

Some Observations on the Manuscript Transmission of the *Nyāyabhāṣya**

Yasutaka MUROYA

0.1 Introduction

Since the *editio princeps* of the NBh was published by Jayanārāyaṇa Tarkapañcānana 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.¹ In spite of this large number of editions, many of them are of doubtful value because they clearly have not been

*This is a revised and enlarged version of my paper read at the annual conference of the Society for the History of Indian Thought, Kyoto, on December 10, 2006. On this occasion, I would like to express my cordial gratitude to those colleagues who kindly made remarks on my paper at and after the conference, especially, em. Prof. Noritoshi Aramaki, Prof. Toru Funayama, Dr. Kengo Harimoto, em. Prof. Masaaki Hattori, em. Prof. Yasuke Ikari, Prof. Kei Kataoka, Prof. Werner Knobl, Prof. Esho Mikogami, Prof. Hojun Nagasaki, Prof. Masanobu Nozawa, Dr. Yasuhiro Okazaki, Prof. Yuko Yokochi, and Prof. Kiyotaka Yoshimizu, and furthermore to Prof. Akihiko Akamatsu who kindly took the trouble to arrange the subsidiary support for my stay in Kyoto and gave me the chance to talk about the issue treated in this paper at a session of the VAADA research group (part of the COE Program, Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University) on December 11, 2006. I would also like to acknowledge my indebtedness with sincere gratitude to the following institutions and individuals for their assistance in gaining access to the manuscripts explicitly used in this paper and for permission to obtain copies of them: Asiatic Society (Kolkata), Banaras Hindu University (Varanasi), Government Oriental Manuscripts Library (Chennai), L. D. Institute (Ahmedabad), Oriental Research Institute (Mysore), Oriental Research Institute & Manuscripts Library (Trivandrum), Research Library for South Asian, Tibetan and Buddhist Studies (Vienna), Śrīhemaandrācārya Jaina Jñāna Mandir (Patan), Muni Shree Jambuvijayaji, Dr. Sung Yong Kang, Dr. Hisayasu Kobayashi, em. Prof. Asko Parpola, Prof. Karin Preisendanz, Mr. P. L. Shaji, Prof. Ernst Steinkellner and Dr. Dominik Wujastyk. I am also very grateful to the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science for granting a scholarship for overseas post-doctoral research which enabled my research in South India in November and December 2002, and to the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) for funding the project “Metaphysics and Epistemology of the Nyāya Tradition” (FWF Project 17244 G-03) directed by Prof. Preisendanz. My cordial thanks are due to Dr. Sung Yong Kang, who has considerably contributed to my textual study of the NBh as a project collaborator and discussed various issues with me. I am also grateful to Dr. Anne MacDonald for reading this paper. I am deeply indebted to Prof. Preisendanz for taking the trouble to read through this paper and conveying a number of critical comments, thought-provoking discussions, and valuable suggestions. However, responsibility for the text remains entirely with me.

¹For unidentified editions, cf., for example, the “*kṛpārāma* Ed.” mentioned in Sowani 1920: 88, fn. 12.

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 Pakṣilasvāmin,² 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 E_M) under the title “Nyāyadarśana of Gautama.” 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 Akṣapāda”³). After the finalization of the editorial work in 1988,⁴ the monumental enterprise was completed in the year 1997 with the publication of the NBh by the Indian Council of Philosophical Research, Delhi (hereafter E_D).

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 ŚṬ (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.⁵

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

²For a recent study of the author’s date, confirming “the second half of the fifth century,” cf. Franco/Preisendanz 1995: esp. 86; cf. also Franco 2002: 282–283. For the designation “*pakṣila*,” cf. Steinkellner/Krasser/Lasic 2005: 99.

³Cf. Thakur’s Preface to E_M: vii.

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

⁵The manuscript which has been used by the editor is GOML(2). Cf. also Jha’s introductory note (*prāstāvikaṃ kiñcit*) 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 *mahārājaraśrī* (cf. Grünendahl 2001: 52). On other manuscripts in the Paliyam manuscript library, cf. Winternitz 1928, where “Pāliyath Valia Achan” 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. 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 Malayālam script, unless the family possessed another manuscript of the work. My present collation does not provide any negative evidence as regards this identification.

in their exegetical discussions,⁶ but also enhance the possibility of 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.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

⁶For the controversies on theoretical issues among the Nyāya commentators such as Viśvarūpa, Trilocana and Vācaspati, cf. Thakur's Preface to the NVP: v–vii.

⁷For 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 *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā* and points out its difference from that of the printed edition of the NBh (probably referring to the edition in the Calcutta Sanskrit Series).

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 focus for the present article.

0.2 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.⁸ 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 *Nyāyapariśiṣṭa* (ms. no. 14980B)

⁸ *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).

⁹ 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 *Nyāyapariśiṣṭa*. 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" (*viśayasaṅgraharūpo 'dhiko 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

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 *śrī*,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 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.¹³ 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*,”

Valiya Accan, Chennamangalam, Cochin State.” Cf. Kuppuswami Sastri 1927: 5038–5041 under R. No. 3377.

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

¹²For practical purposes, when referring to the text of T, I will refer to the leaf marked with *śrī* as “f. 1” and to the leaf marked with *na* as “f. 2.”

¹³Burnell (1878: 82) regards the mark as “various forms of the word ‘Çrī’.” 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: lxxxviii) regards it as *om*, following Grünendahl (2001: 52, 92); cf. also his forthcoming edition of the first chapter of the *Yogabhāṣya* (Philipp André Maas. *Samādhipāda. Das erste Kapitel des Pātañjalayogaśāstra zum ersten Mal kritisch ediert. The First Chapter of the Pātañjalayogaśāstra 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 mss. 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 *akṣara*-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.

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 (*āhnikā*) and books/chapters (*adhyaṃya*), as well as in colophons. As concerns the features of the *sandhi* or conjoint forms of *akṣara*-s, Ikari (1996: 13–17) provides various pertinent observations. In this connection, a notable feature in T is the very rare usage of the *avagraha*, which occurs thrice in the first book of the NBh.¹⁴

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 Paliyam ms.¹⁵ As mentioned before, GOML(1) was assumed to be 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 “*sū*” 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.

0.3 *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

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

¹⁵Cf. Kuppuswami Sastri (1927: 5513): “Transcribed in 1921–22 from a MS. of M.R.Ry. Paliyattu Valiya Acchan, Chennamangalam, Parur post, Cochin State.” Cf. also the colophon of GOML(1): p. 220. Reference to passages in this ms. is made according to the page numbering.

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, *grahaṇakavākya*, 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 *akṣara*-s or signs: a *virāma* or a special *halanta* form is marked by an asterisk after the *akṣara* in question, an ornamental sign placed before a *sūtra* by ‘⊕,’ a sign placed at its end by ‘◦,’ and a missing or damaged *akṣara* or part of an *akṣara* by ‘+’; otherwise I have made no further changes or additions to the ms. evidence.

0.3.1 NS 1.1.2

T has a substantially different reading for NS 1.1.2 than the common one which reads (cf. E_M 150,3–4): *duḥkhajanmapravṛttidoṣamithyājñānānām uttarottarāpāye tadanantarābhāvād apavargaḥ*. T reads (I also cite the introductory part before 1.1.2; cf. f. 3r 6–7): *kin tarhi tatvajñānāt* ⊕ duḥkhajanmapravṛttidoṣamithyājñānānām uttarottarāpāye tadanantarābhāvāt* ◦ niśreyasādhigama iti*. The sign ‘◦’ shows that the *sūtra* ends with *tadanantarābhāvāt*. This ending disagrees with the commonly accepted text of 1.1.2 where *apavargaḥ*, as cited above, should be the concluding word after ◦ *bhāvāt*.¹⁶ The reading of T may also suggest that an original *niśreyasādhigamaḥ* was replaced by *apavargaḥ* for some reason, or vice versa.¹⁷ However, it should be emphasized that T excludes the word from the

¹⁶For observations on the “original” text of the NS that ends with the ablative and also on its relation to the introductory part of the NBh, cf. Preisendanz 1994: 412–414, 610–611.

¹⁷This variant of T reminds us of a critical note in E_M: “◦ *ntarāpāyān niśreyasādhigama iti bahutra*” (cf. E_M 150, fn. 3). This mysterious remark indicates that the variant, which is different from *tadanantarābhāvād apavargaḥ* adopted by Thakur, is common in many texts (*bahutra*); however, this variant *niśreyasādhigamaḥ* instead of *apavargaḥ* 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

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 *danḍa*, before the uniformly accepted *apavargaḥ*. T's termination of 1.1.2 with °*bhāvāt*, on the other hand, is supported by several independent testimonies, such as the NM,¹⁸ the three *sūtrapāṭha* mss. written in Malayālam script,¹⁹ and a direct commentary on the NS, namely the NTD.²⁰ Furthermore, these testimonies do not affirm that the text of the NBh ends with *niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ* after °*bhāvāt*.

As regards the supplementation of the *sūtra* with *niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ*, Gambhīraṃśa's *Nyāyasūtravivaraṇa* (hereafter NSV(G)), is worthy of our attention.²¹ The ms. of the NSV(G) written in Grantha script reads *tatvajñānād iti o duḥkhañmapravṛttidoṣamithyājñānānām uttarottarāp++++nantarāpāyāt* niśreyasādhigama iti tena sambandhaḥ*.²² The last phrases *niḥśreyasādhigama*

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 *niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ* 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 *sūtrapāṭha* ms. from ORIML, but did not provide information on which ms. he consulted, nor on the absence of *apavargaḥ*.

¹⁸Cf. NM(V) 513,3–6: *uktam eva bhagavatā sūtrakāreṇa — duḥkhañmapravṛttidoṣamithyājñānānām uttarottarāpāye tadanantarābhāvād iti*. The absence of *apavargaḥ* 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 "°*rābhāvādē*"). The Mysore edition of the NM reads *tadanantarāpāyād apavargaḥ*. The presence of *apavargaḥ* here may be a silent emendation of the editor's for the sake of adapting the *sūtrato* the common reading, further by replacing °*bhāvād* with °*pāyād*, and omitting *iti*; 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 *duḥkhañmapravṛttidoṣamithyājñānānām 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 utilized by the editor nor its original ms. ORIML(5) has this passage. Jha remarks on the absence of *apavargaḥ* in an appendix to his edition: "If the word *apavarga[h]* is employed subsequently to *tadanantarābhāvāt* in the first line of the commentary here, then the incoherence of the meaning [of 1.1.2] is removed" (*iha vṛtteḥ prathamāyām paṃktau "tadanantarābhāvāt" ity anantaram apavarga iti padaṃ yadi yojyate tadārthasya viśaṅgatiḥ apahṛtā bhavati*; cf. NTD *pariśiṣṭam* (1), p. 1 under 1.1.2).

²¹This 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 *maṅgalaśloka*, the work is called "*Nyāyavārttikasaṃgraha*" by the author himself. The NSV(G), or probably more correctly the *Nyāyavārttikasaṃgraha*, is rich in quotations from both the NBh and the NV.

