

II

**Introduction to the text,
manuscript description
and editorial principles**

1. Dharmottara's *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭkā*

Dharmakīrti (7th c. or earlier), the main figure of the Buddhist epistemological school, had a major influence on the development of Indian philosophy in general, and of Buddhist thought in particular.¹ He is known to have authored nine works (two of which are auto-commentaries).² Among them, the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* can be considered his second major work, the first being the *Pramāṇavārttika*. Tibetan scholars commonly refer to Dharmakīrti's works—all of which are preserved in Tibetan translation—as “the seven-fold collection” (*sde bdun*).³ They often classify the seven treatises into two groups: three major treatises, referred to as the “body”—distinguished as ‘extended,’ ‘medium,’ and ‘condensed,’ respectively—and four minor treatises, referred to as the “limbs,” characterized as appendices on specific issues related to inference.⁴

| MAJOR WORKS | | MINOR WORKS |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Extended (<i>rgyas</i>) | <i>Pramāṇavārttika</i> | <i>Hetubindu</i> |
| Medium (‘bring) | <i>Pramāṇaviniścaya</i> | <i>Sambandhaparīkṣā</i> |
| Condensed (<i>bsdus pa</i>) | <i>Nyāyabindu</i> | <i>Vādanyāya</i> |

This classification explains in part the central role the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* played during the first phase of the development of Tibetan epistemology at the time of the Later Diffusion of Buddhism.⁵ Its size and the fact that it combines verses and prose make it easier to study than the longer and

¹ See Eltschinger 2010 and 2019 and Tillemans 2011.

² Cf. Steinkellner and Much 1985: 23–44.

³ They do not count the two *vṛttis* (*Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti* and *Sambandhaparīkṣāvṛtti*) as distinct works.

⁴ The earliest evidence for this classification dates from the second part of the 12th century. Cf. Hugon 2008: 64, n. 184 for references.

⁵ Cf. van der Kuijp 1989 on the periodization of Tibetan epistemology.

more complex *Pramāṇavārttika*. Its being designated a “body”-like work in the abovementioned classification suggests that its contents cover the same range of topics as the *Pramāṇavārttika* (although this is actually not the case) and merely differs from the latter in view of its length, and thus legitimized its use as the main, if not the only source of reference for Tibetan scholars of the 11th–13th c. who were composing their own epistemological treatises. The *Pramāṇaviniścaya* was Dharmakīrti's most commented upon work until the 13th century, when the *Pramāṇavārttika* began to take precedence and, within a few centuries, supplanted it as the principal reference.

There are two extant Indian commentaries on the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, both entitled *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā*: one by Dharmottara (ca. 740–800, fl. 760–790),⁶ the other by Jñānaśrībhadrā (second half of the 11th c.). The impact these commentaries had in India remains to be investigated.⁷

⁶ Cf. Krasser 1992: 157. Dharmottara's date falls between Śāntarākṣita (ca. 725–788) and Kamalaśīla (ca. 740–795). On Dharmottara, see Frauwallner 1961: 147–148, Sakai 2019, and Hugon (forthcoming).

⁷ Dharmottara's *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā* was consulted by Karṇakagomin (ca. 800) when the latter commented on Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika* in his *Pramāṇavārttikasvavṛttiṭīkā*. It was cited in Jaina works, namely, the *Syādvādaratnākara* by Abhayadeva (1057–1135) and the *Dravyālanākāraṭīkā* by Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra (12th c.). Cf. Sakai 2010: xiii and Ishida 2011: xxxvi for references. Ishida (2011: xxxvi) remarks that the *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā* is cited less often by later authors discussing Dharmottara's views than his smaller works, such as the *Apoḥaprakaraṇa*.

While Dharmottara's *Nyāyabinduṭīkā* was the object of a subcommentary, it is questionable whether this was the case for his larger *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā*. One finds a mention by Abhinavagupta (950–1020), in his *Dhvanyālokalocana*, of a *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkāvivṛtti* with the surname *Dharmottamā* ascribed to the Kashmiri poet Ānandavardhana (second half of the 9th century). But another remark by Abhinavagupta suggests that this *Dharmottamā* was a polemical work against Dharmottara rather than a commentary on the *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā* (Steinkellner and Much 1985: xvi). Frauwallner (1933: 241), based on two passages in Devasūri's *Syādvādaratnākaraḥ*, mentions a possible commentary on the *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā* by Devabala (10th c.). The Sa skya scholar Nor bzang dpal (fl. end of the 13th/first half of the 14th c.) suggests that Yamāri (middle of the 11th c.) authored a subcommentary in twelve thousand *śloka*s to

Dharmottara profiles himself as an influential thinker (Frauwallner speaks of him as “the first important personality after Dharmakīrti in the field of logic”⁸) and his views on, for instance, valid cognition, concept formation and language, are frequently discussed by later Indian, Kashmiri, and Tibetan authors. In addition to his two commentaries on Dharmakīrti’s works (the *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā* and the *Nyāyabinduṭīkā*), Dharmottara’s extant works include five monographs preserved only in Tibetan translation.⁹

The two extant Indian commentaries on the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* were translated roughly in the same period, viz., the second half of the 11th c. Dharmottara’s work was translated by rNgog Blo Idan shes rab and Parahitabhadrā, the same team that also translated the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* when rNgog Blo Idan shes rab was studying in Kashmir, from 1076 to 1092.¹⁰ Although the Tibetan title of the work is translated as *Tshad ma rnam par nges pa’i ’grel bshad*, Tibetans more

“the large Dharmottara,” i.e., Dharmottara’s *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā* (van der Kuijp 1994a: 387). The same attribution is found already in the *bsTan pa rgyan gyi me tog* of bCom ldan ral gri (1227–1305) (van der Kuijp 1994b: 25, n. 11) as well as in his *Tshad ma’i byung tshul* (f. 3a8), where its size is also given as twelve thousand *śloka*s. bCom ldan ral gri adds in this text the mention of a commentary on the *Pramāṇavārttikālaṅkāra* and the *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā* by Dza yan ta (=Jayanta, or *Jina) (reported as Dza ya a nan ta, i.e., Jayānanda by Nor bzang dpal, cf. van der Kuijp 1994a: 387). But bCom ldan ral gri does not mention these commentaries among the translated Buddhist works listed in his *bsTan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nyi ’od* (see Schaeffer and van der Kuijp 2009). Yamāri himself refers to a *Tshad ma rnam nges kyī rgyan* (**Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkālaṅkāra*) but does not name its author (van der Kuijp 1994a: 388, n. 33).

⁸ Frauwallner 1961: 147.

⁹ Cf. Steinkellner and Much 1985: 67–72. Sakai 2010: xliii–xliv investigates the chronological relation of Dharmottara’s *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā* and *Kṣaṇabhāṅgasiddhi* and determines the former to have been composed after the latter. Sakai suggests that the *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā* was Dharmottara’s final work.

¹⁰ In Hugon 2016 I argue that the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* and the *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā* were translated together, and that Dharmottara’s interpretation of the root text in his commentary influenced the translation of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*.

commonly refer to it as the 'Thad ldan, i.e., "The Correct One,"¹¹ often also as the *Chos mchog chen* "The Large Dharmottara" (the "Small Dharmottara," *chos mchog chung ba* or *chos mchog chung ngu*, being Dharmottara's commentary on the *Nyāyabindu*).¹²

Jñānaśrībhadrā's commentary was translated by the author himself and Khyung po Chos kyi brtson 'grus.¹³ It was not unknown to Tibetan scholars and was even referred to in some Tibetan commentaries on the *Pramānaviniścaya*,¹⁴ but

¹¹ This is the expression used in the colophon of the Tibetan text. Cf. PVinT_{Tib} D178a1; P209b5: *slob dpon chos mchog gis sbyar ba rnam par nges pa'i fi ka 'thad ldan zhes bya ba rdzogs so //*. The 13th-century scholar Chu mig pa refers to this work using the same appellation in the colophon of his own commentary on the *Pramānaviniścaya* (*rNam nges fi kā* 152a4: *slob dpon chos mchog gis mdzad pa'i ti ka 'thad ldan*).

¹² Evidence of these appellations is found, for instance, in a 13th-century survey of Buddhist literature by bCom ldan Rigs pa'i ral gri (1227–1305) (see Schaeffer and van der Kuijp 2009: 272) and in a number of epistemological works dating from the 12th–13th centuries. The nickname for the *Nyāyabinduṭīkā* probably comes from the colophon of the Sanskrit version of the text, which reads: *nyāyabinduḥ samāptaḥ // laghudharmottarasūtram samāptam iti //* (NBṬ 255,8).

¹³ Khyung po Chos brtson attended the religious council of 1076 together with rNgog Blo ldan shes rab, and he and rNgog were among the young men sent to Kashmir to study and become translators. Jñānaśrībhadrā, together with rMa dge ba'i blo gros, also contributed to the initial translation, around 1050, of Dharmakīrti's *Vādanyāya* into Tibetan. It was revised by Dar ma grags and Dīpaṅkara before 1054.

