

## Article

# Of Critical Editions and Manuscript Reproductions: Remarks apropos of a Critical Edition of *Pramāṇaviniścaya* Chapters 1 and 2\*

Harunaga Isaacson | Hamburg

## 1. Introduction

It is regularly lamented that too few Sanskrit texts have been critically edited.<sup>1</sup> This is true, and I agree wholeheartedly that good critical editions by editors with learning and sound judgement are sorely needed, and that the production of such editions is one of the most important ways to advance the field. It should always be remembered, however, that a critical edition is, properly considered, a hypothesis (about some particular state of a text, not necessarily, as is often assumed, its original form, though that is no doubt the most usual case). This does not mean that it is ‘not scientific’ or ‘ahistorical’;<sup>2</sup> on the contrary, the forming and the refining

of hypotheses is arguably the most important task of science and scholarship, be it in the natural sciences or in the humanities, including history and philology. But a ‘definitive critical edition’, popular though that phrase seems to be, is almost a contradiction in terms; and the production of even an excellent critical edition, by the most learned and discriminating of scholars, cannot mean that other scholars and students of a text will cease to consider the primary evidence of the manuscripts themselves, to test, critically, the editor’s hypothesis, and to form their own conclusions and hypotheses.

It is, of course, a fundamental task of the editor to provide information concerning the evidence on which that hypothesis is based, or at least to report (in the critical apparatus) the principal documentary evidence that does not directly support it, i.e. variant manuscript readings. But this alone will not be (or should not be) quite sufficient for all. Just as, in other fields, a scholar or scientist will not rest content merely with a colleague’s reporting of the evidence (data or observations) on which a proposed hypothesis rests, but will wish, sooner rather than later, to examine the evidence (or make the relevant observations and perhaps experiments) for himself or herself, so other scholars engaged in studying the same work will wish to examine for themselves the documentary (i.e. manuscript) evidence on which the hypothesis that the critical edition is based.

To these general considerations, which I would hold to be relevant not to Indologists alone, I shall now try to give some support and specificity by the examination of a recent publication. In the latter half of 2007 a book appeared which for multiple reasons should be, and has been, received with special rejoicing, in particular by Sanskritists and all those interested in Buddhist thought. It is the first edition to be published of the Sanskrit original of the first two chapters

\* This paper has grown out of a review article which had grown out of a review of Steinkellner 2007. Though I have allowed myself to be persuaded to give the paper a more general title in view of the fact that indeed it seeks to make a general point relevant and, I think, of some importance, far beyond the field of the book that was my starting point, it retains nonetheless in many respects the nature of a review article. To save space, I use as far as possible the same sigla and abbreviations for sources (whether manuscripts, editions or secondary literature) as Steinkellner does, and ask readers to refer to his bibliography for details. I thank Prof Michael Friedrich (Hamburg), Prof Dominic Goodall (Paris/Pondicherry), Dr Albrecht Hanisch (Hamburg/Kathmandu) and Prof Jonathan Silk (Leiden) for their comments on a draft of this paper.

<sup>1</sup> Thus e.g. Witzel 1997, p. vi. The requirement, which Witzel clearly implies, that a critical edition should be one ‘with a stemma’ is, however, one which many, including myself, would not agree with. Whether or not a stemma (which is itself, after all, only a representation of a hypothesis about the relationship of the manuscripts, and sometimes other sources) can be plausibly constructed does not determine whether an edition can with justice be deemed critical. Furthermore, the so-called ‘stemmatic method’ or ‘Lachmannian method’ is far more problematic (both in theory and in application), and less unanimously agreed on, than is often realized. See Timpanaro 2005, as just one example from a large body of relevant literature.

<sup>2</sup> As is sometimes implied, e.g. by Schoening, pp. 179ff. Schoening’s surprisingly vehement rejection of critical editions in favour of diplomatic editions reflects a kind of lack of confidence (emendation being regarded with suspicion, although in fact it is often necessary, just as much in reading ancient texts as it is in reading contemporary texts from our own culture, in which everyone routinely emends on the basis of familiarity with language and subject-matter), rather limited familiarity with textual criticism and with

the extensive literature on its theory and methods, and a narrow conception of science/scholarship, in which no place seems to be left for hypotheses. For a more balanced view see e.g. Tanselle 1995, pp. 9–32.

of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, one of the most influential, and arguably one of the most brilliant, works of the Indian Buddhist philosophical traditions. It is based on sources which had long been completely inaccessible, part of the corpus of Sanskrit manuscripts, including many that are more than eight hundred years old, surviving in Tibet, which has been described as 'one of the last 'hidden' treasures of Asia' (Steinkellner 2003, 30).<sup>3</sup> And it is the crown, for the moment at least (there is the promise of yet more to follow), of a scholarly enterprise that can be traced back more than forty years (or, if we take into account the fact that the study of this particular area of the Indian philosophical tradition was pioneered by Steinkellner's teacher, Erich Frauwallner, some seventy-five years), and of what may reasonably be called a diplomatic effort of nearly twenty-five years.

Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇaviniścaya* was long thought to have been lost in its original Sanskrit; pioneering Western translations and studies of the first chapter by Vetter (1966) and of the second by Steinkellner (1973) had to be based, of necessity, on the Tibetan translation and on fragments collected from the numerous citations in other works available in Sanskrit. In his introduction to the edition under discussion (p. ix), Steinkellner reports having first heard 'whispered news' of the existence of Sanskrit manuscripts (in China) in 1984. A fragment, a single folio of a Sanskrit manuscript, was discovered in Nepal by K. Matsuda and published jointly by Matsuda and Steinkellner (Matsuda/Steinkellner 1991); but it was not until January 2004, we are told, that access to the manuscripts in China became possible, thanks to a (historic) agreement of cooperation between the China Tibetology Research Centre and the Austrian Academy of Sciences (p. ix-x).<sup>4</sup> That a critical edition of the first two chapters has been published less than four years thereafter is impressive; this would probably not have been possible (certainly not at the high level that we find here) for anyone other than Steinkellner.

My aim is, however, not simply to celebrate (though celebrations are most certainly in order), but to examine the publication under discussion critically, as a critical edition deserves to be examined. This I shall do in the following sequence: firstly (in section II) I will discuss the use which the edition has made of the primary documentary evidence

<sup>3</sup> Although, as announced in footnote \* above, I use the same abbreviation as Steinkellner does in his bibliography, the item concerned was published in 2004 (as is, in fact, recorded in that bibliography). Perhaps Steinkellner himself refers to it as 'Steinkellner 2003' because the text printed in this small monograph was the Gonda Lecture for 2003, at the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences.

<sup>4</sup> The story of the years of preparation leading up to this agreement is a fascinating one, which has been told, grippingly, in Steinkellner 2003.

on which it is based (i.e. the readings of the manuscripts); then (in section III) the collection of testimonia which are presented in a separate critical apparatus; and thirdly (in section IV) the critical text itself. I move thus, somewhat unconventionally perhaps, from the presentation of the evidence to the presentation of the editor's reconstruction based thereon. Finally, I shall comment briefly on the introduction and indices (in section V), and (in section VI) offer a few concluding remarks.

## 2. The manuscript evidence and its presentation in the critical apparatus

As stated in the introductory section above, a serious reader of a critical edition will want to consider for himself or herself the evidence on which the editor's reconstruction is based. A part of that evidence, presumably the most important part, is normally presented in the critical apparatus, and that is of course the case in this edition as well. It is necessary, therefore, to read the apparatus together with the edited text and, while doing so, to consider at each place whether the reading chosen is really that which best accounts for the evidence of the manuscript readings. At some point, however, the critical reader will no longer be able to rest content with what is only the editor's own reporting of the evidence, but will, as already remarked, wish to examine that evidence directly, at the very least in places where the text seems doubtful or problematic, and quite possibly even more extensively.<sup>5</sup>

In the case of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, the examination of the manuscript evidence is currently only possible to a very limited extent, since access to the copies of the manuscripts held in the library of the China Tibetology Research Centre remains restricted (and even Steinkellner was not in a position to consult the originals). Fortunately, however, the volume contains reproductions of eight manuscript sides; two each from MS A and MS D, and one each from MSS B, C, E and N. Of these, N is the fragment of a single folio, preserved in the National Archives, Kathmandu, that was already published, with a reproduction, in Matsuda/Steinkellner 1991. It contains text from the third chapter of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*.

<sup>5</sup> Of course, the manuscript readings are not the only evidence on which the editor's decisions are based. Many other kinds may be relevant: the evidence of citations, of parallels, of translations (for instance, in the case of Indian Buddhist works such as the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, that of the canonical Tibetan translation), of metre, of grammar, of logic and of internal consistency. Obviously, just which kinds of other evidence are relevant, and how significant they are, may differ greatly from one text to another (or, within one work, from passage to passage). I confine myself in the present paper almost entirely to considering the evidence of the readings of manuscripts of the edited work, a type of evidence which, in a sense, can be called primary, even though this does not necessarily mean that it will always outweigh other kinds of evidence.

MSS D and E also do not contain, in the state in which they were available (as copies) to Steinkellner, any text from the first two chapters. Thus only four of the sides of manuscript folios reproduced were used in this edition, and these make up just under 2 percent of the total manuscript material on which Steinkellner's edition is based.<sup>6</sup>

I have compared these four sides with Steinkellner's text and his apparatus of variant readings. That there are some discrepancies, i.e. places where the manuscripts have not been read or reported accurately, should come as no surprise to those who have first-hand experience of the work involved in producing a critical edition such as this one. I have noticed the following cases where correction, at least to the apparatus, seems to be necessary. References are by page and line of the edited text.