²²Cf. ORIML(4) 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. Māḷagi's Introduction (*prastāvanā*); cf. his

iti tena sambandhaḥ may indicate that 1.1.2 should be connected with the last word of 1.1.1, i.e., *niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ*.²³ A further testimony for the reading in question, namely, *niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ* in place of *apavargaḥ*, is Akalaṅka's *Tattvārthavārttika*.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 °*bhāvāt* or *apavargaḥ* discussed by them? Vācaspati Miśra I inserts a brief, noteworthy digression occasioned by anonymous opponents in the beginning part of his commentary on 1.1.2.²⁵ 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” (*yogavibhāga*) or “division of a coherent connection.”²⁶ The first “rule”

Introduction to the NSV(G): v, fn. 1. For the printed edition, Nagasampige consulted two mss. (cf. his *prāṇinivedanam* “prior announcement”), written in Grantha and Kannada script respectively, and preserved at the Oriental Research Institute, Mysore (mss. nos. P. 4071/B and A. 743/2 respectively; the former is a palm-leaf ms.). Cf. also R. S. Shivaganesha Murthy's Preface to the NSV(G) (p. ii), which states that the edition is based upon a single ms., 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: *duḥkhañjanmapravṛttidoṣamithyājñānānām uttarottarāpāye tadanantarābhāvāt. niḥśreyasādhigama ity sūtreṇa gatena sambandhaḥ*. I find it difficult to construe *niḥśreyasādhigama ity sūtreṇa gatena sambandhaḥ*, which may literally be understood as “a connection [of 1.1.2] with the elapsed *sūtra* [running] ‘the attainment of the highest good’ [should be effected].”

²³Cf. NS 1.1.1: *pramāṇaprameyasamśayaaprayojanadr̥ṣṭāntasiddhāntāvayavatarkanirṇayavādajalpavitaṇḍāhetvābhāsacchalaajātinigrahasthānānām tattvajñānān niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ* (cf. E_D 2,7–9).

²⁴Cf. TAV 12,8–9: *duḥkhañjanmapravṛttidoṣamithyājñānānām uttarottarāpāye tadanantarābhāvān niḥśreyasādhigama ity anyeṣāṃ darśanam*. Akalaṅka's reference to “the view of others” (*anyeṣāṃ 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 *yad uktam pareṇa duḥkha° ... tadanantarābhāvān niḥśreyasa ity* (ellipsis by me). I owe this reference to Mr. Himat Trikha, M.A.

²⁵Cf. Perry 1995: 74, fn. 158.

²⁶Cf. NVTṬ 62,21: *atra kecid yogavibhāgam icchanti*. On *yogavibhāga* 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 *yogavibhāga* 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 *yogavibhāga*.

or coherent connection runs *duḥkhajanmapravṛttidoṣamithyājñānānām*, the second *uttarottarāpāye tadanantarābhāvād apavargaḥ*.²⁷ 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” (*itaretarayoga*) 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*).²⁸ 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.²⁹ The opponents’ view is dismissed by Vācaspati who appeals to Uddyotakara’s explicit mention of the *sūtra* in the singular as invalidating evidence.³⁰ It should be noted that in this

²⁷As regards the reading °*bhāvād*, I follow E_M (157,17), which is supported by the Jaisalmer ms., whereas NVTṬ (63,3–4) reads *tadanantarāpāyād* instead of *tadanantarābhāvād*. Cf. also footnote 29 below.

²⁸Cf. NVTṬ 631,1–2 = E_M 157,15–16: *duḥkhajanmapravṛttidoṣamithyājñānānām ity eko yogaḥ. atra kila samāsād eteṣām itaretarayogo ’vagamyate. sa ca yogyatayā kāryakāraṇabhāvaḥ*.

²⁹Cf. NVTṬ 63,3–5 = E_M 157,17–18: *ataḥ siddhe kāryakāraṇabhāva uttarottarāpāye tadanantarābhāvād^a apavarga ity anena yogena kāraṇocchedakrameṇa kāryocchedakramapratipādanenāpavargaḥ pratipadyate.* (^a °*bhāvād* “J” in E_D, E_M; °*pāyād* NVTṬ.) In Śrīkaṇṭha’s ŚṬ, the second coherent connection as presented by the opponents is not identical with that adduced in the NVTṬ. Śrīkaṇṭha seems to presuppose that it ends with °*bhāvāt*, and thus his analysis is considerably different from Vācaspati’s: *uttarottarāpāye tadanantarābhāvād ity asmin* dvitīye yoge ... duḥkhajanmapravṛttidoṣamithyājñānānām ity asmin* prathamayoge* (ellipsis by me). Cf. LDI(1) f. 42r 6–7, a passage which is 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 Śrīkaṇṭha regarded 1.1.2 as ending with °*bhāvād*, but this assumption evidently contradicts the discussion adduced by Vācaspati which Śrīkaṇṭha supposedly comments upon. In fact, Śrīkaṇṭha’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: “une” abbreviating “Udayane”). It is totally unclear how he could keep silent about the possibility of the charge of contradicting the NVTṬ.

³⁰Cf. NVTṬ 63,7–8 = E_M 157,20–21: *tam imaṃ sūtravibhāgam amṛṣyamāṇo vārttikakṛd āha — idaṃ sūtram. ekavacanena bhedaṃ vyāvartayati.* Vācaspati further adduces as the argument against the theory of *yogavibhāga* the fault of the “splitting of a statement” in 1.1.2 (cf. *vākyabheda*). Cf. NVTṬ 63,8–9 = E_M 157,21–22: *na hi samucchedakramapratipādanenāpavargaparatayaikavākyatve sambhavati vākyabhedo nyāyyaḥ.* (“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

digression both the opponents and Vācaspati appear to regard 1.1.2 as ending with *apavargaḥ*, the reading which represents the generally accepted text.³¹ 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.³²

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, problematic 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* such as attachment (*rāga*), aversion (*dveṣa*) and delusion (*moha*), he refers to the previous discussion, stating *evam ca kṛtvā tattvajñānād duḥkhañmapravṛttidoṣamithyājñānānām uttarottarāpāye tadanantarāpāyād apavarga iti vyākhyātam iti*.³³ As Thakur typographically marked the text *duḥkhañma*° ... °*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 vyākhyātam*: in a commentarial text, the verb *vyākhyā* normally designates the commentator's own activity, and does not refer to the basic text upon which commentary is provided.³⁴

statement (*ekavākyatva*), insofar as 1.1.2 has “liberation” as its main objective to be presented (*apavargaparatayā*). Cf. NVT 63,8–9 = E_M 157,21–22; NVTP 108,7–9 = E_M 173,22–24. For *ekavākyatā*, see Preisendanz 1994: 204–207; Kane 1962: 1297–1298. For *vākyabheda*, cf. Kane 1962: 1299–1303.

³¹For another problematic instance, cf. SDS(BI) 115,8–10: *kintu tattvajñānād duḥkha*° ... °*bhāva iti*, 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 pāramarṣaṃ sūtraṃ duḥkhañma*° ... °*bhāvād apavarga iti* (ellipsis by me). Abhyankar's edition, however, provides a different reading in both places, namely, the one ending with °*pāyād apavargaḥ*. Cf. SDS 245,7–9 and 246,16–18.

³²NBhūṣ 72,15–17 (= HJJM(1) 16r 7–8), which runs parallel to the introductory part of the NBh on 1.1.2, does not support *niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ* of the T version: *tat khalu vai tattvajñānaṃ kim ātmaābhānantaram eva niḥśreyasaṃ sampādayatīti. ucyate — na, kiṃ tarhi tattvajñānād duḥkhañmapravṛttidoṣamithyājñānānām uttarottarāpāye tadanantarābhāvād*^a *apavargo bhavati* *vākyasēṣaḥ*. (^a °*bhāvād* HJJM(1); °*pāyād* NBhūṣ, 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 *bhāvāt* or with *apavargaḥ*, it depends on the interpretation of “the rest of the sentence” (*vākyasēṣaḥ*). Yogīndrānanda, the editor, places a *daṇḍa* after *apavargaḥ*, which indicates that he regards *bhavati* as the rest of the sentence. However it is also possible to assume that the words *apavargo bhavati* are intended as that which is to be supplied. The latter assumption entails that Bhāsarvajña regarded 1.1.2 as ending with °*bhāvāt*. On Bhāsarvajña's discussions on NS 1.1.2, cf. Yamakami 2001: 13–18.

³³Cf. E_D 221,12–15. Further alleged references to 1.1.2 in the NBh that need to be carefully examined are E_D 248,17–21 on 4.1.59 = (Ruben) 4.1.55, and E_D 259,7–10 on 4.2.1.

³⁴The *vyākhyā* and its derivatives do not occur in the NS, as opposed to the VS(C), e.g., 1.1: *athāto dharmaṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ*. The style of Vātsyāyana's references to *sūtra*-s requires a comprehensive study.

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 *niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ* after °*bhāvāt* 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 inconsistency (“auffällige terminologische Inkonsistenz”) 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 *niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ* 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 interpretation of Vātsyāyana’s previous statement in the commentary on 1.1.1: *ātmādeḥ khalu prameyasya tattvajñānān niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ, tac caitad uttarasūtreṇānūdyate* (“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*.”).³⁸ It may be supposed that in the following Vātsyāyana actually introduces 1.1.2 by adding the two phrases *tattvajñānāt* and *niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ* in accordance with his own previous announcement.³⁹ If this were the case, the T ver-

³⁵Cf. Strauss 1930; Biardeau 1964: 101–102; Oberhammer 1964; Slaje 1986: 164; Akamatsu 1989; Perry 1995: 29–81; Akamatsu 2000.

³⁶Cf. Slaje (1986: 164–165): “[W]arum denn nur hier in den ersten beiden Sūtren verschiedene Termini verwendet wurden.” Perry (1995: 70–81) critically reviews Slaje (1986).

³⁷It remains unclear how the *iti* appearing after *niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ* in T functions, especially in relation to the *sūtra*.

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

³⁹Instead of taking *anu-vad* in the sense of ‘restate’ or ‘confirm,’ some commentators interpret

sion of 1.1.2 could be understood to be [*tattvajñānād* 1.1.1] *duḥkha*janmapravṛtti-*doṣam*ithyājñānānām *uttarottarāpāye* *tadanantarābhāvād* [*niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ* 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 1.1.2.⁴⁰ 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.

0.3.2 The *atha* in NS 1.1.5

As is well known, the generally accepted text of NS 1.1.5 begins with *atha tatpūrvakam anumānam*.⁴¹ In his critical notes on the NTĀ, Jha has rightly observed that some secondary testimonies do not read *atha* before *tatpūrvakam* in 1.1.5,⁴² 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*pūrvakan trividham anumānam**. Here, *atha* is part 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 with *tatpūrvakam*. 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

it literally and etymologically in the sense of ‘state afterwards.’ Cf. NVTṬ 32,19 = E_M 47,3: *niḥśreyasahetubhāvābhidhānasya anu paścād udyate ’nūdyate*. Cf. also Perry 1995: 38, fn. 33. Cf. further ŚT 39,5–6: *ṭikāyām niḥśreyasetyādi. nātraikasyaivārthasya dviruccāraṇātmake ’nuvādo gṛhyate*. (“[It is said] in the *Ṭikā*: ‘the highest good,’ and so forth. Here [in the NBh the author] does not refer to *anuvāda* that has the nature of stating only one thing twice.”) On Vātsyāyana’s exposition of the technical usage of *anuvāda*, cf. Oberhammer/Prets/Prandstetter 1991: 62–63.

⁴⁰Cf. NV 10,19 = E_M 152,6: *niḥśreyasasya parāparabhedāt*, which is to be compared with his first theory on the classification of *niḥśreyasa*. Cf. NV 2,2–3 = E_M 6,14: *tac chreyo bhidyamānam dvedhā vyavatiṣṭhate dṛṣṭādrṣṭabhedena*. Cf. also NV 10,19 = E_M 13,14: *niḥśreyasaṃ punar dṛṣṭādrṣṭabhedād dvedhā bhavati*.

⁴¹NS 1.1.5: *atha tatpūrvakam trividham anumānam pūrvavac cheṣavat sāmānyato dṛṣṭam ca*. Cf. E_D 12,2.

⁴²Most 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.