¹⁴ rNgog Blo ldan shes rab does not mention Jñānaśrībhadrā's commentary. It does appear, for instance, in the list of commentaries on Dharmakīrti's works by Glo bo mkhan chen (1456–1532) in his *rTags rigs* (cf. Hugon 2002: 39). Earlier yet, the 13th-century scholar Chu mig pa seng ge dpal mentions it as a source of reference in the colophon to his own commentary on the *Pramānaviniścaya* (*rNam nges fi kā* 152a4: *kha che dznya na shri'i ti ka*) and refers explicitly to Jñānaśrībhadrā's interpretation several times, referring to his source as *dznya na shri'i ti ka* (cf. f. 32a4, f. 80b8, f. 90b6, f. 90b9, f. 95b2, f. 96b9), or without naming a source text (f. 103b4, f. 103b8, f. 127b1). He also discusses Jñānaśrībhadrā's translation of the *Pramānaviniścaya* (*dznya na shri'i 'gyur*) on f. 43b9. Another commentary on the *Pramānaviniścaya* that takes into account the interpretation of Jñānaśrībhadrā is the one by Grags pa rgya mtsho bde legs 'byung gnas (cf. for instance *rNam nges nor bu*, f. 3a1, f. 4a4).

the impact of Dharmottara's commentary clearly prevailed. The reason for this is probably that the mainstream tradition of epistemology originally issued from rNgog Blo ldan shes rab and primarily revolved around gSang phu ne'u thog monastery and its "satellites."¹⁵ rNgog Blo ldan shes rab not only translated the *Pramānaviniścaya* and Dharmottara's *ṭīkā*, but also authored the first Tibetan exegesis on the *Pramānaviniścaya-cum-ṭīkā*.¹⁶ There is a great deal of evidence attesting to the impact of Dharmottara's thought on Tibetan scholars, even though he was also openly criticized. It would appear that it was not so much the translation of Dharmottara's works, but rather the syntheses provided by the pioneer exegete rNgog Blo ldan shes rab, who was also their translator, that were instrumental in diffusing Dharmottara's views. I know of a single (non-extant) Tibetan work that appears to be a commentary on the *Pramānaviniścayaṭīkā*. It is referred to by A khu shes rab rgya mtsho (1803–1875) in his list of rare works under the title *rNam nges 'thad ldan gyi 'grel bshad* and ascribed to Zhang zhung Chos dbang grags pa (1404–1469/71), a disciple of mKhas grub rje (1385–1438).¹⁷

¹⁵ See Hugon 2016, where I discuss in terms of "satellites" the various vehicles of diffusion for the learning tradition at gSang phu. I distinguish "itinerant satellites" (scholars of gSang phu going on teaching tours) and "fixed satellites," which include establishments founded as extensions of gSang phu, study centers established within other monasteries, and teaching institutions led by scholars schooled in a teacher-student lineage going back to a gSang phu scholar.

¹⁶ Gro lung pa's list of rNgog Blo ldan shes rab's works ascribes to him two works on the "*tshad ma rnam par nges pa ṭi ka dang bcas pa*," an expression generally understood by modern scholars to refer to the *Pramānaviniścaya* together with Dharmottara's commentary. Only one work by rNgog Blo ldan shes rab on the *Pramānaviniścaya* is currently available, an "explanation of the difficult points of the *Pramānaviniścaya*" (*tshad ma rnam nges kyi dka' gnas rnam bshad*). In this work, the author systematically examines Dharmottara's commentary on the selected passages of the *Pramānaviniścaya* being explained. Preliminary remarks on this work can be found in van der Kuijp 2003 and Hugon 2008: 27–28.

¹⁷ See Chandra 1963 (part 3): 675–676 (No. 11864).

Whereas Jñānaśrībhadrā's commentary is only available in Tibetan, a Sanskrit version of part of Dharmottara's commentary has fortunately surfaced among the Sanskrit manuscripts preserved in Tibet. It is thus at present the only Indian commentary on Dharmakīrti's second major work that is extant in Sanskrit, in the form of a *codex unicus* described in Section 2 below. Although the first chapter of the *Pramānaviniścayaṭīkā* remains lost, the last part of the second chapter is extant in an incomplete manuscript; this has been briefly described by Steinkellner in his introduction to the edition of chapters 1 and 2 of the *Pramānaviniścaya* (pp. xxx–xxxī, Dh2). Part of the extant Sanskrit text was edited and translated in two University of Vienna dissertations, by Masamichi Sakai (2010) and Hisataka Ishida (2011).¹⁸ The colophon of the third chapter was edited and translated in Steinkellner 2006. Portions of the third chapter are in the process of being critically edited: the portions on *prasaṅga* (ff. 5b–11b) and on *hetvābhāsa* (ff. 110b–126b) by Toshikazu Watanabe, selected sections on *anupalabdhi* (ff. 83b5–89a7, 111a5f.) by Birgit Kellner, and the opening section (ff. 1–5) by myself. I hope that the present publication will serve as incentive for contributions to the establishment of the critical edition of the entire third chapter.

2. Manuscript description

The incomplete palm-leaf manuscript of the third chapter of Dharmottara's *Pramānaviniścayaṭīkā* is kept in the Potala Tanjur collection in a bundle labeled 'no. 024' together with another incomplete manuscript containing the second chapter of this work. Microfilms of these manuscripts were made in the 1980s in Lhasa, and Photostat copies of them are kept

¹⁸ The manuscript of the second chapter contains 71 folios, numbered 65–74, 76–103, and 105–137. Sakai's dissertation contains an edition and translation of ff. 83a5–91a4, Ishida's an edition and translation of ff. 110b1–116b7.

at the China Tibetology Research Center (CTRC) in Beijing.¹⁹ The manuscripts of the second and third chapters are mentioned in the descriptive catalogue of this collection that was prepared by Luo Zhao in 1984 and 1985.²⁰ A preliminary description of the two manuscripts was provided in Steinkellner 2007: xxx–xxxiii. The script and corrections made to the text by the scribe and other hands in the second chapter are discussed in Sakai 2010: iv–vii and in Ishida 2011: xxv–xxxiii. Watanabe (2020) offers a paleographic analysis of the script of the third chapter and of its marginal notes.

a. Extant leaves

120 leaves of the third chapter’s original 160 leaves are extant, namely, ff. 1–90, 101–126 and 157–160.

According to Luo Zhao’s catalogue, the folios measure 28.6 cm by 5.8 cm.

The leaves are generally well preserved, but some of the folios are marred by partial (e.g., f. 109a) or extensive blurring (e.g. ff. 6a, 33a, 47b, 48a, 67b, 68a, 79b, 83b, 84a, 86b, 97a, 108a). The ink has frequently faded in the margins, making the insertions difficult to decipher.

The recto of the first folio bears 3 lines (illegible) that are not part of the chapter. The text of the chapter starts on f. 1b (after a *siddham* sign), and runs up to f. 159b7. It is followed by a colophon (ff. 159b7–160a3) consisting of a series of five

¹⁹ See Steinkellner 2007: xii–xiv. Steinkellner (2007: xxxii) notes: “The 40 photocopies of the third chapter of the *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā* (Box 109/2) bear three recto and three verso pages each, in the correct order. The first copy bears only folios 1 and 2. The last folio (160) was micro-filmed together with the first two folios of Dh2.” [Dh2=the manuscript of the second chapter].

²⁰ Steinkellner (2007: xxx, n. 33) reports that Luo Zhao notes the following about the manuscript of the second chapter: “71 leaves. Incomplete, only nos. 65–137 (of which two leaves missing) available. 28.6 by 5.8 cm. Black ink, Dhārikā script, 7 lines.” And about the manuscript of the third chapter (Steinkellner 2007: xxxii, n. 38): “120 leaves, incomplete, only fols. 1–90, 101–126 and 157–160 available. 28.6 by 5.7 cm. Black ink, Dhārikā script, 7–8 lines.”

strophes in different meters and the beginning of a sixth, which ends abruptly at the end of f. 160a.²¹ On f. 160b, one finds a note to the right of the string-hole that consists of one illegible line and 14 *akṣaras* in the line below: (tasmā) •īreh[?] ••(yatnena) ••(smai)raṃ[?] •i••.

Ff. 1b–87 have 7 lines of 62–68 *akṣaras*. Ff. 88–160 have 8 lines of 70–78 *akṣaras*, but f. 126a has only 7 lines, and f. 160a (the incomplete end of the text) has 3 lines.

From f. 64 on, the left margin becomes wider.

On f. 73a, the characters from the end of l. 4 to the last third of l. 6 are written in a smaller and tighter script, possibly replacing a deleted portion of the text. The same phenomenon can be observed in the last part of l. 3 on f. 85a.

The string-hole has been punched to the left of the center of the folio. The space that has been left blank around it is more or less square up to f. 63—extending from the third to the fifth lines, with a length of ca. 5 *akṣaras*. From f. 64 on the blank space is oblong—extending from the third to the fifth lines up to f. 87, and from the third to the sixth line from f. 88 on, with a length of 3 to 4 *akṣaras*.

Slashed *daṇḍas* and broken *daṇḍas* (see section c.i below) are often used at the end of lines and before the string-hole, for the sake of providing the text with even borders.

b. Numbering of the folios

All the leaves are numbered on the left side of the versos, except for f. 160, which is not numbered.

