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Introduction

Dignāga’s last work, the Pramāṇasamuccaya, was composed shortly before 540 CE as a concise summary of his many epistemological, logical, dialectical, and polemical treatises, of which almost all are lost. It is composed in verses to which are added short explanations in prose (Vṛtti) that mainly serve to provide the polemical or argumentative context.¹ This work founded a fascinatingly rich and influential tradition of Buddhist epistemology and logic. The text has not yet been found in its original Sanskrit form. Hope, however, remains that it is still extant among the Sanskrit manuscripts in Tibet, the access to which slowly becoming more open.²

Because of its importance for the Indian history of ideas in general, as evident from the numerous references and citations in late classical Indian philosophical literature, scholars tried to fill this deplorable gap very early on, not only by collecting the available fragments of

¹ It is my opinion that this explanatory part in prose should not be considered an independent work, but this is not the place to present my reasons for this assumption in any detail. The traditional and the scholarly separation of the stanzas of the Pramāṇasamuccaya and its prose parts as a Vṛtti on these, however, is still useful for bibliographical reasons and references, and I therefore follow this usage, but think that this distinction should not be understood as hypostatizing two originally separate works.
² Cf. STEINKELLNER 2004. To my present knowledge the text has not yet been identified in any of the collections in the TAR. This may, however, be due to the fact that until now almost only the palm-leaf manuscripts have been subject to the attention of the curators of Tibet’s cultural relics. Paper manuscripts, even if containing Sanskrit texts, are not yet considered culturally as valuable as those on palm-leaves. They are, therefore, not only in the ambivalent position of being less protected, on the one hand, and being treated less greedily, on the other, but also give us a reason to hope that may contain long-lost texts. For example, from the catalogue of Prof. Luo Zhao Dignāga’s Nyāyamukha is known to exist in the Potala as part of a bundle of paper manuscripts which also contains other unique Sanskrit texts, but it was not photographed, evidently because of its assumed minor value in addition to the fact of being partly burnt. It thus does not seem to be contained in the China Tibetology Research Center’s collection of photocopies at this time. Since a fairly large amount of manuscripts produced in Nepal or Tibet have been written on paper, it will be necessary to make the authorities in charge of these documents in the TAR aware of the fact that not only palm-leaf manuscripts, but also paper manuscripts may contain valuable Sanskrit texts and should therefore also be protected.
this work, but also by reconstructing the text itself with the help of the fragments, the Tibetan
translations, and Jinendrabuddhi’s commentary, which until very recently was also only
available in its Tibetan translation. These activities began already with Satischandra
Vidyabhusana in his dissertation *History of the Mediæval School of Indian Logic* (Calcutta
1909, pp.82-89; cf. also *A History of Indian Logic*, Calcutta 1921, pp. 274-285), and
continued in the publication of first collections of fragments by H. N. Randle (RANDLE 1926)
and Rangaswamy Iyengar (IYENGAR 1927), which were followed by many others. 3

Three major efforts have been undertaken in the past to reconstruct, restore, or retranslate the
text,4 up to now largely only of its first chapter if we disregard individual passages: by H. R.
Rangaswamy Iyengar in 1930, by the Muni Jambūvijaya in 1961, 1966, and 1976, and by
Masaaki Hattori in 1968. Their works differ in method, style and extent, and clearly represent
three stages of progress. While the Sanskrit text in Iyengar’s pioneering attempt still consists
almost entirely of retranslations from the Tibetan translations, the discovery and publication
of new sources in the following decades, above all by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana, helped Hattori to
reconstruct and Jambūvijaya to both reconstruct and retranslate in a much more substantial
and reliable way.

The Jaina Muni Jambūvijaya’s edition of Candrānanda’s *Vaiśeṣikasūtravr̥tti* (1961) and his
reconstruction of Mallavādin’s *Dvadaśāraṃ Nayacakrapuṣṭa* with the edition of Sinhāsūri’s
commentary *Nyāyāgamāṇusārini* (1966, 1976) added new fragments and information to those
fragments already known. In the footnotes and in various appendices he added fragments,
reconstructions, retranslations of the Pramāṇasamuccaya stanzas and the Vṛtti, as well as
retranslations of Jinendrabuddhi’s commentary on these passages to the two editions. Prof.
Hattori collected all known primary material, thus building upon the materials published by
Jambūvijaya in 1961 and 1966, and also introduced numerous parallel passages, particularly
from the traditions of Dignāga’s opponents, in his substantial notes to the first complete
translation of the first chapter together with an edition of the two Tibetan translations. In

3 Cf. HATTORI 1968: 16 with note 82. For further literature containing fragments and other information on the
text up to 1993 cf. the entries 1.15 and 1.16 in STEINKELLNER/MUCH 1995 as well as its new on-line continuation
under the address http://www.istb.univie.ac.at/cgi-bin/suebs/suebs.cgi.

4 The terms used in this connection by scholars should be clearly distinguished. “Reconstruction” (or
“restoration, reconstitution”) is only possible if a large amount of original linguistic materials is available from
citations or commentaries. When offering a “reconstruction”, the original linguistic material should be clearly
distinguished from those parts of the text for which no original wording has been found so far. These parts may
either be filled in with a “retranslation” of the Tibetan translation into Sanskrit which is, if possible,
typographically differentiated, or by adding the Tibetan text as such, or even by adding a modern, e.g., English
addition, Prof. Hattori added six unnumbered pages of text written in his own hand (inserted between pp.238 and 239) as a sample of a reconstruction of the PS with the Vṛtti for the first twelve stanzas, i.e., the siddhānta. To produce this text he collected the attested Sanskrit words and passages, and added, for all parts not yet attested in the original Sanskrit, the corresponding Tibetan translations.

The present attempt represents yet a further stage in this process of regaining the Pramāṇasamuccaya insofar as it was possible to include new linguistic materials from Jinendrabuddhi’s commentary. The original Sanskrit text of this commentary, the Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā, is preserved in a single palm-leaf manuscript kept in the collection at Norbulingka, registered and first described by Prof. Luo Zhao in 1984, and which was subsequently photographed, presumably in 1987. Photocopies of this commentary are presently kept in the library of the China Tibetology Research Center (CTRC), Beijing. The codex itself may have been moved meanwhile to the Tibet Museum in Lhasa. The photocopies are the basis of both a diplomatic and critical edition of Jinendrabuddhi’s text, one of the subjects of an agreement on scholarly cooperation between the CTRC’s Institute of Religious Studies and the Institute for Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia of the Austrian Academy of Sciences. The editions, starting with Chapter 1 (“On perception”), will be published in Beijing and issued jointly in all probability in 2005. This is to be the first volume of a new series entitled “Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region”.

The pratikas, explanations and paraphrases in Jinendrabuddhi’s commentary greatly expand and improve our knowledge of Dignāga’s text, and thus yet another up-to-date presentation of this ‘text in progress’ seems justified. It was, of course, necessary right from the beginning of the work on the commentary, in which I was joined by Helmut Krasser and Horst Lasic, to provide a hypothetical reconstruction of the text being explained to base our work on, to provide a chāyā so to speak of that being explained. This was, in fact, the beginning of the text presented here. During the course of reading the commentary this chāyā was much improved upon. After the completion of our work it would have been desirable to edit Dignāga’s text in the light of the new knowledge gained including detailed documentation of all references not only of the fragments known so far, but also of the new linguistic materials. What this would have meant will be clearly demonstrated by the reconstruction of the second chapter being prepared by Horst Lasic under the same conditions but with an appropriately translation of the Tibetan text. In the latter case we can only hope to be able to grasp the meaning. In all three
more rigorous and comprehensive method of documentation which I cannot now afford to invest. In consideration of the possibly short time my age leaves me and of the greater importance of other projects I have in mind, I have decided for a more pragmatic and less time-consuming mode. Information already existing in the works of Jambuvijaya and Hattori on fragments, reports and contextual, mostly polemical material is not repeated. Only newly identified materials are indicated. However, new materials from the Ţīkā are also not specifically identified if they belong to the narrower commentarial context that can be expected, because in the critical edition all linguistic material assumed to be imported from the Pramāṇasamuccaya(vṛtti) is in bold print and easily visible. Thus, the source is indicated only for words and passages that are found in sections of the PST that are not actual commentary.

Since the presented text is a hypothetical proposal only and will hopefully be improved upon in the future, I also refrain from supporting the retranslated parts with arguments. In general I followed the following principles:

When a portion of text, either a passage or a word, is testified by the PST, variants from available Sanskrit fragments and deviations from the Tibetan translations (T meaning that the translations of V = “Vasudhararaksīta” and K = Kaṇakavarman can considered to be the same) are not reported. As a rule K has a better translation and is therefore the version preferred as a basis of the retranslation.

Where the two translations differ strongly, the retranslation may be based on either V or K. In such cases a small superscript $^K$ or $^V$ is added at the end of a sentence or phrase as valid for the preceding syntactic group, or if within a sentence, as valid for only the preceding word.

In addition to the above-mentioned partial reconstructions of the first chapter, the following complete or partial translations are available: HATTORI 1968: 23-172 (English translation of the complete chapter with annotations and including all available Sanskrit materials), FRAUWALLNER 1956: 391-394 (introduction and German translation of kk. 11-13 with the Vṛtti), FRAUWALLNER 1968: 62-83 (analysis, Tibetan texts, German translation and Sanskrit fragments of the Mīmāṃsā section) and DREYFUS / LINDTNER 1989: 36f. (English translation of kk. 8cd-11ab). In addition, several partial translations into Japanese are available: MIYASAKA 1956 (Vaiśeṣika section), KITAGAWA 1958 (Nyāya section) and HARADA 1992 (Nyāya section).

cases we can never be certain of the original wording.
Complete or partial editions of the Tibetan translations are available in: HATTORI 1968: 173-237 (complete edition of both V and K) and FRAUWALLNER 1968 (only the Mīmāṃsā section of both V and K).\(^5\) An only recently identified and interesting partial sKu-’bum version which deviates considerably from V and K was edited in YAITA 2004.

Considerable progress in the interpretation of Dignāga’s Mīmāṃsā polemics has been achieved in John Taber’s recent publication of a richly annotated and thoroughly explained translation of the *pratyakṣa* chapter of Kumārila’s Ślokavārttika (TABER 2005). This chapter’s focus is mainly on Dignāga’s polemics. Thanks to Karin Preisendanz who received an early copy I had the chance of quickly appreciating Taber’s profound interpretations, but was unable to incorporate possible consequences from his work into the present work. In the case of new insights into the meaning of certain points raised by Dignāga, it may be necessary to improve upon my analysis for the section presented below.

**Editorial conventions:**

- **Bold** script is used for the ślokas and for words from the śloka used in the prose.
- **Italics** are used for all retranslated text, i.e., text that has not been attested as such.
- **Underlining** is used for personal names and text titles as well as pronouns referring to them.
- **Parentheses (…)** contain retranslations that are possibly superfluous.
- **Pointed brackets < …>** contain text emended in the critical edition of the PST.
- **Slashes / within parentheses** present alternative retranslation proposals.
- **Superscript question marks ?** indicate more substantial uncertainty.
- An **aAsterix * after a concluding danda marks a śloka** in which the individual words are more or less firmly attested, but not in the sequence proposed.