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 NBhūṣ,⁴⁶ the NTD,⁴⁷ and all three mss. of the *sūtrapāṭha* 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 tatpūrvakam trividham anumānam iti. athety ānantarye. anumānaviśeṣaṇārthaṃ sūtram*.⁴⁹ Uddyotakara does not explicitly specify 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*

⁴³Cf. PSV(V) 33b5–6: *rigs pa can rnam na re de sñon du soñ ba can gyi rjes su dpag pa ni rnam pa gsum ste, sña ma dañ ldan dañ, lhag ma dañ ldan pa dañ, spyir mthoñ ba can no žes zer ro.*; PSV(K) 115a3–4: *rigs can rnam ni de sñon du 'gro ba can gyi rjes su dpag par ni rnam pa gsum ste. sña ma dañ ldan pa dañ, lhag ma dañ ldan pa dañ spyi mthoñ ba'o žes zer ro.* (Cf. also Kitagawa 1965: 563); VS(C) 215,9–10 (reconstruction): *nañyāyikānām api tatpūrvakam trividham anumānam pūrvavac cheṣavat sāmānyato dṛṣṭam ceti*.

⁴⁴PST Ms.(B) f. 75v 3: *nañyāyikānām[!] ityādi pratyakṣānumānopamānaśabdāḥ pramāṇāñity uddiśya pratyakṣalakṣaṇe bhihite tadanantaram prāptāvasaram anumānalakṣaṇam āha | tatpūrvakam ityādi*. 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.

⁴⁵Cf. NM(V) 109,21–22 = NM(M) I 282,6–7: *tatpūrvakam ca trividham anumānam pūrvavac cheṣavat sāmānyato dṛṣṭam ca*.

⁴⁶Cf. NBhūṣ 189,3–5: *athedānīm anumānasvarūpaṃ vicāryate — tatpūrvakam trividham anumānam pūrvavac cheṣavat sāmānyato dṛṣṭam ceti sūtram*.

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

⁴⁸ORIML(1) f. 1v 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 = E_M 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 *tatpūrvakam* 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 *tatpūrvakam* as a predicate of *anumānam*, since the former is the definiens and the latter the definiendum. Cf. NVT 127,14 = E_M 303,4–5: *lakṣyaṃ pramāṇabhedam anumānam anūdyā tatpūrvakam iti lakṣaṇam vidhatte*. Jha (1915: 153) puts *tatpūrvakam* in a relative clause specifying *anumānam*: "After Perception comes Inferential Cognition, which is led up to by Perception; it is of three kinds."

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 *athopamānam* (NV 53,19 = E_M 356,1) and *atha śabdaḥ* (NV 54,16 = E_M 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: *athopamānam iti bhāṣyam* (NVTṬ 161,21 = E_M 356,18) and *atha śabda iti bhāṣyam* (NVTṬ 166,5 = E_M 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 *athānumānam* in the T version was unfamiliar to him. He introduces 1.1.5 with *pratyakṣalakṣaṇānantaram anumānalakṣaṇaparam sūtram paṭhati — atha tatpūrvakam trividham anumānam 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 states that “now then (*athedānīm*) inference is explained as possessing a cause (i.e., perception)” is

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 (cf. footnote 22 above), where his commentary is literally based on the NBh. Cf. NSV(G) 16,10–12: *athety ānantarye. anumānaviśeṣaṇārthaṁ sūtram*. Gambhīravamśaja’s commentary on 1.1.5 is evidently based on the NV. Cf. also page 14 above.

⁵¹Cf. NVTṬ 127,4–5 = E_M 302,20–21.

⁵²It is understandable that one is inclined to take the subject of *paṭh* ‘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 *paṭh*, cf. NVTṬ 424,14 on 2.2.53 = (Ruben) 2.2.51: *bhāṣyakāro ’traivārthe sūtram paṭhati*; for Uddyotakara as the subject, cf. NVTṬ 327,19 on 2.1.22 = (Ruben) 2.1.22: *tad etad vārttikakāro bhāṣyam anubhāṣya pūrvapakṣasūtram paṭhati*. Udayana comments on *sūtram paṭhati* that appears in the NVTṬ on 1.1.5 (cf. NVTṬ 127,4 = E_M 302,20), and suggests the supplementation of “in order to comment [upon it]” (*vyākhyātum*). Cf. NVTP 184,3 = E_M 331,14: *sūtram paṭhati. vyākhyātum iti śeṣaḥ*. In the above translation, one can take the subject as either Vātsyāyana or Uddyotakara. It may also be noted that if the subject of *paṭh* 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.

meant.⁵³ This fact that *atha* is firmly established as part of 1.1.5 by Vācaspati 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 Vācaspati 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 NVTṬ or its commentarial tradition. For example, in the NTĀ of Vācaspati 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 NVTṬ.⁵⁴ Should the introductory part of the T version be original, it would have to be supposed that the direct or indirect influence of Vācaspati 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., *athānumānam*, which only T has, was also accordingly corrected in the transmission of the text of the NBh. Vācaspati'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 *Ṭīkā*."⁵⁵ Keśavamiśra does not go into the issue and therefore the issue remains vague. Udayana and others are silent on the issue.⁵⁶

0.3.3 *traikālyagrahaṇāt* 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): ⊕ *traikālyagrahaṇāt** ○. The scribe

⁵³ Cf. NVTṬ 127,15–16 = E_M 303,5–6: *athety ānantarye, uktaṃ pratyakṣam anumānasya hetuḥ, athedānīm anumānam hetumad vyutpādyata ity arthaḥ*.

⁵⁴ Cf. NTĀ 69,22–23: *athoddeśakramasaṃgatyanumānalakṣaṇāya sūtram. atha tatpūrvakaṃ trividham anumānam*. Cf. also NTĀ 69,25: *atheti hetuhetumadbhāvasūcanāya*; GSP 5,25: *atheti hetuhetumadbhāvapratipādanārtham*.

⁵⁵ Cf. GSP 5,25–26: *nanv atheti sūtrabahirbhūtam, bhāṣyavārttikaṭīkāvirodhāt*.

⁵⁶ There is no corresponding *pratīka* 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.

clearly understands this phrase as a *sūtra* because of his usage of the common pair of signs. The phrase appears in a context where Vātsyāyana differentiates inference from perception in view of the distinction of the time to which their objects pertain.⁵⁷ Neither Ruben's critical edition nor any other edition mentions even the possibility that this phrase could be regarded as a *sūtra*. Moreover, it is to be noted that neither Uddyotakara nor Vācaspati specifies it as a *sūtra*.⁵⁸ The selection of the phrase as a *sūtra*, on the other hand, is supported by a ms. of the *sūtrapāṭha* from Kolkata and the three mss. of the *sūtrapāṭha* from Trivandrum.⁵⁹

As to the possibility that it can be regarded as a *sūtra*, Bhaṭṭavāgīśvara's NTD provides intriguing evidence:

*traikālyagrahaṇāt. na kevalaṃ lakṣaṇataḥ, kiṃ tarhi viśayabhedād apy anumānam pratyakṣabhinnam, trikālaviśayatvāt. vartamānaikaviśayaṃ pratyakṣaṃ trikālaviśayam anumānam iti sūtrārthaḥ.*⁶⁰

[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.⁶¹ This is the meaning of the *sūtra*.

It is evident that Bhaṭṭavāgīśvara's treatment of *traikālyagrahaṇāt* basically follows Vātsyāyana's intention to differentiate inference from perception from the

⁵⁷Cf. E_D 13,5: *sadviśayaṃ ca pratyakṣam, sadasadviśayaṃ cānumānam. kasmāt. traikālyagrahaṇāt*. For recent translations of the relevant passages, cf. Oberhammer/Prets/Prandstetter (1991: 51) and Okazaki (2005: 168).

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

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

⁶⁰Cf. NTD 4,17–19 = GOML(2) p. 6,8–10. For unknown reasons, the edition places the word *pratyakṣam* in square brackets. In the transcript, *traikālyagrahaṇāt** appears in a new line and is put between double *daṇḍa*-s, which suggests that the phrase is regarded as a *sūtra* by the scribe of the transcript. The original ms. ORIML(5) has a short *daṇḍa* before and after the phrase; but these *daṇḍa*-s seem to be added secondarily by the scribe himself or, more probably, by another hand, and the color of ink used for the *daṇḍa*-s is different from that of the text.

⁶¹Cf. also NVTṬ 152,5–6 = E_M 323,17–18: *pratyakṣaṃ hi laukikaṃ vartamānaviśayam eva. anumānam tu traikālyaviśayam.*

temporal perspective.⁶² Although the printed edition of the NTD does not formally acknowledge the phrase in question as a *sūtra*, the last phrase *iti sūtrārthaḥ* can hardly refer to 1.1.5, since the content of the *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 *sūtrārthaḥ* refers to the phrase *traikālyagrahaṇāt*, 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 *traikālyagrahaṇāt*, and he clearly ascribes the idea to Vātsyāyana.⁶³ Jayanta, on the other hand, directly quotes the expression in question, but does not specify it as a *sūtra*.⁶⁴

A further occurrence of the phrase may be noted. In the second chapter of his PSV, Dignāga takes up the phrase **traikālyagrahaṇāt* (V: *dus gsum la 'dzin pa'i phyir*) when criticizing the Naiyāyikas' definition of inference presented in 1.1.5.⁶⁵ However, the Naiyāyika referred to by Dignāga does not appeal to the phrase *traikālyagrahaṇāt* 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.⁶⁶ In his Japanese translation and exposition of the relevant phrase in the PSV, Kitagawa (1965: 378) makes the

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. NVTṬ 152,3–4 = E_M 323,15–16: *evam tāval lakṣaṇabhedād anumānaṃ^a bhinnam pratyakṣād darśitam. bhāṣyakāras tu viśayabhedād api bhedam āha.* (^a *lakṣaṇabhedād anumānaṃ* NVTṬ; *lakṣaṇabhedānumānaṃ* E_M, which seems to be a misprint.)

⁶³ See footnote 62 above.

⁶⁴ NM I 359,5–6: *tad ucyate — trikālaviśayam anumānam iti. kasmāt. traikālyagrahaṇāt. trikālyuktā arthā anumānena grhyante.* For similar formulation, cf. NV 239,3 on 2.1.39 = (Ruben) 2.1.37: *trikālaviśayam anumānam, traikālyagrahaṇād ity uktam*, where it remains obscure whether Uddyotakara quotes a *sūtra* or the NBh with *ity uktam*. For a parallel to the relevant passage of the NBh (cf. footnote 57 above), cf. further NSV(G) 18,11–12: *sadviśayam ca pratyakṣam. sadasadviśayam anumānam. kasmāt. traikālyagrahaṇāt.*

⁶⁵ On 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.

⁶⁶ Cf. PSV(K) 116a6–7: *gañ yañ sña ma dañ ldan pa kho na rnam pa gsum yin te dus gsum du 'dzin pa'i phyir ro, ñes par gzuñ ba de ni mi rigs te gañ gi phyir ro.*; PSV(V) 34b8–35a1: *gañ yañ sña ma dañ ldan pa'i rjes su dpag pa kho na rnam pa gsum du 'gyur te, dus gsum la 'dzin pa'i phyir ro zes pa'i ñes par gzuñ ba de yañ rigs pa ma yin te.* (cf. also Kitagawa 1965: 567–568); VS(C) 217,10–11 (reconstruction): *yac ca pūrvavad [V: anumānam] eva trividham traikālyagrahaṇād ity avadhāraṇam. tad [V: api] na yuktam, yasmāt sarvaṃ trikālaviśayam.* The phrase *traikālyagrahaṇāt*, translated into Sanskrit by Muni Jambuvijayaḥ, is attested by way of indirect mention by Jinendrabuddhi in his PST (Ms.(B) f. 78v 5): *ayam eva traikālyagrahaṇād iti.*

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*.”⁶⁷

As briefly shown above, the interpretation of *traikālyagrahaṇāt* 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 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 *traikālyagrahaṇāt* is explicitly mentioned by Dignāga as a Naiyāyika’s statement additionally supporting the qualification *trividham* in 1.1.5,⁶⁸ we may again consider whether the expression as such played a certain, possibly supplementary, role in relation to 1.1.5.⁶⁹ The question also remains whether an additional *sūtra* was adduced here by Vātsyāyana, as most probably assumed by Bhaṭṭavāgīśvara, 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.