The number appears at approximately the level of the fourth line. Up to f. 63 it is located close to the left border of the leaf. From f. 64 on, where the right and left margins are wider on both the rectos and the versos, the number is more indented and closer to the text.

All folio numbers are indicated by figure numerals, except for the first folio, which is marked with the word *śrīṭh*.

On f. 4, there is an illegible marking next to the number 4.

²¹ The colophon was edited and translated in Steinkellner 2006.

On the recto of f. 59, one finds the number 5 followed by a small horizontal stroke. It is likely that the scribe started writing the folio number on the wrong side of the folio.

On f. 107b, the number 107 is written as usual on the left-hand side, and also appears upside-down on the right-hand side of the folio, in somewhat faded ink. The folio was possibly placed upside-down when it was first numbered.

On 111b and 112b, respectively, another number has been written above “111” and “112,” but is crossed out. On 110b there is faded ink above “110” (maybe also a deleted number).




On f. 123b, lines 1–3 have been written slightly more to the left than lines 4–8. The folio number has been written at the level of line 4. The scribe must have started writing 1. 1 too far to the left and had to indent once he reached the line where the number was located. This would suggest that the number was written before the text on this side of the folio, or before writing line 4.

c. Script

Luo Zhao identified the script as “Dhārikā script.” Steinkellner (2007: xxxii) describes the script as Proto Bengālī, flat-topped, clear and upright.²²











i. Multi-formed characters

A number of *akṣaras* are represented in alternative ways:















- Medial *ā*, as well as the right part of medial *o*, usually appears in its regular form, i.e., a vertical stroke on the right of the *akṣara* (e.g., *dhā* on f. 1b2: ). It is also written as a short, straight or flowing stroke attached to the upper right of the *akṣara* (e.g., *nā* on f. 13b2: ; *syo* on f. 1b6: ), notably before the string-hole and at the end of a line.

²² See also MacDonald 2005 for the description of the manuscripts of Jinendrabuddhi’s *Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā*, which are also written in Proto Bengālī script, and Ishida (2011: xxvi–xxviii) for a description of the particularities of the script used in the manuscript of the second chapter of the *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā*, most of which are similar to those described below for the third chapter.

It is, in most other cases, not possible to decide whether this form has been employed to make corrections or is merely an alternate form. Such medial *ā*-s are, by default, never noted as insertions in the edition.²³

- Medial *o* is usually written with a *pr̥ṣṭhamātrā* and a stroke to the right of the *akṣara* (as noted above, the right stroke is sometimes written as a straight or flowing stroke) but on some occasions (maybe *a posteriori* corrections?) it is written with a stroke on the right side of the *akṣara* and a *śiromātrā* above the *akṣara*. Both are exemplified for instance in °*yogyo* on f. 49a7: .
- Initial *i* is found in several forms:  (f. 4a4),  (f. 13b3),  (f. 80b4).
- Medial *i* is written as in modern Devanāgarī and as a curved stroke above the *akṣara* (but no vertical stroke on the left of the *akṣara*). Both are found for instance in *siddhir bhi*° on f. 125a1: .
- Medial *e* is commonly written as *pr̥ṣṭhamātrā*, e.g., in °*d eve*° on f. 125a: . On some occasions one also finds a flowing diagonal above the *akṣara*, in particular in the first line (e.g., *ghaṭena* on f. 17a1: ). The same flowing form is frequently found for the top stroke of *ai* and *au* in the first line (e.g., °*lenai*° on f. 17a1: , *kau* on f. 11a1: ). Some cases of “*e*” written on top of the consonant can be understood as the being representative of corrections, as in *kriyeta* on f. 31b5:  (the scribe probably initially wrote *kriyate*, which was subsequently corrected to *kriyeta* by deleting the *pr̥ṣṭhamātrā* medial *e* before “*r*” and adding a “*e*” on top of “*y*”). But as this cannot be decided in most cases, such medial *e*-s are, by default, never noted as insertions.

²³ Sakai (2010: vi), in his edition of the second chapter, notes such medial *ā*-s as insertions except when they occur before the string-hole or at the end of the line.

- Initial *e* has a different form before f. 64 (at the exception of one instance on f. 30a5) and from f. 64 to f. 125. As noted in Watanabe 2020: 432, the first looks like an F-clef and touches the vertical line at its upper part (e.g., on 18a1: ); the second has a rounded top and a hook-like bottom part slanting upward (e.g., on 65a4: ). From f. 126a initial *e* returns to the form used before f. 64.
- The cluster *cta* is written as *ca* with a subscribed *ta*—e.g., in *ctam* on f. 105b2: —or in a shape resembling that of *ku* or *kr*, e.g.,  (f. 1b6).
- The cluster *jña* is written as  (f. 18a1), but in one case differently, as  (in *jñā*, f. 54b6).
- There is a single occurrence of *tha* similar to its form in modern Bengali script (*thā* on f. 61b6: ) which is different than the form used elsewhere in this manuscript, e.g.,  (f. 13b1).
- The *akṣara tha* is written as an oval— (*°t paṭhita_m*, f. 50a6)—and as a small circle:  (*māṭharād i°*, f. 122b6).
- The *akṣara ha* up to f. 63b is written differently than from f. 64a to f. 125b. As noted by Watanabe (2020: 432), the first has a rather large s-curved part and a dilated form, the second is somewhat simplified.
- *r* before a consonant appears in the form of a hook—e.g.,  (in *rvvo*, f. 9a1)—or as the horizontal line of the *mātrā* with the next consonant written below, in particular for the clusters *rtha* (, in *rthā* f. 1b1), *rthya*, *rṇṇa*, and *rśa*.
- *anusvāra* is written as a dot above the *akṣara* (e.g., *vam*, f. 9a5: ). This sign on the Photostat copies is in many cases indistinguishable from dots that appear as the result of irregularities on the surface of the palm leaf. Uncertain cases have been decided according to expectation. When occurring in the first line, it is sometimes written as a small (or large) circle above the *akṣara* (e.g., *ṇam*, f. 1b1: ). *anusvāra* also appears as a small circle written on the

right of the *akṣara* (e.g. *ṇa_m*, f. 1b4: ण^०; *rya_m*, f. 78b1: र्य^०). This kind of *anusvāra* plus *virāma* (also called stylized *m* with *virāma*, cf. Steinkellner 2007: xii) occurs regularly (e.g., *na_m*, f. 1b2: ण^०).²⁴ *anunāsika* (e.g., *yaṁst*, f. 9a2: यँष्ठ) is found eighteen times: before *s* (ff. 6a5, 9a2, 61a6, 71a2, 82b2), before *ś* (ff. 56b2, 64a5, 77b3, 86b5, 119a8), before *śc* (f. 121a1), before *c* (ff. 67a5, 104a5), before *cch* (f. 104a5), twice before *kṣ* (f. 158a2), once before *t* (f. 115a5), once before *n* (f. 125b3), and once in an unallocated marginal note on f. 68b.

- *visarga* is formed in a figure eight—ॐ (f. 2a3)—and as two dots aligned vertically in insertions, e.g., तता<ḥ> सॉ^०, f. 2a6).
- *avagraha* is written as ॐ (f. 4a6) or ॐ (f. 69a6).
- The line-filling *daṇḍas* appear in two different forms: slashed *daṇḍa* † (f. 4b5) and broken *daṇḍa* † (f. 119a5). Up to f. 63 only the first form is found. From f. 64 on, the second form is used in the majority of cases up to f. 111, but the first is more frequent from f. 112b on.

ii. Undistinguished characters

- Initial *ī* is distinguished from initial *i* by a stroke below on f. 19a5 (ई) and f. 38b1 (ई), but does not include this stroke on ff. 101b6 (ई), 102a8, 106b3, 119b4, 121a8, 124a4 and 126b6. On f. 50b2 it is unclear whether the *akṣara* is undistinguished from *i*, or if the stroke below has merged with the medial *i* of the line below. The *ī* in the correction in tighter script on f. 85a3 seems to have a stroke. No additional stroke is visible for the expected *ī* in the marginal note at the bottom of f. 85a, but the note's *akṣaras* are not entirely clear.
- The cluster *jjñā* is sometimes recognizably written as it would be expected (e.g., *jjñā* on f. 1b5: ज्ञ), but is often not

²⁴ On f. 52b1, an *akṣara* which looks like a stylized *m* appears in an insertion to represent “ma.” It has been transcribed as <ṁ_{ma}>.

distinguished from *jña* (e.g., expected *yaj jñā°* on f. 72a5: यज्ञ).

- In words in which the cluster *ḍya* is expected—*kuḍya* (ff. 16b4, 16b6, 20a4, 72b7, 74b7, 75a7); *jāḍya* (ff. 83a1, 83a7)—the relevant *akṣara* is not distinguished from *dya*.
- There is a single occurrence of a word in which the cluster *ḍva* is expected—*naḍvaloddake* (f. 114b7)—where the relevant *akṣara* is not distinguished from *dva*.