**Sandhi** is applied within the ślokas which are considered to be a unit, even if their parts are separated by text in prose, but is not applied between the last and first words of adjacent prose and metrical sections. **Vowel sandhi** is not applied between attested words and retranslated words written in italics, nor between bold and non-bold words. The necessity of vowel sandhi is, however, indicated by a subscript . .

---

\(^5\) Cf. also the entries in STEINKELLNER / MUCH 1995: 11f.
Metrical problems:

The kārikās of this first chapter’s siddhānta section (kk. 1-12) are completely attested. Difficulties arise in the less well attested second section (kk. 13-44) in which Dignāga summarizes his polemics against the pratyakṣa definitions of the Vādavidhi, the Nyāya-, Vaiśeṣika- and Mīmāṃsāsūtras together with their early commentaries, and against the Sāṅkhya system that is represented by the Śaṣṭitantra and its tradition of commentaries as well as by Mādhava.

These difficulties are corollary to the advantages gained by the considerable increase of attested linguistic matter now available. In most cases only parts of the ślokas are attested through citations or pratikas. The logical sequence of the arguments indicated by these attested parts is clearly defined by the introductory and/or explanatory (Vṛtti-)text in prose which separates these parts from one another. In addition, words from Jinendrabuddhi’s explanations can be claimed for the śloka where gaps remain between attested parts. In these cases the sequence of words as well as their syntactic form are not always certain and can/must be adjusted to metrical requirements. The same holds true when only retranslations from the Tibetan can be offered. Here, however, even the words themselves can/must be chosen and adapted according to metrical needs, if the context does not provide any hints for the use of particular words.

Even under these favourable conditions the ślokas cannot be reconstructed without suggesting a few vipulās. In general I think I have managed to avoid any metrical irregularities, vipulās, however, I introduced. In the well-attested ślokas of the first chapter only the following vipulā occur: ma-vipulā (14c, 40c) and na-vipulā (34c). The reconstruction of some ślokas was only possible by introducing a few more: ma-vipulā: 22c, 28c, bha-vipulā: 36a, and na-vipulā: 43c.

Analysis of contents:

The structure of the contents and arguments in this first chapter is shown clearly by its division into paragraphs in Hattori’s translation and through some explanations in the notes,

---

6 In accordance with the rules summarized in STEINER 1996: 248.
and, for the Mīmāṃsā section, in Frauwallner’s survey of the contents (FRAUWALLNER 1968: 63-65). Karl Potter’s recent summary (POTTER 2003: 328-337) is based on Hattori’s divisions. For an example of the traditional Tibetan analysis cf. the sa bcad of rGyal tshab Darma rin chen prepared by Fumihito Nishizawa (NISHIZAWA 1997). The analysis presented in the appendix below differs from these inasmuch as it outlines the entire contents of Dignāga’s work following the logical structure of its presentation and argument in detail, thus trying to impart both the contents and the relationships between the different paragraphs. This kind of analysis was originally developed by Professor Frauwallner for his reading notes on Indian philosophical literature. It is, in fact, a close relative of the more refined examples of the Tibetan sa bcad method without the latter’s specific historical and exegetical considerations.

●●●

The internet provides a simple tool to share this stage of recovery with interested colleagues. The on-line presentation of this working hypothesis as a summary of the current stage of progress will, in addition, hopefully not only facilitate improvement upon my proposals by other scholars, but may also enable them to find additional testimonies more easily. For future improvements of the text presented please mail to office.ias@oeaw.ac.at.

Finally I would like to thank Helmut Krasser, Horst Lasic, and Tōru Tomabechi for their invaluable help, from preparing electronic files from my handwritten text at the beginning of our common work on Jinendrabuddhi to preparing the final PDF format, and, above all, for their many contributions towards improving the present product.

I would also like to thank the presidency of the Austrian Academy of Science which, in cooperation with the Austrian Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, enabled my temporary concentration on research that I have enjoyed for the past three years, as well as the Austrian Science Fund which supported the series of projects that have allowed me to create a scholarly environment over many years from which this contribution is a small offshoot.

Vienna, April 2005
Ernst Steinkellner
Pramāṇasamuccaya 1. 1-44
Pramāṇasamuccaya 1.1–3

atra bhagavato hetuphalasampattyā pramāṇabhūtatvena stotrābhidhānaṃ prakaraṇā- 
dau gauravotpādanārtham. tatra hetur āśayaprayogasampat. āśayo jagadhitaśītā. 

prayogo jagacchāsanāc chāṣṭṛtvam. phalam svaparārthasampat. svārthasampat suga- 
tatvena trividham artham upādāya prāṣastatva,"artham" surūpavat, apunarāvṛttyartham 
sunāṣṭajvaravat, niḥśeṣārtham supūrṇaghaṭavat. arthatrayāṃ caitad bāhyavītarāgaśai- 
kśāśaikṣebhyāḥ svārthasampadviśeṣaṇārtham. parārthasampat tāraṇārthena tāy- 
tvam. 
evāṅguṇāṃ sāstāraṃ prāṇaṃya pramāṇasiddhyāi svaparakaraṇaṃbhāyo nyāyamu- 
khādibhya iha samāḥṛtya pramāṇasamuccayāḥ kariṣyate parapramāṇapratisedhāya 
svapramāṇaṇagunodbhāvanāya ca, yasmāt pramāṇāyattā prameyapratiṣṭhartir bahavaś 
cātra vipratiṣṭhānāḥ. 

tatra

pratyakṣaṃ anumāṇam ca, pramāṇe 
te dve eva. yasmāt 

lakṣaṇadvayam |

prameyamā 
na hi svasāmāṇyalakṣaṇābhyaṃ anyat prameyam asti. svalakṣaṇavāṣayaṃ ca praty- 
akṣaṃ sāmāṇyalakṣaṇāvāṣayam anumānam iti pratipādayisyāmāḥ. 
yat tarhīdam anityādibhir ākārair varṇādi grhyate ’sakṛd vā tat katham. asty etad 
grahaṇam, kiṃ tu 
tasya sandhāne na pramāṇāntaram 
svasāmāṇyalakṣaṇābhyaṃ hy avyapadeśavyaṃvarṇatvābhyaṃ varṇādi grhītvānityatayā 
cāṇityaṃ varṇādi iti manasā sandhatte. tasmān na pramāṇāntaram. 

na ca || 2 || 
punāḥ punar abhijñāne 
yad asakṛt tad evārtham praty abhijñānam, tathāpi na pramāṇāntaram. kiṃ kāra- 
ṇam.
'niṣṭhāsakteḥ
yadi sarvaṃ jñānaṃ pramāṇatveneṣyate, evaṃ pramāṇam anavasthitatvena syāt.

smṛta
divat

smṛtir eva smṛtam. tad yathā smṛticchāḍvedeṣādayāḥ pūrvādhigataḥ arthe na pramāṇaṃ tāntaram, tadvat.

tatra

pratyakṣaṃ kalpanāpoḍham

yasya jñānasya kalpanā nāsti, tat pratyakṣam. atha keyaṃ kalpanā nāma.

nāmajātyādiyojanā

yadhṛčaśabdeṣu nāmnā viśiṣṭo ’rtho ucycate doṭha iti. jātiśabdeṣu jātyā gaur iti. guṇaṃśabdeṣu guṇena śukla iti. kriyāśabdeṣu kriyāyā pācaka iti. dravyaṃśabdeṣu dravyeṇa daṇḍī viṣaṅśītī.

atra kecid ăhuḥ – sambandhaviśiṣṭa iti. anyo tu – arthaśūnyaiḥ sabdair eva viśiṣṭo ’rtha ucycate iti icchanti. yatraiśā kalpanā nāsti tat pratyakṣam.

atha kasmād dvayaḍhīṃṭyāṃ utpattau pratyakṣam ucycate na pratiḥiṣayam.

asādhāraṇaḥetutvād aṣkaṣaḥ tad vyapadiśyate

na tu viṣayai rūpādibhiḥ. tathā hi viṣayā manovijñānānyasantānākaviṣṭijñānasādhāraṇāḥ. asādhāraṇena ca vyapadeṣo drṣṭoṣa yathā bherāśabdo yavāṅkura iti. tasmād upapannam etat pratyakṣaṁ kalpanāpoḍham.

abhidharme ’py uktam – caṅsurvijñānasamaṅgī nīlāṃ vijānāti no tu nīlam iti, arthe ’rthasaṅgī niṣa tu dharmasaṅgī niṣa iti.

kathāṃ tarhi saṅcitaḥ saṅbandhāḥ pānca vijñānakāyāḥ, yadi tad ekato na vikalpayanti. yac cāyanasvalakṣaṇaṃ praty ete svalakṣaṇavāya na dravyasvalakṣaṇam iti.

tatrānekārthajanyatvāt svārthe sāmānyagocaram

anekaḥ dravyotpādyatvāt tat svāyatane sāmānyaviṣayam uktam, na tu bhinnēṣv abhedaka kalpanāt.
āhuṣ ca

dharmiṇo ’nekarūpasya, nendriyāt sarvathā gatiḥ |
svasamvedyam hy 6 anirdeśyam rūpam indriyagocaraḥ, 5 |
evam tāvat pañcendriyajām pratyakṣajñānam nirvikalpam.

paramatāpekaḥ cātra viśeṣanaṁ, sarve tv avikalpakā eva.
mānasam cārtharāgadīsvasaṁvittir akalpīkā |
mānasam api rūpādiviśayālambanam avikalpakam anubhāvākārapraṅrttaṁ rāgādiṣu ca svasaṁvedanām indriyānapekaṁ satvān mānasam pratyakṣam.

tathā

yogināṁ gurunirdeśāvayavakīrṇārthamātradrk2 6 |
yogināṁ api āgamavikalpāvayavakīrṇam arthamātra

yadi rāgādīsvasaṁvittih pratyakṣam, kalpanājñānam api nāma. satyam etat.
kalpanāpi svasaṁvittāv iṣṭā nārthe vikalpanāt |
tatra viṣaye rāgādivad eva apratyakṣatvate ’pi svaṁ saṁvettīti na doṣaḥ.

evam tāvat pratyakṣam.

bhṛntisaṁvṛtisaṁyānam anumānānumānīkam 7 |
smārtābhilāṣikam ceti pratyakṣābhāmaṁ sataimām |
tatra bhṛntijñānam mrgatṛṣṇādiṣu toyādikalpanāpravṛttatvāt pratyakṣābhāsam, saṁvṛtīsatu arthāntaraḥhyāropāt tadrūpakalpanāpravṛttatvāt. anumānaṁ tatphalādiṣu jñānam pūrvānubhūtakalpanayeti na pratyakṣam.

atra ca

savyāpārapratītatvāt pramāṇaṁ phalam eva sat 8 |

na hy atra bāhyakāṇāṁ iva pramāṇād arthāntaram phalam. tasyaiva tu phalabhūtasya jñānasya viṣayākāratayā upattaṁ savyāpārapratītiḥ. tām upāḍāya pramāṇatvam upa-
caryate nirvyāpāram api sat. tad yathā phalaṃ hetvanurūpam utpadyaṃānaṃ heturūpam grhnāitya kathyate nirvyāpāram api, tadvañ atrāpi.