1, 3. A probably reads *vyaktan* (f. 1v1) rather than *vyaktas*, as reported in the apparatus.<sup>7</sup> Since *vyaktan* is a non-substantive sandhi variant (of a type which Steinkellner does not record) for the accepted *vyaktam*, which is reported to be the reading of C (B is illegible here, according to an earlier entry in the apparatus), the entry in the apparatus could (or should) be deleted.

1, 5. A is reported as reading *avadhareneti* for the adopted *avadhīraṇeti*. The reading *re* here cannot be right; a medial *e* would be much more curved than is the stroke that has been so interpreted.<sup>8</sup> Almost certainly A in fact reads *avadhīraṇeti* (f. 1v1-2), with the medial *ī* being slightly broken, whether

<sup>6</sup> By my count, the first two chapters of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* cover (though not completely) a total of 202 folio-sides in the three MSS used by Steinkellner. A more precise calculation would, of course, have to take into consideration the fact that not each folio-side has the same quantity of text written on it; in particular, C has considerably less text per folio-side than A or B. Greater precision is not, however, of importance to me here; it suffices to note that only roughly 2 percent of the manuscript material Steinkellner has used is reproduced, with some 98 percent remaining at present inaccessible, at least to the vast majority of scholars.

<sup>7</sup> This results in a ligature *nta*, which is indeed quite hard to distinguish, at least in the rather small reproduction, from *sta*, as Steinkellner in effect reads. Comparison with other instances of the ligature *nta* show, however, that the reading *nta* here is extremely probable. Cf. for example the *nta* in *nāntarīyakatāyāms* at A f. 1v5, or that in *pramāṇāntaram* at A f. 1v7. The *nta* in *antarbhāvāt* at A f. 1v3 is however different, so that we must conclude that the scribe has two different graphs for this ligature, although the one at the last mentioned place is used, to judge from this side at least, less frequently. Unfortunately, there is no instance of *sta* on this side; the other side of A which has been reproduced, f. 26v, is written in another hand. Note that the *stā* on that side, at A f. 26v5, can be clearly read, with no possibility of confusion with *ntā* (there are no instances of *sta* with short *a*, but the presence of an additional stroke for the long vowel should not affect the appearance of the consonant cluster).

<sup>8</sup> For a real *re* as the scribe of A would write it, see f. 1v4 (in *anvayavyatirekāv*).

due to a flaw in (or damage to) the manuscript, or as an artifact of multiple reproduction. This entry in the apparatus too could (or should) therefore probably be deleted.

8, 1. B is reported as reading *apanipatya*, in place of the *upanipatya* which is recorded as the reading of A and C and which has been accepted in the text. In my view, B can probably be read, however, as also having *upanipatya* (f. 3v1); though the sign for (medial, after the *d* of the preceding *tasmād*) *u* is small, I think the scribe should be 'given the benefit of the doubt', in which case this entry in the apparatus too might be deleted.

8, 11–12. No variant is reported for *sambhavati*; but B (f. 3v4) reads in fact not that but *bhavati*.

9, 9. For *avikalpakaṃ* again no variant is recorded; but B (f. 3v7) reads *avikalpaṃ*.

82, 7. For *kṣaṇasthāyī*, adopted in the text and reported as being the reading of MSS B and C, A is recorded as reading *kṣaṇas'ātasthāyī*. It reads, however, almost certainly *kṣaṇamātrasthāyī* (f. 26v7), a substantive variant.

84, 14. For *aṃśena*, accepted in the text and reported as being the reading of MSS A and B, C is recorded as reading *aṅgena*. I read C, however, as having *aṃśena*<sup>9</sup> (f. 32v1), which would be a non-substantive orthographic variant for *aṃśena*, of a type usually not recorded.

85, 4. For *idaṃ gamyate*, the adopted text, no variants are recorded. But C reads *idaṃ avagamyate* (f. 32v2–3). Note that at 82, 11 C is reported as reading *avagamyate* for the *gamyate* which there too has been adopted.

85, 8. The apparatus reports C alone among the manuscripts as reading the adopted *tatkāryaḥ*, for which the Tibetan translation (*de'i bras bur*) is also quoted as support; the other manuscripts, A and B, are recorded as having *kāryaḥ*. However, C reads *kāryaḥ* (f. 32v4). We are left uncertain whether this means that, in fact, none of the manuscripts have *tatkāryaḥ*, or whether the sigla of two manuscripts have been exchanged due to a slip (i.e. whether it is A or B, neither of which the reader can check, which reads *tatkāryaḥ*). Note that the *Pramāṇavārttikasvavṛtti*, Dharmakīrti's early work, of which he is re-using the wording here, also has

<sup>9</sup> *ś* and *g* are certainly similar in the Proto-Bengali script of the scribe of MS B, but *ś* can nonetheless be easily distinguished by the additional curve in the top, which is clearly visible here.