These cases have been transcribed according to the expected reading.

iii. Punctuation


Punctuation takes the shape of

- full-size single *daṇḍas*—𑀘 (after *ha* on f. 1b1)—or shorter *daṇḍas*—𑀙 (after *ti* on f. 1b4);
- short *daṇḍas* written as dots: 𑀚 (after *te* on f. 1b7);
- some rare double *daṇḍas*—𑀛 (f. 1b1)—indicating the end of a discussion on a given topic (several of them on f. 28a mark the boundaries of the commentary on a sequence of verses of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*); one double *daṇḍa* on f. 48b5 has a small circle on the right: 𑀜.

iv. Other signs

- A stylized final *t*—𑀝 (f. 1b3), 𑀞 (f. 90a8)—is frequently found in place of *t* plus *virāma*.
- Vertical strokes—called “hasty strokes” in the Section “Editorial signs and conventions” (I.1)—occur as the result of scribal mistakes (falsely anticipated vowel stroke or *daṇḍa*) that are not always corrected: e.g., 𑀟 (uncorrected hasty stroke in *viruddham iti* on f. 47a5; the scribe probably started to write *viro°*), 𑀠 (deleted hasty stroke in *°saṃbhavi* on f. 8a2).
- Clearly identifiable gap-filling signs are only used once: 𑀡 (f. 85a1). Unusual circle-like characters found only on f. 67a5 (𑀢) and f. 67b5 (𑀣) have been understood to

be gap-filling signs as well. They resemble the *ṭha* on f. 122b6, but not that on f. 50a6 (see above, c.ii). A deleted circle-like character on f. 73a2 has, on the other hand, been interpreted to be an incomplete *akṣara* rather than a gap-filling sign, as the direction of the stroke is different from the latter (it could have been a large in-line *anusvāra* or the beginning of a *visarga*).

- A *siddham* is found at the beginning of the text on f. 1b1.
- A large black mark is found at the beginning of f. 87b1, probably intended to indicate that the whole folio has to be considered “deleted” (cf. II.2.g).
- A marking of unknown meaning, resembling a Roman-script capital L and an inverted L-like sign, occurs on f. 114b above the first words of l. 1.
- An unidentified side-stroke occurs before *tathā* in the area of the string-hole on f. 120b4 (). It has been noted as an illegible *akṣara* in the edition.

d. Orthographic particularities

- Gemination of consonants after a semi-vowel (most frequently after *r*), e.g., *sarvva*, *varttate*, *dharmma*, etc. (by mistake *satvva* on ff. 47a5, 52a7, and 60b2).
- Degemination (notably of *t*) before a semi-vowel (most frequently before *v*), e.g., *satva*.
- Non-application of the classical rules of *sandhi* (unresolved *sandhi*).
- Regular omission of *avagraha*.
- Use of the *avagraha* to indicate an initial *a* or *ā* in *sandhi* with a preceding *ā* (e.g., *tathā 'paro*) or an initial *a* following a final *ā* in hiatus (e.g. *jñānaśabdā 'nupalambhanimittāḥ*).
- Omission of *virāma* (the quality of the copy does not allow for distinguishing cases where *virāma* is missing and cases where it is illegible).

- Use of *anusvāra* for homorganic nasal and vice-versa.
- Use of class sibilant before sibilant instead of *visarga*.

e. Scribal mistakes

- **Forward eye-skip.** For instance, on the very first line of the text (f. 1b1), an eye-skip from °*nā*° to the next *nā* generates the mistaken reading *svenā* for *svenātmanā*; f. 55a2: an eye-skip from *avyabhicāri*° to a later °*āvyabhicāri*° (ca. 100 *akṣaras* in-between); f. 89a4: eye-skip from °*pratiṣedha*° to a later °*pratiṣedha*° (ca. 118 *akṣaras* in-between); f. 101a3: eye-skip from *niścitaḥ* to an almost immediately following *niścitaḥ*.²⁵
- **Backward eye-skip.** For instance, f. 31b2: an eye-skip from *abhīdhānasya* back to the °*sya* of *asiddhasya* and repetition of *hetor āgamadr̥ṣṭasya* (uncorrected); f. 71a5: eye-skip from *sādhyadharmmasāmānye*° to the almost immediately preceding *sādhyadharmmasāmānye*°, the repeated *akṣaras* are deleted;²⁶ f. 59a6–7: eye-skip from *tirodhānā*° to a previous *tirodhānam* (f. 59a3) (ca. 180 *akṣaras* in-between), the repeated *akṣaras* are partially deleted; f. 90a1: eye-skip from °*virodhaḥ* to a preceding °*virodhaḥ* (f. 89b7) (ca. 150 *akṣaras* in-between), the repeated *akṣaras* are deleted.
- On f. 85b4, a 46-*akṣara* passage was omitted (the omitted passage is added in the bottom margin). The first 33 *akṣaras* are found, misplaced, at the end of f. 85b7 and the beginning of f. 86a1 (this is corrected by deletion).

Conversely, on f. 102a3, a forward eye-skip led the scribe to write 13 *akṣaras* of a later passage, which are

²⁵ In the last three cases, the scribe realizes his mistake after writing several *akṣaras* of the later passage (respectively, 11, 26 and 8 *akṣaras*). He deletes them and continues with the correct part of the sentence in the last two cases. On f. 55a, the scribe makes another mistake after deleting the *akṣaras* from the later passage; he skips 11 *akṣaras*, which are inserted on top of the folio.

²⁶ Same phenomenon on ff. 72a7, 76b5, 77a5.

corrected by deletion. When copying the later passage (f. 102a5), the scribe only writes part of these 13 *akṣaras*, and a (partially illegible) insertion corrects the text.

- **Haplography.** For instance, f. 3b4: *abhyupagantavyatiriktena* for *abhyupagantavyavyatiriktena*; f. 16a2: *viparyasiddham* for *viparyayasiddham* (or °*siddhim*).
- **Dittography** of an *akṣara* or part of it. Primarily the repetition of an *akṣara* which occurs at the end of a line (or folio) at the beginning of the next line (or next folio). For instance, the *na* at the end of f. 2b5 and *vyā°* at the end of f. 15a3 are repeated at the beginning of f. 2b6 and f. 15a4; *sa* at the end of f. 46a7 is repeated at the beginning of f. 46b1. There is sometimes the dittography of a *pr̥ṣṭhamātrā* medial *e* which occurs before the string-hole immediately after it. For instance on f. 22a5, in *ity etad*, the medial *e* of *tye* is found once before the string-hole area, once after; this appears (somewhat unclearly) as “ie!⊙ty etad” in the edition (the medial *e* before the string-hole is marked as unfinished inasmuch as the *akṣara* it is part of [namely, *tye*] was not written completely before the string-hole).
- **Omission.** Extremely frequent omission of one *akṣara* in a word. For instance f. 4a1: *parityas tenādūṣaṇaśravaṇaṃ* for *parityaktas tenāpi dūṣaṇaśravaṇaṃ*. Frequent omission of final *r* before consonant (due to the quality of the copy, it is sometimes difficult to determine if the expected hooked *r* is omitted or illegible).
- **Orthographical mistakes** (often due to homophony). For instance, *āgamakau* for *agamakau* (f. 10b7–11b1); *rupa* for *rūpa* (f. 16a4, f. 87b3), *śabda°* for *śābda°* (f. 50a5), *karaṇena°* for *kāraṇena°* (f. 58b4), *dhanuddhara°* for *dhanurdhara°* (f. 63a1–2), *nyuno* for *nyūno* (f. 68b1), *nyāyo* for *nyāyyo* (f. 30b7), *sahakari°* for *sahakāri°* (f. 79a5), *dukhe* for *duḥkhe* (f. 106a7), *mūmūrṣutayā* for *mumūrṣutayā* (f. 110b6).

- **Confusion** due to words' similarity. For instance, f. 4a7: °śramaṇa° for °śravaṇa°; f. 58a3: aśrāmaṇa° for aśrāvāna°; f. 51b1: pakṣābhāvaseṣu for pakṣābhāseṣu; f. 58a6–7: pratipakṣepe for pratikṣepe; f. 102b8: darśayatitum for darśayitum.
- **Metathesis.** For instance, f. 10a3 and f. 47a2: dhābakam for bādhakam; f. 10a6: sampraga° for prasaṅga°; f. 56a7: śabdavācyasyatva for śabdavācyatvasya.
- **Confusion of sibilants.** For instance, f. 4b1: avasyatyaktavyaḥ for avaśyatyaktavyaḥ; f. 18a6: vipratīśiddham for vipratīśiddham; ff. 28b5, 31a2, 43a6: sāstra° for śāstra°; f. 42a4: śādṛśaḥ for sādṛśaḥ; f. 42b6: °śodhanīyatvam for °śodhanīyatvam; f. 47a7: doṣo for doṣo; f. 51b7: śāmarthyād for sāmarthyād; f. 89a1: dṛṣyo° for dṛśyo°; f. 90a4: vināsa° for vināśa; f. 106a7: yoniso° for yoniśo°; f. 114b2: praśaktam for prasaktam; f. 121a8: bhāsita° for bhāṣita°. In several cases the mistake has been corrected. For instance on f. 27b1, sāstropagame was corrected to śāstropagame by deletion of “sā” and insertion of “śā,” and on f. 35a2 sāstropagamād was corrected to śāstropagamād in the same way; on f. 82a5, dṛṣyā° was corrected to dṛśyā°. On ff. 47b1, 51b5, 53a2, 101b6, 114a5, 126b7, the mistake (in several cases due to anticipation of the next sibilant) is corrected by transformation of the akṣara.
- **Misreading** of akṣaras. For instance, f. 47a2, the two strokes of a medial o were copied as two pṛṣṭhamātrā e-s, i.e.: pakṣe dueṣṭa instead of pakṣo duṣṭa; f. 107b3, confusion of pṛṣṭhamātrā e with t, i.e.: masye° for matsya.