**svasaṃvittīḥ phalaṃ vātra**

dvyābhāsaṃ hi jñānam utpadaye svābhāsaṃ viśayābhāsaṃ ca. tasyobhayābhāsasya yat svasaṃvedanaṃ tat phalaṃ. kim kāraṇam.

**tadrūpo hy arthaniścayaḥ**

yadā hi saviṣayaṃ jñānam arthaḥ, tadā svasaṃvedanānurūpam arthaṃ pratipadyata iṣṭam aniṣṭam vā. yadā tu bāhya evārthaḥ prameyāḥ, tadā viśayābhāsataivāsyāḥ pramāṇaṃ
tadā hi jñānasvaṃvedyam api svarūpam anapekṣārthaḥbhāsataivāsyā pramāṇam. yasmāt so ’rthaḥ

tena mīyate 9 |
yathā yathā hy arthākāra jñāne pratibhāti subhāsubhāditvena, tattadrūpaḥ sa viṣayā pramīyate. evaṃ jñānasvaṃvedanaṃ anekākāraṃ upādāya tathā tathā pramāṇaprameyam upacaryate. nirvyāpāras tu sarvadharmāḥ.

āha ca

**yadābhāsaṃ prameyaṃ tat pramāṇaphalate punaḥ**

**grāhakākārasaṃvītyos** trayaṃ nāthaḥ prthak kṛtam 10 |

atha dvirūpam jñānam iti katham pratipādyam.

**viṣayajñānatajñānaviśeṣat tu dvirūpataḥ**

viṣaye hi rūpādau yaj jñānaṃ tad arthasvābhāsam eva. viṣayajñāne tu yaj jñānaṃ tad viṣayānurūpaṇaṃjñānaviśeṣasam svābhāsaṃ ca. anyathā yadi viṣayānurūpam eva viṣayajñānaṃ syāt svarūpaṃ vā, jñānajñānam api viṣayajñānenaviśeṣaṃ syāt.

na cottirottarāṇi jñānāni pūrvaviṃprakṛṣṭaviṣayābhāsāni syuḥ, tasyāviṣayatvāt. ataś ca siddham dvairūpyaṃ jñānasya.
smṛter uttarakālaṁ ca
dvairūpyam iti sambandhah. yasmāc cānubhavottarakālaṁ viṣaya iva jñāne 'pi
smṛtir utpadyate, tasmād asti dvirūpatā jñānasya svasaṃvedyatā ca.
kim kāraṇam.

na hy asāv avibhāvite || 11 ||
na hy ananubhūtārthavedanasmṛtir rūpādismṛtvat.

svaḥ etat – rūpādivaj jñānasyāpi jñānāntareṇānubhavah. tād apy auyuktam, yasmāj
jñānāntareṇānubhave 'niśṭhā
anavasthā iti tajjñāne jñānāntāreṇa, anubhūyamāne. kasmāt.

tatāpi hi smṛtiḥ |
yena hi jñānena taj jñānam anubhūyate, tatāpy uttarakālaṁ smṛtir drṣṭā yuktā. tatas
tatāpy anyena jñānena-anubhavē 'navasthā svaḥ.

viṣayāntarasaṅcāras tathā na syāt sa ceṣyate || 12 ||
tasmād avasyam svasaṃvedyatā jñānasyābhuyeyā. sā ca phalam eva.

tathā pratyakṣaṁ kalpanāpoḍham iti sthitam.

tadanantaraṁ parapraṇītaṁ pratyakṣaṁ parīkṣyate.

na vādavidhir ācārasyāsāro veti niścayah |
anyathāvavaproktes tena asmābhīḥ parīkṣyate || 13 ||
na hi vādavidhir ācāryavasubandhor athavā, ācāryasya tatrāsāraniścayāh. katham.
anyathāvavaprokteḥ, tenāsmābhīḥ api pramāṇādiṣu kiṃcīt parīkṣaṇāḥyām.

stato 'rthād vijñānaṁ pratyakṣaṁ iti.

atra

tato 'rthād iti sarvaḥ cedaṣya tat tata eva na |

---

7–7 Cf. Vibh 2447: ... arthavedanaṁ vinārthasmṛtāryogad ...
8–8 Ce Vādavidhi (cf. Hattori 1968: 1152.8 (NV, NVṬṬ, DNCV)
yadi tata ity anena sarvaḥ pratyaya ucyate, 6 yasya viṣayasya jñānam tad vyapadiśyate, 9 na tat tata eva bhavati, nālambanapratyayād evodpadyate, 10 ārambhīśa cittacaittāh hi 10 iti siddhāntasambhavāt.

ālambaṇaṃ cet smārtādi jñānaṃ nānyad apekṣate | 14 |
yadi tato ’ṛthād ity anena viṣayamātram, smṛtyanumānābhilāsādi jñānaṃ apy ālambaṇāntarani apekṣam. na hy agnyādi jñānaṃ dhūmādēv ālambyotpadyate.

1, rūpādiṣu tv ālambanārtho vaktavyāḥ. kim yadābhāsāṃ teṣu jñānam utpadyate, tathā te ālambanam ity uktā atha yathāvidyamānā anyābhāsasyāpi viṣṇāsasya kāraṇāṃ bhavanti. 11

tataḥ kim iti cet, yadi yathābhāsāṃ teṣu jñānam utpadyate, tathā saṃcitālambanatvāt pañcānāṃ viṣṇānakāyānāṃ saṃvrītsad evālambanam iti.

kāmaṃ niśādyābhāseṣu viṣṇāseṣu tato ’ṛthād utpannaṃ viṣṇānam pratyakṣaṃ syāt. tathā hi teṣu tatsamudāye prajñāptisaty api dravyasādākāro labhyate. dravyasaṅkhyādyākāreṣv api tu prāṇoṇi. te eva hi dravyāditvena ābhāsante.

12 atha yathā vidyamānā kāraṇāṃ bhavanti, 12 evam sati dravyādiṣu prasaṅgadoso na syāt, tathā teṣāṃ asattvāt. evam tu yasya tad vyapadiśyata ity etan na prāṇoṇī. na hi pratyekāṃ teṣu jñānaṃ. pratyekāṃ ca te samuditāḥ kāraṇam, na tatsamudāyah, prajñāptisattvāt.

tad evāha

yadābhāsāṃ na tat tasmāc citālambaṃ hi pañcakam |
yatas tat paramārthena na tasya vyapadiśyate | 15 |

ity antaraślokaḥ.

12 yāvac cakṣuśādiṇāṃ apy ālambanatvaprāsaṅgaḥ. te ’pi hi paramārthato ’nyathā vidyamānā niśādyābhāsasya dvicaṇḍādyābhasasya ca jñānasya kāraṇibhavanti. 13

artharūpaviviktaṃ ca na vācyam |
sarvaṃ jñānam artharūpavyatirekenāśakyaṃ vyapadeṣuṃ.
viṣayō 'syā ca

sāmānyarūpanirdeśyas tasmāna vyapadiśyate

pañcānāṁ vijnānāṁ viṣayās tatsāmānyarūpeṇa vyapadiśyate, na tu svarūpeṇa vyapadiśyate. sāmānyarūpeṇa rūpāditvena vyapadiśyeta. tasmāt pañcānāṁ vijnānāṁ viṣayō na śakyo vyapadeśṭum iti vādaavidheḥ.

naiyāyikānāṁ tv 14 indriyārthasannikṣrotpannaṁ jñānam avyapadeśyam avyabhi-cāri vyvasāyātmaṁ pratyakṣam 14 iti.

atrāpi viśeṣanāṁy ayuktāṇi, yasmāt

indriyārthodbhave nāsti vyapadeśyādisambhavāḥ

viśeṣanāṁ hi vyabhicārasyambhave kriyate. na cāstindriyabuddher vyapadesyaviśayatvat, anumānaviśayatvād vyapadesyasya. anirdeśyate cāvyabhičāraḥ. na hindriyabuddhī sarvā nirdeśṣum śakya. tasmād viśeṣanāvacaṇāṁ naiva kartavyam.

na ca vyabhicāraviśayatve, manobhāntiviśayatvād vyabhičāriṇāḥ.

vyavasāyō 'pi hi niścayaḥ. sa sāmānyo,ādiyād gavādi no vikalpya adarśanāṁ na sambhavati.

athāyathārthādiṣṇānanivrttaya ucyate, 15 athāpy ayuktaṁ viśeṣanāṁ. avyabhicārāc ca. sarvā hindriyabuddhiḥ svārthamātraγṛāhīnī.

etena utkavikalpo 'pi pratyuktaḥ, yad uktam 16 vyavasāyatmakam iti vyavasāya-kāryam 16 iti. na hy asti sākṣād ayathārthādiṣṇānakāryam indriyabuddhau.

athāpy avyapadesyādigrāhaṇam tasya jñānasya svabhāvapadarśanāya, tan na, pratyakṣalakṣaṇavācyatvāt tasya cendriyārthasannikāreṇa eva siddharvāt. jñānasvabhāvanirdesyātve ca guṇatvadṛṣṭrayānārambhakatvaniṣkriyātvaśādyaviṣayatvasyāpi nirdeśvyatvād atiprasaṅgaḥ.

sarvatra ca sannikārotpannāṁ pratyakṣam iṣṭau rūpaśabdayoh

sāntaragrahaṇaṁ na syāt prāptau jñāne 'dhikasya ca 17

na hindriyanirantar gandhādau 17 sāntaragrahaṇaṁ drṣṭam, naḍyāḥ adhikagrahaṇaṁ iti.

14–14 Ce NSū 1.1.4 15–15 PST 102,10 16–16 Re NSū-commentary (cf. PST 98,4f) 17–17 PST 106,12f

7 Jinendrabuddhi saw also a Ms without ca (cf. PST 102,9).
bahirvṛttitvād upapannam eva. bahir hy adhiṣṭhānād vṛttir indriyadvayasya. ata
upapannam tadviṣayasya sāntarādhikagrahāṇam api ity cet, tad apy ayuktam, yasmāt
adhiṣṭhānād bahir nākṣaṃ

siddham iti vākyāśeṣaḥ. adhiṣṭhānadeśa evendriyam, tatra cikitsādiprayogāt. ata
indriyād eva vicchinne 'ṛthe grahaṇam.

saty api ca bahirnirgat

na śaktir viṣayekṣaṇe |

anyathādhiṣṭhānapidhāne 'pi viṣayagrahaṇaṃ syāt. tataś cakṣuḥśrotrayor adhiṣṭhā-
nāntaḥṣthitayor evāsannikṣya viṣayekṣaṇāt sāntarādhikagrahāṇam yuktam.

paṅcānāṃ cendriyatve

na sukhādi prameyaṃ vā

veti grahāṇaṃ vāśabdāt pramāṇāntaropādānam. yad dhi lingādyabhāve svasukhā-
duḥkhechcchādveṣaprayatnesu grahāṇaṃ, tad apramāṇam iti sukhādīṇāṃ prameyatā
na syāt, tasya vā pramāṇasya pramāṇāntaratvatam upasankhyeyam.

mano vāstv indriyāntaram ||18||

athavā manasa evendriyatvam vācyāṃ tatsannikarṣotpannasya pratyakṣatva-
siddhyartham.

aniṣedhād upāttam ced

athāpi paramatasya-pratiṣiddhasya siddhau manasa indriyatvam aniṣedhād upāttam
eva. asti hy ekeśāṃ mate manasa indriyabhāvāyattiḥ. tathā

anyendriyarutam vṛthā |

yadi pareṇa paṭhitasya manaso 'pratiṣedhād indriyatvam, tato ghrāṇādīni indriyāny
ucyanta iti nirdeśo vṛthā syāt, apratiṣedhād eva siddhatvāt.

jñāṇasya cārthāntaraphalavādinah pramāṇatve

niṣcīte 'ṛthe phalābhāvo

niṣcayātmaṇaṃ hi jñāṇaṃ pramāṇam. tatpramāṇotpattāv arthādhigamāt phalābhā-
vaḥ syāt.