0.4 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 E_M, Thakur states that those “manuscripts offered better readings,

⁶⁷In the context of the interpretation of NS (Ruben) 2.1.35–36 = NS (E_D) 2.1.37–38 = NS (E_J) 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).

⁶⁸The 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.

⁶⁹For 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; Hattori 1979: 350, 351, fn. (7); Schuster 1972: 354.

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. used for the *Nyāyacaturgranthikā* can be applied to his recent editions: “[T]hey were copied by the same scribe in or around Saṃvat 1501, the date given at the end of the Tātparyaṭikā MS.”⁷¹ It can therefore be surmised that other relevant Nyāya mss. remained unused.⁷² 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.

0.4.1 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

⁷⁰Cf. Thakur’s Preface to E_M: 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.”

⁷¹Cf. Thakur 1968: 380. For the mention of the Jaisalmer material in a singular form, cf. Thakur’s Preface to E_D: xiii: “[I]n 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 Pothī 5, serial no. 67 for the NBh (57 fols.), serial no. 68 for the NV (142 fols.), Pothī 6, serial no. 69 for the NVTṬ (201 fols.) and serial no. 70 for the NVTP (165 fols.). Cf. Punyavijaya 1972: 188–189; Jambuvijaya 2000: 50. Concerning the NBh, another possibly untapped ms. would be the ms. Pothī 65, serial no. 1274(3) (70 fols.), dated *saṃvat* 1279. Cf. Punyavijaya 1972: 356; Jambuvijaya 2000: 110.

groups.⁷³ 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, will be 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 *āhnika* of the first *adhyāya* of the NBh (Calcutta 1936), respectively designated as ‘E_G,’ ‘E_{PH},’ ‘E_J,’ and ‘E_T’.⁷⁴ 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, and minor distinctions, such as *sandhi* variants or scribal errors in individual readings of the mss., are not taken into account. Thus 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, *catasṛṣu caivaṇvidhāsu tattvaṇ parisamāpyate* (“And in these four kinds [such as *pramāṇa* and so forth] the true nature is accomplished.”), MSS_A and T read *tattvaṇ*, agreeing with E_M. E_{PH} reads closely to MSS_A: *catasṛṣv evaṇvidhāsu tattvaṇ parisamāpatye*.⁷⁵ MSS_B read *arthatattvaṇ*, agreeing with E_G, E_J and E_T. In corroboration of *tattvaṇ*, Thakur refers to Prajñākaragupta’s PVBh.⁷⁶ The reading *tattvaṇ* is also supported by the NM, though not in an exact quotation, and by the NBhūṣ.⁷⁷ J_M

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 Ferstl, Ms. Heidrun Jäger and Mr. Gautam Liu, M.A., and also based on their comments on it.

⁷⁵*parisamāpatye* in E_{PH} 12,1–2 has to be corrected to *parisamāpyate*.

⁷⁶*Pramāṇavārttikabhāṣya* 401,19–20: *catasṛṣu caivaṇvidhāsu tattvaṇ parisamāpyate — pramātā prameyaṇ pramāṇaṇ pramitir iti*. Cf. E_D 1, fn. 5 and E_M 1, fn. 6; cf. also E_{PH} 12, n. *.

⁷⁷Cf. NM I 32,6–7: *evaṇ ca yad ucyate — pramātā pramāṇaṇ prameyaṇ pramitir iti catasṛṣu vidhāsu tattvaṇ parisamāpyata iti, tad vyāhanyate*. Cf. also NBhūṣ 580,18–19 = HJJM(1) f. 145v 2: *pramāṇopapattau pramātrādhedasiddhiḥ. tathā cokaṇ — catasṛṣu cedam vidhāsu tattvaṇ parisamāpyata iti*.

and T read *cedaṃ* for *caivaṃ*, which is supported by the NBhūṣ; the variant of J_M is not adopted in E_D. In this case, *idam* would have to be construed with the following, but separated *tattvam*; such a construal is syntactically very unusual. As regards *arthatattva*, the first member *artha-* appears to be an extension; the reading lacking *artha-* is also corroborated by the immediately following question “What is then the true nature?” (*kiṃ punas tattvam?*)⁷⁸

2. In the case of E_D 4,6–7 on 1.1.1, *nāstikaś ca dr̥ṣṭāntam abhyupagacchan nāstikatvaṃ jahāti* (“And a nihilist, insofar 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 *nāstikaś ca dr̥ṣṭāntam abhyupayan nāstikatvaṃ 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 *nāstikatvaṃ*: *nāstikaś ca dr̥ṣṭāntam abhyupayan nāstikyañ jahyāt*.*⁷⁹ Interestingly, the NBhūṣ preserves a conflated text of MSS_A and MSS_B: It supports *jahyāt* as found in MSS_A and *abhyupagacchan* as in MSS_B.⁸⁰ The optative form 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.⁸¹ The reading *abhyupayan* is the *lectio difficilior*⁸²; the two variants *jahyāt* and *nāstikyam* that contain the more difficult conjunct letters *hyā* and *kya*, in contradistinction to simpler *hā* and *ka* in MSS_B, may not be regarded as corrupt.
3. In the case of E_D 4,13–14 on 1.1.1, *tasya pañcāvayavāḥ pratijñādayaḥ, samūham apekṣyāvayavā ucyante* (“To this [aggregate of statements (*śabdasamūha*)] 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_B and all the editions mentioned, whereas MSS_A

⁷⁸E_D 1,16 = E_M 1,13.

⁷⁹For evidence for the secondary derivative “*nāstikya*” formed with the suffix *-ya*, cf. E_D 7,3–4 = E_M 150,19–20, where *nāstikyam* “anti-Vedic heterodoxy” (cf. Halbfass 1991: 73) is mentioned as a type of bad mental deeds or activities (*pāpātmikā pravṛttiḥ*) causing demerit (*adharma*). The instance of *nāstikatva* adduced above is the only occurrence in the NBh.

⁸⁰Cf. NBhūṣ 64,21–65,1 = HJJM(1) f. 14r 9: *nāstikaś ca dr̥ṣṭāntam abhyupagacchan nāstikatvaṃ jahyāt, anabhyupayan kiṃsādhanaḥ param upālabheta?* The reading *anabhyupayan* in the NBhūṣ agrees with MSS_A, J_D and J_M.

⁸¹Cf. E_D 4,7 = E_M 4,1–2: *anabhyupagacchan kiṃsādhanaḥ param upālabheta?* (“If he does not admit [any generally accepted] example, through what means could he refute an opponent?”)

⁸²In his gloss on this passage, Uddyotakara employs the nominal form *abhyupagama*. Cf. NV 14,18 = E_M 16,18: *nāstikasya ca vyāghāto ’bhyupagame ’nabhyupagame vā. tad uktaṃ bhāṣya iti*.

read *samūham abhyupetyāvayavā ity ucyante*. The reading *iti* in MSS_A is supported by J_M, though the variant of the Jaisalmer ms. is not adopted in E_D. *abhyupetya* ‘after having admitted’ seems to be a corruption (unless it is differently rendered), and it is difficult to construe the absolutive with its subject, namely *pañcāvayavāḥ* or *pratiññādayaḥ*. *iti* seems to serve as syntactical clarification and should probably be regarded as an addition.

T (f. 2v 2) reads *vākyasamūham apekṣyāvayavā ucyante*, agreeing with MSS_B on two points, *apekṣya* and the lack of *iti*. The first member *vākya-* of the compound *vākyasamūha* ‘aggregate [of parts] that constitutes a statement’(?) should be regarded as an extension; *vākyasamūha* (“aggregate of statements”) is the term employed in Vātsyāyana’s exposition of *viṭaṇḍā* (“contentious debate”) and *vāda* (“amicable debate”).⁸³

4. In the concluding part of the commentary on 1.1.1 which contains a verse allegedly adopted in modified form from Kauṭilya’s *Arthaśāstra*,⁸⁴ E_D (5,18–6,3) reads⁸⁵: *seyam ānvīkṣikī ... prakīrtitā — iti. tad idaṃ tattvajñānaṃ niḥśreyasādhigamaś ca yathāvidyaṃ veditavyam. iha tv adhyātmavidyāyām ātmādiññānaṃ tattvajñānaṃ, 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.”).⁸⁶ Apart from the final *iti* after *apavargaprāptiḥ*, this text is supported by MSS_A, agreeing with E_{PH} and E_M. MSS_B, on the other hand, read: *... prakīrtitā. tad idaṃ tattvajñānaṃ niḥśreyasādhigamārthaṃ yathāvidyaṃ veditavyam. iha tv adhyātmavidyāyām ātmāditattvajñānaṃ niḥśreyasādhigamo ’pavargaprāptiḥ*, a text which is represented by E_G. MSS_B disagree with MSS_A on three points: MSS_B lack *iti* after *prakīrtitā*; they read *niḥśreyasādhigamārthaṃ* instead of *niḥśreyasādhigamaś*

⁸³For *viṭaṇḍā*, cf. E_D 3,21; for *vāda*, cf. E_D 5,10–11.

⁸⁴Cf. 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 *Arthaśāstra*, cf., e.g., Halbfass 1991: 27.

⁸⁵Cf. Preisendanz 2000: 229, fn. 37.

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

*ca*⁸⁷; and they read *ātmādi* instead of *ātmādiññānam*, compounding it with *tattvajñānam*.⁸⁸ In E_J and E_T, the first two readings of MSS_B are preferred. Concerning the problematic last reading, E_J reads *ātmāditattvajñānam tattvajñānam*, but this reading does not have any support from the mss. available to us⁸⁹; E_T favors the version of MSS_A, and thus has a conflated text. The *iti* concluding the commentary on 1.1.1 is favoured only by E_{PH} and E_M.⁹⁰

The MSS_A version is evidently supported by the two unmarked quotations in the NV: *tad idaṃ tattvajñānam niḥśreyasādhigamaś ca yathāvidyaṃ veditavyam* (cf. NV 20,12 = E_M 21,9; cf. also NVTṬ 59,1–2 = E_M 68,9) and *iha tv adhyātmavidyāyām ātmādiññānam tattvajñānam niḥśreyasādhigamo 'pavargaprāptir iti* (cf. NV 20,20–21 = E_M 21,16–17). The coordinate structure of *tattvajñāna* and *niḥśreyasādhigama* is evidently better than the MSS_B version, considering the significant role both terms play in 1.1.1 and also indirectly in 1.1.2; the MSS_A version should thus be regarded as original. The reading *°dhigamaśca* may have caused a syntactical difficulty in the ms. transmission; for example, syllepsis pertaining to *veditavyam*, as a result of construing a neuter noun *°jñānam* and a masculine *°dhigamaḥ* with a neuter predicate *veditavyam*.⁹¹ The text *ātmāditattvajñānam* of MSS_B may be the result of an omission of *°jñānam* after *ātmādi°*, due to haplography.

T (f. 3r 4–5) reads in partial agreement with MSS_A: ... *parīkṣiteti tad idan tattvajñānan niḥśreyasādhigamaś ca yathāvidyam* veditavyam* iha tv ātmavidyāyām tattvajñānam ātmādiññānan niḥśreyasādhigamo pavarggaprāpti+*. The distinctive reading *parīkṣitā* instead of *prakīrtitā* will be addressed below in

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

⁸⁸On the MSS_B version of the text, cf. Perry's (1995: 42) critical comments.