f. Corrections

A large number of the mistakes pointed out above (but far from all) have been corrected by the scribe himself or by someone else.²⁷ Up to f. 63b, one finds two sets of corrections

²⁷ Corrections that can be presumed to be by the scribe himself are, typically, the deletion of a later akṣara written as the result of an eye-skip. For instance, f. 4a2: a{ya}vayavasambandhavād.


by different hands, one set written in large *akṣaras* just above the first line and below the last line, another set in smaller *akṣaras* at the upper and lower edges, respectively, of the top and bottom margins (e.g., ff. 14b, 39a, 40ab, 42a, 45a, 55a, 59a).²⁸


The corrections are made by means of deletion, insertion, and transformation of characters. The intended correction is not always entirely explicit. Not all of the mistakes have been corrected, and some corrections are actually mistaken.


i. Deletion

Deletion (over 1,400 cases), by way of the following methods:

(1) **Strokes.** One or two small strokes above an *akṣara* (the stroke is often hardly distinguishable from the *mātrā*) indicate the deletion of:

- an entire *akṣara*. For instance, double-stroke deletion of *re* (f. 76b5): 

- an unfinished *akṣara*. For instance, deletion of an unfinished *tva* (f. 37b4): 

- part of an *akṣara* (in such cases, the stroke is sometimes located diagonally below the part to be deleted). For instance, deletion of *i* and *ti* in *miti* to obtain the reading *ma* (f. 14b5): 

Partial deletion of an *akṣara* includes deleting the right line of a medial *o* to obtain the reading *e* (but the stroke can also in such cases intend the deletion of the whole medial *o*, cf. f. 50a7), or deleting the left stroke to obtain the reading *ā*.²⁹ A deleting stroke on a medial *i* can indicate the deletion of the *i*, or the deletion of only the upper hook of the *i*, in order to generate the reading *e* (*pr̥ṣṭhamātrā*) (e.g. f. 52b6: °*vācyatven{i}ety*). On f. 104a3, the scribe wrote *vyāvṛttau hetuḥ* instead of *vyāvṛtto hetuḥ*. He could have deleted the top stroke of the *au*, but instead marked the *e* in *hetuḥ* as deleted.

²⁸ See Watanabe 2020: 436–439 for some observations regarding the styles and hands in the marginal notes. He notably identifies notes written in Proto-Bengali, Old-Bengali and Modern-Bengali.

²⁹ Our transcription method does not allow us to note the partial deletion of *o*. Such cases are thus noted “{o}e,” respectively “{o}ā.”

As strokes constitutive of medial vowels can sometimes be interpreted as belonging to the following *akṣara*, the intended reading is obtained by reading the right line of the *au* as *pr̥ṣṭhamātrā e* in *he*, leaving the left and top lines to be read as *o* in *tto*. This correction is marked as a “transformation” (see below section iii) in the edition.

(2) Crossing out *akṣara*(s). With the exception of one occurrence on f. 37b (crossing out of two *akṣaras* written in the bottom margin) and f. 51b4 (crossing out of the seven first *akṣaras* of a 13-*akṣara* mistaken expression), crossing out is used as a means of deletion mainly from f. 74a onward: f. 74a7 (1 *akṣara* crossed out), f. 75a3 (5 *akṣaras* crossed out), f. 78b2 (3), f. 82b (3 *akṣaras* in an insertion), f. 83a4 (2), f. 83a7 (3), f. 87b6 (6), f. 107b5 (1), f. 117a8 (1), f. 120a7 (1), f. 122a2 (1), f. 122b3 (2), f. 123b7 (2), f. 125b8 (1), f. 157b6 (5), f. 159a6 (1). Such deletion mainly takes the form of a horizontal line through the *akṣara*(s) to be deleted, but one also finds scribbling over the *akṣara* (f. 74a7), and a vertical stroke through single *akṣaras* (ff. 107b5, 117a8, 120a7, 122a2, 125b8).

(3) Erasure. Erasure of an *akṣara* or part of an *akṣara* usually leaves some faint traces of the original *akṣara*. In several cases, it was not possible to decide whether a space containing some black marking was the result of the erasure of an *akṣara* or blotting on the manuscript or the Photostat copy. Ambivalent cases (cf. ff. 3b7, 6a4, 16a3, 51b4, 83a4 and 83a5) have been noted in the edition as a “space” (×) rather than a deletion.

(4) Parentheses. Parenthesis-like marking at the beginning and the end of a sequence of *akṣaras* to be deleted; or only at the beginning (f. 71a5). This means of deletion is found only 12 times from f. 71a onward.

ii. Insertions

Method

Insertions (over 1,000 instances) supply *akṣaras* that the scribe forgot to write or *akṣaras* meant to replace erroneously written *akṣaras* (these may or may not be explicitly deleted).

In the former case, the forgotten *akṣara* is generally to be inserted between two *akṣaras*. For instance, f. 6a7: *e<ka>sya*. Sometimes it is to be inserted between the consonant and the vowel of an *akṣara*; for instance, on f. 51a2, the insertion *tva* is meant to correct *śabdavācyā* to *śabdavācyatvā*, and is thus to be read as *tv^o* and inserted between *cy* (to which the default vowel *a* needs to be added) and *ā*, e.g., *śabdavācyatv^o>ā*.


In the case of an *akṣara* meant to replace an erroneously written *akṣara*, the insertion can replace a whole *akṣara* or (less often) part of it (typically, only the consonant). For instance, on f. 26b6, to correct *upapattibādhitam* to *upapattibādhitam*, only the *d* of *di* is marked as deleted, and a consonant (illegible, but presumably *dh^o*) is to be inserted before *i*.

Location



The *akṣaras* to be inserted are generally found in the top and bottom margins (above the first line and below the last line, or in the upper or lower edges of the folios), on occasion in the right margin after the last *akṣara* of the line (ff. 76a, 80b, 81a, 158ab, 159b), less often in the left margin before the first *akṣara* of the line (f. 5a, f. 120b), and in the blank area around the string-hole (ff. 39a, 62a, 68a, 157b). Some *akṣaras* such as *visarga* (numerous cases), *avagraha* (f. 87b8), *daṇḍa*, but also *t* (ff. 66b2, 87b2, 118b8, 124a1), *n* (f. 23b3), *ra* (f. 90a8), etc., are inserted in the body of the text or just above/below the line.

The location of material to be inserted in the top or bottom margins tends to be horizontally aligned with the place of insertion.

On a few occasions, an *akṣara* to be inserted that has been written below the last line is partly circled—e.g., the inserted

ma in *ya<m a>prāmāṇyam* on f. 45a7: —or completely circled (ff. 29a7, 121b8, 124b8). On one occasion, a circled *akṣara* is found above the first line (f. 123b1).


Insertion Marks

For insertions found in the margins, the place of insertion within the text can be indicated by an upward-pointing *kāka-pada* below the line (e.g., , f. 5a6) or a downward-pointing *kākapada* above the line (e.g., , f. 23b2). These two marks are not always consistent with the actual required points of insertion, e.g. f. 52b4: *yata<tas tat*>smān* instead of *ya<tas tat*>tasmān*.

References to the place of insertion

Akṣaras written in the margins are frequently followed by a numeral (unfortunately often unclear or illegible) indicating the line into which they are to be inserted. Sometimes the line number indicated is wrong (e.g., on f. 40a, the numeral indicates l. 6 for a *na* which is needed in l. 5). On rare occasions, the number is written to the left of the *akṣara* (in these cases another correction follows, and there was not enough space to the right of the final *akṣara* for the numeral, e.g., f. 107b7).

iii. Transformations

Transformations (ca. 200 identified cases), which are often combined with deletion and insertion, refer to modifications of an *akṣara* that had already been written or had been started (the original *akṣara* is not always identifiable) in order to obtain a shape that corresponds to the intended reading (the result can be more or less successful). For instance on f. 51b5, when copying *saṃśaya*, the scribe inadvertently wrote *śa* (eye-skip) for the initial *sa*; *śa* was then corrected to *sa* by adding a horizontal line, but retained a trace of the wave of the left part of the *śa*: .

iv. Implicit corrections

Many corrections are not made explicit, but were obviously intended.

When several *akṣaras* should be deleted, only the first or some of the beginning *akṣaras* are effectively marked as deleted. For instance, on f. 8a1, only *na viparyaya* is marked as deleted, whereas the following *ity uktam* should be deleted as well.