---

18–18 Cf. ŚVV 130,20f  19 Cf. the pūrvapakṣa in NV 35, 15-22 which is based on PS(V) 1.18c.  20 Cf. NSū 1.1.12
viśeṣaṇajñāṇāḥ pramāṇaḥ. yat sāmāṇyādiviśeṣaṇajñāṇam, tat pramāṇam, yac ca
dravyādiviśeṣaṇajñāṇam, tat phalam iti cet, tat
bhinnatvān na viśeṣaṇe || 19 ||

bhinnāṇaḥ viśeṣaṇam viśeṣyād bhinnam. 21 na hy anyaviṣayasya pramāṇasyaṁyatra pha-
lam yumtaṁ21, yathā khadiraviṣayāṁ chindatāt cchedanena na palāśacchidā drṣṭā.

viśeṣaṇajñāṇaḥhetutvāt tadviṣayatvam apy astīti cet, na, atiprasaṅgāt. evaṁ hi
sarvakārakasankaraḥ syāt, viśeṣaṇajñāṇaḥhetutvena tatkaraṇāvāt. tasmāt yasya karma-
ṇi vyāpāraḥkhyāṭaḥ, tasyaiva tatphalatvam yumtaṁ.
apī ca

na tatra ca
tatra viśeṣaṇe ’dhigantavye phalābhāvaḥ pramāṇābhāvo vā.
dvayam tac cen

athāpi tad eva viśeṣaṇajñāṇāḥ pramāṇaṁ prameyaṁ ca dvayam api bhavet. tad
yathā svātmādhiṣamamātrey prameyaṁ ca bhavati grahītā ca.

na viśeṣye ’pi vartate |
evāṁ hi viśeṣaṇajñāne ’pi pramāṇaṁ prameyaṁ cobraḥ prāṇotiti, yady arthāntare
’pi jñānaḥjñeyayoḥ pramāṇaṁ prameyaṁ ca syāt. svādhiṣam tu jñānasya ātmavat
tasyaiva ubhayaḥbhāvaḥ. viśeṣaṇajñāṇaṁ ātmānā samānaṁ ity ubhayaṁ na yujyate.
evāṁ tarhi prameyaḥdhiṣam yā jñānasamāṇyaṛṣyavayajñāṇanirvṛttīḥ, sā pha-
lamḥ bhaviṣyati. tad apy ayuktam.

aṇānādi na sarvatra

sarvatra tāvad aṇānādier bhāvanviṃyamo nāsti, kvacid ābhogamāṭreṇa jñānotheṣāt.
bhavatu nāmāṇānādiḥ, tathāpi

nivṛttir nāsaṃ phalam || 20 ||
nivṛttir ity aṇānādyabhāve kriyate. sāṣatī na phalam, tasyāḥ prameyaḥbhāvāyuktat-
tvāt.
evāṁ tāvan naiyāyikānāṃ pratyakṣam ayuktam.

vaiśeṣiṣkānāṁ sautraṁ tāvat kenacit sambandhena dravye22 nispannaṁ pratyakṣa-
lakṣanam iti – 23ātmendriyanorthasannikarsād yan nispadyate, tad anyad23 iti.

21-21 Cf. PSV introducing PS 1.21ab 22 PST 118,6 23-23 VSū 3.1.13
kecit tu pramāṇaḥ phalam arthāntaram icchanti – asādhāraṇakāraṇatvād indriyār-thasannikarṣaḥ pramāṇaḥ pratipattavyaḥ iti. anye tu – prādhānyād ātmamanāh-sannikarṣaḥ pramāṇaḥ iti.

evaṁ ca samśayanirnayayor nispatthi pratyakṣaśalāṅgikābhyaṁ jñānābhyāṁ vyā-khyātā, iti yad uktam, tad virudhyate. na tulyam catuṣṭayasanikarṣaṇaśajñaṇena nirṇayajajñānaṁ, vicārāprūvakatvān nirṇayasya pratyakṣasya ca viśayālocaṇārthavatvāt. viśayālocaṇamātrārtham hi catuṣṭayasanikarṣajñaṁ tatra kuto vicāraḥ.

indriyārthasannikarsapramāṇavādino ’natidesa eva syāt. indriyārthasannikarṣa-pramāṇavādino hi kim etad iti jighṛksāyāṁ satyāṁ sarvathāgraḥaṇaprāsāṅgāḥ, sarvātmanā sannikṛṣṭā.

ātmamanāh-sannikarṣavādināḥ ca viśayabheda pi. ena hy anyaviṣayasya pramāṇasyāṇyatra phalam, iti pūrvam uktam.

<api ca> – saṃmānyaviśeṣāpekṣaṁ dravyagyūnakarmāpekṣaṁ ca pratyakṣaṁ iti na yujyate, yasmād indriyārthasannikarṣotpannasya

viśayālocaṇārthavatvāṁ na sandhānaṁ viśeṣaṇaṁ
driyabuddhau svārthamātra-grāhikatvād viśeṣaṇaṁ saha sandhānaṁ na, upapadyate. idam asya saṃmānya dravyādī vety avasyaṁ arthavāyaṁ grhitvā tathā sambandhaḥ kalpyate. tena matublopād abhedopacārād vā grhyate. tac ca smārtenākṛṣya viśeṣaṇaṁ manobuddhau upapadyate. anyathā hi surabhi madhuram iti grahaṇaṁ api pratyakṣaṁ syāt. na cārhati evam, viśeṣaṇaṁviśeṣayor bhinnendriyagrāhāyatvāt.

yadi ca ekam dravyam anekendriyagrāhyam iti, tathā

naikaṁ

rūpādivad anekam syāt. rūpādiṣu hy anekendriyagrāhāsyaiṣtāvaṁ na kvacid api drṣṭam.

rūpādyabheda vā

yady anekendriyagrāhyam apy abhinnaṁ iyate, rūpādy api dravyavad ekaṁ syāt.

drṣṭam cen
ete yadi evam – 30bhinndriyaviśaye dravye abhedajñānam drṣṭam eva bhāvaguna-tvayor iva30. na rūpādiṣu. tasmād ekānekasiddhir iti (tasmād rūpādiṣv ekatvāneka-tvaprasāṅgo ‘iddha iti8), abhedajñānam tathā drṣṭam, kiṃ tu

nendriyena tat || 21 ||

5 na tad indriyadväreṇendriyāntaraviśaye jñānam. kutaḥ.

31aṅśeṣekatvavaiyarthyaī8 29

yatindriyāntaraviśaye pi indriyāntarasya grahaṇaśaktir iṣyate, rūpādiṣv anekendriyakalpanāḥprthikā.

athāpi syād – rūpādīnāṃ bhedaśadbhāvād ekam indriyāṃ na grahaṇaśaktimad iti, tad ṣaptam. kasmāt. indriyān hi

svārthe bhinne ’pi śaktimā 29

svārthe nilādibhedena saṅkhyādibhedena ca bhavanmatena bhinne ’pi indriyāṃ śaktimā, na tv indriyāntarārthe, indriyāntarārthatvenaiva rūpabhinnasparśavat, yataḥ caṅkuṣāgraḥaṇāṃ (tasya8). tad yadi caṅkuḥ sparśanagṛhyām api dravyāṃ grhrṇāti,

15 indriyāntarārtho ’pi caṅkuṣāḥ svārtha ity abhyanujñātavād bhinnasāpi nilāder iva sparśāder api caṅkuṣā grahaṇaṇaṃ sparśaṅga iti na bhinnatvam anekendriyagraḥyātvet hetuḥ, kiṃ tarhīndriyāntarārthāgraḥanam.

yadi caṅkuhinnam ṣaptam anekam indriyāṃ grhrṇyāt, rūpādīnāṃ pratyekam api

sārvendriyatvam āpnoti 29

dravyavat. evaṃ hi rūpādaya ‘ne<ke>ndriyagraḥyāḥ prāpnuvanti.

30 na santy ete dosāḥ. rūpādayas teṣu svaviśeṣaniyāmākāḥ. 33tadabhāvād9 indriyabuddhīnāṃ niile 33 vyahicārā33.32 iti cet, katham teṣām niyāmakatvam. 32tasya rūpavābhāvāḥ, na tasya caṅkuṣaṅgraḥyātvam. tadvat sparśādīnāṃ api svasvaviṣayaniyāmakatvam32. tathā sparśanacakṣuṣāṃ vyrttir

na dravyādau

25 na hi dravyasāṅkhyādikarmasu rūpavasparśatve iṣyeta iti na syāt teṣāḥ sparśanena ca grahaṇam.

30-31 Cf. PSV ad PS 1.23d, end 510-512; 1994a: 882 with n. 66) 31-32 Cf. PSV ad PS 1.41cd 32-33 Ce’e VSū8 (cf. PREISENDANZ 1994: 8VŚ 4.1.11

8 8vaiyarthyaī PSṬ 126,1 : 8vaiyarthyaṃ PSV on PS 1.41cd, NR
34 evaṃ tarhi yasya rūpatvam, tac caksuṣā grāhyam. tasmāt sparśādāv api tadvan niyāmakatvena viśeṣah. evaṃ ca rūpatvādyabhāvād dravyādiṣu niyāmabhāvaḥ syād iti cet.

   tathā sati 22

35 tadabhāvād

avyabhicārāḥ iti sūtravirdhaḥ. rūpatvādeḥ śabdādāv abhāvād avyabhicāra ucyate, na rūpatvāde rūpādaṃ bhāvadvārena.

yuktyāpi ca iyaṃ kalpanā nopapadyate, yasmāt

abhāvatvād agrahasya,

indriyāntareṇāgraṇaṃ hi grahaṇābhaṇavaḥ. sa katham rūpatvādinā kriyate, syāt tu hetvabhāvād grahaṇābhaṇavaḥ. tasmād rūpatvādināṃ niyāmataṃ na yujyate.

yat tarhi dravyādiṣy abhedajñānaṃ drśtam, tat katham iti cet, anyagocaram

36 caṣṭhaśparśanābhīyāṃ bhinnāṃ viśayaṃ upalabhīyāny eva tatsahacarasamudāya-viśayaṃ smārtam abhedajñānam utpadyate, rūpādyagrahe tadbuddhyabhāvāt. tathā viśeṣān svair indriyair bhinnāṃ upalabhyārthāntaravyavacchedaviṣayaṃ abhedena sarvatra mānasam jānānam upajyate. na bhāvagunavayoḥ pratyakṣaṃ. tasyānupalakṣaṇāḥ pratyakṣābhimānaesa kutarkikānām.