*kāryaḥ* (PVSV 22, 6).<sup>10</sup> The weight of evidence in favour of *tatkāryaḥ* is therefore less than one would at first suppose; exactly how much less cannot be determined without confirming what A and B read here. If their readings are correctly reported, a future editor will surely decide to adopt *kāryaḥ*, with all the manuscripts and with the support of the wording of the *Pramāṇavārttikasvavṛtti*.

85, 9. For *asaty apy* (with no variant recorded), C reads *apy asaty* (f. 32v5).

The above amount to ten places where the manuscripts seem to have been misread. Four are cases where an entry in the critical apparatus could be deleted (since a variant reported, when checked against the MS reproductions, turns out to be incorrect, with the MS reading identical with the accepted text, bar orthographical variation of a type generally not recorded). The remaining six all concern substantive variants which have either been inaccurately reported or not reported. Probably in only one of these passages (85, 8) is there a substantial likelihood that a future editor may make a different decision as regards the constitution of the text; nonetheless, the other five too are of interest at least for the study of the transmission and perhaps the reception of Dharmakīrti's work.

Extrapolating from these numbers, one would arrive at the estimate that, if all the manuscript evidence which Steinkellner used were to be checked, the number of errors, including errors of omission, in reporting manuscript readings might be found to be around 500, with around 300 of those concerning substantive variants. It is possible that the number would, in fact, be somewhat smaller; but be that as it may, comparison of these four manuscript sides with the edition and apparatus demonstrates clearly that, as asserted above on much more general grounds of principle, scholars engaged in careful study of Dharmakīrti's work will want to have the possibility to consult (reproductions of) the manuscripts themselves.

### 3. Testimonia

The top apparatus 'contains all references to the testimonia known to me' (i.e. to Steinkellner) 'at this time' (p. xl), with, in the case of testimonia which had been identified earlier, attribution to the scholar who had first noticed them, and

<sup>10</sup> This is not reported in Steinkellner's apparatus; as he explains, he adduces the readings of testimonia of various kinds—including Dharmakīrti's frequent self-citations or adaptations of his earlier formulations—only occasionally, in some cases where 'the primary sources are insufficient for a decision between equally possible alternatives' (p. xli; cf. p. xlii). This particular case might, however, be deemed to fall in just that category.

if the earlier identification was unpublished, a brief statement of the circumstances under which it was communicated to Steinkellner. These earlier identifications are many; but there is also a very substantial number of testimonia, that have been now for the first time identified, by Steinkellner himself.

The decision has been made not to report all the variants found in the testimonia (cf. footnote 10 above.) This is quite understandable, especially given that most of the texts in which they are found have not been critically edited. Nonetheless, there are some places where the evidence of the testimonia could play a significant role in establishing the text, and it is in part through making greater use of this evidence that a future, new, critical edition might, I think, occasionally be able to find scope for improvement.

The references to testimonia that have been identified are, as far as I can see (without having exhaustively checked them), very accurate indeed. However, numerous though they are, particularly for the first chapter, the collection of testimonia is still not complete, even for the works from which they have been culled.<sup>11</sup> Restricting myself here to the same corpus, with the addition of only one other text, namely Haribhadra's *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* (AAĀ),<sup>12</sup> a masterpiece of post-Dharmakīrtian Buddhist philosophy and soteriology, which quotes on several occasions from Dharmakīrti's works (and whose apparent neglect by Steinkellner is somewhat surprising), I have noted the following that can be added to the collection. It is no doubt to be expected that there are yet others from this corpus which have so far escaped my attention as well as Steinkellner's. References are by page and line of the edition; in the case of verses, verse and pāda references are added after the text passage. I use the same system of identifying testimonia of different kinds that Steinkellner does; see his explanation on pp. xxxv–xxxvi.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup> No doubt there are quite a few works, especially unpublished ones, which have not yet been searched for testimonia which may yield some.

<sup>12</sup> My references are to Wogihara 1932–1935.

<sup>13</sup> Relevant for my supplementary list are Ci' 'citatum in alio usus secundarii / citation in another text used secondarily, that is, a passage not marked by an author as being a citation', and Ci'e 'citatum in alio usus secundarii modo edendi / citation in another text used secondarily, that is, not marked by an author as being a citation, with redactional changes'. Incidentally, an explanation of the category Ce' (which should be *citatum ex alio usus secundarii*) seems to have been omitted.