Similar-looking *akṣaras* are also left to stand for one another without an explicit correction. For instance, on f. 54b4, the scribe mistakenly wrote *pakṣa* for *yathā* (due to an eye-skip to the following word). *kṣa* is corrected to *thā* via the deletion of *kṣa* and the insertion of an *akṣara* (although illegible on the Photostat copy, one can surmise that it is *thā*), and *pa* is left to be read as *ya*.

Unfinished *akṣaras* (which the scribe obviously stopped writing upon realizing his mistake) are often left undeleted. For instance, on f. 57b3 the scribe started writing *evo* instead of *evā*. He did not complete the left line of the *o* and left it undeleted (this is recorded as *evōārtha_m* in the edition). Similarly, on f. 10b3, the scribe started writing *ceṣyanto* instead of *ceṣyante*; there is a faint trace of the right line of the *o*, which was not completed and left undeleted (this is marked *ceṣyantōe* in the edition).

When an *akṣara* is inserted in the margin to correct a mistaken *akṣara* in the text, the latter is not always marked as deleted (but it may also be the case that no deletion mark is visible due to the quality of the Photostat copy).

v. Mistaken corrections

(1) **Mistaken deletion.** On occasion, one finds an *akṣara* marked as “deleted” when no deletion is necessary. For instance, f. 9b3: *abhyupt{e}anaikatvādinā*, yet the correct reading is *abhyuptenaikatvādinā*; f. 50b5 *granth{e}ana*, yet the correct reading is *granthena*; on f. 103a3, the *ti* in *vyatireka* is marked as deleted. In some of these cases, it is possible that the scribe or someone else was not satisfied with the shape of the *akṣara* and replaced it with an *akṣara* written in the margin, but the marginal *akṣara* is not visible on the Photostat copy.

Sometimes the deletion mark has been placed on the wrong *akṣara*. For instance, on f. 88b8, to correct *nopalabhe i upalambha*^o to *nopalabhe ity upalambha*, *tyu* was inserted, but the initial *i* is mistakenly deleted instead of the initial *u*, generating the mistaken reading *nopalabhetyu upalambha*^o. On f. 103a3, the corrector meant to change ^o*deśavṛtterar hetoḥ* to ^o*deśavṛtter hetoḥ*, but instead of marking *ra* as deleted, he placed the deletion stroke on *tte*.

(2) Mistaken insertion. For instance, the redundant insertion of *ddhe* at the end of f. 55a2 (^o*viru<ddh(e)>*). The *akṣara ddhe* is not missing (it is written at the beginning of f. 55a3). On f. 103a4, a *na* is inserted into the correct reading *balavān anvayaḥ*, generating the (logically) incorrect reading *balavān ananvayaḥ*.

g. Hands







Steinkellner assessed that the manuscript was copied by one scribe, or possibly two scribes with very similar hands, based on the change in the number of lines per folio and the style of writing at f. 88a: “clear, upright, with regular lines (first hand), and tighter and less regular lines (second hand)” (Steinkellner 2007: xxxii). One may add that initial long *ī* is not distinguished from initial *i* in the latter part of the manuscript. In his in-depth paleographical investigation, Watanabe (2020) identifies at least four different hands (the change of scribes being unrelated to the contents of the text), the first that of the scribe who also copied the second chapter.

i. Change of hands at f. 64a

Watanabe locates the first scribe change at f. 64a based on the following elements:

- the shape of initial *e* and the *akṣara ha*;
- the presence of stylized final *t*, found more than 200 times until f. 63a4, but occurring only three times afterwards;
- the presence of notes at the very edges of the folios only until f. 63b.

Further observations hint at a change of hand taking place around f. 70:

- Change in the shape of numeral “2” in the units between f. 62 and f. 72. Compare  (f. 2b),  (f. 22b) and  (f. 62b) to  (f. 72b) and  (f. 82b). On f. 122b, the decimal “2” differs from the unit “2”: .
- *jjñ* and *jjñ* are distinguished in the first part of the manuscript, where one finds two expected occurrences of *jjñ* (f. 1b5, f. 49b3). But from f. 72a onward, *jjñ* is used when *jjñ* is expected.
- Deletion by crossing out is used after f. 74a (with two exceptions) and deletion by means of parentheses from f. 71a on.
- There are frequent eye-skips after f. 76b.
- Line-filling *daṇḍas* of another form are used from f. 64 on.

The different shapes of the rare *akṣaras* initial *i* and *ṭha* (see II.2.c.i) also support a change of hands around this point.

ii. Change of hands at f. 88a

Regarding the change of hands at f. 88a, I have noted in the introduction to the edition of the third chapter of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* (Hugon and Tomabechi 2011: xx) that the text on f. 87b ends in the middle of a sentence and that f. 88a does not continue on from there, but instead starts with the text at the very beginning of f. 87b, repeating what was already written on f. 87b and only then continues on. A big black mark visible at the beginning of f. 87b1 could indicate that this whole side of the folio has to be deleted. This contrasts with the other changes of hands, where the text just continues from one hand to the next. One can only wonder whether this was coincidental, or whether the copy of f. 87b was judged to be of such poor quality that the subsequent scribe opted for starting anew.

The diplomatic edition of the two folios is presented below in parallel, sentence by sentence, for the sake of comparison. Line numbers are not reported (the pagination of the two folios differs); the capital letters A to P in the left column are given for the sake of reference in the subsequent discussion. Unclear and uncertain characters, as well as line numbers and the string-hole, are not reported.

The variations regarding the punctuation and *sandhi* between the two folios are marked with wavy underlines. The expressions being compared in the subsequent discussion appear in italics. Uncorrected mistakes are marked in bold. Corrected mistakes are underlined.³⁰

| | 87b | 88a |
|---|--|--|
| | syāt tatra caitat pramāṇam syāt ⁰ | syāt tatra caitat pramāṇam syāt* |
| A | na <i>tāvatad</i> abhāvād bhavati | na <i>tāvad</i> abhāvād bhavati |
| B | yasmān nābhāvaḥ kasyacit kāraṇam sāksāt <i>paramparayā</i> vā | yasmān nābhāvaḥ kasyacit kāraṇam sāksāt <i>paramparāyā</i> vā |
| | kuto ₀ 'samarthatvāt* | kuto ₀ asamarthatvāt* |
| | samarthas tarhi bhaviṣyati | samarthas tarhi bhaviṣyati |
| C | bhāva <i>e</i> <va> tarhi syāt* | bhāva <i>eva</i> tarhi syāt ⁰ |
| D | sāmarthyarūpatvād* <t ⁰ > <i>bhāvasya</i> | sāmarthyarūpatvād <i>abhāvasya</i> |
| | cākāro nte vakṣyamāṇo bhinnakramaḥ | cākāro nte vakṣyamāṇo bhinnakramaḥ |
| E | kiñ cānyat <i>tasyā</i> <bhā>vasyānapāyāt <t>atkāryan nitya _m bhavet ⁰ | kiñ cānyat <i>tasyābhāvasyānapāyāt*</i> <i>tatkāryan nityaṃ bhavet⁰ </i> |
| F | na <ca> sahakāryanurodhān nityo pi kadācit karoti | na <i>ca</i> sahakāryānnarodhān nityo pi kadācit karoti |
| | anapekṣatvāt ⁰ | anapekṣatvāt* |
| G | katham <i>anape{so}</i> <kso> | katham <i>anapekṣo</i> |

³⁰ See also the analysis of these two folios in Watanabe 2020: 428–430.