37 tulyagocarateṣā ced

syād evam, viśeṣānāvānabhāvayos tv avasāyaṃ tulyendriyaviṣayatvam abhyupagantvam, tadagrahe tadbuddhyabhāvād iti cet, evam sati

aniṣṭam anuṣajyate 23

38 yady ubhayasya tulyendriyagrāhyatvam, dravyagunakarmāṇaḥ api dravyavanti. iti bhāvavad dravyam sārvendriyaṃ syāt. tathā ekadravyavatvān na dravyam bhāvāḥ bhāvasya sārvendriyatvāt.

39 dravyavrūṭteḥ bhāva ekadravyas tadvān ucyata iti cet, na, abhinnatvāt. abhinno bhāvaḥ sarvatra dravyādibhāve na pratiṣidhyate. tathā hy utkam – gunakarmasūna ca
bhāvān na karma na guṇa

yat ca dravye vartamāna eva ekadravyah, nānyatra
vartamāna ekadravya iti, bhinnah syāt.

yat ca caksuḥ-pratyakṣena agnim uṣṇo <'yam> iti grhrnāti, tadā sparśo ’pi caksuṣāḥ syāt. na caivaṃ.

tasmād bhāvagunatvatvad bhinnendriyagrāhyatvad 'py abhinnaṃ dravyam iti na yuyate.

yady evam, bhinnendriyagrāhyatvād apy anekatvavāde

ānekānto

drṣṭo hy ekendriyagrāhyatve ’pi dravyagunākaraṇanām bheda niḥādhedaś ca. anantareṇāpi ca indriyena grahaṇabhedaṃ niḥādiṣu bheda drṣṭaḥ. Yad yadabhāve ’pi bhavati, na tasya tat kāraṇam iti nendriyabheda ’nekatve hetur iti cet,

'nyathoktaṃ tan

bhinnendriyagrāhyatvād anekatvam uktam, naikendriyagrāhyatvād ekatvam, yato ’nekāntah syāt. na cātānekāntaḥ. na hi bhinnendriyagrāhyatvād eva anekatvam ucyate, kiṃ tarhy anekatvam eva.

anantareṇāpi ca indriyena iti yad uktam, atra

na sarvam sādhyam ucyate |

na hi – sarvam anekam indriyabhedaḥ ity uktam, kiṃ tarhi – yatrendriyabhedaḥ, tad anekam iti. na buddhibhedaṃ ’py anyatve kāraṇaṃ niśidhyate.

api ca

aṅkṣabhede ’pi dhībhedaḥ bhede ’bhedāḥ kuto ’nyathā 24 ||

yatra cānantaṃ-pindriyena dhībhedaḥ nānātvam ucyate, tatrendriyabhede grahaṇa-bhede ca ekam iti nāvakāśaḥ.

etena guṇādiṣu pratyakṣajñānaṃ apy apoditaṃ veditavyam. tad api hi svādhārasambhandhavreṇa cauṣṭāyādisannikarṣād evotpadyate.

yathā ca na sarvatra sannikarṣāj jñānotpattih, evam naivāyikapratyakṣaparikṣā-
vām uktam.

evam vaiśeṣikānaṃ pratyakṣam api sadoṣam.

42–42 Cf. PSV ad PS 1.21d' 43–43 Ce' VVi frg. 16a (cf. Frauwallner 1957: 124, 140; also NMu (KATSURA VI: 59) 44–44 Cf. PSV ad PS 1.24a' 45 Cf. PS 1.17c-18b with PSV
kāpilānām tu 46 śrōtrādi-vṛttīḥ pratyakṣaṁ 46 īṣṭam. 47 śrōtratvakcaksūrjihvāgraṁ-
nānāṁ manasādhiśhitā vṛttīḥ śabdāsarāpūparasagandhēṣu yathākramaṁ grahaṇe vartamānā pratyakṣaṁ pramāṇaṁ 45 iti.

**text punar** indriyāṇām

anavasthā\(^{9}\)

tair hi 48 anindriyāntara-grāhyaviśayatvenendriyaṁ svaviśayavinviveṣāṁ 48 abhimāni, traigunyotkarsāpakarsaṁātrabhedaḥ śabdādeḥ bhinnajātīyatvāt. ekaśabdasyāpi guṇotkarsāpakarsaṁātrabhedenānantiyād grāhakaṁ indriyaṁ anantam abhyupeyam.

atha vā

`indriyaikyaṁ` vā

atha tatra traigunyābhedād abhinnajātīyatvate śabdavisēṣagrāhakavat sparsādīnāṁ api grāhakavat prāptam ekam evendriyaṁ, sarvatra traigunyasyābhedāt. na hi traigunyavatireṇa śabdajātīr asti, yā śabda eva bhavati na sparsādau\(^{9}\).

kathāṁ nāsti, yadā sattvādīsamsthānabhedaḥ śabdādayo bhidyante. abhinnajāti-

śabdeṣu samānaṁ samsthānaṁ sparsādībhyo 'samānaṁ ca. sā jātiḥ śrotrāyṛtter
graiḥyam, tathā sparsādiṣv api. tato na yathoktadosaprasāṅga iti cet,

`tathāpi caksuḥsparśanayoḥ samānaviśayatvaṁ prāptam, yataḥ samsthānam`

dvigrāhyam

dīrghādīsamsthānasya caksuḥsparśanayor dṛṣṭavatvā svaviśayavinviveṣāvyāghātāḥ.

śabdādayaḥ ca na śrotrādi-grāhyāḥ syuḥ. kutaḥ samsthānam

na trigocaraḥ |

samsthānasya śrotrajihvāgraṁagrāhyatvadṛṣṭavati\(^{K}\) śabdarasagandhā na praty-

ākṣāḥ syuḥ.

samsthānākṛtaṁ ca jātibhedam icchataḥ samsthānā bahavaḥ

samānadesaḥ āpannā

ekendriyaviśayajātīyanatikrameṇa tadbhedajātibahutvād bahavaḥ samsthānāḥ samā-

nadesatvaṁ prāptāḥ\(^{K}\).

---

\(^{46-46}\) Re Saṣṭhītantra (cf. PST 136,2)  \(^{47-47}\) Ce Saṣṭhītantra (cf. PST 136,2-4)  \(^{48-48}\) Re Saṣṭhītantra (cf. PST 137,7; 162,7f; STEINKELLNER 1999: ST 3 and 15)

\(^{9}\) indriyānāvasthā PST 138,10 (pratika)
Pramāṇasamuccaya 1.25–27

tulyasaṃsthāneṣu ca suvarṇādi darvyałañkārādīṣu

abhedo

samsthānatulyatvād āpannam ekatvaṁ suvarṇādiśabdādisattvādijātiṁām. tathā ca svavisayavṛttyabhāvāḥ.

5  indriyavrīttir jātimātragrāhikā vā jātivīśiṣṭasukhādigrāhikā vā.

yadi jātimātragrāhikā, arthasya

|  na svabhāvakṛ10 | 25 |

samsthānamātragrāhakatve śabdādīnāṃ sukhdīsvabhāvāgrahaṇām prasajyeta. yasmād drṣṭā mandaprakāśa upalabhyāmānasya samsthānamātrasya arthasvabhāvānu-palabdhiḥ. samsthānamātragrāhakatve

arthabhedāgraḥo

śabdāder viśeṣagrahaṇāṃ na syāt. tathā hi viṇāśabdabherīśabdetyādibhedāgrahaṇāṃ syāt, tatra saṃsthānāntarābhāvāt.

'ṛthe vā yathā ceto vikalpikā |

svārthaviśiṣṭasya tadviśeṣasya grahaṇād manovṛttivat svaviṣaye vikalpikā syāt.

atha saṃsthānaviśiṣṭasukhādigrāhikā, tathāpi

tadavasthā

manovṛttivada vikalpikaivety arthaḥ.

sukhdīnāṃ ca13 pratyekam samuditaṃ vā grāhikā syāt.

tatra na tāvat pratyekam. indriyavrīttināṃ svaviṣaye nivesāt śabdādi grāhyam,

|  na sattvādi |

na hi sattvādi pratyekaṃ śabdādisvabhāvam. tasmān na te śrotrādivṛttigrāhyāḥ.

nānanyatvāt (sukhārthayoh)12 | 26 |

yasmāt śabdādibhyo 'nanyat sukhdāi, (tasmātK) śabdādivat tad api grāhyam.

ananyac13 cen na vā kāryaṃ

---

10 But cf. arthasvabhāvāgrahaṇam PST 141,13 (pratīka) (cf. HATTORI 1968: 152.15.16) 11 Or sukhdīnāṃ ca : sukādīnāṃ ca PST 142,15 (pratīka)
12 No support for this supplementation except from context ! 13 ananyac em. : nānayac PST 143,9 (pratīka)
yadi sattvādi sabdāder ananyat, abhinnaśabdādi na kāryam, sattvādi na sabdādeḥ kāraṇam. yad uktam — 49 sattvam sabdakāryam pray ākhyaḥ sabdātmanā vyavati-ṣṭhamānām ityādi, tad api virudhyeta.

sattvādīṇam vā parasparābhedaḥ sabdādi vānekaṃ eva (lśabdāder vānekatvamY) syāt, kāryakāraṇayor abhinnasvabhāvatvād iti vikalpārtho vāsabdah.

api ca

ananyatve 'pi na grāhyam14 |

yady api sukhādi sabdāder ananyat, tathāpi 50 latparamāṇuḥ api na grāhya iti pratyekaṃ na grāhyam, tanmātrādi vā. na ca yad indriyārthād ananyat, tat sarvam indriyārtho bhavati, kāryatvādigrāhane sāmānyavisayatvaprasaṅgāt.

tathā tāvan na pratyekaṃ grāhyam.

atha samuditaṃ grahaṇe, tathāpindriyavṛttih sarvā syāt
citrākārā15

na bhinne grāhye 'bhinnākāraṃ grahaṇaṃ yuktam, tadvaśena grāhyāparicchedāt. drṣṭāṃ ca sabdādiṣv abhinnaṃ grahaṇam.

sukhādivisayatva indriyānām

samārthavatam

indriyānāṃ samān naveṣayatvāṃ syāt, na svaviṣaye vrśttivam. viṣayāntare sukhādinām abhinajātītvāt. tena ekendriyavaprasaṅgāḥ.

nanu ca samsthānaviṣṭāṃ grhṇāti 51 ity uktam iti, tathokte na yuktam uktam, tathaḥ

naikānugamadarśanam 27 ||

anekasamsthānahbedenaikasyāṃ rūpajātau grahaṇāṃ naika samsthānānuvṛttir drṣṭā. tatra samsthānahbedāj jātiḥṛṣa idṣe sa evendriyānanyakaprasaṅgāḥ.

atra ca ekeśām 25

_____________

14 paḍa b (pratīkā in PSṬ 144,10) is unmetrical!! 15 PSṬ 144,14 has sarvā syāc citrākārā as pratīkā by combining Vṛtti and paḍa a.
संख्यानं्थः भेदः इष्टः सदेः

पुर्वसेम कपिलनम् अभिमतातिक्रमं संक्षयानास्को मधवास्क यहा — ५२ नावा हि सङ्क्तिकसेम किर्तिक्रमं सर्पसङ्क्तितम् त्रिकाजातयो 'भिन्नः, अभिनम् हिंद्रियान्तरेण म्रहणम् अयुक्तम्। तस्मात् सुक्तहिंद्रियाविशयस्य भिन्नाजातयो यादवस्या स्वविशयविनिवेष्यत्वम् इंद्रियाम् ५२ इति।

