

**Miszellen zur erkenntnistheoretisch-logischen
Schule des Buddhismus IX:
The Colophon of Dharmottara's
Pramānaviniścayaṭīkā***

A copy of an incomplete, to my present knowledge unique 120-folio manuscript (MS) of the third chapter of Dharmottara's Pramānaviniścayaṭīkā in the palm-leaf manuscripts collection, Tanjur division, of the Potala is kept in the library of the Chinese Tibetology Research Center, Beijing.¹ A detailed description of this manuscript will appear in the introduction to my forthcoming edition of the first two chapters of Dharmakīrti's Pramānaviniścaya, and more information will follow with the edition of the third chapter by Pascale Hugon, Toru Tomabechi and Tom Tillemans.

Helmut Krasser drew attention to the colophon of Dharmottara's Ṭīkā as a possible source of Bu ston's statement that Dharmottara was a pupil of Dharmākaradatta, i.e., Arcāṭa, and Śubhagupta.² While the hitherto only available Tibetan translation of this colophon seems quite ambiguous to me, the Sanskrit text of the colophon reveals that Bu ston's statement is an interpretation. Dharmottara does refer to his predecessors, but he does not say that they were his teachers. I nevertheless see no reason to doubt the validity of Bu ston's understanding. In the hope of finding other historical information, I copied and edited the text of the colophon. But, alas, nothing more of historical interest appeared, except for the fact that this colophon is also the source of the

* I gratefully acknowledge the pleasure of discussing the problems in this little piece with Vincent Eltschinger, Helmut Krasser, Horst Lasic, Toru Tomabechi and Ven. Vinīta Tseng, the good suggestions made by Ulrich Timme Kragh and Chlodwig H. Werba, as well as the thorough finishing touches by Karin Preisendanz.

¹ I would like to express my gratitude to the Center for being able to study this colophon on the basis of the 2004 cooperation agreement between the Center and the Austrian Academy of Sciences.

² Helmut Krasser, *Dharmottaras kurze Untersuchung der Gültigkeit einer Erkenntnis: Laghuprāmāṇyaparīkṣā*. Teil 2: Übersetzung. [SbÖAW 578 = Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 7]. Wien: VÖAW, 1991, p. 5, n. 1.

name 'Thad ldan³ so often used in the Tibetan tradition when referring to this Ṭikā.

However, on closer inspection of the Sanskrit text and upon comparison of it with the Tibetan translation, some points of relevance for the transmission of this colophon became clear and are worth noting: The *lacuna* without a space at the beginning of verse 4, which is inferable from metrical necessity and for which words are attested by the Tibetan translation, as well as the sudden end of the text would indicate that this colophon was copied from an already corrupt exemplar. Moreover, while it is clear that the Tibetan text suffered during its transmission, it is also evident that the translation is based on a different Sanskrit manuscript than the one I was able to see.

Thus, even if its historical value is somewhat disappointing, the edition below may nonetheless be of use for further appreciation of Dharmotara's style and poetical prowess.

MS 159B7-160A3⁴

iti pravacanodadher vvitatayuktisetur ggalat⁰pradeśapariśankayā calitadrṣṭipātair ayam gato hi na *viniścayas* tad ayam adyaja(tn)o⁽⁸⁾ māyā svaśaktisadrśaḥ kṛtaḥ kṛtibhir eva vijñāsyate | mahadbhir avivecitam kiyad api pramityā mayā vivṛtya sukṛtam kṛtam ya(d uta) muktisampatphalam avāpya padam acyutam sakala^(160a)bodhidharmmottaram tarantu bhavasāgaram sucaritād ato jantavaḥ <||> mitraih samākramya *viniścaya*sya *ṭikām* anicchann api kārīto 'haṃ mitram hi saṃśliṣya kareṇa lokam kārye nirudyogam api pra(yu(ñj)e)⁽²⁾t⁰ | sumahatī cintāpravāsasthitir vyā{khye}{kṣe}pāyatanāni sūktakaṇikā tasmād iha syād yadi | sā *dharmākaradatta* ity avihataprakhyātayo bhūtale pādā ye *śubhagupta* ity api laghus te⁽³⁾śām prabodhānkuraḥ || suśliṣṭapakṣasthitir anyayā tām ☼ dūram samutsrjya bhuvam pravṛttā | teśam <gatā du(rgga-magamyā)>{prati}dve/dviṣṭhā(m) prajñā vihaṃgādhipateś ca sāmyam || sūryāgamadyutim uṣātighanena yu⁵

³ Krasser proposes *Yuktimatī as its original name.

