhamāna's comment on the issue in an unpublished part of his *Nyāyanibandhaprakāśa*, see the text given by S.T.G. Bhattacharya in his edition of the *Nyāyasūtravivaraṇa: na hetvabhāvād iti bhāṣyam iti tīkā ca sūtravyākhyānaparabhāṣyābhīprāyeṇāpi saṅgacchata ity āhuḥ*; cf. NSV 204, n. 2. S.T.G. Bhattacharya, the editor of the NSV, appears to regard this statement as Vardhamāna's opinion and holds that it serves as evidence for his endorsement of the identification of the phrase as a *sūtra*. Vardhamāna's endorsement is also pointed out by K.N. Jha (1978: 135 and 1995: 513) and Sen (2003: 628). Since Sen quotes the whole text of the footnote presented by Bhattacharya, one cannot tell whether Sen regards further passages included therein as pertaining to Vardhamāna's commentary and documenting his opinion, for example, *idaṃ nyāyasūcīnibandhe nāsti, ata idaṃ bhāṣyam eveti kecit* (cf. Sen 2003: 628,14 = NSV 204, n. 2, line 2); if this is a precise quotation from the *Nyāyanibandhaprakāśa*, Vardhamāna must indeed have known a work called *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*. G. Jha (1919: 222, n. \*), however, appears to limit Vardhamāna's statement to *na ... āhuḥ* and assigns the view adduced there to some anonymous opponents, not to Vardhamāna. I agree, differently than other scholars: “Vardhamāna says that some people call it ‘Siddhānta-Sūtra,’ and adds that the *Ṭātparyā* calls it ‘*Bhāṣya*’.” Jha (1919) himself takes the phrase in question as part of the text of the NBh because of its absence in the NSN and in spite of its presence in two *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts available to him, in contradistinction to the case adduced before (cf. footnote 9).

Mohan Gosvami Bhattacharya (19th century).<sup>70</sup> Raghūttama simply introduces the sentence as a *sūtra* without any discussion.<sup>71</sup>

4.4.1 As regards the total number of *sūtra*-s treated in Section 4.1, the following manuscripts also explicitly count 523 *sūtra*-s: DJMS (f. 9v 6), PPM (f. 8v 2), and PUL (f. 13r 3). On the other hand, there are some manuscripts mentioned above which explicitly count 497 *sūtra*-s, namely, SBL(2) (f. 11r 2) and SBL(3) (f. 12r 13), both of which belong to the second sub-group of manuscripts adduced above (cf. § 4.2).

4.4.2 Concerning the additional selection of a *sūtra* treated in Section 4.3, the following manuscripts include a further *sūtra*, namely, (Ruben) 3.2.10-a: *upacayāpacayaprabandhadarśanāc charīrādīṣu*: BLI (f. 2v 3), DJMS (f. 6r 7-8), SBL(4) (f. 11r 1), OI (f. 7r 3), NAK (f. 8v 1), PUL (f. 7r 5-6), and AL (f. 9r 8); it is interesting to note that the manuscripts of sub-groups 2, 5-b and 5-c adduced above do not have this additional *sūtra*. This acceptance of an apparently secondary, or spurious, *sūtra* is remarked upon by Viśvanātha. He makes mention of the phrase as a *sūtra* that is only acknowledged by some people (Naiyāyika-s?).<sup>72</sup> This suggests that the transmission of these *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts represents the tradition(s) of the NS commentators who are opposed to Viśvanātha's view and tradition as regards the status of (Ruben) 3.2.10-a.

4.4.3 A benedictory verse associated with the NSU<sup>73</sup> is found in manuscripts such as BOI, PUL and NAK; in their version, the proper name “*śrī-Vācaspatimīśra*” and the epithet “*Mithileśvarasūri*” appear. PPM, SBL(2) and SLB(3), however, have “*śrī-Vācaspatidhīra*” instead.

5. This study has focused on the concept of *upodghāta* referred to and exemplified in the NSN and aimed at an analysis of the historical relationship of this work with the extant NS commentaries (cf. § 1.3) and its “objective” relationship with a specific type of *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts. In spite of its limited focus on NS (Ruben) 3.2.10-17, the analysis points to some peculiar and

<sup>70</sup> For the discussion in their commentaries, cf. GSP 56,24-27, NR 178,6-11, NVṛ 821,26-27, NSV 204,14 and Sen 1980: 122-123. For the date of Radha Mohan Gosvami Bhattacharya, called a *mitram* of H.T. Colebrooke, see the “*vijñāpanam*” to the edition (cf. NSV (1903): 1-2 [= 125-126]).