⁸⁹Cf. Preisendanz 2000: 229, fn. 36. In his edition of the NBh, Laksmana Sastri Jatapathin gives this text using parentheses: "*ātmāditattvajñānam (tattvajñānam)*" (cf. NBh(KSS) 7), with a footnote, implying that the text in parentheses has no basis (in the mss.): "() *etaccihnamadhyasthapāṭho nāsti*."

⁹⁰Cf. E_{PH} 60, fn. *. Phanibhusana argues that *iti* is necessary to denote the completion of a *sūtra* (*samāptisūcak*), referring to Vācaspati's gloss on *iti*. Cf. NVTṬ 59,14: *itiḥ sūtrasamāptiḥ*. *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 adhyātmavidyāyām ... 'pavargaprāptir iti* (ellipsis by me), is made (cf. NV 20,20–21). E_D (cf. 6, fn. 2: "iti Om C") and E_M (cf. 5, fn. 13: "*ititi nāsti C*") refer to the lack of *iti* in E_T. This explicit mention of E_T implies that J_D, J_M and E_{PH} also have *iti*.

⁹¹Cf. footnote 86 above.

relation to the Jaisalmer ms.⁹² Besides, the reading *ātmaavidyāyān* instead of *adhyātmaavidyāyām* and the different word sequence of *tattvajñānam ātmādiññānam** are unique to T and in contrast to the evidence of the NV.⁹³ As regards the reading *adhyātmaavidyāyām* instead of *ātmaavidyāyām*,⁹⁴ 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, Vātsyāyana again uses the term *ātmaavidyā* in his commentary on NS (Ruben) 4.2.46 = E_T 4.2.47.⁹⁵

5. For E_D 7,1–2 on 1.1.2, *rāgadveṣādhikārāc cāsatyerṣyāsūyāmānalobhādayo doṣā bhavanti* (“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 *rāgadveṣādhikārāc cāsūyerṣyāmāyālobhādayo doṣā bhavanti*.⁹⁶ *rāgadveṣādhikārāc* is adopted in all printed editions. As for the enumeration of the *doṣa*-s, the text of MSS_B is also found in E_J; E_G, E_{PH} and E_T read *cāsatyerṣyāmāyālobhādayo*.⁹⁷ The text adopted by Thakur is supported neither by the

⁹²Cf. no. 4 on page 30 below.

⁹³The inverse order of words in T amounts to a syntactical distinction from the version in MSS_A and the NV: In the T version, the subject (*tattvajñānam*) comes first and then the predicate (*ātmādiññānam*); the same sequence can subsequently be observed with *niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ* as subject and *apavargaprāptiḥ* as predicate (i.e., <P+S P+S>). In contradistinction, in MSS_A 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 Vātsyāyana’s text is required.

⁹⁴The former term *adhyātmaavidyā* is used by Vātsyāyana in a preceding passage where it refers to the Upaniṣads (cf. E_D 2,20–3,1 = E_M 2,17–18). It is not clear to what extent there is a difference between *ātmaavidyā* “science of the self” (cf. Halbfass 1991: 24) and *adhyātmaavidyā* “science concerned with the Self” (cf. Preisendanz 2000: 229). The use of *ātmaavidyā* would be in opposition to Uddyotakara’s explicit mention of *adhyātmaavidyā* in the present context.

⁹⁵Cf. T f. 89r 3: *ātmaavidyāddhyātmaśāstram**, which comprises the two phrases *ātmaavidyā* (f., nom.sg.) and *adhyātmaśāstram* (n., nom.sg.). At the same place, although it reads closely with T, E_D (cf. 280,11 on 4.2.47) has *adhyātmaavidyā-adhyātmaśāstram*, presumably a reading of the Jaisalmer ms., because the omission of this reading in E_T and E_{PH} is reported in the corresponding critical note of E_D. It is evident that there is no occurrence of *ātmaavidyā* lacking the prefix *adhi* in E_D and E_M, whereas in T there are two instances where the expression *ātmaavidyā* is used to designate the Nyāya system. For the variant *ātmaavidyāśāstram* in compound form, cf. E_T 1097,3 on 4.2.47, which is also supported by some mss. checked by me.

⁹⁶Chattopadhyaya/Gangopadhyaya (1967: 28) render *rāgadveṣādhikārāt* as “[u]nder the influence of attraction and repulsion,” and *māyā* as “deception.” Sudarśanācārya 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. E_J 8, fn. 3.

⁹⁷The reading of E_{PH} as it might be reconstructed from the relevant critical note in E_D (“*māyā* for *māna* TC”) is “*cāsatyerṣyāsūyāmāyālobhādayo*”; in fact, this is not found in E_{PH}. However, the reading that can be constructed from the corresponding note in E_M (“*asūyā*° om *māyā* for *māna* CT”) is identical with that of E_{PH}. Accordingly, the critical note “*asūyā* Om C” in E_D (cf. p. 7, fn. 2) has to be corrected, for example, to “*asūyā* Om CT”.

mss. available to us nor by other printed editions. MSS_A, on the other hand, read *rāgadveṣādhikaraṇāś cāśūyerṣyāmānalobhādayo doṣā bhavanti*; the reading °*dhikaraṇāḥ* (m., nom. pl.) is supported by the Jaisalmer ms. (cf. J_M and J_D).⁹⁸ A further distinction of MSS_A 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 E_M and E_D, 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 *rāga* and *dveṣa* (cf. footnote 101 below).

T reads differently: *rāgadveṣā+ikaraṇā dveṣyāsūyāmānamadamatsaralobhādayo doṣāḥ prādurbhavanti*. *dveṣyā*° seems to be a corruption, which could be corrected, for example, to *ścerṣyā*°. The beginning part of the emended text, i.e., *cerṣyāsūyāmāna*-, 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 “aggregate.”¹⁰⁰ *prādur-bhū* instead of *bhū* explicates the

⁹⁸ The variant *cerṣyāsūyāmānalobhādayo*, which is reconstructible as the text of the Jaisalmer ms. from J_D (°*dhikaraṇāś cerṣyā*°), is not attested by any of the mss. available to us.

⁹⁹ For *māna* as a subtype of *moha*, cf. E_D 220,7–8 (cited in footnote 100 below). It should be noted that in Viśvanātha’s *Nyāyasūtravṛtti* *māyā* is classified into the “attachment side” (*rāgapakṣa*). Cf. E_T 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, MSS_B.

¹⁰⁰ For another enumeration of *doṣa*-s, cf. E_D 220,3–4 on 4.1.3: *tathā ceme mānerṣyāsūyāvicikitsāmatsarādayaḥ*. The variant of T enumerates the various faults according to a discernible order, with the exception of *mada*: (1) *īrṣyā* (“envy”) and *asūyā* (“malice, jealousy”), belonging to the *dveṣapakṣa* (“aversion side”); (2) *māna* (“self-conceit, pride”) belonging to the *mohapakṣa* (“delusion side”), and *mada* (“conceit”), although it is not referred to in the NBh (see below); (3) *matsara* (“selfishness, jealousy”) and *lobha* (“greed”), belonging to the *rāgapakṣa* (“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 rāśayaḥ*) 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 (*trairāśya*), cf. E_D 220,6–8 on NS 4.1.3: *teṣāṃ doṣāṇāṃ trayo rāśayas trayāḥ pakṣāḥ*. *tatra rāgapakṣaḥ — kāmo matsaraḥ sprhā tṛṣṇā lobha iti*. *dveṣapakṣaḥ — krodha īrṣyā asūyā droho ’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 NSV(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.

causal aspect of the actualization and the “manifestation” of *doṣa*-s; it should probably be regarded as (a secondary) clarification; however, the possibility of an eyeskip over *prādur*- may not be ruled out.

The reading *rāgadveṣādhikaraṇāḥ* of MSS_A is supported not only by the Jaisalmer ms., but also by T. As a secondary testimony for it, the *pratīka* and following gloss in Abhayatilaka’s NA should be noted: *rāgadveṣādhikaraṇā iti na tadāśrayatvaṃ tadadhikaraṇatvaṃ iha vivakṣitam, api tu tadabhinnatvaṃ*. “[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.”¹⁰¹ Abhayatilaka’s gloss provides somewhat convincing evidence for accepting the reading of MSS_A, T and the Jaisalmer ms.; moreover, the optical confusion of *śca* with *cca* (especially in Devanāgarī and Śāradā scripts) 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 pre-

¹⁰¹Cf. NA 40,23–24. In his commentary on 1.1.2 (cf. E_D 7,1–2), Vātsyāyana singles out twofold *doṣa*-s, namely, attachment (*rāga*) and aversion (*dveṣa*) that are a fixed pair causally preceded by *mithyājñāna*; cf. E_D 7,1: *etasmān mithyājñānād ... rāgaḥ ... ca dveṣaḥ* (ellipsis by me). On the other hand, in Vātsyāyana’s commentary on 4.1.3 false knowledge (*mithyājñāna*) is regarded as a type of *moha*, namely, the third “aggregate” that is evenly correlated with attachment and aversion (cf. also footnote 100 above). However, he states that attachment and aversion have delusion as their source (*yonī*) (cf. E_D 221,11), which is associated with his soteriological thought in 1.1.2: *tāv imau mohayonī rāgadveṣāv iti*. Furthermore, both items as a fixed pair are mentioned in his commentary on 1.1.18 where *doṣa* is defined (cf. E_D 20,3–4): *jñātāraṇaṃ hi rāgādayaḥ pravartayanti puṇye pāpe vā. yatra mithyājñānaṃ tatra rāgadveṣāv iti*. (“Indeed, attachment and the others make the agent of knowledge become active towards good or bad [deeds] (cf. E_D 7,2–6; 19,13–14). Where there is false knowledge, there is attachment and aversion.”) Here Thakur suggests the emendation of *rāgadveṣamohā iti* instead of the reading *rāgadveṣāv iti* (cf. E_D 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. *adhikaraṇa*) for their own concrete varieties and for the concrete varieties of delusion.

sented 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

0.4.2 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 testimonia 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.

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 ’yaṃ prāṇabhṛnmātra-sya vyavahārah, pramāṇenārtham upalabhamānas tam artham īpsan* (or *abhīpsan* J_D) *vā jihāsan vā samīhamānas tam artham āpnoti vā jahāti vā*.¹⁰³ This text as an additional passage is placed between *duḥkhaḥetuś ca* and *so ’yaṃ*

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.

¹⁰³Cf. E_D 1, fn. 3 and E_M 1, fn. 3.

pramāṇārthaḥ.¹⁰⁴ T (f. 1r 3–4) has similar additional text at the same place: *so yam* prāṇabhṛnmātrasya vyavahāraḥ pramāṇe+ārttham upalabhyamānam* samarttham īpsan* jihāsan* vā samīhamānas tam arttham āpnoti jahāti veti*. This passage concerning the “everyday practice of all [creatures] who breathe” (*prāṇabhṛnmātrasya vyavahāraḥ*) is located in Vātsyāyana’s own exposition of the very first statement (*ādivākya*) of his work.¹⁰⁵ It may be noted that Uddyotakara also briefly refers to the “everyday activity” (*lokavṛtta*) in connection with the same first statement.¹⁰⁶ Uddyotakara’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 homœoarchy, namely the similarity of the beginning part *so ’yam prā/pra-* cannot be ruled out.¹⁰⁷ 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 *ayam* in *so ’yam prāṇabhṛnmātrasya 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.¹⁰⁸ The passage in question should rather be regarded as an insertion of a marginal or interlinear gloss.