## Additional Testimonia for PV in chapters 1 and 2

Page, line	Text (abbreviated)	Testimonium
1, 10	na hy ... viṣaṃvādyate	PST 62, 10f <sup>14</sup>
4, 6–7	pramāṇe°... sadbhāvaḥ (1.2a–c)	MṛV 149, 7f
7, 7	abhilāpa°... kalpanā	TĀV IV 26, 9f <sup>15</sup>
9, 7	arhasya ... °payogāt	NBhūṣ 182, 24
10, 1–2	jāti°... °yogāt	NBhūṣ 183, 10f
19, 11–12	bhinna°... °kṣamam (1.20)	NPT 29, 15f; ŚD 149, 12f; ĪPVV II 159, 6f
20, 3–4	niṣpādita°... atipatati	AAĀ 2, 8f
21, 1–2	nainam ... virodhāt <sup>16</sup>	ŚVT I 123, 12f; ŚVT I 258, 14f
21, 11	tad°... °hetukāḥ (1.22ab)	AAĀ 175, 11; MṛV 69, 9
25, 6	ekam ...paśyāmaḥ	NPT 17, 12f
26, 3–6	saṃsargād ... °vastuṣu (1.25) <sup>17</sup>	ĪPVV I 175, 21f
27, 13–28, 1	kāma°...iva	TĀV I 77, 15f; TĀV X 115, 14f <sup>18</sup>
p. 28, 4–5	tasmād ... °phalam (1.31)	AAĀ 4, 26f
28, 11	na ... °pratibhāsita (1.32ab)	NK <sup>1</sup> 188, 3f
29, 2	tan na ... sphuṭayati	ĪPVV II 410, 16 <sup>19</sup>
29, 6	vikalpo ... upaplavaḥ (1.33ab)	AAĀ 158, 16
31, 3	na hi ... sādhanam	PST 1 66, 4f <sup>20</sup>
38, 5–6	avibhāgo ... lakṣyate (1.44)	NBhūṣ 57, 6f; NPT 20, 10f
40, 13	apratyakṣo°...prasidhyati (1.54cd)	AAĀ 97, 11
41, 12–13	svayam ... iti	ŚVT II 108, 20 <sup>21</sup>
42, 1	siddhaḥ ... °yogāt	ŚVT II 108, 21 <sup>22</sup>
42, 3–4	saṃvedanam ...kasyacit	ĪPVV II 86, 11f
43, 9	bāhya°...°rekataḥ (1.56cd)	ĪPVV II 129, 1
60, 2	yāvān ... °palabdheḥ	NBhūṣ 288, 21; 289, 5; ĪPVV I 279, 15f
64, 9	nāsattā°... viprakarṣiṇām	R 80, 16f
86, 9–10	nityam ... °sambhavaḥ (2.58)	AAĀ 179, 14–15

## 4. The critical text

The edited text, i.e., to stress again what should perhaps be obvious, the editor's hypothesis, is, as was to be expected, a superb achievement. It is presented neatly enough in Devanāgarī type; some may find the readability reduced, however, by the potentially distracting plenitude of stars above the *akṣaras* (indicating the presence of a variant in the critical apparatus), raised lower-case roman letters (indicat-

ing the existence of a testimonium, with the details recorded in the apparatus dedicated thereto), lowered upper-case roman letters (indicating folio changes in the three manuscripts), and lowered numbers (indicating line changes in one of those manuscripts, A). The latter are printed more than once overlapping the lower parts of the *akṣaras*, e.g. at 2, 8, where the lowered number 5, marking the start of

<sup>14</sup> Recorded as a citation from the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* in the apparatus of the edition of PST by Steinkellner, Krasser and Lasic, so that the omission here, in the apparatus of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* edition, is a somewhat surprising oversight.

<sup>15</sup> Note that TĀV volume IV has different page numberings; numbering is started again from 1 at the beginning of the seventh *āhnika*. This citation is in the seventh *āhnika*, so on the second p. 26.

<sup>16</sup> No testimonium had, it seems, hitherto been identified for this sentence.

<sup>17</sup> The testimonium is of the verse only, not the prose between the verse-halves.

<sup>18</sup> Steinkellner does note one other testimonium for this verse from the TĀV.

<sup>19</sup> Clearly the *tatra* of the KSTS edition of the *Īsvaraṇḍīyābhijñānavivṛti-vimarśinī* is an error for the (in Śāradā script particularly similar) *tan na*.

<sup>20</sup> Ci'e.

<sup>21</sup> Ci'.

<sup>22</sup> Ci'.

line 5 of A f. 1v, overlaps with the medial *u* of *vastu*<sup>o</sup>, which does not make for really smooth reading. No doubt many readers would have preferred to have the text in Roman transliteration, if that would have avoided these problems.

According to the introduction (p. xlv), ‘the classical rules of *sandhi* have been consistently applied’. There are, in fact, some places where this is not the case (e.g. 25, 2, where we find *sukham anatisāye* printed instead of *sukham anatisāye*; 31, 10, where we find *iti ayam* printed instead of *ity ayam*; or 65, 6, where we find *tān śāstram* printed instead of *tāñ śāstram* or *tāñ chāstram*); but this is not likely to cause any trouble to readers.