<sup>71</sup> Cf. BhC 555,13-14: *tad idaṃ dūṣayati naiyāyiko “na hetvabhāvāt” iti sūtreṇa*.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. ND(C) 825,25-28: *tatsāadhanāya bhāṣyam – upacayāpacayaprabandha° ... idaṃ sūtram eveti kecit* (omission by YM).

<sup>73</sup> On the benedictory verse in the beginning of the NSU, cf. NV(BI) bhūmikā 43-44 = NV(KSS) bhūmikā 41-42; Preisendanz 1994: 3-5.

non-negligible aspects of the NSN in terms of the tradition of the NS commentaries. As remarked in Section 2.7, Raghūttama is the only known NS commentator who regards the relationship of *sūtra*-s 3.2.10-17 with the preceding section as *upodghāta* (and gives the same title to the *prakaraṇa* as the NSN). This assignment of the relationship *upodghāta* to section 3.2.10-17 is incongruent with the adoption of the relationship *prasaṅga*, which alone is historically verifiable in the extant tradition of the NS commentaries from Udayana to Keśavamiśra, whereas a comparative study of selected *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts (cf. § 4.1 and 4.2) clearly shows that it enjoys exclusive dominance in their transmission. The popular structural interpretation reflected in these manuscripts and the NSN could therefore hardly have been established in, or before, the period of Keśavamiśra. It may thus be supposed that in the Navya-Nyāya period such an interpretation was given rise to by NS commentators whose relatively late commentaries seem to have been lost to us, and that it was obviously authoritative in a certain tradition of Nyāya scholars which is imprinted in the NS manuscripts treated in this article.

5.1 Under this assumption, inasmuch as the printed NSN regards the relevant relationship as *upodghāta*, strong doubt is thrown upon the antiquity of the work, resulting from the alleged authorship of Vācaspati Miśra I. As already remarked in Section 1.2, the authorship issue cannot be settled until exact information on the original manuscript utilized by Dvivedin is made available. His exemplar must carefully be examined, or, if at all available, other manuscripts of the NSN collated. This is imperative especially because of Dvivedin's pregnant mention of the editorially achieved "conformity" (*saṃvāda*) between the NSN and the NVTṬ. This could entail, depending on our understanding of this statement to the effect that cases of nonconformity (a doubtful case will be 3.2.9-a; cf. § 4.3) were editorially corrected, that the conformity between the printed NSN and the NVTṬ does not necessarily become operative in substantiating the authorship of Vācaspati Miśra I. These doubts would have an influence on our determination of the genuine *sūtra*-s and call for methodological reconsideration in view of the study of the NS. To put it in other words, could the printed NSN still play a crucial role in distinguishing genuine *sūtra*-s from spurious ones, or *sūtra*-s as not explicitly mentioned by Vācaspati Miśra I, when the other *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts treated here present evidence different from the NSN as we have it?

5.2 Despite the preliminary character of this study on the intricate transmission of *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts, its result suggests that a truly comprehensive examination of the *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts treated here is required and should be extended to other types of such manuscripts. During the course of

this extensive survey of *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts, the selected manuscripts treated here should be examined anew in terms of their internal relation to other types of *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts.<sup>74</sup> This research, in its turn, may contribute to our knowledge of the hitherto little explored development of the transmission of *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts of the NS.

## Bibliography

### 1. Abbreviations for Manuscripts Consulted

- AL: Adyar Library, Chennai, Ms. No. PM 1490.  
 BLI: Bhogilal Leherchand Institute, Alipur, Delhi, Ms. No. 1085.  
 DJMS: Digamara Jain Mandir Sanghiji, Jaipur, Ser. No. 1038, Veṣṭan No. sam 895.  
 MSMSM: Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum, Jaipur, Ms. No. 6962.  
 NAK: National Archives, Kathmandu, NGMPP Reel No. E120/9.  
 NGMPP: Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, Hamburg.  
 OI: Oriental Institute, Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, Vadodara, Ms. No. 12365.  
 ORIML: Oriental Research Institute & Manuscripts Library, University of Kerala, Thiruvananthapuram, Ms. No. 19865.  
 PPM: Prājña Pāṭhaśālā Maṇḍala, Wai, Ms. No. 5682.  
 PUL: Punjab University Library, Lahore, Ms. No. 6915.  
 SBL(1): Sarasvati Bhavana Library, Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, Varanasi, Ms. No. 32238.  
 SBL(2): Sarasvati Bhavana Library, Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, Varanasi, Ms. No. 32672.  
 SBL(3): Sarasvati Bhavana Library, Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, Varanasi, Ms. No. 33181.  
 SBL(4): Sarasvati Bhavana Library, Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, Varanasi, Ms. No. 33182.  
 SBL(5): Sarasvati Bhavana Library, Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, Varanasi, Ms. No. 33378.