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| H | <u>[[[pi yā yadi</u> <u>śe(s)akātarupatvāt*]]]<apeksā</u> <u>vā viśeśalābharupatvāt⁰> </u> | <i>pekṣāyā viśeśalābharūpatvāt*</i> |
| | tasyāpi viśeṣo bhaviṣyati | tasyāpi viśeṣo bhaviṣyati |
| | bhavatu abhāvas tu na syāt ⁰ | bhavatu abhāvas tu na syāt* |
| I | <u>kuta[~]<s ta> lakṣaṇatvād iti </u> | <i>kutas tallakṣaṇatvā[ti*]d iti </i> |
| J | <i>pūrvvarūpatyāgo</i> rūpāntarasambandhaś ca bhāvasvabhāvo | <i>pūrvvatyāgo</i> rūpāntarasambandhaś ca bhāvasvabhāvo |
| | yadi tāv abhāve staḥ bhāva evāsau nābhāvaḥ | yadi tāv abhāve staḥ bhāva evāsau nābhāvaḥ |
| | tasmān nābhāvād aya _m pratyayo yo sya viśayaḥ | tasmān nābhāvād aya _m pratyayo yo sya viśayaḥ |
| | ayañ ca tatra pramāṇa _m syāt* | ayañ ca tatra pramāṇa _m syāt* |
| | abhāva ity apīty api samuccaye 'yañ ca doṣaḥ | abhāva ity apīty api samuccaye 'yañ ca doṣaḥ |
| K | abhāvaśabden{fo}a na bhāvḡ abhāva iti bhāvapraṭiśedha ucyate | abhāvaśabdena na bhāvḡ 'bhāva iti bhāvapraṭiśedha ucyate |
| | tathā ca saty abhāvād bhavati bhāvapraṭiśedhād bhavati bhāvān na bhavatīti sāmarthyād vākyaṛthaḥ syāt ⁰ | tathā ca saty abhāvād bhavati bhāvapraṭiśedhād bhavati bhāvān na bhavatīti sāmarthyād vākyaṛthaḥ syāt* |
| L | nañ ⁰ samāso hi yenārthena sāmānādhikaraṇyena vaiyadhikaraṇyena vā saṃbadhyate tato rthāt tathai vottarapa [~] <dā>rthan nivarttayati | nañ ⁰ samāso hi yenārthena sāmānādhikaraṇyena vaiyadhikaraṇyena vā sa _m badhyate tato rthāt tathai vottarapadārthan nivarttayati |
| M | yathā abhāvo 'brāhmaṇo bhāvo na bhavatī gatir abhāvena kṛta _m {bhām iti pratīti} <bhāvena <<na>> kṛtām iti> {s}<••> | yathā abhāvo 'brāhmaṇo bhāvo na bhavatīti gatir abhāvena kṛta _m bhāvena kṛta _m iti pratīti |
| N | tathā 'bhāvād bhavati bhāvān na bhavatīty uktau hetur asya pratyasya niśiddhaḥ syāt* | tathā 'bhāvād bhavati bhāvān na bhavatīty uktau hetur asya pratyasya niśiddhaḥ syāt ⁰ |
| O | tato <'>hevukatvam ukta _m | tato 'hetukatvam ukta _m * |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| P | atha nañ ⁰ samāsa uttarapadārthābhāvopalakṣite dravye varttate tato <'> <i>bhā</i> | atha nañ ⁰ samāsa uttarapadārthābhāvop{ā}ala- kṣite dravye varttate tato <i>bhāva</i> eva kaścīd abhāvaḥ |
| | | evaṃ tarhi nāmāntareṇa bhāva evoktaḥ syāt* tato bhāvapratyaya evāyam iti katham abhāvaviṣayaḥ anena śabdārtho pi nābhiprāyānugata iti darśita _m bhavati tasmān nāsyābhāvapratyayasya viṣayābhāvād anutpatter asti sambhavaḥ kiñ ca pratyakṣaḥ |

The variations regarding the punctuation and *sandhi* between the two versions are puzzling. Notably, the scribe of f. 88a uses more punctuation, and favors *t* with *virāma* for final *t*, whereas the scribe of f. 87b favors *t* without *virāma*. These differences may reflect the scribes' preferences, or may suggest that the scribes were not copying from an exemplar but were being dictated to by someone reading the source manuscript (but not reciting from memory, as reciting would not account for the eye-skip phenomenon). The fact that some scribal mistakes involve a confusion of *akṣaras* does not necessarily speak against the possibility of dictation, as they could be explained as the mistakes of the (unskilled) person dictating.

On f. 87b one finds 4 uncorrected mistaken readings (in A, M, N and O) and 13 mistakes that have been corrected (in C, D, 2 in E, D, G, H, I, K, 2 in L, M, O).

Of the 4 uncorrected mistakes, only one (*pratyasya* in N, for *pratyayasya*) is also found on f. 88a. It is likely that this mistake was already present in the exemplar being copied. The other 3 uncorrected mistakes of f. 87b are not mirrored on f. 88a, which has instead a correct reading. These can thus be understood as copying mistakes of the scribe of f. 87b.

Among the 13 mistakes that were corrected on f. 87b, 7 cases involve an omitted *akṣara* corrected by a marginal insertion (C, 2 in E, F, I, L, O); 1 case a wrongly written *akṣara*

corrected by deletion and marginal insertion of the correct one (G); 1 a wrongly written *akṣara* deleted to obtain the correct reading (K); 1 the transformation of a wrongly written *akṣara* (L); 1 case *akṣaras* wrongly written due to confusion caused by the shape of the *akṣaras* being copied (H), which were corrected by deletion of the wrong *akṣaras* and a marginal insertion that, however, contains two mistakes (*viśeṣalābharuṣpatvāt* for *viśeṣalābharūpatvāt*).

As for D, the scribe of f. 87b wrote the mistaken reading *sāmarthyarūpatvād abhāvasya* (the correct reading being *sāmarthyarūpatvād bhāvasya*), but it is likely that this was the reading of the exemplar being copied, as the mistake is repeated by the scribe of f. 88a. But on f. 87b this mistake is first corrected, it seems, by adding a *virāma* to *d* at the end of °*tvād*, then (maybe for the sake of additional clarity) by indicating in the margin the insertion of *t⁰* intended to replace *d* (for which there is not a clear sign of deletion).

The reading of f. 87b for M can be explained as follows: the exemplar being copied probably had the mistaken reading reflected on f. 88a:

...*abhāvena kṛtaṃ bhāvena kṛtam iti pratītiḥ,*

which should be emended for the sake of the sense of the passage's logic to:

...*abhāvena kṛtaṃ bhāvena na kṛtam iti pratītiḥ.*

The scribe of f. 87b omitted the second occurrence of the *akṣaras vena kṛta* during his copying and wrote:

...*abhāvena kṛta_m bhām iti pratītiḥ.*

This mistake could have been corrected by inserting missing *akṣaras* between *bhā* and *m*. Instead, *bhām iti pratītiḥ* was marked as deleted (by crossing out the *akṣaras* “*bhām iti pratītiḥ*” at the end of l. 7 and marking the *s* of *sta* as deleted at the beginning of l. 8) and *abhāvena kṛtām iti* was added in

the lower margin (misspelling *kṛtam* as *kṛtām*). Note that this correction implies the elimination of *pratītis*.³¹

The corrected reading

...*abhāvena kṛtām* (sic!) *bhāvena kṛtam iti*

is further changed to the (logically more correct) reading

...*abhāvena kṛtām* (sic!) *bhāvena na kṛtam iti*

by the insertion of the negation (*na*) written above the inserted sentence.³²

With the exception of the three mistakes that were presumably already present in the exemplar being copied (D, N and M), the scribe of f. 88a does not repeat any of the other 14 copying mistakes made by the scribe of f. 87b (he may have been more careful, or less tired than his predecessor). However, the scribe of f. 88a makes errors that the scribe of f. 87b did not, two left uncorrected (*paraṃparāyā* for *paraṃparayā* in B and the omission of *rūpa* in J), and two corrected (in I and P). The reading *tato bhāva* in P, found on f. 88a, is the correct reading; it is wrongly corrected to *tato 'bhā...* on f. 87b with the insertion of an *avagraha* in the line.

Given that the text on f. 87b ends in the middle of a sentence, the presence of corrections on this folio could indicate

³¹ Since the corrector took the trouble to delete the final *s* of *pratītis* on the next line, one cannot understand the crossing out of *pratīti* as an involuntary over-extension of the line that crosses out *bhām iti*.

³² The Tibetan translation reads (D91b5, P108b5): *dnogs po med pas byas pa* (P add. *dang*) *ni dnogs pos ma byas pa zhes bya ba yin pa bzhin no //*. It includes the negation, which is necessary for the passage's logic, and has no equivalent for *pratītiḥ*. This could indicate that the translating team had a Sanskrit text which contained the negation, or that they supplied it to obtain a logical meaning. The absence of an equivalent for *pratītiḥ* may indicate that this word was not there in their Sanskrit version, but could also suggest that the translators deemed it to be an intrusive gloss parallel to the expression “*gatiḥ*” (Tib. *rtogs pa*) in the previous sentence (*abhāvo brāhmaṇo bhāvo na bhavatīti gatiḥ*), or that they chose not to mirror this word in their translation (maybe because *gatiḥ* and *pratītiḥ* are both translated as *rtogs pa*).

that proof-reading was done on a folio-basis rather than content-basis, either by the scribe himself or by someone else (or both). That the scribe of f. 88a copied D and M without modifying or correcting the reading of the exemplar being copied seems to indicate that he did not check what was written on f. 87b. Watanabe (2020: 431) concludes that it is possible that the copy of f. 88a was made before the marginal notes were written on f. 87b.

iii. Change of hands at f. 126a

Watanabe locates a further change of scribe at f. 126a based on the change of the form of initial *e* (but not of *ha*), and the observation that “the handwriting of the scribe of folios 126a–160a is often more angulated” (Watanabe 2020: 433).

3. Editorial principles

The present edition is a diplomatic edition of a single incomplete manuscript. Our reading is based on Photostat copies of photographs of the extant palm leaves (which were not available for consultation), and is thereby dependent on the quality of these copies. In the case of blotted folios or portions of folios (cf. II.2.a), the marking of *akṣaras* as “unclear” has been accordingly adjusted. Excessive blotting on occasion prevented even the determination of the number of *akṣaras* to be read; in such cases an approximate number is given in the right margin. When dealing with blotted passages, we have attempted to avoid using what the team of contributing editors jokingly called “the *divyacakṣuḥ*.” That is, *akṣaras* that are in fact illegible have been marked as such despite being arguably decipherable when the Tibetan translation is used to guess at probable Sanskrit readings.