Occasionally, the reading experience is slightly marred, however, by minor printing errors. For the most part, however, these can be quite easily recognized and corrected. Steinkellner has himself already published a list of thirty-three corrigenda, with two important addenda as well, to the book.<sup>23</sup> Of these thirty-three, sixteen concern rectifications of what should probably be classified as typographical errors in the text; the rest are corrections, again almost exclusively of typographical errors, to the introduction, the critical apparatus and the bibliography.

I have noticed a few further typographical errors in the critical text which could be added, if a ‘Corrigenda 3’ (see footnote 23) is to be prepared.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Steinkellner 2008, pp. 207–208. The reason for the ‘2’ in the title of this paper is presumably (though this is not explained in the paper) that a PDF file with a less comprehensive list of corrigenda was made available earlier by Steinkellner online at [http://ikga.oew.ac.at/Mat/steinkellner07\\_corrigenda.pdf](http://ikga.oew.ac.at/Mat/steinkellner07_corrigenda.pdf) (last consulted Nov. 24th, 2009). That is dated 16. 01. 2008, whereas the published article gives July 15, 2008, as its cutoff date (p. 207, asterisked note); it includes all the corrigenda in the earlier list.

<sup>24</sup> The following are the further corrigenda (in the strict sense; I do not note, for instance, cases of awkward phrasing in the English, which is generally good) I have noticed, apart from the corrections to the critical text, which could be added to a future integrated list.

Page, line	Printed Text	Correct Text
vii, n. 1, l. 17	translations	translations of PVin 3 <sub>1</sub> , 1
xxvi, 8–9	<i>gṛdhrānupāsmāhe</i>	<i>gṛdhrān upāsmāhe</i>
xxxvii, 17	establishment	establishment
xxxviii, 23	<i>nānavayah</i>	<i>nānavayah</i>
xxxix, 4	2. 60, 4	2. 60, 6
2, App. 1, l. 3	(VETTER: 32 n. 2)	(VETTER: 32 n. 2)
34, App. 1, l. 2–3	(cf. NVTI 337,21–338, 11)	(cf. NVTI 337,21–338, 11)
41, App. 2, l. 3	pa’ phyir	pa’i phyir
51, App. 1, l. 1	NĪPP	NPT
57, App. 2, l. 2	°tvāt	°atvāt
104, 30	SSTAR	STAR

#### Additional Corrigenda to the Critical Edition

Page, line	Printed Text	Correct Text
47, 2	pratyakṣenānyathā	pratyakṣenānyathā
54, 3	abrūvan	abruvan
54, 3	brūvan	bruvan
85, 8	akāryatve ’kāranāt	akāryatve ’kāraṇāt

With printing errors corrected, the text presented is very readable. In most places, it is unlikely that it can be improved on, unless perhaps one day further important manuscript evidence should be discovered (though note section II above). This is not to say, however, that each editorial decision is likely to be agreed to by all students of Dharmakīrti. There are still some passages which are in one way or another problematic and deserve, in my judgement, discussion and reconsideration. One would want to know, in these places, what Steinkellner’s reasons were for his choices, so that they could be justly evaluated. In the absence, however, of a detailed textual commentary, or an annotated translation (which amounts to practically the same as a commentary),<sup>25</sup> those reasons can only be guessed at.

An attempt to discuss thoroughly even a few of these remaining textual problems would go beyond the scope of the present paper. I will however give, as a hint which I hope may be useful to other readers of the edition, one general rule, with a few examples. Places where, according to the critical apparatus, Steinkellner has emended against the reading of all his manuscripts should be considered carefully. In not a few of them, the emendation, or conjecture, is probably not necessary; sometimes it can be labelled with some certainty as an error.

The first such case of emendation occurs at 2, 11, where Steinkellner emends *yathāvidhaḥ* for the manuscripts’ *yathāvidhe* (A and B) or *yathāvidha*<sup>o</sup> C. This is a somewhat tricky case to decide,<sup>26</sup> but since the relative must

<sup>25</sup> Steinkellner’s translation of 1973 of the second chapter, being based on the Tibetan translation, can of course not be looked on as a guide to the decisions he took more than thirty years later in editing the Sanskrit text.

<sup>26</sup> Steinkellner’s decision was probably influenced, though this is not made explicit, by the fact that *yathāvidhaḥ* is given in Vetter 1966, 32 n. 2, to which the apparatus of testimonia refers here, as the reading found in the quotation of the passage in the *Nyāyavārtikātparyāyikā*. However, the edition by Thakur, which is that to which Steinkellner himself refers for the NVTI, and which, thanks to its use of the famous Jaisalmer manuscript, is probably the best edition available at present, gives *yathāvidhe*, the same reading as Steinkellner’s MSS A and B. The other testimonium for this passage, in the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa* (NBhūṣ 381, 11–12), reads, incidentally, *yathāvidha*<sup>o</sup> in the notoriously unreliable edition; Dr Elliot Stern informs me, however, that the manuscript of this work reads in fact *yathāvidhi*<sup>o</sup>, which if anything strengthens slightly the case for *yathāvidhe* (e-mail of December 13th, 2009).