सा कांभिन्नः स्वविशेष्ये इति

अक्षानन्त्यामः प्रसाज्यते

यदि सुक्तहिंद्रियाजत्विशयाजत्तिभदशिङ्गरथम् पुर्वसिद्धहान्ताद अतिक्रंताम्, तदाद स्पष्टतारूप्ना न्यायेना अस्मविहर व्याख्येऽहः ५३।

स्काकारुपाः सर्वत्रा प्रधानम् अनवाहः प्रथक् ॥ २८ ॥

सुक्तहाः खमोहसंक्तिसिद्धेण्द्र हिंद्रियान्म् जातिः सर्वगतानम् प्रधानां इत्य उच्यते। तहाः सप्तयोगान्वीषा तत्रां प्रधानम् कारुप्ताः इति ५३।

अनुनाम् तु त्रिरुपत्वे कारुप्ते एका दुः कुतो गातम् ॥ २९ ॥

शब्दे शब्दा इति सुक्तदिवयातिरेकणा या ’भिन्नः बुध्दिः उत्पन्ना भिन्ने ’नेकसवाभाव्ये ना युज्याते। किं का्रानं।

विजातिपरिनामो हि साप्रयोगे ’पि नेयायेः ॥*

त्रयासप्रयोगान्नाकिभवाहं, संक्ष्यानम् जातिभेदत। एकासबद्वाच्यांस सुआः सवाभाव्ये सांति। ५४।

अथा — ५४ यदूतकतम् त्रिकाजसवाभवे शब्दे सुक्तहिंदिकम् जिह्खिक्ताम् वा तद्इंद्रियास्याविशयाय स्यात् ।

अनिःस्ते दिविरुपत्वे स्यात् कारुस्याकारुपाताः ॥ ३० ॥

यदू ग्रहणना साब्दाग्रहान्तनिराक्रेषा बुध्दिः सुक्तहिंदिनाम् अन्यातामे वर्ताते, तदाद सा एव एतमाकाह स्यात्। किं का्रानं।

इंद्रियार्थो विषिष्टो हि अनेकारुपे ’पि वस्तुनाः ॥
anekarūpe hi ˢabdādaṣu yasmin buddhir vartate, sa evendriyaṣa viṣayāḥ. sa caika eva. samānaṣ ca sparśādiṣu iti so 'yuktāḥ.

tasmād varāṃ prahāṅgāti sānkhyaṣṭer ekaikarūpaṭaḥ 31

pūrva-prasiddhasānkhya-darśanād viṣiṣṭātaraṃ satyam evaṃ kāryasya jātibhedaḥ ekaikarūpāt kāraṇād utpatṭiḥ kalpyate. evāṃ na vijātiyakāryam ārabhate. na trikā-nām ekarūpaṭāḥ.

yady api ˢabdādigrahaṇaṃatra indriyavṛttiḥ prayakṣam, tathāpi na sarvaprame-yaviṣayaṃ pramāṇam. kutāḥ.

aṣeṣaviṣaye vr̥ttiprāmāṇasyāviddhānataḥ 1

indriyavṛttisamvedakasya manaso līṅgādīṃ antareṇa pramāṇānabhidhānān nyūnātā. tadvr̥ttisamvedanaṃ pramāṇānyatame nāntarbhavati.

naiṣa doṣāḥ. 55-smātaṃ hi tad vr̥ttisamvedanaṃ, 56 kāmādaiva. yatoktam - 56-smṛti-pratyakṣavyavasāya viṣayaśeṣaṃ 56-iti. tasmād indriyajñānaṃ bāhe & ṛthe prayakṣam, indriyavṛtttau tv anantaraṃ smārtam iti cet,

smārtā nānanubhūtatvād

anantaraṃ manasa-indriyavṛttigrāhahākāḥ smārtō na yuktāḥ, pūrvaṃ ananubhūtatvāt. 15

yugapad dve bhaviṣyataḥ 32

57-indriyavasāya yatadanubhūya-mānamanasor yugapad abhivyaktir upagatā 57-iti cet, 58-evāṃ ca 58-aviṣayamimito viṣayī syāt. 58.

sa ca aṭprāmāṇaṃ

sa ca aṭ, indriyānubhāvaḥ prayayāḥ pramāṇam nokta iti vr̥ttāv api pramāṇāsiddheḥ saiva nyūnatā. svasaṃvedeyatvāt kāmādiṣu smārtā iti na doṣāḥ. 58-smṛtiprathyakṣavyavyasaśayaviṣeyaṃ 59 ity andhapadam evaitat.

tathā hindriyārthe 'pi smārtō na sambhavati anantaram 60, manasa ananubhūtatvāt.

na hi manasa bāhyārthaḥ pūrvaṃ anubhūtaḥ

hānir vā smṛtriṣpy anyadarśane 1

55-55 PST 157.2 56-56 Ce Śaṣṭitantra (cf. STEINKELLNER 1999: ST 10 and 11) 57-57 Ce Śaṣṭitantra (?) 58-58 PST 153.3 59-59 Ce Śaṣṭitantra (cf. above n. 56) 60 Cf. PST 157.13

16 evāṃ ca PST 158.1 (pratīka) : evam api PST 153.3
indriyavṛttimātrānubhūtatvād ānanubhūte vā smārto hānir vā iti vāsabdo vikalpārthaḥ. kathāṃ hānir. yadi 61indriyavṛtisahajo bāhye ’rthe manaso ’nubhava31 iṣyate, yad uktam – 62naikārthakhāriṇor indriyoyoh kalpane sāmarthym astī62 iti, tad vyāhan- yate.

naiśa doṣaḥ. smārtādhihikavyavasāyapradarśanārtham hi sahavyavasāyakriyā prati- śidhyate. saha tu siddha eva 63kim bāhyesv artheṣv indriyamanobhyaṃ saha vyavasā- yāḥ63 iti vyavasāye praśnāḥ, 64sāmprate kāle kenacid indriyena yuktam yadā mano bhavati64 iti prāg uktaṁvā.

tathāpi

smṛty adhikam uktaḥ

yadi smārtasya adhikoktyarthaṃ bāhyārthe manasā saha pratiśidhyate, tathā 65yathā ca indriyavyavasāye mano ’nuvyavasāyaṃ kurute, evaṃ mānasāṃ vyavasāyam indriyam samvedayata65 ityādi tasya

yāghāto

tenā bāhyārthe smārtas tan nāsti.

yadi mano bāhyārthe vastuto vartate, tathāpi

’nyākṣaṃ apārthikam 33

indriyāntarāṇāṃ bāhyārthe vrṭīḥ apārthikā prāpnoti manasā puṃso ’rthaḥ kṛta iti.

tathā viśayavabhaḥvagranaḥsāmarthyān na sāṅkhyaapratyākṣaṃ pramāṇam.

mīmāṁsakānāṃ tu 66satsamprayoge puruṣasyendriyāṇāṃ buddhijanma tat praty- aksam66 iti.

tatra

sad ity asadvyudāsāya na niyogāt sa gaṃsyate |
samprayogo hi niyamāt sata evopapadyate 34 |
asadvyudāśarthaṃ na satprayogo yuktah.

pratiyogy atha nirdiṣṭo

61-62 Cf. PST 163.3f (Re Ṣaṣṭitantravṛttib) 62-62 Ce Ṣaṣṭitantra (cf. STEINKELLNER 1999: ST 18 and 13)
63-63 Ce Ṣaṣṭitantra (cf. STEINKELLNER 1999: ST 13) 64-64 Ce Ṣaṣṭitantra (cf. STEINKELLNER 1999: ST 16)
65-65 Ce Ṣaṣṭitantra (cf. STEINKELLNER 1999: ST 7) 66-66 Ce MSū 1.1.4 (first part)
atha — indriyāṇām samprayoga ity uktau kena samprayoga iti cintāyāṁ pratiyog-isaṃprayaṅgō ganyate, tadarthan sadgraṅaṇam iti, tathāpi

viśiṣṭo ʾkṣasya kathyatāṁ |

indriyasya viśiṣṭa eva, arthaḥ pratiyogī vaktuṁ yuktam.

atha, 71(indriye sīdati yo yasya vā syāt praśastā 71)

yo yasminn indriye sīdati, anyatāvṛṭteḥ, tena tatsamprayogaḥ. yo vā yasya, indriyasya praśastā yogyatvena samyag uktaḥ, tena tatsamprayogaḥ ity uktaṁ. 72

tat sīdaty anyad api atrāṇjanādeś ca praśastā || 36 ||

tad iti vacanam upanyāṣārtham. antarā api rajahprabhṛṭaya indriye sīdanti, na kevalam artha eva, indriyasya praśastāś ca, aṇjanapādalepa, ādayo 'pi. atas tatsam-prayoge 'piV pratyakṣatā syāt.

naivam bhaviṣyati. yathā gamanād gaur iti vacane nānyad api gacchad gauḥ syāt, tathārtha eva sadanāt san syāt, nānyat. tathā praśastasyāpi vaktavyam iti viṣama upanyāṣaḥ, yatāḥ

rūḍhāv evaṃvikalpe 'pi17 sabdo ʾkṣaviṣaye na saḥ |
goṣabdo gamanād gavi rūḍhāḥ. na ca evaṃ sacchruṭiḥ sadanāt praśastatīyāḥ vā indriyārthe rūḍhā. tasmād evaṃvikalpe 'pi na sacchabdo yuktaḥ. 25
pramāṇasamuccaya 1.37–40

75 sarvārthhasamprayogas ca yad dṛṣṭaṁ rūpaśabdāyoh

vicchinnapṛthuviṃśānam tan nairantaryābhādham

yadi hi sarvārthesy indriyaprāptih, yad rūpaśabdāyoh vicchinnagrahanām indriya-parināmādhiagramaḥ ca tan na syāt, indriyānirantrāragandhādiṣu tayor adarśa-nāt.

buddhikāraṇāsāmagraṅīm uktāṁ muktāv pramāṇataḥ

yataḥ sā,

vṛttikāro hy arthāntaraphalavādy āha - buddhijanmano 'nyan na dṛṣṭaṁ kāryam iti 78 yato buddhijanma, tat pratyakṣaṁ ity uktam. atra ca yathoktāmādhisamprayogāṁ sāṃskāra-ādīvāṁ 22 buddhikāraṇāṁ anyaśaṁ nāsti, yat pratyakṣaṁ eva nirdeśyaṁ.

"atheyam eveti"

atha vā kāraṇāsāmagraṇa eva pratyakṣaṁ uktā,

buddhijanmeti kīṁ punaḥ

evaṁ - satsamprayogāḥ puruṣasyendriyāṇāṁ pratyakṣaṁ ity alam uktam syāt. tad yata utpannam iti vikalpya kīṁ buddhijanmanā.

kīṁ ca

arthendriyamanahpuṃssamyogāḥ sāṃskāravān yadaṁ

buddhyutpādakasāmagraṅī uktā pratyakṣeṇa tat katham

sarve hi tāṁ samuditāṁ nākṣaṁ prati vartante. yo 'pi hi kalpayet - 76 indriyārtha-sannikāraṇāḥ pratyakṣaṁ iti, tasyāpi dvīṣṭhatvād nendriya eva vartaniyam ity akalpaneyam.

gaur evāyam aśva evāyam iti yato yanniscayo jāyate, tat pratyakṣaṁ ity yad uktam, tad apy ayuktam.