---

<sup>74</sup> For example, a group of manuscripts that I have not included in the examination presented under Section 4 has the designations of *prakaraṇa*-s after each cluster of *sūtra*-s embedded in the concluding phrases “*samāptam ... °prakaraṇam*” or “*iti ... °prakaraṇam*,” and does not mention any *saṅgati*-s.



## 2. Primary Sources

RV: Śālikanātha's *R̥juvimalā*. In: *Bṛhatī of Prabhākara Miśra [on the Mīmāṃsā Sūtra-bhāṣya of Śābara] with the R̥juvimalā Pañcikā of Śālikanātha (Adhyaya I Pādas 2, 3, 4 and Adhyaya II complete)*. Ed. S. Subrahmanya Sastri. Madras University Sanskrit Series 24. Madras: University of Madras, 1962.

Khadyota: *Khadyota* of Ganganatha Jha. In: BhC.

GSP: *Keśvamiśrapraṇītaḥ Gautamīyasūtraprakāśaḥ*. Ed. Kisoranātha Jhā. Allahabad: Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, 1978.

JS: *Jaiminisūtra* of Jaimini.

TCDG: *The Gādādhara. A Commentary on Dīdhitī, the Commentary of Tattva Chintāmaṇi by Gadādhara Bhaṭṭāchārya Chakravartin. (Anumānakhaṇḍa)* Eds. Vindhyeśvarī Prasād Dvivedī, Vāmācharaṇa Bhaṭṭāchārya, Śrī Rāma Śāstrī Bhandari and Dhunḍiraja Śāstrī. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 42. Benares: Vidya Vilas Press, 1927.

TV: *Tantravārttika* of Kumārila. In: *Śrījaiminipraṇīte Mīmāṃsādarśane, ādita ārabhya dvitīyādhyāyaprathamapādāntaḥ. Prathamā bhāgaḥ*. Eds. Kāśīnātha Vāsudevaśāstrī Abhyankara and Gaṇeśaśāstrī Ambādāsā Jośī. Vol. 1. Ānandāśramasamskṛta-granthāvaliḥ 97. Poona 1929.

NA: *Nyāyālaṅkāra (Pañcaprasthānanyāyamahātarkaviśamapadavyākhyā). A Commentary on the Five Classical Texts of the Nyāya Philosophy of Abhayatilaka Upādhyāya*. Eds. Anantalal Thakur and J. S. Jetly. G.O.S. 169. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1981.

NKoś: *Nyāyakośa, or Dictionary of Technical Terms of Indian Philosophy*. Ed. Bhīmācārya Jhalakīkar. Rev. and Re-ed. Vāsudev Shāstrī Abhyankar. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series 49. Original ed. Bombay 1875. 1st ed. 1928. Reprint of 4th ed. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1996.

NTĀ: *Nyāyatattvāloka. A Commentary on the Nyāyasūtras of Gautama by Vācaspati Miśra (Junior)*. Ed. Kishore Nath Jha. Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapitha Text Series 33. Allahabad: Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapitha, 1992.

ND(C): *Nyāyadarśanam with Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya, Uddyotakara's Vārttika, Vācaspati Miśra's Tātparyāṭikā & Viśvanātha's Vṛtti*. Eds. Taranatha Nyaya-Tarkatirtha, Amarendramohan Tarkatirtha and Hemantakumar Tarkatirtha. 1st edition. Calcutta Sanskrit Series 18 and 19. 2 vols. Calcutta: Metropolitan Printing & Publishing House, Limited, 1936-1944. Reprint, Kyoto: Rinsen, 1982. Reprint, New Delhi 1985.