⁴ (...) = marginal additions; (...) = unclear *akṣaras*; {...} = deleted *akṣaras*; ..⁰ = *virāma* lacking.

⁵ At the end of lines 2 and 3 four illegible *akṣaras* separated by a vertical line have been added.

EDITION⁶

1. iti pravacanodadher vitatayuktisetur galat-
pradeśapariśaṅkayā calitadṛṣṭipātair ayam |
gato hi na *viniścayas* tad ayam adya yatno⁷ mayā⁸
svaśaktisadrśaḥ kṛtaḥ kṛtibhir eva vijñāsyate |⁹
2. mahadbhir avivecitam kiyad api pramityā mayā
vivṛtya sukṛtam kṛtam yad uta muktisampatphalam |
avāpya padam acyutam sakalabodhidharmottaram |
tarantu bhavasāgaram sucaritād ato jantavaḥ ||¹⁰
3. mitraih samākramya *viniścayasya*
ṭikām anicchann api kārīto 'ham |
mitram hi saṁśliṣya kareṇa lokam
kārye nirudyogam api prayuñjet |¹¹
4. <*anyokter anuvartanā>¹² sumahatī cintāpravāsasthitih¹³ /
vyākṣepāyatanāni sūktakaṇikā tasmād iha syād yadi |
sā *Dharmākaradatta* ity avihataprakhyātayo bhūtale /
pādā ye *Śubhagupta* ity api laghus teṣāṃ prabodhāṅkuraḥ ||¹⁴
5. suśliṣṭapakṣasthitir anyayātām
dūram samutsṛjya bhuvam pravṛttā |
teṣāṃ gatā durgamagamanyaniṣṭhām¹⁵
prajñā vihamgādhipateś ca sāmyam ||¹⁶
6. sūryāgamadyutim uṣātighanena yu ///¹⁷

⁶ <...> = emendational addition with no space in the MS; | = *danḍa* in MS; / = editorial *danḍa*.

⁷ yatno *em.* : jatno *MS*.

⁸ mayā *em.* : māyā *MS*.

⁹ Pṛthvī.

¹⁰ Pṛthvī.

¹¹ Indravajrā.

¹² anyokter anuvartanā *em.* (gʒan zer rjes 'jug *Tib.*).

¹³ mi mthun par ni gnas par dag *Tib. for* °pravāsasthitih.

¹⁴ Śārdulavikrīḍita.

¹⁵ °niṣṭhām *em.* (*cf.* mthar *Tib.*) : °dve/dviṣṭhām *MS*.

¹⁶ Indravajrā.

¹⁷ Meter?

TIBETAN TEXT¹⁸

1. de ltar phyogs ñams dogs pas gsuñ rab rgya mtsho yi //
 rigs gziñs¹⁹ rgya chen *rnam ñes* 'di ni mi brtan²⁰ pa'i //
 lta bar ltuñ bas ma rtogs des da²¹ rañ²² nus bzin //
 bdag gis 'bad pa²³ 'di byas byas rnams kho nas šes //
2. bdag gis tshad mas che²⁴ bas ma phyed cuñ zad
 tsam yañ rnam bkral²⁵ bas //
 'di ltar thar pa phun tshogs 'bras can legs
 par bya ba byas 'gyur ba //
 legs spyad des ni 'gro rnams 'pho med go 'phañ
 byañ chub kun gyi ni //
 chos mchog thob nas 'khor ba'i rgya mtsho
 las ni rab tu rgal bar šog //
3. grogs po rnams kyis bskul bas mi 'dod kyañ //
 rnam par ñes pa'i 'grel bśad ñas²⁶ byas te //
 'di ltar 'jig rten spro ba med pa yañ //
 grogs po²⁷ lag gis 'jug nas 'bras la sbyor //
4. gzan zer rjes 'jug śin tu cher sems mi mthun par ni gnas pa dag //
 rnam g.yeñ skye mched des 'dir gal te legs
 bśad gzegs ma yod na der //
 gañ dag źal śna *Chos 'byuñ byin* dañ *dGe sruñs* źes byas sa steñ na //
 sgrib med rab grags de dag gis ni rtogs pa'i myu gu cuñ zad yin //
5. legs 'brel phyogs gnas gzan gyis bgrod ba'i sa²⁸ //
 riñ du spañs nas rab tu 'jug bgrod dka'i //
 bgrod bya'i mthar phyin šes rab de dag gi //
 tshul ni bya yi rgyal po dag dañ mtshuñs //