---

18 sarvārtha° PST 173,5 : samprāpta° VMMS 19 dṛṣṭaṁ em. (cf. mtho ba yi K) : iṣṭaṁ VMMS 20 pṛthuviṃśānam (FRAUWALLNER) : "pṛthivijīṇānam VMMS 21 nairantaryā (FRAUWALLNER, "nair-attaryā°" VMMS) : nairantarasya PST 173,4 (pratīkāḥ) 22 On the questionable ādi cf. FRANCO/PREISENDANZ 1995: note 11. 23 sāṃyogāḥ m.c. for sannikāraṇa (cf. yogaḥ, PST 175,11, as synonym in this context).
gotvādiyogac cārtho gotvāditvena pramāya

na cendriyadhiyāḥ sāmartyam asty artheṣu yojane

tvāṃmatyā 1 indriyadhiyo gotvamātradarśanasya tadāśrayadarśanasya ca śaktir asti, na tu tayor anusandhāne. na ca vināpi sambandhena gavādiniścayo yuyate. tasmān mānasā viśeṣaṇaviśeṣayor abhidhānābhidheyayoṣ ca sarvo 'bhedopacāravikalpaḥ, nendriyadhiḥ.

kim karaṇam. sv asamvedyaḥ hy anirdeṣyaḥ rūpam indriyagocaraḥ.

anekadharmaḥ 'pindriyārtho yo 'sādhāraṇena,ātmanendriye 'vabhāsamānas tadābhāsajñānotpatiḥtuḥ, sa pratyātmovedya eva jñānasvāṁśavat. sa tādāmanāśakyānirdeśah, nirdeṣyasya sāmānyaviśayatvāt.

atha punah sāmānyākāreṇāpi so 'rtha indriyaviśaye sati sarvatha viśayaḥ syāt,

sarvathā nārthavijñāne sthitā pratyakṣadhīr bhavet.

pratyakṣaśābdo hi triṣu vartate pramāṇajñānaviśayeṣu. tatra pramāṇe mukhyo 'nyayor upacāritaḥ. tatra viśaye pratyakṣaṃeyavat pratyakṣospacārah. jñāne 'kṣaṃ prati vr̥tteḥ pramāṇatulatyavat pratyakṣospacārah. yadi ca dhī rūpādisāmānyākārā-lambanā, sendriyanirapekṣaḥ bhedopacārapravṛttā nākṣaparatantrā syāt.

sarvathā ca, arthavijñānam icchato rūpa,ādiṇāṃ gunatvasattājñānād indriyāntara-viśaye saṅcāra ity 1.40–42a sākṣeṇekatvavaiyarthaṃ. iti prāgūktaṃ. tasmād asādhāraṇam eva viśayasvarūpam indriyagocaraḥ.

tathā tāvad yato buddhijanma, tat pratyakṣam ayuktam.

buddhijanma yadisyeta

vasya buddhijanma eva pratyakṣam śrūyata ity āśaṅkā, tam pratyudgamyottaram vaktavyam. arthāntaraphalavādinā phalam anyan na labhyate |

katham kṛtveti cet,

buddhāv eva hi jātāyam tato 'nyan na phalaṃ bhavet.
adhiṣṭamo hi phalam avasitam. sa cet pramāṇam, buddhern ananyatvāt phala, abhā-vah.

90 buddhēs ca yadi janma, anayat samavāyah svakāraṇe

sa pramāṇam sa tu kuto

5 janma vaiśekānāṃ phalasya svakāraṇe samavāyah sattā, ādisamavāyo vā. tatra yadi tāvat samavāyo buddhijanmesyate. 91 samavāyaḥ pratyakṣam prāṇoti. tasya ca nityatvād na kutaścid utpadyate. tasmād ubhayathāpi sa pramāṇam na yujyate.

tha, ananyatvam apārthakam 43 |

yadi buddher janma, ananyat, evaṃ buddhir eva pratyakṣam iti janmagrahaṇam apārthakam 90.

buddhijanmani puṃsaḥ ca viṃśāḥ yady anityatā
dunavidvat sattā, ādiṣṭam phalāyāḥ.

5 yadi ca buddhijanmani puṃsaḥ pūrvavasthāṃ viṃśāḥ pramāṭṛtveneṣyate, evaṃ satyāḥ puṃsaḥ syāt. tac cāniṣṭam.

athāviṃśāḥ tāṃśyāḥ pramāṭeti na yujyate 44 |

15 avikṛtayu buddhijanmani puṃso 'pramāṭṛavasthāya aviṣṭāḥ pramāṭṛtvena na yujyate.

evaṃ parābhimatāṃ pratyakṣam atra pramāṇam nopapadyate doṣavac ca vākyam.

prathamaḥ paricchedaḥ.

90-90 Ri ŚVT 1. 228,22-26; ŚVV 133,8-12 91-91 Cf. PST 180,7 (Re MSūBh)
Analysis of Pramāṇasamuccaya, chapter 1

0. Maṅgala: salutation (1ab) and purpose (1cd) 1,1-13
0.1 explanation 1,3-13
0.11 explanation of the Buddha’s attributes 1,3-9
0.12 explanation of the purpose: establishment of the (means of) valid cognitions (pramāṇa) and refutation of other theories 1,9-13

1. The number of the (means of) valid cognitions is two: perception and inference (2ab’ ) 1,12-2,5
1.1 reason: there are only two objects, the particular (svalakṣaṇa) and the general (sāmānyalakṣaṇa) (2’b-c’ ) 1,14-20
1.2 refutation of further kinds of (means of) valid cognitions 1,21-2,5
1.21 cognition of the combination (sandhāna) of a particular and a general (2’c-d’ ) 1,21-25
1.22 repeated cognition (asakrdabhiṣṭiṇa) of the same object (2’d-3b) 1,26-2,5

2. The nature of the (means of) valid cognitions (3c- end of chapter 2) 2,6-...
2.1 Perception (pratyakṣa) 2,1- 23,16
2.11 Dignāga’s theory (svamata) 2,6-5,15
2.111 Definition: “a cognition free of conception (kalpanāpodha)” (3c) 2,6-3,4
2.1111 definition of conception (kalpanā) (3d) 2,9-14
2.11111 five kinds of concepts: association with name, genus, quality, action, substance 2,10-12
2.11112 the reference of words 2,13-14
2.1112 the reason for the name pratyakṣa is the specific cause (4ab) 2,15-19
2.1113 the definition is not incompatible with Abhidharma statements 2,20-26
2.11131 and not incompatible with Abhidharma statements on the objects of sense-cognition (4cd) 2,22-26
2.1114 the object of sense cognition (5) 3,1-4
2.112 appendix to the definition 3,5-20
2.1121 kinds of perception 3,6-15
2.11211 mental perceptions (mānasā): object-awareness (arthaśamvitti) and self-awareness (svasamvitti) (6ab), yogic perception (6cd) 3,6-14
2.112111 self-awareness of concepts (7ab) 3,12-14
2.1122 apparent perceptions (pratyakṣābhā) (7c-8b) 3,16-20
2.113 Means (pramāṇa) and result (phala) of perception 3,21-5,14
2.1131 cognition is result; it is instrument only metaphorically as it arises with the shape of an object (8cd) 3,21-4,2
2.1132 or: self-awareness is the result of a perception with its two aspects (ākāra), that of itself and that of an object (9-10) 4,3-5,14
2.11321 proof of the two aspects of cognition 4,19-5,3
2.113211 from the difference between the cognition of an object and the cognition of this cognition (11ab) 4,20-25
2.113212 from later recollection of the cognition of an object (11c) 5,1-3
2.11322 proof of self-awareness (svasamvedana) 5,4-13
from the possibility of recollection only of something cognised (11d)  5,5-13
supportive arguments of impossible implications  5,7-13
infinite regress on the assumption of another cognition to cognise the cognition of an object (12ab)  5,7-12
cognition could not shift between objects (12cd)  5,13

2.12
Refutation of other theories  5,16-23,16

2.121
Vasubandhu’s Vādavidhi  5,17-7,5

2.1210
Preamble: Vādavidhi is not a work of Vasubandhu or a work of immature character (asāra) (13)  5,17-20

2.1211
Definition: “a cognition on account of that object (tato ‘rthā)”  5,21

2.1212
Refutation  5,22-7,5

2.12121
If “object” means the object-condition (ālambana), this definition contradicts the Abhidharma theory of four conditions (14ab)  5,22-6,3

2.12122
If “object” means only the object-condition, memory etc. would also be perception (14cd)  6,4-6

2.12123
Object-condition refers to either the content or the cause of cognition  6,7-24

2.121231
If it means the content, the cognition would have merely a conventional content, its object being an aggregate  6,10-14

2.121232
If it means the cause, this contradicts the Vādavidhi’s idea that a cognition is named for its content, for the cause is the single atoms not cognised as such (15)  6,15-24

2.1212321
The senses would also be object-cognition, being also different when causing apparent perceptions  6,23-24

2.12124
A cognition cannot be designated without reference to its content; designation refers to a universal; the content itself cannot be designated (16)  6,25-7,5

2.122
Nyāya  7,6-9,27

2.1221
Definition of Nyāyasūtra 1.1.4: “Perception is a cognition arisen from a contact between sense and object, is inexpressible, non-deviating, and of determining nature.”  7,6-7

2.1222
Refutation  7,8-9,27

2.12221
Refutation of the terms (viśeṣaṇa)  7,8-8,9

2.122211
Deficiency of the terms (17ab)  7,9-19

2.1222111
Deficiency of “inexpressible” (avyapadeśya)  7,10-12

2.1222112
Deficiency of “non-deviating” (avyabhicārin)  7,13

2.1222113
Deficiency of “of determining nature” (vyavasāyātmaka)  7,14-19

2.12221131
Also if “nature” means “result”  7,18-19

2.122212
Uselessness and insufficiency of the terms for defining the nature of this cognition  7,20-23

2.122213
Deficiency of “arisen from a contact” (sannikarṣotpanna): neither distant nor larger objects could be perceived (17cd)  7,14-8,9

2.1222131
Senses do not occur beyond their physical seats (18a)  8,1-5

2.1222132
If they do, they are ineffective or should be able to grasp also hidden objects (18b)  8,6-9

2.12222
The definition is too narrow if only five senses are assumed  8,10-23

2.122221
Perception of lust etc. (sukhād) is not included (18c)  8,11-14

2.122222
Or the mind (manas) must be a further sense (18d)  8,15-23

2.1222221
If mind is accepted because not denied, to mention other senses would be useless (19ab)  8,18-23

2.12223
Problems in the Nyāya-theory that the means and result of a cognition are different  8,24-9,26

2.122231
If a cognitions as the means already determines, there is no result (19c)  8,25-9,18

2.1222311
If cognition of a qualification is the means and of the qualified
the result, the resultant cognition is not of the qualification (19d) 9,1-18
also not, if the cognition of a qualification is to be the cause
of the cognition of the qualified 9,6-8
if the qualification is cognised, the qualified is not. Then
there is no result and thus also no means (20a') 9,9-18
if the cognition of a qualification is both means and cognised
object, the cognition of the qualified must be the same (20'ab) 9,12-18
the result of a cognition as the cessation of ignorance, doubt
and error is not different from the means 9,19-26
because ignorance, etc. do not always occur of necessity (20c) 9,21-22
because cessation as an absence cannot be a result (20d) 9,23-26
2.1223121