NBh(KSS): *Nyāyadarśanam śrī-Gautamamunipraṇītam. śrī-Vātsyāyanamunipraṇīta-bhāṣyasahitam. śrī-Viśvanāthanyāyapañcānanabhaṭṭācāryaviracita-nyāyasūtravṛtṭyanugatam*. Eds. Lakṣmaṇa Śāstrī Jaṭāpāthin and Śrīrāma Śāstrī. 1st ed. Kashi Sanskrit Series 43. Benares: Vidya Vilas Press, 1920.

- NBh(P): *Śrī-Gautamamahāmuni-praṇītaṃ Nyāyasūtram. (Nyāyasutra of Gautama: A System of Indian Logic)*. Ed. Ganganatha Jha. Poona Oriental Series 58. Poona: Oriental Book Agency, 1939.
- NBh(BhC): *Nyāyabhāṣya* of Vātsyāyana. In: BhC.
- NR: *Nyāyasūtras with Nyāyarahasya of Rāmabhadra Sārvabhauma and Ānvīkṣikī-tattvavivaraṇa of Jānakīnātha Cūḍāmaṇi*. Ed. Prabal Kumar Sen. 2 vols. Bibliotheca Indica Series 324. Kolkata: The Asiatic Society, 2003.
- NV(KSS): *Nyāya-Vārttikam*. A Critical Gloss on Nyaya Darshana Vatsyayana's Bhashya. Eds. Vindhyeswari Prasad Dwivedi and Lakshmana Sastri Dravida. Kashi Sanskrit Series 33. Varanasi: Vidya Vilas Press, 1916. (The copy of the 1916 edition available to me does not contain the NSN.)
- NV(BI): *Nyāya-Vārttikam*. Ed. Vindhyeśvarī Prasād Dvivedin. 1st ed. Bibliotheca Indica 113. Calcutta 1887-1914. Reprint Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers, 1986.
- NVṛ: *Nyāyasūtravṛtti* of Viśvanātha Pañcānana. In: ND(C).
- NVṛ(ASS): *Śrīmadvātsyāyanamunikṛtabhāṣya Śrīviśvanāthabhaṭṭācāryakṛtavṛttisam-etāni Śrīgautamamuni-praṇītanīyāyasūtrāṇi*. Ed. Digambara Joshi Śarma. Ānandāśramasamskr̥tagranthāvaliḥ 91. 1st ed. 1922. Reprint, Pune 1985.
- NVTṬ: *Nyāyavārttikatātparyatīkā* of Vācaspatimiśra. Ed. Anantalal Thakur. Nyāyacaturgranthikā vol. III. New Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research, 1996.
- NVTP: *Nyāyavārttikatātparyapariśuddhi* of Udayanācārya, Ed. Anantalal Thakur. Nyāyacaturgranthikā Vol. 4. New Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research, 1996.
- NS: *Nyāyasūtra* ascribed to Gautama or Gotama.
- NSU: *Nyāyasūtroddhāra*. In: *The Nyāyasūtras with Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya and Extracts from the Nyāyavārttika and the Tatparyatīkā*. Ed. Gangadhara Sastri Tailanga. 1st ed. Varanasi 1896. 2nd ed. Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series 12. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1984.
- NSN: *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* ascribed to Vācaspati Miśra I.
- NSN(KSS): *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*. In: NBh(KSS).
- NSN(P): *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*. In: NBh(P).
- NSN(BI): *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*. In: NV(BI).
- NSN(BhC): *Nyāyasūcīnibandha*. In: BhC.
- NSV: *The Nyāyasūtravivaraṇam by Rādhā Mohan Vidyāvāchaspati Goswāmi Bhaṭṭāchārya*. Ed. Surendralāl Tarkatirtha Goswāmi Bhaṭṭāchārya. Pandit 23,3-25,2 (1901-1903).

BhC: *The Nyaya-Darshana. The Sūtras of Gautama and Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana with Two Commentaries, the Khadyota and the Bhāṣyachandra by Raghūttama up to Adhyāya iii, Ahnikā ii, Sūtra 17 only.* Eds. Ganganatha Jha, Dhundhiraja Shastri and with notes by Ambadas Shastri. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 55. Varanasi: Vidya Vilas Press, 1920-1925.

ŚBh: *Śābarabhāṣya* of Śābarasvāmin. In: TV.

### 3. Secondary Literature

Aklujkar, Ashok. 1999. "The prologue and epilogue verses of Vācaspati-Miśra-I," *Rivista Degli Studi Orientali* 73/1-4: 105-130.