2. As compared to E_D 1,14 on 1.1.1,¹⁰⁹ *sa yenārtham pramiṇoti vijānāti ... yo ’rthaḥ pramīyate jñāyate* (ellipsis by me), other printed editions such as E_{PH}, 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 yenārtham* pramiṇoti vijānāti ... yo rthaḥ pramīyate vijñāyate* (ellipsis by me). The reading of T and the Jaisalmer ms. suggests the synonymy between *pra-mā* and *vi-jñā*.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁴Cf. E_D 1,10 = E_M 1,6.

¹⁰⁵On the designation “*ādivākya*,” cf. NVTṬ 3,16, etc.

¹⁰⁶Cf. NV 3,16–17: *lokavṛttānvādo vā. sarvaḥ pramātā pramāṇenārtham avadhārya pravartamānaḥ phalam upalabhata iti lokavṛttaṁ tadvākyenānūdyata 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 Uddyotakara as probably “recording interpretations of other commentators on the *Bhāṣya*.”

¹⁰⁷Cf. E_D 1,10–11: *so ’yam pramāṇārtho ’parisaṃkhyeyaḥ*.

¹⁰⁸Cf. E_D 1,10 = E_M 1,5–6: *arthas tu sukhaṁ sukhahetuś ca duḥkhaṁ duḥkhaḥetuś ca*.

¹⁰⁹Cf. also E_M 1,10–11.

¹¹⁰On *mā* and *pramiṇoti*, cf. Preisendanz 2000: 225–226, fn. 22. Cf. further Werba (1997:

This paraphrase of *pra-mā* with *vi-jñā* and the idea of their equivalence are also reflected in Vātsyāyana's gloss which states that *pramiti* ("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 pañcāvayavāḥ pratijñādayaḥ* ("To this [collection of statements (*śabdasaṃūha*)] pertain the five members, [i.e.,] the thesis and so forth."), T (f. 2v 2) reads: *pañca bhāgāḥ pratijñādayo*. The reading *pañca bhāgāḥ* instead of *pañcāvayavāḥ* agrees with J_M and J_D. Cf. also NV 15,6 = E_M 17,2–3: *tasya* (scil. *vākyasya*) *bhāgā ekadeśā iti*. Uddyotakara's paraphrase indicates that he commented upon the expression *bhāgāḥ*.
4. As mentioned before (cf. no. 4 on page 24 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 *parīkṣitā* instead of *prakīrtitā*. 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 *parīkṣitā* "[w]ith 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 *prakīrtitā*, instead of *parīkṣitā*.¹¹³ If this reading is original in the NTĀ, 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 *prakīrtitā* instead of *parīkṣitā* by his time, namely by the 15th century.¹¹⁴

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

310–311, no. 331): *pra-mā* 'ermessen/kennen'.

¹¹¹Cf. E_D 1,15 and E_M 1,11: *yat tadarthavijñānaṃ sā pramitir iti. tad* after *yat* and the final *iti* find no support in the mss. available to us; the former does not seem to be necessary, whereas the latter is problematic. (I do not go into this problem here.)

¹¹²For her discussion and other relevant parallels, cf. Preisendanz 2000: 227, fn. 29.

¹¹³Cf. NTĀ 32,10–11.

¹¹⁴On the date of Vācaspati Miśra II, cf. Preisendanz (1994: 1–2): "ca. 1420–1490." Cf. also Jha's Preface to the NTĀ: (6)–(7).

“attainment of the highest good”: *heyam tasya nirvartakam hānam ātyantikaṃ tasyopāyo ’dhigantavya ity etāni khalu*¹¹⁵ *catvāry arthapadāni samyag buddhvā niḥśreyasam adhigacchati* (“One attains the highest good, after having rightly comprehended these four *arthapada*-s which one should know, namely, *heyam* ...”).¹¹⁶ What is problematic here is the enumeration before *iti*. MSS_A and MSS_B 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*, *hānam*, *upāyaḥ* and *adhigantavyaḥ* (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 Uddyotakara as to the interpretation of the four relevant matters, Wezler (1984) refers to Vātsyāyana’s equation of the *tattvajñānam* with *tasyādhigama-upāyaḥ* (“a means to the attain-

¹¹⁵MSS_B omit *khalu*, as do the printed editions such as E_G, E_{PH}, E_J and E_T.

¹¹⁶Cf. E_D 2,15–16 = E_M 2,10–12. On the English equivalent for *arthapada*, cf. Wezler (1984: 325): ‘right statements’ with reference to *atthapada* in Pāli, meaning “‘a right or profitable word (often referring to the holy texts)’, i.e. a word that is to the advantage of another person.” Halbfass (1991: 247), however, takes the expression to refer to a “set of important topics or significant terms”; cf. also Chattopadhyaya/Gangopadhyaya (1967: 8): “human concerns” and “lit. ‘the basis of the human end’”; Halbfass (1990: 276): “relevant matters”; Halbfass (1991: 260, fn. 24): “fundamental topics”; Perry (1995: 186): “cardinal entities.” On the other hand, Vācaspati paraphrases *arthapadāni* as *puruṣārthasthānāni* (“bases of human purpose”), and there “word” (*pada*) is paraphrased as “basis” (*sthāna*). Cf. NVTṬ 33,2 = E_M 47,9; cf. also Hattori 1979: 336.

¹¹⁷Cf. also Chattopadhyaya/Gangopadhyaya (1967: 8).

¹¹⁸Cf. NV 11,10–11 = E_M 14,1–2: *heyahānopāyādhigantavyabhedāc catvāry arthapadāni samyag buddhvā niḥśreyasam adhigacchati*. On the masculine of this gerundive, cf. Wezler 1984: 326, fn. 105a.

¹¹⁹Cf. Perry (1995: 187, fn. 7): “Pakṣilasvāmin seems here ... to mention a fifth *arthapada*, ‘that which produces it’ ..., unless this is to be taken parenthetically” (ellipsis by me).

¹²⁰Cf. NV 11,11–12 = E_M 14,2–3: *heyam iti. heyam duḥkham. tasya nirvartakam avidyātrṣṇe dharmādharmāv iti*.

ment 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 *tattvajñāna* with *hāna* and of *upāya* with *śāstra*.¹²² As a structural understanding of the *iti*-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.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 *lyuṭ*-suffix (-*ana*) added to the verb *hā*,¹²⁴ namely the *nomen actionis* (*bhāva*) and the *nomen instrumenti* (*karaṇa*) (cf. *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 3.3.115 and 3.3.117). In his NVTP, in fact, Udayana presents the twofold interpretation of *hāna*, namely, the equation of *hāna* with *tattvajñāna*, on one hand, and with *apavarga*, on the other hand, obviously in order to reconcile the interpretational discrepancy.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 NBhūṣ.¹²⁶ It should be noted, furthermore, that the word is omitted in J_D and J_M. 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 NBhūṣ.¹²⁷

¹²¹E_D 259,1: *apavargo 'dhigantavyatayā, tasyādhigamopāyas tattvajñānam*. Cf. Wezler 1984: 325, fn. 105.

¹²²NV 11,11–13: *heyam duḥkham, tasya nirvartakam avidyātrṣṇe dharmādharmāv iti, hānaṃ tattvajñānam, upāyaḥ śāstram, adhigantavyo mokṣaḥ*. Wezler (1984) assumes that Uddyotakara was not satisfied with the strikingly similar fourfold classification of soteriologically significant topics (*caturvyūhatva*) as presented in Yoga texts. Cf. Wezler 1984: 325–326. Cf. also Oberhammer 1964: 312–315.

¹²³The 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.

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

¹²⁵NVTP 72,16–17: *karaṇavyutpattim āśrityānena tattvajñānaṃ vivakṣitam. bhāvavyutpattiyā tv ātyantikapadasamabhivyāhārād apavarga ity arthaḥ*. Cf. ŚṬ 39,23–31. Cf. also Perry 1995: 41 and 42, fn. 44.

¹²⁶Cf. NBhūṣ 436,15–16: *tac (scil. prameyam) caturvidhaṃ heyam tasya nirvartakam hānam ātyantikam tasyopāya iti*. For an English translation of the relevant passage, cf. Wezler 1984: 327. Wezler (1984) seems to disregard the absence of the word *adhigantavyaḥ* in the NBhūṣ.

¹²⁷Cf. footnote 126 above.

Further extremely interesting evidence for the omission of *adhigantavyaḥ* is provided by Śrīkaṇṭha, a commentator chronologically located between Udayana and Abhayatilaka¹²⁸; his comments actually illustrate the textual criticism as developed in the medieval Nyāya tradition.

une. atra ca heyam ityādi. heyam duḥkhaṃ tasya nirvartakam avidyā-trṣṇe ityādi vārttikam keṣu cit pustakeṣu na drśyate. tato na bhavaty eveti^a nāśanikanūyam, tīkākr̥tā heyam itīty ullekkena grhṇatā siddhavad upasthāpitatvāt. ayathābhāṣyetyādi. heyam ityādaḥ bhāṣye 'dhiganta-vyavārtāpi na śrūyate. vārttike tv adhigantavyo mokṣa ity uktam. ato 'yathābhāṣyatā vārttikasya.^b iyaṃ ca kutaḥ. ucyate. arthānuvādatvāt. bhāṣyaparamārtha evāyaṃ vārttikakr̥tā 'nūditāḥ, ananubhāṣyākṣaravyākhyānaṃ kṛtam ity arthaḥ.¹²⁹

(^a *eveti* LDI(1); *eva* ŚT. ^b *'yathābhāṣyatā vārttikasya* LDI(1); *'yathābhāṣyavārttikasya* ŚT.)

In Udayana[’s NVTP (72,8–9) it is said,] “and here what is to be abandoned” 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 (*pustakeṣu*). Therefore [the passage] is definitely not present [in the NV]. [Reply:] [This] should not be suspected, because [the passage in the NV] is presented¹³⁰ as established by the author of the *Tīkā*, inasmuch as he employs the expression “what is to be abandoned” as an allusion [to this passage in his NVTP (32,21)].

[In his NVTP (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

¹²⁸Cf. Thakur’s Introduction to the ŚT (cf. xiii): “[H]e flourished in western India between Udayanācārya (c. 1070–80 A.D.) and Abhayatilaka Upādhyāya (1263 A.D.).”

¹²⁹Cf. ŚT 39,9–12 = LDI(1) f. 23r 3–5.

¹³⁰In place of Śrīkaṇṭha’s *upasthāpitatvāt*, the NVTP has *utthāpitatvāt*. Cf. footnote 131 below.

the NBh]. This very ultimate meaning of the *Bhāṣya* 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 Uddyotakara’s non-conformity 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 absent 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” (*lekhakadoṣa*) 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 work.¹³¹ Śrīkaṇṭha 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. (*keṣu pustakeṣu*, 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 Śrīkaṇṭha is accepted, it adduces 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” (*ayathābhāṣyatā*), Udayana does not provide any concrete explanation apart from the vague reference to “restatement of the meaning [intended in the NBh].”¹³² It remains unclear how unconformable the NV is to the NBh and which precise phrase(s)

¹³¹ NVTP 72,9–10 = E_M 125,25–126,1 = NVTP(BI) 238,7–8 = LDI(2) f. 26v 6–7: *atra ca heyam ityādy*^a *anuvādavārttikaṃ nāsty eveti nāśaṅkanīyam*,^b *ṭīkāktā siddhavad utthāpitavāt, kvacil lipyabhāvasya lekhakadoṣeṇāpy upapatteḥ*. (^a *heyam ityādy* LDI(2); *heyatvādy* NVTP, E_M; *heyetyādy* NVTP(BI). ^b *eveti nāśaṅkanīyam* LDI(2); *evety anāśaṅkanīyam* NVTP, E_M, 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 E_M) 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 bhāṣyatātparyārthanuvādatvāt* with no variants recorded (cf. NVTP 72,10 = E_M 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 to Prof. Preisendanz. Against the text adopted in the printed editions and recorded in the Adyar Library ms., I read *ayathābhāṣyatā tv arthānūvādatvāt*, based upon the reading of LDI(2) (f. 26v 7), which is supported by some secondary testimonia: ŚT 39,11–12: *ayathābhāṣyetyādi*; NA 31,23: *ayathābhāṣyatā tv ityādi*. As an indirect reference to the phrase in Vardhamāna’s commentary on the NVTP, cf.

are concerned. Śrīkaṇṭha 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" (*adhigantavyaḥ*). Śrīkaṇṭha thus clearly presupposes that the word *adhigantavyaḥ* is not present in the NBh, but only occurs in the NV.¹³³ This statement by Śrīkaṇṭha 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 Śrīkaṇṭha'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 Śrīkaṇṭha, 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 *adhigantavyaḥ* would have crept into the text of the NBh some time after Udayana, or even Śrīkaṇṭha, most probably under the influence of Uddyotakara's philosophically motivated re-interpretation and modification of the words of his predecessor, Vātsyāyana.