2.123

Vaiśeṣika

Definition of Vaiśeṣikasūtra 3.1.13: "That (cognition) which
is arisen from a contact between soul, sense, mind, and object
is (as perception) different (from other means of cognition)." 9,29
theories on means and result 10,1-3
"some": means is the contact between sense and object,
result is the cognition 10,1-2
"others": means is the contact between soul and mind 10,2-3
Refutation of VŚū 3.1.13 10,4-12
incompatibility with their śāstra 10,4-12
incompatibility with VŚū 10.4 regarding doubt and
determination as explained by the explanation of perception
and inference: determination presupposes conceptual
activity (vicāra), thus is not the same as cognition arisen
from the fourfold contact; the latter is bare presentation
(ālocanāmātra) of an object 10,4-7
undesired consequences in the theories of "some" and
"others" 10,8-12
under the theory of "some", it follows that an object is
grapshed in all aspects 10,8-10
under the theory of "others", means and result would have
different objects 10,11-12
Refutation of VŚū 8.6 and 7 (Cee!): "Perception depends on
universals and limitationals as well as on substance, quality
and motion": as mere presentation this cognition has no
connection with qualifiers; qualifiers and the qualified are
grasped by different senses (21ab) 10,13-13,25
refutation of this explanation of perception with regard to
substance (dravya) 10,21-13,23
the object of different senses cannot be one (21c) 10,21-13,6
its cognition would not be sense-perception, for the
difference of senses would then be useless (21d-22a) 10,27-12,18
senses grasp variations of the specific objects, but not
objects of other senses (22b) 11,9-17
if one substance were grasped by different senses,
also colour, etc. would be grasped by all senses (22c) 11,18-12,11
colour, etc. are not restricting their senses through
their specific properties, otherwise tactile and visual
sense could not function in regard to substance, number
and motion (22d') 11,21-12,11
the assumption that substances can be grasped by any
sense because such restricting properties are absent is
contradicted by VŚū 4.1.11 “Because of their non-
existence there is no deviation (of other senses).” (22'd-23a') 12,1-7
it is also contradicted by reason, since non-grasping
through another sense as an absence of grasping
cannot be caused by a specific property such as
The object of one substance’s cognition is a conceptual construct based on the memory of different sense cognitions.

Undesired consequences with the assumption that the object of one sense can be different as the qualified and the qualifier.

Substance would be grasped by all senses in accordance with VŚū 1.1.7 “…having substance, …are common to substance, quality and motion” and VŚū 1.2.8-9 (Cee!).

“Being is not a substance, because it has one substance.”

Refutation of a Vaiśeṣika-interpretation of “because it has one substance” as “because it occurs in substance.”

If visual perception of fire had the content “it is hot”, temperature would also be visible.

To infer the difference of the qualifier and the qualified from their being objects of different senses is not inconclusive.

Objection: the objection is a futile rejoinder (jāti).

Refutation of the assumption that even if the sense is one the object may be different because of the difference of cognitions.

Refutation of the Vaiśeṣika explanation of perception (cf. 2.1223) with regard to qualities, etc.

Refutation of “arisen from a contact”: reference to the Nyāya section (cf. 2.122213, 17c-18b).

Sāṅkhya

Definition of the Saṣṭāntra: “The function of ear, skin, eye, tongue and nose as directed by the mind is the means of the valid cognition perception when operating towards grasping sound, a tangible, colour, taste and odour respectively.”

Refutation according to this definition and the Sāṅkhya theory of the three constituents (gaṇa), a function of senses with regard to their specific objects is impossible (svavsvāvyṛtyabhāva).

The senses would have to be infinite.

Or one sense would grasp all objects (sva).

The assumption of a different configuration (samsthāna) of the three constituents for the classes of respective objects is impossible:

Configurations of something long would be grasped by two senses, the tactual and the visual.

Configurations as objects of the other three senses would not be perceived.

If difference of classes were due to configurations, many configurations would occupy the same place.

There would be no difference between configurations of different classes.

The function of senses is neither possible with regard to a mere class of objects (jātmātra) nor to the three constituents as qualified by a class (jātivivṣāṣasukkādi).

In the case of a mere class, i.e. a configuration the specific nature (svabhāva) of the objects would not be perceived.

The difference of objects of the same class would not be perceived.

Or sense-function would be conceptual.

In the case of the three constituents being qualified by class-configuration sense-function would also be conceptual.
the constituents are grasped neither individually nor collectively
because the constituents are not individually the nature of sense-objects (26c)
if no difference is assumed, sense-objects could not be an effect of the constituents (26d-27a)
and the constituents would still not be grasped (27b)
not collectively
because each sense-function would have to have similarly various aspects (27c')
all senses would have the same object (27c)

there is no conformity (anuvriti) of the senses to the different object-configurations (27d)
sense-function is also impossible with regard to configurations of the constituents, if assumed to be different
(Mādhava’s theory) (28a)
because senses would have to be infinite (28b)
detailed refutation of Mādhava’s theory
Mādhava’s explanation: primal matter consists of different atoms configurated by the three constituents; as effects these are sense-objects (28c-29b)
refutation: atoms with three constituents cannot be grasped as a single effect (29cd)
transformation of three to one is impossible (30ab)
oneness of the sense-object cannot result from preponderant (utkīja) or cognitively intended constituents (30c-31b)
Mādhava’s idea that different classes of sense-objects result from respectively different atoms is superior to traditional Sāṅkhya, but not the idea that the three constituents are of one nature (31cd)
the definition is too narrow (nyūnatā)
because the function of the mind (manas) would not be mentioned at all in this system (32ab)
mental cognition of sense-functions cannot be memory (32c)
simultaneous function of sense and mind is impossible (32d)
mental cognition of sense-function is not mentioned (33a)
it would contradict the śāstra or would be the memory of another seen object (33ab)
it would also contradict the śāstra, if memory were meant to be ascertaining an external object in addition (adhikāra)
to sense-functions (33cd)
if the mind were to function with regard to external objects, other senses would be useless (33d)

Definition of Mimāṃsā: “The arising of a cognition when there is a contact of the senses of a person with something existent, that is perception.”
Refutation by refuting the definition’s main terms
reputation of the term “existent” (sat)
the term is redundant: it does not serve to exclude something non-existent, for contact occurs only with something existent (34)
it does not refer to a specific object as the counterpart (pratiyogin) of a sense (35ab)
it does not refer to the counterparts of sense, mind and soul in general (35cd)
it does not serve to exclude the contact with something non-existent
2.1252112  
* sat * does not refer to something which “sits” (*sīdati*) at a sense or which is “apt” (*praśasta*) to a sense (36) 20,13-25
2.12521121  
the word *sat* is not commonly used (*rūḍha*) for sense (37ab) 20,20-25
2.12522  
refutation of the term “contact” (*sampryoga*) (37c-38b) 21,1-5
2.12523  
refutation of the term “arising of a cognition” (*buddhijanma*) 21,6-23,10
2.125231  
in the *Vṛttikāra*’s (i.e. *Bhavadāsa*) interpretation: “perception (as means) is that from which cognition arises” (38c-39a’) 21,6-22,20
2.1252311  
the term “arising of a cognition” would be redundant (39’ab) 21,11-15
2.1252312  
all relevant causes do not function with regard to the sense (39c-40b) 21,16-21
2.12523121  
if the cause is limited to the contact of a sense and an object, still the contact is related to more than the sense 21,19-21
2.1252313  
refutation of the interpretation “perception is that by means of which a determining cognition (*niścaya*) arises”, because the senses lack the capacity of connecting a universal with an object (40c-41b) 21,22-22,19
2.12523131  
a cognition of something in all its aspects is not perception (41cd) 22,11-19
2.125232  
in the words of the *Śūtra*: “the arising of a cognition is perception” 22,21-23,10
2.1252321  
if “arising of a cognition” is the means, there is no result (42) 22,23-23,2
2.1252322  
if “arising” is the means as different from cognition, 23,3-7
2.12523221  
the latter would, as a means, be inherent in its cause, and inherence (*samavāya*), being eternal, cannot arise (43a-c) 23,3-7
2.1252323  
if “arising” is not different, the word is redundant (43d) 23,8-10
2.12524  
refutation of the term “person” (*puruśasya*) 23,11-15
2.125241  
if the soul changes (*vikṛti*) with cognition, it is not eternal (44ab) 23,11-13
2.125242  
if it does not change, it is not a cognising agent 23,14-15
## Abbreviations and Literature

### General Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJG</td>
<td>Śrī Ātmānand Jain Granthamālā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASG</td>
<td>Anantaśayanasaṃskṛtagranthāvalīḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>Baudhā Bharati Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS</td>
<td>Gaekwad’s Oriental Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMJJG</td>
<td>Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevi Jaina Granthamāla, Sanskrit Grantha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Tibetan translation by Kaṇakavarman and Dad pa’i šes rab (Q 5702)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESB</td>
<td>Miszellen zur erkenntnistheoretisch-logischen Schule des Buddhismus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSS</td>
<td>Madras University Sanskrit Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STTAR</td>
<td>Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Tibetan (V=K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSWS</td>
<td>Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Tibetan translation by *Vasudhararakṣita and Señ ge rgyal mtshan (Q 5701)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VÖAW</td>
<td>Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WZKS</td>
<td><em>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Primary Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Abhidharmakośa (Vasubandhu): cf. AKBh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ For the reasons why I do not refer to Professor Hattori’s edition of this text (HATTORI 1968: 174-237) cf. STEINKELLNER 1971.


NR  Nyāyaratnakara (Pārthasārathimiśra): Mīmāṃsāśākavārttika by Kumārila Bhaṭṭa with the commentary called Nyāyaratnakara by Pārthasārati Miśra. Ed. RĀMA ŚASTRI TAILANGA. Benares 1898-99.


NSū  Nyāyasūtra


PVP  Pramāṇavārttikapāṇījikā (Devendrabuddhi): Q 5717b Che 1-390a8.


PS  Pramāṇasamuccaya (Dignāga)

PSV  Pramāṇasamuccayavrūtti (Dignāga)


MSū  Mīmāṃsāsūtra

MSūBh  Mīmāṃsāsūtrabhāṣya used by Dignāga

MSūV  Mīmāṃsāsūtravrūtti (Bhavadāsa) used by Dignāga


VSū Vaiśeṣikasūtra: cf. VSūV

VSūBh Vaiśeṣikasūtrasbhāṣya used by Dignāga


Vibh Vibhūticandra’s marginal notes in PVV

ŚV Ślokavārttika (Kumārila): cf. ŚVV


ŚṬ Śaṣṭītantra

Secondary Literature


MIYASAKA 1956  YUSHŌ MIYASAKA: “Juryōron chūso ni tsutaeru Vaiśeṣika gakuha no genryōron [The Vaiśeṣika theory of perception as transmitted in the commentaries on PS],” Mikkyō Bunka 34, 1956, 53-44.