correspond to the immediately following correlative (in *tathāvidhasannidhānam*), and since that must refer to the object of inference, the locative, dependent on the preceding *pratibaddhasvabhāvaḥ*, is probably to be preferred.<sup>27</sup>

Perhaps clearer is the case at 15, 1, where Steinkellner prints *upayannāpayamś*, reporting the manuscripts as all reading *upayannapayamś*. The lack of word division in the apparatus is surprising, and it is not clear to me what Steinkellner wanted his text to mean. In any case, the reading of the manuscripts, which should be understood as *upayannapayamś*, two present participles, is unproblematic and should surely not be emended.

Another minor illustration of the need to consider the editor's emendations carefully: at 65, 9, the apparatus reports B and C as reading 'vyavasātum and A as having *vyavaśāntam*. Certainly neither of these would be possible, whereas the emendation that has been adopted, *vyavasātum*, is, and many are likely to read over this passage without noticing anything doubtful. However, bearing in mind that in the scripts of B and C the ligatures *vyā* and *dhyā* are extremely similar, indeed sometimes probably indistinguishable, it would be better to read the equally possible 'dhyavasātum; and it would not be a surprise to me if B and/or C, when checked, would be found to read just this.

As a final example, let me note that at 63, 9, Steinkellner's emendation *antyaḥṣaṇe 'pratibandhaḥ*, where the manuscripts are reported as reading *antyaḥṣaṇo 'pratibandhaḥ* (A and C) or *antyaḥṣaṇo apratibandhaḥ* (B; not substantively different from the reading of A and C, for which it may be called a non-standard sandhi variant), is unnecessary. The nominative transmitted unanimously is quite unproblematic; note that *apratibandhaḥ* should be understood as a bahuvrīhi adjective qualifying *antyaḥṣaṇaḥ*.

## 5. Introduction and Indices

The introduction reports on the circumstances, unusual and of considerable interest, which led to this publication, describes the sources used, outlines the editorial policy, and explains the conventions used. All these are admirably done; readers are given ample information and can learn much here, especially about the sources; at nearly twenty pages, the sub-section describing the manuscripts, 1.1, is by far the longest part of the introduction.

What is striking, in contrast, is the brevity of the discussion of editorial policy (section III). This is probably an indication of a pragmatic approach to textual criticism, which I applaud, although I would have been glad if a few more

words had been said on this, to make Steinkellner's position clearer and more explicit. In any case, it is striking that no appeal is made to the stemma (as it effectively is, though the word is not used here) proposed and argued for in the directly preceding section (II), as a basis for editorial decisions. This is just as well, no doubt; all the more so since one of Steinkellner's two addenda (given at Steinkellner 2008, 208; see footnote 23 above) implies a significant change to the stemma.

Of interest for codicologists may be the sub-section entitled 'A note on *lacunae* and their filling', on pp. xxii–xxiii. This note is made apropos of manuscript C, which contains 'a considerable number of different gap-filling signs' (p. xxii). Steinkellner suggests the following explanation:

Wherever the scribe was initially unable to decipher a portion of the exemplar, he left a gap approximately the length of the undeciphered *akṣaras*. When, in a second step, the text that had been undecipherable became clear, e.g., by referring to another manuscript, the gap was filled with the previously problematic *akṣaras*. [...] However, in cases where no text was found to be actually lacking, gap-filling signs were inserted. Why, then, were gaps left in the first place? Some of the undecipherable *akṣara* chains may have been portions of the text that had been deleted or erased in the exemplar, but which could not be distinguished from a case of normal illegibility. The scribe thus left a gap because the deletion was unclear. When it became apparent that no text was missing, gap-filling signs were inserted to close the line. I also assume this to be the cause of most other cases of gap-filling devices within lines that have no apparent reason. (p. xxiii)

This hypothesis is certainly worthy of note. There are many Nepalese and East-Indian manuscripts that display the same phenomenon of gap-filling signs without an obvious cause, such as a correction which has resulted in a gap. My impression has been that in several cases these have another reason, namely to cover an area which was deemed less suitable for copying on, because of a minor flaw in the palm-leaf. However, it must be admitted that in some cases such a flaw cannot be detected (at least not from micro-film images), and that it is possible that in these cases at least another explanation, such as that put forward by Steinkellner, may have to be sought. The problem of gap-filling signs remains, I would say, one which requires further investigation.

The book has no less than five indices, which will certainly prove very useful. They are: an index of modern authors, an index of Names of Persons, Schools and Texts, an Index locorum, and a *pāda* (verse-quarter) index. At least the

<sup>27</sup> It is also supported by the best edition of one of the testimonia; see footnote 26 above.

first of these could have been more valuable if it had also given references to occurrences in the introduction, rather than only to occurrences in the critical apparatus.