0.5 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

NNP 238,7–8: *atra bhāṣyānuvādatāyām ayathābhāṣyatā na yujyate iti vārttikam evaitan nāstīty āśaṅkyāha — atra ceti*. Vardhamāna's (fictive) opponent appears to argue in favour 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. *bhāṣyānuvādatā*). It could also imply that there was a (historically preceding?) editorial movement forward, or a controversy relating to, intentionally adapting the text of the NV to that of the NBh lacking *adhigantavyaḥ*, namely, removing the relevant phrases, inclusive of *adhigantavyaḥ*, 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. *arthānuvādatva*), 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.

¹³³This is corroborated by Abhayatilaka. Cf. NA 31,23–25.

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. Furthermore, the close affinity to the Kerala tradition with 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 mss. transmission of the NBh which is closer to the original text than the other available mss. Among the latter, MSS_A stand out through their frequent agreement with the evidence of the Trivandrum and Jaisalmer mss., and thus, compared with MSS_B (and all printed editions except Thakur's), also preserve more original readings of the text. Because of the reasons stated above (cf. page 4), 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 0.3.2 and 0.4.2, 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 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 *pratīka*-s in the NV.

Furthermore, as shown in Sections 0.3.1 and 0.3.2, the divergency of the text of the NS in the Kerala tradition from the one represented by Vācaspati 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.¹³⁴ Uddyotakara and Vācaspati 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

¹³⁴In this connection, it has to be noted that Vācaspati makes suggestive mention of a variant reading of the text of the NBh. In the introductory part of his commentary on NS 1.1.23, he adduces the variant *sthānavata eva tarhi* as a *kvacit pāṭhaḥ* different from the *sthānavata etarhi* quoted by him as a *pratīka*. Cf. NVT 204,8–9 = E_M 475,14–15: *saṃśayalakṣaṇāvatāraṇaparaṃ bhāṣyaṃ sthānavata etarhīti. ... kvacit pāṭhaḥ sthānavata eva tarhīti.*

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 NVTṬ referring to the NBh, as shown in Section 0.4.2, 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.

0.6 Bibliography

Abbreviations for the Manuscripts Consulted

- ASC(1): Asiatic Society, Kolkata, “*nyāyasūtra*,” Ms. No. I.M. 613.
- BHU(1): Benares Hindu University, “*Nyāyamañjarī*,” Ms. No. C1015.
- GOML(1): Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Chennai, “*Nyāyabhāṣyam*,” Ms. No. R. 3725.
- GOML(2): Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Chennai, “*Nyāyasūtratātparyadīpikā*,” Ms. No. R. 3405.
- HJJM(1): Śrīhemacandrācārya Jaina Jñāna Maṇḍira, Patan/Pāṭaṇa, “*Nyāya Bhūṣaṇa Sāra Saṃgraha Vārttika*,” Ms. No. 10717.
- LDI(1): Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Institute, Ahmedabad, “*Śrīkaṇṭhīya Tīppaṇa*,” Photocopy Ms., Register No. 71182.
- LDI(2): Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Institute, Ahmedabad, “*Tātparyapariśuddhivṛtti*,” Photocopy Ms., Register No. 71181.
- MORI(1): Oriental Research Institute, Mysore, “*Nyāyamañjarī*,” Ms. No. C1374.
- ORIML(1): Oriental Research Institute & Manuscripts Library, University of Kerala, “*Nyāyasūtrāṇi*,” Ms. No. 974E.
- ORIML(2): Oriental Research Institute & Manuscripts Library, University of Kerala, “*Nyāyasūtram*,” Ms. No. L.1251P.
- ORIML(3): Oriental Research Institute & Manuscripts Library, University of Kerala, “*Nyāyasūtram*,” Ms. No. 22615A.
- ORIML(4): Oriental Research Institute & Manuscripts Library, University of Kerala, “*Nyāyasūtram Savivaranam*,” Ms. No. 19866.
- ORIML(5): Oriental Research Institute & Manuscripts Library, University of Kerala, “*Nyāyasūtratātparyadīpikā*,” Ms. No. 14670.

Primary Literature

ASTV: *Nyāyaviśārada-nyāyācārya-mahopādhyāya Śrīyaśovijayagaṇivaraviracitam Aṣṭasahasrītātparyavivaraṇam*. Ed. Vairāgyarativijaya. Śrīvijayamahodayasūrigranthamālā 15. Pune 2004.

E_G: *The Nyāyasūtras with Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya and Extracts from the Nyāyavārttika and the Tātparyatīkā*. Ed. Gangadhara Sastri Tailanga. 1st ed. 1896. Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series 12. Delhi 1984.

E_J: *Śrīgautamamahāmuniṣaṅgahāṣya Nyāyasūtram. (Nyāyasūtra of Gautama: A System of Indian Logic)*. Ed. Ganganatha Jha. Poona Oriental Series 58. Poona 1939.

E_T: *Nyāyadarśanam with Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya, Uddyotakara's Vārttika, Vācaspati Miśra's Tātparyatīkā & Viśvanātha's Vṛtti*. Eds. Taranatha Nyaya-Tarkatirtha and Amarendramohan Tarkatirtha. Calcutta Sanskrit Series 18–19. 2 Vols. 1st ed. Calcutta 1936–1944. Reprint, Kyoto 1982. New Delhi 1985.

E_D: *Gautamīyanyāyadarśa with Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana*. Ed. Anantalal Thakur. Nyāya-caturgranthikā Vol. 1. New Delhi 1997.

E_{PH}: *Nyāyadarśana (Gautamasūtra). Vātsyāyana Bhāṣya*. Ed. Phanibhusana Tarkavagisha. Vol. 1. 1st ed. 1917. 2nd ed. Calcutta 1989.

E_M: *Nyāyadarśana of Gautama, with the Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana, the Vārttika of Uddyotakara, the Tātparyatīkā of Vācaspati & the Pārisuddhi of Udayana*. Ed. Anantalal Thakur. Mithila Institute Series, Ancient Text 20. Vaisali, Muzaffarpur 1967.

GSP: *Keśvamiśrapraṇītaḥ Gautamīyasūtraprakāśaḥ*. Ed. Kishor Nath Jha. Allahabad 1978.

J_D: Variant readings recorded in E_D.

J_M: Variant readings recorded in E_M.

TAV: *Tattvārtha-Vārttika [Rājavārtika] of Śrī Akalanīkadeva*. Ed. Mahendra Kumar Jain. Part 1. 6th ed. New Delhi 2001.

NA: *Nyāyālaṅkāra (Pañcaprasthānanyāyamahātarkaviśamapadavyākhyā), A Commentary on the five classical texts of the Nyāya philosophy of Abhayatilaka Upādhyāya*. Eds. Anantalal Thakur and J. S. Jetly. Baroda 1981.

NTĀ: *Nyāyatattvāloka. A Commentary on the Nyāyasūtras of Gautama by Vācaspati Miśra (Junior)*. Ed. Kishor Nath Jha. Allahabad 1992.

NTD: *Bhaṭṭavāgīśvarapraṇīta Nyāyatātparyadīpikā*. Ed. Kishor Nath Jha. Allahabad 1979.

NNP: *Nyāyanibandhaprakāśa* by Vardhamāna. In: NVTP(BI).

NP: *Udayana's Nyāyapārisiṣṭa with Pañcikā of Vāmeśvaradhvaṇa*. Ed. S. N. Srirama Desikan. Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha Series 25. Madras 1976.

NBh(KSS): *Nyāyadarśanam. Śrīgautamamuniṣaṅgahāṣya. Śrīvātsyāyanamuniṣaṅgahāṣyasahitam*. Ed. Lakṣmana Sastri Jatapathin. Kashi Sanskrit Series 43. Benares 1920.

NBh(BBS): *Mahāmuni Vātsyāyan's Nyāya-Bhāṣya on Gautama-Nyāya-Sūtras with Prasannapadā Commentary of Pt. Sudarśanācārya, Śāstrī*. Ed. Dwārikādās Śāstrī. 1st ed., by Sudarsanacharya Sastri Punjabi. Bombay 1922. Reprint, Sudhi Series 10, 1986. Unique ed., Bauddha Bharati Series 38, Varanasi 1998.

NBhūṣ: *Śrīmadācāryabhāsarvajñapraṇītasya Nyāyasārasya svopajñam vyākhyānam Nyāyabhūṣaṇam*. Ed. Svāmī Yogīndrānanda. Varanasi 1968.

- NM(M): *Nyāyamañjarī of Jayantabhaṭṭa with Ṭippaṇi — Nyāyasaurabha by the Editor.* Ed. K. S. Varadacharya. Oriental Research Institute Series 116 and 139. 2 vols. Mysore 1969, 1983.
- NM(V): *The Nyāyamañjarī of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa.* Ed. MM. Gangadhara Sastri Tailanga. Vizianagram Sanskrit Series 8/1. Benares 1895.
- NV: *Nyāyabhāṣyavārttika of Bhāradvāja Uddyotakara.* Ed. Anantalal Thakur. Nyāyacaturgranthikā Vol. 2. New Delhi 1997.
- NVTṬ: *Nyāyavārttikatātparyatīkā of Vācaspatimiśra.* Ed. Anantalal Thakur. Nyāyacaturgranthikā Vol. 3. New Delhi 1996.
- NVTP: *Nyāyavārttikatātparyapariśuddhi of Udayanācārya.* Ed. Anantalal Thakur. Nyāyacaturgranthikā Vol. 4. New Delhi 1996.
- NVTP(BI): *Nyāya-Vārttika-Tātparya-Parīśuddhi by Udayanācārya, With a gloss called Nyāya-Nibandha-Prakāśa by Varddhamaṇopādhyāya.* Eds. Vindhyeśvarī Prasād Dvivedin and Lakshmana Sāstri Drāviḍa. Bibliotheca Indica Series 205. Calcutta 1911f.
- NVP: *Nyāyabhāṣyavārttikatīkāvivaraṇapañjikā [II-V] of Aniruddhācārya.* Ed. Anantalal Thakur. Mithila Institute Series, Ancient Text 19. Darbhanga 1969.
- NSV(G): *Nyāyasūtravivaraṇam of Gambhīravaṃśaja.* Ed. Anandateertha V. Nagasampige. Mysore 1992.
- PVBh: *Pramāṇavārtikabhāṣyam or Vārtikālaṅkāraḥ of Prajñākaragupta (Being a Commentary on Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārtikam).* Ed. Rahula Sankrityayana. Patna 1953.
- PST: *Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā* by Jinendrabuddhi. On Ms.(B), cf. Steinkellner/Krasser/-Lasic 2005.
- PSV: *Pramāṇasamuccayavṛtti* by Dignāga.
- PSV(K): Tibetan Translation of the PSV. Trans. Kanakavarman (gSer gyi go cha) and Dad pa's śes rab. Peking ed., Vol. 130. No. 5702, ce 93b4–177a7.
- PSV(V): Tibetan Translation of the PSV. Trans. Vasudhārarakṣita and Seṅ rgyal. Peking ed., Vol. 130. No. 5701, ce 13a6–93b4.
- VS(C): *Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda with the Commentary of Candrānanda.* Ed. Muni Śrī Jambuvijayaḥ. G.O.S. 136. Baroda 1982.
- ŚT: *Nyāyadarśane Śrīkaṇṭhaṭippaṇakam. [A Commentary on the Major Nyāya-texts] by Śrīkaṇṭhācārya.* Ed. Anantalal Thakur. Calcutta 1986.
- SDS: *Sarva-Darśana-Saṃgraha of Sāyaṇa-Mādhava.* Ed. Vasudev Sastri Abhyankar. Government Oriental Series Class A, No. 1. 3rd. ed. Poona 1978.
- SDS(BI): *Sarvadarśana Saṅgraha; or an Epitome of the Different Systems of Indian Philosophy. By Mādhavācārya.* Ed. Īśwarachandra Vidyāsāgara. Bibliotheca Indica Nos. 63 and 142. 1st ed., 1853–58. Reprint, Calcutta 1986.