¹⁸ P, We, 209a5-b7; N, We, 188a4-188b6; D, Tshe, 177b2-178b3; C, Tshe, 181b7-182b1.
 (P = Peking; N = Narthang; D = Derge; C = Cone); cf. postscript.

¹⁹ gziñs *em.* : gziñs *PND*C.

²⁰ brtan *PN* : brten *DC*.

²¹ da *em.* : de *PND* : der *C*.

²² rañ *em.* : rab *PD* : ba *C*.

²³ pa *em.* : pas *PD* (bas) *C*.

²⁴ che *em.* : phye *PDC*.

²⁵ bkral *DC* : bgral *P*; dkral *N*.

²⁶ ñas *P* : ñes/des *ND*, des *C*.

²⁷ po *PN* : pos *DC*.

²⁸ ba'i sa *em.* : ba yis *PND*C.

6. ñi śar 'od 'joms mun stug gis bsgribs gañs rum du //
 gnas pa'i mi 'am kha bas 'khyags pa'i padma dag //
 rab tu rgyas par 'gyur ba dag ni ga la yod //
 des na che rnam s dpyod med bdag la mi mñes med //

7. stoñ phrag bži dañ gsum dañ bži //
 brgya phrag lña dañ drug dañ gsum //
 ñi śu gñis dañ gsum cu ste //
 de ni gñis drug gsum beas so //²⁹

slob spon *Chos mchog* gis sbyar ba *rNam par nes pa'i tika 'Thad ldan zes*
 bya ba rdzogs so ////

bstan beos chen po³⁰ don dañ tshig tu beas //
 legs rtogs 'gro na ñi bžin gsal byed pa //
 tshul khriims gtsaṅ ma'i dri ṅad ldan³¹ ba gañ //
 slob dpon *Chos mchog* rtog ge ṅan 'joms mchog //

yañ dag don gsal tshad ma'i bstan chos 'di //
 legs par bsgyur las byuñ ba'i bsod nams gañ //
 des ni log lta'i rgyun phyogs skye bo rnam //
 yañ dag rigs pa'i lam du 'jug par śog //

kha che'i pañdi ta *gZan la phan pa bzañ po* la sogs pa dañ / bod kyi lo
 tstsha ba *Blo ldan śes rab* kyi *Groñ khyer dpe med du* bsgyur pa'o //

TRANSLATION³²

1. In this manner (*iti*) [as presented in my explanation] this *Viniścaya*, a broad bridge of reasoning over the ocean of the Teachings, has surely (*hi*) not been understood/crossed by those whose vision is disturbed by (their) fear of dissolving/swallowing regions [like the ocean of Teachings]. Therefore, this effort [in composing a commentary], which to my (best) ability I brought to an end today, will be understood only by the intelligent ones.

²⁹ I have no idea what the meaning of these numbers could be. They may represent an accounting of the size of the work and its parts. But how? Any information in this regard would be much appreciated (mail to ernst.steinkellner@oeaw.ac.at).

³⁰ po *PN* : po'i *DC*.

³¹ ldan *DC* : ldañ *PN*.

³² Slashes separate *śleṣa*-alternatives. Round brackets contain implied meanings or words. Square brackets contain additional words that indicate my understanding.