Bhattacharya, Dineshchandra. 1987. *History of Navya-Nyāya in Mithilā*. Mithila Institute Series 2. 1st ed. 1958. 2nd ed. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.

Jha, Ganganatha (tr.). 1915/1917/1919. *The Nyāya-Sūtras of Gauṭama with the Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana and the Vārtika of Uddyotakara*. Vol. 1. Indian Thought Series 7. 1915. Vol. 2. Indian Thought Series 9. 1917. Vol. 3. Indian Thought Series 12. 1919. Allahabad: The Belvedere Steam Printing Works. Reprint, Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co., 1983.

Jha, Ganganatha (tr.). 1924. *Tantravārttika, a Commentary on Śābara's Bhāṣya on the Pūrvamīmāṃsā Sūtras of Jaimini*. Bibliotheca India Work No. 161. Calcutta. Reprint Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1983.

Jha, Ganganatha (tr.). 1973. *Śābara-Bhāṣya*. Vol. 1. Adhyāyas I-III. G.O.S. 66. 1st ed. 1933. 2nd ed. (Reprint). Baroda: Oriental Institute.

Jha, Kishore Nath. 1978. *avataṛaṇam* and *pariśiṣṭam* (2). In: GSP.

Jha, Kishore Nath. 1987. "The Nyāyatattvāloka of Vācaspati Miśra II." In: *Philosophical Essays*: Professor Anantalal Thakur Felicitation Volume. Ed. Rama Ranjan Mukhopadhyaya, et al. Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1987. 182-189.

Jha, Kishore Nath. 1995. *pariśiṣṭam* (1). In: NTĀ.

Kataoka, Kei (ed. & tr.). 2004. *The Theory of Ritual Action in Mīmāṃsā: Critical Edition and Annotated Japanese Translation of Śābarabhāṣya & Tantravārttika ad 2.1.1-4*. Tokyo: The Sankibo Press.

Kunjunni Raja, K. 1978. *New Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors*. Vol. 10. Madras University Sanskrit Series 10. Madras: University of Madras.

Marui, Hiroshi. 2001. "On the chronological order of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa and Vācaspati-miśra" (Jayanta Bhaṭṭa to Vācaspatimiśra no sengo-kankei wo megutte). In: *Empti-*

- ness and Reality, Collected Papers in Memory of Dr. Yasunori Ejima*. Tokyo: Shunjusha Publishing Company. (Japanese)
- Paranjpe, V. G. 1941. "The text of the Nyāya-sūtras according to Vācaspatimiśra," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Tenth All-India Oriental Conference, Tirupati*, March 1940: 296-309.
- Perry, Bruce Millard. 1995. *An Introduction to the Nyāyacaturgranthikā: With English Translations*. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania. UMI No. 9532256.
- Potter, Karl. 1995. *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*. Vol. I. Bibliography (Third Edition). Section I. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publ.
- Preisendanz, Karin. 1994. *Studien zu Nyāyasūtra III.1 mit dem Nyāyatattvāloka Vācaspati Miśras II*. Alt- und Neu-indische Studien 46. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Preisendanz, Karin. 2005. "The production of philosophical literature in South Asia during the pre-colonial period (15th to 18th centuries): The case of the *Nyāyasūtra* commentarial tradition," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 33: 55-94.
- Ruben, Walter. 1928. *Die Nyāyasūtra's. Text, Übersetzung, Erläuterung und Glossar*. Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft.
- Śāstrī, Haraprasād. 1905. "An Examination of the Nyāya-Sūtras," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 1/10 (N. S.): 245-250.
- Sen, Prabal Kumar. 1980. "Vaṃśadhara's works and his textual criticism of the Nyāyasūtras," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 8: 99-133.
- Sen, Prabal Kumar. 2003. In: NR.
- Srinivasan, Srinivasa Ayya (ed.). 1967. *Vācaspatimiśras Tattva-kaumudī. Ein Beitrag zur Textkritik bei kontaminierter Überlieferung*. Alt- und Neu-indische Studien 12. Hamburg: Cram, de Gruyter & Co.
- Vattanky, John. 2003. *A System of Indian Logic. The Nyāya Theory of Inference. Analysis, Text, Translation and Interpretation of the anumāna section of Kārikāvalī, Muktāvalī and Dinakarī*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

(Keywords: Nyāyasūcīnibandha, Nyāyasūtrapāṭha manuscripts, upodghāta)