Secondary Literature

- Abhyankar, Kashinath Vasudev. 1986. *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar.* Baroda.

Akamatsu, Akihiko. 1989. “Uddiyōtakara no Shisō — NV Kenkyū (1) — *tattvajñānān niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ*” (= A Study of the *Nyāyavārttika* (1) — *tattvajñānān niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ*), *Studies in the History of Indian Thought* (= Indo-Shisōshi Kenkyū) 6: 67–76. (Japanese)

Akamatsu, Akihiko. 2000. “Uddiyōtakara no Shisō — NV Kenkyū (3) — NS 1.1.2 no Gedatsu-ron wo megutte —” (= The Thought of Uddiyotakara — Study on the NV (3) — with a reference to the theory of salvation in NS1.1.2). In: Akamatsu Akihiko (ed.). *Indo no Bunka to Ronri: Tosaki Hiromasa Hakase Koki Kinen Ronbunshū* (= Indian Culture and Logic. A Volume in Commemoration of Dr. Hiromasa Tosaki on his Seventieth Birthday). Fukuoka. 667–683. (Japanese)

Apte, Vaman Shivaram (ed.). 1957. *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Revised and enlarged by P. K. Gode and C. G. Karve. Poona. Reprint, Kyoto 1986.

Biardeau, Madeleine. 1964. *Théorie de la connaissance et philosophie de la parole dans le brahmanisme classique*. Le Monde d’outre-mer passé et présent, première série: Études XXIII. Paris.

Burnell, Arthur Coke. 1878. *Elements of South-Indian Palaeography, from the Fourth to the Seventeenth Century A.D., being an Introduction to the Study of South-Indian Inscriptions and Mss.* Second enlarged and improved edition. London.

Chattopadhyaya, Debiprasad and Mrinalkanti Gangopadhyaya (trans.). 1967. *Nyāya Philosophy. Literal Translation of Gautama’s Nyāya-sūtra & Vātsyāyana’s Bhāṣya, along with a free and abridged translation of the Elucidation by Mahāmahopādhyāya Phaṇibhūṣaṇa Tarkavāgīśa. Part I: First Adhyāya*. Indian Studies Past & Present. Calcutta.

Franco, Eli. 2002. “A Mīmāṃsaka among the Buddhists. Three fragments on the relationship between word and object.” In: J. Braarvig et al. (eds.). *Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*. Vol. 2. Oslo. 269–285.

Franco, Eli and Karin Preisendanz. 1995. “Bhavadāsa’s Interpretation of *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* 1.1.4 and the Date of the *Nyāyabhāṣya*,” *Berliner Indologische Studien* 8: 81–86.

Grünendahl, Reinhold. 2001. *South Indian Scripts in Sanskrit Manuscripts and Prints. Grantha Tamil — Malayalam — Telugu — Kannada — Nandinagari*. Wiesbaden.

Halbfass, Wilhelm. 1990. *India and Europe: An Essay in Philosophical Understanding*. Albany 1988. Indian ed., Delhi.

Halbfass, Wilhelm. 1991. *Tradition and Reflection. Explorations in Indian Thought*. Albany.

Hattori, Masaaki. 1979. “Ronshō-gaku Nyūmon” (=Introduction to the Dialectic). In: Gadjin Nagao, et al (eds.). *Baramon Kyōten, Genshi Butten* (= Brahmanical Scriptures and Early Buddhist Literature). Originally ed. in 1969. 1st ed., Tokyo. 4th ed., Tokyo 1987. 331–397. (Japanese)

Ikari, Yasuke. 1995. “Vādhūla Śrautasūtra 1.1–1.4 [Agnyādheya, Punarādheya] — A New Critical Edition of the Vādhūla Śrautasūtra, I —,” *Zinbun* 30: 1–127.

Ikari, Yasuke. 1996. “Towards a ‘Critical’ Edition of the Vādhūla Śrautasūtra — A Report on the New Manuscripts —,” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik, Festschrift für Paul Thieme* 20: 145–168.

- Isaacson, Harunaga. 1995. *Materials for the study of the Vaiśeṣika system*. Dissertation (Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden). Unpublished.
- Jambuvijayaji, Muni Shree (ed.). 2000. *A Catalogue of Manuscripts in Jaisalmer Jain Bhandaras*. Delhi.
- Jha, Ganganatha (trans.). 1915. *The Nyāya-Sūtras of Gauṇama with the Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana and the Vārtika of Uddyotakara*. Vol. 1. 1st ed. Indian Thought Series 7. Allahabad. Reprint, Kyoto 1983. Reprint, Delhi 1984, 1999.
- Junankar, N. S. 1978. *Gautama: The Nyāya Philosophy*. Delhi.
- Kane, P. V. 1962. *History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient Mediæval Religious and Civil Law in India)*. Vol. V, Part I. Government Oriental Series, Class B, No. 6. Poona.
- Kitagawa, Hidenori. 1965. *Indo Kōten Ronrigaku no Kenkyū. — Jinna (Dignāga) no Taikei* — (= A Study of Indian Classical Logic — Dignāga's System —). Tokyo. (Japanese)
- Kunjunni Raja, K. 1978. *New Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors*. Vol. 10. Madras.
- Kuppuswami Sastri. 1927. *A Triennial Catalogue of Manuscripts, collected during the Triennium 1919–20 to 1921–22 for the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras*. Vol. IV, Part I, Sanskrit A. Madras.
- Maas, Philipp André. 2004. *Samādhipāda. Das erste Kapitel des Pātañjalayogaśāstra zum ersten Mal kritisch ediert*. Dissertation (Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Bonn). To be published in 2006 (cf. footnote 13).
- Nagasaki, Hojun. 1968. “Pramāṇamīmāṃsā ni araware taru Shori-Gakuha no Bunken” (=A Study of the Pramāṇamīmāṃsā — Quotations from Nyāya Works —), *The Otani Gakuho, The Journal of Buddhist Studies and Humanities* 48.1 (=177): 61–74. (Japanese)
- Oberhammer, Gerhard. 1964. “Pakṣilasvāmin's Introduction to his Nyāyabhāṣyam,” *Asian Studies* 2(3). University of the Philippines, Institute of Asian Studies: 302–332.
- Oberhammer, Gerhard. 1966. “Zur Deutung von Nyāyasūtram I,1,5,” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 10: 66–72.
- Oberhammer, Gerhard, Ernst Prets and Joachim Prandstetter. 1991. *Terminologie der frühen philosophischen Scholastik in Indien. Ein Begriffswörterbuch zur altindischen Dialektik, Erkenntnislehre und Methodologie*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Denkschriften, 223. Band. Wien.
- Okazaki, Yasuhiro. 2005. *Uddoyōtakara no Ronri-gaku. — Bukkyō-ronri-gaku tono Soukoku to sono Toutatsu-ten* — (= The Logic of Uddyotakara — The Conflict with Buddhist logic and his Achievement —). Kyoto. (Japanese)
- Perry, Bruce Millard. 1995. *An Introduction to the Nyāyacaturgranthikā: With English Translations*. Dissertation (University of Pennsylvania). UMI No. 9532256.
- Preisendanz, Karin. 1994. *Studien zu Nyāyasūtra III.1 mit dem Nyāyatattvāloka Vācaspati Miśras II*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 46,1. Stuttgart.
- Preisendanz, Karin. 2000. “Debate and Independent Reasoning vs. Tradition: On

the Precarious Position of Early Nyāya.” In: Ryutaro Tsuchida and Albrecht Wezler (eds.). *Harānandalaharī. Volume in Honour of Professor Minoru Hara on his Seventieth Birthday*. Reinbek.

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.

Punyavijayaji, Muni Shree (ed.). 1972. *New Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts. Jaisalmer Collection*. L. D. Series 36. Ahmedabad.

Randle, H. N. 1930. *Indian Logic in the Early Schools. A study of the Nyāyadarśana in its relation to the early logic of other schools*. Reprint, New Delhi 1976.

Renou, Louis. 1957. *Terminologie grammaticale du Sanskrit*. Paris.

Ruben, Walter. 1928. *Die Nyāyasūtra's, Text, Übersetzung, Erläuterung und Glossar*. Leipzig.

Schuster, Nancy. 1972. “Inference in the Vaiśeṣikasūtras,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 1: 341–395.

Sinha, Jadunath. 1961. *Indian Psychology. Emotion and Will*. Vol. 2. Calcutta. Reprint, Delhi 1986, 1996.

Slaje, Walter. 1986. “Niḥśreyasam im alten Nyāya,” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 30: 163–178.

Sowani, V. S. 1920. “The history and significance of upama,” *Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute* 1: 87–98.

Steinkellner, Ernst, Helmut Krasser and Horst Lasic. 2005. *Jinendrabuddhi's Viśālāmalavati Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā. Chapter 1*. 2 vols. Beijing–Vienna.

Strauss, Otto. 1930. “Die Anordnung der Reihe in Nyāyasūtra 1, 1, 2,” *Journal of the Taisho University* 6–7(2): 13–19. In: Friedrich Wilhelm (ed.). *Kleine Schriften*. Wiesbaden 1983. 304–310.

Thakur, Anantalal. 1968. “Textual Studies in the Nyāyavārtika,” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens, Festschrift für Erich Frauwallner* 12–13 (1968/1969): 379–387.

Werba, Chlodwig. H. 1997. *Verba IndoArica. Die primären und sekundären Wurzeln der Sanskrit-Sprache. Pars I: Radices Primariae*. Wien.

Wezler, Albrecht. 1969a. “Dignāga's Kritik an der Schlusslehre des Nyāya und die Deutung von *Nyāyasūtra* 1.1.5,” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Supplementa I.3: 836–842.

Wezler, Albrecht. 1969b. “Die ‘dreifache’ Schlussfolgerung im *Nyāyasūtra* 1.1.5,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 11: 190–211.

Wezler, Albrecht. 1984. “On the quadruple division of the Yogaśāstra, the caturvyūhatva of the Cikitsāśāstra and the <four noble truths> of the Buddha (Studies in the *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa* II),” *Indologica Taurinensia* 12: 289–337.

Winternitz, Moriz. 1928. “Zwei neue Arthaśāstra-Manuskripte,” *Zeitschrift für Indologie*

und Iranistik 6: 14–27.

Yamakami, Shodo. 2001. “Bhāsarvajña on the First Chapter of the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa*,”
Studies in the History of Indian Thought (= Indo-Shisōshi Kenkyū) 13: 5–21.