2. Having explained with proper knowledge even a little which was not (yet) examined by the great ones, I created (such) good which (may) well result in complete liberation. May the people because of this good work reach that permanent station, the highest factor of complete awakening, and thus cross the sea of existences!
3. Pressed by friends, I have been prompted, though unwilling, to compose a *Ṭīkā* on the *Viniścaya*. For a friend, in clasping with (his) hand, may direct even indolent people to an enterprise.
4. Excessive (*sumahatī*) imitation of the words of others [means] estrangement from [one's own] reflection [and] ground for distraction.³³ Hence, if here [in my work there might] be a little grain of good statements, it (would be) a small sprout from the thorough knowledge of the honourable *Dharmākaradatta*, whose fame on earth is unimpeded, as well as (from the knowledge) of *Śubhagupta*.
5. Their insight with its steadiness due to well-joined theses/wings, which commenced after leaving the ground upon which others walk far behind, has reached the very end of the most difficult places to go (*durgama*), and³⁴ has become equal³⁵ to the king of birds.
6. ³⁶The people who live among masses of snow covered by intense darkness that conquers even the light of the rising sun, or the lotuses shivering in the cold, how can they be brought to expansion? Thus, the Great Ones will not be pleased with me, if I do not examine [this].³⁷
7. ³⁸4000+3+4/4000+3000+4000
500+6+3/500+600+300
22+30
this with 2,6,3 (?).³⁹

³³ This line is quite uncertain. I took *anuvartanā* as subject and °*sthitiḥ* as well as °*āyatanāni* as subject predicates.

³⁴ *ca* without equivalent in Tib.

³⁵ *tshul ni- dan mshuñs* Tib. for *sāmyam*.

³⁶ The remainder is translated from the Tibetan.

³⁷ The beginning of this stanza is attested in the manuscript. I find it noteworthy that here the author seems to indicate the idea that his work may be of benefit to the mental development of peoples in the Himalayan or even Tibetan regions.

³⁸ Cf. n. 29 above.

³⁹ The following is the colophon of the Tibetan translation: “Ācārya Dharmottara’s composition, Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā *Yuktimatī by name, is completed. Dharmottara, who illuminates a well understood great treatise of meaningful sentences like the sun (illuminates) the world, is the best defeater of bad logicians. May the people who side

POSTSCRIPT

In their proposal for standardised sigla for the hand-written and printed versions of the Tibetan Canon (Kanjur and Tanjur),⁴⁰ Harrison and Eimer suggested the use of Q for the “Peking edition of Kanjur and Tanjur prepared in 1737 under the Qianlong emperor”. This edition is the basis of the photographic reprint by Otani University (1955-1961) which earlier had the siglum P. The reason for their proposal was that the siglum P had already been allotted to the Petersburg MS of the Mongolian Kanjur. I was never quite happy with their choice of the new siglum Q, but out of solidarity followed their commonly accepted proposal.

In the introduction to his study and edition of Śrāvakabhūmi 4,⁴¹ however, Deleanu made it clear with regard to the Tanjur that the edition prepared under the Qianlong emperor in 1738 (!) was nothing but “a new impression” of the Canon whose Tanjur was printed as the first woodblock edition in 1724 under the Shizong emperor in Peking.

Thus, we are actually using, even though we may not be totally aware thereof, a Tanjur edited in Peking. Thus the former siglum P is duly validated, and its attribution to the time of the Qianlong emperor implied by the siglum Q can no longer be supported. I will return, therefore, to the siglum P for the Peking edition in the form of its Otani reprint. I am grateful to Katsumi Mimaki for his early word of caution in this matter.

with the stream of wrong views enter the path of correct logic on account of the merit accrued from the good translation of this treatise, which clarifies the true meaning [of the Pramānaviniścaya]! Translated in Anupamapura by the Kashmirian pandit Parahitabhadra and others together with the Tibetan translator Blo ldan śes rab.”

⁴⁰ Paul Harrison – Helmut Eimer, Kanjur and Tanjur Sigla: A Proposal for Standardisation. In: Helmut Eimer (ed.), *Transmission of the Tibetan Canon*. Wien: VÖAW, 1997, p. XI-XIV.

⁴¹ Florin Deleanu, *The Chapter on the Mundane Path (Laukikamārga) in the Śrāvakabhūmi*. Vol. I. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 2006, p. 85f. and n. 97.