In general, the indices appear to be very accurate. However, the last index suffers from a few wrong divisions of *pādas*. Thus, for example, the first half of 2.42 reads thus: *na yuktibādhā yatrāsti tad grāhyaṃ laukikaṃ yadi*. The two eight-syllable *pādas* are hence, of course, *na yuktibādhā yatrāsti* (2.42a) and *tad grāhyaṃ laukikaṃ yadi* (2.42b). The *pāda* index, however, gives 2.42a as *na yuktibādhā yatrāsti tat* (p. 133); and if one looks for *tad grāhyaṃ laukikaṃ yadi*, it cannot be found, because 2.42b has been wrongly identified as *grāhyaṃ laukikaṃ yadi* and hence is on p. 131, alphabetized under *ga*, instead of on p. 132, alphabetized under *ta*, as it should be. 2.21cd and 2.27ab have likewise been wrongly divided, with the same consequence that in each case the second *pāda* cannot be found where it should be.

The rather questionable decision to undo sandhi between the *pādas*, even when this results in a *pāda* appearing in the index in nine-syllable form, may also make the task of a user more difficult. For example, 2.58b is found alphabetized under *a*, in the nine-syllable form *ahetor anyānapekṣaṇāt*, whereas readers are more likely to look under *h*, expecting the eight-syllabled *'hetor anyānapekṣaṇāt*.

## 6. Concluding remarks

The critical edition of the first two chapters of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* testifies to rare skills, diplomatic as well as philological. The amount of learning and the amount of patient, careful, labour that has gone to produce it is staggering, though this can perhaps only be fully appreciated by readers who have worked on a comparable project themselves. With this book, Steinkellner has made another contribution of tremendous importance to what is no doubt a common goal of students and scholars of Sanskrit and of Indian Buddhism: to ‘incorporate it’ [i.e. the corpus of Sanskrit manuscripts from Tibet] ‘into the intellectual and spiritual history of mankind’ (Steinkellner 2003, 30).

Nevertheless, in this task, I would like to stress once more in conclusion that the production of critical editions, important though it is, cannot render consultation of the manuscripts themselves unnecessary – even if these editions are produced to the highest possible levels of scholarship. For this reason, the publication of facsimiles, or rather, more generally, making reproductions of the manuscripts available to scholars,<sup>28</sup> is no less important. And while praising, with-

out reservations, the initiative of the Austrian Academy of Sciences and the China Tibetology Research Centre to publish critical editions such as this one, we should encourage them at the same time not to neglect this other equally urgent priority. For, to restate the very simple main theme of this paper, while progress in scholarship is to a very large extent made through the putting forward of hypotheses (including critical editions), it is necessary, if the construction of an edifice of speculation and theory that is ever shakier and ever further removed from empirical observation is to be avoided, that students and scholars should study and should base their own further proposals on, not those hypotheses alone, but the evidence itself, i.e., in this case, above all the manuscripts.

## REFERENCES

- Schoening, Jeffrey (1995), *The Śālistamba Sūtra and its Indian Commentaries. Volume 1: Translation with Annotation* (Vienna: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien; Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 35,1).
- Steinkellner, Ernst (2007) (ed.), *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścaya Chapters 1 and 2* (Beijing/Vienna: China Tibetology Publishing House/Austrian Academy of Sciences Press; Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region No. 2).
- (2008), ‘Miscellen zur erkenntnistheoretisch-logischen Schule des Buddhismus X: Corrigenda 2 et addenda to *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścaya*. Chapters 1 and 2. Critically Edited by Ernst Steinkellner. Beijing – Vienna 2007’, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 51, 2007–2008: 207–208.
- Tanselle, G. Thomas (1995), ‘The Varieties of Scholarly Editing’, in D.C. Greetham (ed.), *Scholarly Editing: A Guide to Research* (New York: The Modern Language Association of America).
- Timpanaro, Sebastian (2005), *The Genesis of Lachmann's Method*. ed. and trans. by Glenn W. Most (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Witzel, Michael (1997), *Inside the Texts, Beyond the Texts: New Approaches to the Study of the Vedas. Proceedings of the International Vedic Workshop, Harvard University, June 1989* (Cambridge: Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University).
- Wogihara, Unrai (1932–1935) (ed.), *Abhisamayālamkāra-ālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā (Commentary on Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā) by Haribhadra Together with the Text Commented on* (Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, Toyo Bunko Publications, Series D, vol. II).

<sup>28</sup> This would of course be equally possible by, for instance, putting digital images online. As models in this regard, one might mention the International Dunhuang Project (<http://idp.bl.uk/>) and the less publicized but no less laud-

able initiative of Tokyo University Library to put digital images of all their Sanskrit manuscripts online ([http://utlskms.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp/list\\_kh.jsp](http://utlskms.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp/list_kh.jsp)).