Ink fading in the margins posed a similar problem when it came to reading insertions, or merely deciding whether a mark on the Photostat copy is indeed an *akṣara* to be inserted. Border-line cases have been dealt with according to the degree of possibility and presumption of correction: If an insertion is expected at a location vertically aligned with that of

the (possible) *akṣara* in the margin, we have reported an inserted illegible *akṣara* (<••>) in the corresponding place in the transcribed text. If no insertion is expected, at least according to our present understanding of the meaning of the passage, the presence of a possible but unallocated *akṣara* (or several *akṣaras*) has been recorded in a footnote.

Marginal notes that we interpret to be glosses rather than corrections are not transcribed as insertions in the text. The indication “GLOSS” is added in the text after the *kākapada*, and the gloss is recorded in a footnote.

Akṣaras that are occasionally written in similar ways (such as *pa* and *ya*) or those not distinguished by the scribe (see II.2.c.ii) have been read according to expectation and transcribed accordingly.

The text in the manuscript has been transcribed with all its orthographic and scribal peculiarities (see II.2.d). For the reader’s convenience, the editors have separated out the words of the text, following their present understanding of the meaning of the text. Hyphenation at the end of the lines is purely editorial and as a rule is made between *akṣaras*.

When an *avagraha* is used for *a* or *ā* in unresolved *sandhi* with a preceding *ā*, we insert a space before it, except in compounds. For example: *muktvā ’drśyāvasthām, pratijñayā ’gamarūpayā*, but *anupakāryāpekṣā’yogād, tadekadeśā’va-yavāḥ*.

Each folio side appears on one page in the edition (except ff. 102a, 102b, 104a, 104b and 111b). Each page is structured as follows:

| | | | |
|---|-----|--|---|
| | A | | |
| B | C | | D |
| | | | |
| | (E) | | |

F

- A Folio number and side
- B Line number
- C Diplomatic edition of line B

- D** Indication of a) transformation marked with italics in C; b) location of *akṣara*(s) to be inserted in C; when required, the cipher indicating the line of insertion; c) approximate number of illegible *akṣara*(s) marked with ellipse in C. These are recorded in the order they appear in C. When more than one of the aforementioned indicators pertains to the same line in the edition, they are separated by commas.
- E** Reference to the beginning of the passage corresponding to this folio in the Tibetan translation in D and P.
- F** Footnote recording a) unallocated (potential) *akṣaras* in the margins or presumption thereof; b) transcription of glosses; c) other remarks.

4. Notes on the Tibetan translation

A careful comparison of the Sanskrit text with the Tibetan translation was carried out during the preparation of the present diplomatic edition. Exhaustive remarks on the Tibetan translation exceed, however, the scope of the present publication.³³ I will limit myself here to briefly discussing a few passages in the Sanskrit text that have no equivalent in the Tibetan translation and some passages in the Tibetan translation which lack any correspondence in the Sanskrit. The range of situations they suggest should be kept in mind for the establishment of the critical edition.

a. Sanskrit without equivalent in Tibetan

i. Entire sentences present in the manuscript's Sanskrit text of the third chapter are not found in the Tibetan translation. For some of these, the omission can be explained as due to the nature of the Sanskrit sentence, which, although not completely untranslatable, may have been considered as making

³³ Sakai (2010: viii–xii) discusses the Tibetan translation for the second chapter of the *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā*. See also Hugon 2016, which discusses the Tibetan translation of the third chapter of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* and explores some connected aspects of the translation of the *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā*.

little sense for Tibetan readers who did not know the Sanskrit text. They are, notably, etymological explanations:

- f. 68b3–4: sa_[68b4]ndeheṇa sahitā satī sandeḥa ucyate
 f. 81a3: antara_m vyavadhānaṃ karoty antarayati | antarayitum śakyam antaryam (e)˘ <vā>ntaryaka_m nāntaryakam a˘ <nāntaryaka(m) a>vyavadhey_{a,m}

and grammatical explanations:³⁴

- f. 37a3–5: ihākṣepaśabdaprayoge yadi sāmānyam ka_[37a4]rmma viśeṣaḥ kartta bhedo tayoḥ prayoge saty ubhayaprāṅtau karmmaṇīti ṣaṣṭī | karmmaṇī ceti pratiśedhān na samasyate tataś ca viśeṣeṇa sāmānyasyākṣepād iti syā_[37a5] samāsa{**}prayuktas tataḥ ṣeṣavi(ś)eṣa / tasyāi ca satyāṅm viśeṣaḥ karttā ṣaṣṭyānto pi na virudhyate
 f. 74b1–2: saḥakāriśabdaś ca sāmānyaviśeṣe kṛtavvyutpatt{i}e˘{h}r napumsakaliṅgo bahuvrīḥau nity{u}am <***>ttarapatadvā योग्यातशब्देना विशेषमणश sa{n}ni veśeṣaṇali_[74b2]ṅgam upādatte |

Other entire passages or sentences not found in the Tibetan translation include, for instance:

- f. 8a3–4: etad uktaṃ bhavati na vyaṃ brūma ekatvasyānekatvam avaśyam evan tu brūmo nekatvavyāpta_[8a4]śya sambhave vyāpakasambhava eṣitavyo vyāpakābhāv{o}e˘ <vā> vyāpyābhāva iti |
 f. 22b5: iṣṭaśabdasyānyad vyavacchedyan darśayati |
 f. 123b2: idam iṣṭam eva |

ii. More frequently, it is only part of a sentence that is not found in the Tibetan translation. For instance (the part missing in the translation appears in bold):

- f. 17b2: yasyārthasya yena sādhanena siddhir ākṣipyate **so rthas tatsāmarthyena vyāptas**
 f. 19a6: **dvayoś ca bhojanīyam**³tvaviśeṣayoḥ pratiśedhe bhojanīyatvasāmānya˘ <(m a)>py a˘nyataraśabdārthaviśayo na sambhavaty eva

³⁴ In contrast, the grammatical discussion of the compound *pakṣadharmā* on f. 62b was integrally translated. Sakai (2010: viii–xii) notes that not all grammatical explanations are duly translated in rNgog Blo ldan shes rab’s translation of the second chapter and explains in detail five examples.

- f. 22b5–6: eteneṣṭasya **sādhya^vvecchayā vyāptasya** sā_[22b6]dhyatvavacanena dharmmadharmmiṇau dharmmidharmmābhyāṃ viśiṣṭau dharmmiviśiṣṭaṃ dharmmaṃ **dh{ā}ar^mmaviśiṣṭa^m ca dharmmiṇaṃ** kṛta{t}katvena hetunā nirākurvvan vādī nirastaḥ
- f. 28b5: yaś ca sāstra!⊙dṛṣṭaviparītavyāptaḥ **sa viruddha iti** na kaścid dhetuḥ ||
- f. 35b2: nanu **ceṣṭāśabdo varttamānām** icchām āha
- f. 72b2: yadi prāg **api prayatnāc** chabdo 'sti tasya **prāk⁰sataḥ śabdasya** jñān{e}a_m niyamena prayatnānantara_m bhavan na yujyate | kadāci tu syāt
- f. 78b7: **tathopakārād** eva jñānotpattir iti **śabdasyākāratvam** iti dvitīye pariccheda ukta_m
- f. 103a3: **asparśatvasya hy anvayo vya{ti}rekasahāyaḥ** | anitye⊙bhyo hi **ghaṭādibhyo** sparśatva_m* vyāvṛttaṃ na punar yathānityatvaṃ
- f. 107a4: tad eva <ca> **svakāryā{nu}bhimukhyaṃ rasopādānasya** rūpopādānahetūnām pravṛtteḥ | kāraṇaṃ
- f. 124a8–b1: **tathā hi sat⁰ pradhānaṃ mameṣṭatvād** iti nokta_m kim tv itaradviparītavinirmuktatvād iti _[124b1] vacanaṃ

iii. More frequently, a single word in the Sanskrit text lacks an equivalent in the Tibetan canonical translation. For example (the word that is not translated appears in bold):

- | | |
|--|---|
| f. 1b2–3: khyāpakas tu trirūpasya liṅga _[1b3] śya yaḥ śabdaḥ sa evānumānam iti | (D1b2–3, P2b3): sgra gang zhig tshul gsum ston par byed pa de nyid rjes su dpag pa yin no // |
| f. 3a4: api tu parīkṣāyā eva sakāśād abhyupagamaḥ karttavya[h] | (D3b5, P4a7): 'on kyang brtags (P brtag) pa nyid las khas blang par (DP bar) bya ba yin no // |

This phenomenon must be distinguished from cases where the Sanskrit word or expression was taken into account by the translator, but rendered in Tibetan with an unusual or unexpected expression.

Various reasons can be suggested to explain these omissions, some of which consider them from the perspective of the translation process—the translator's choice (for instance, a stylistic choice leading to omission of a calque translation of a final “*iti*” or of a “*ca*,” the decision to ignore a given word/passage as an intrusive gloss, etc.), the translator's mistake, reliance of the translator on an alternative manuscript

which lacks the given word/passage—or others which view them from the perspective of the transmission and revision of the Tibetan translation and the compilation of the canonical versions. These will have to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

b. Tibetan without Sanskrit correspondence

i. A number of cases where the Tibetan features words or expressions absent in the Sanskrit version can be understood as additions for the sake of clarity by the translator. It is not necessary to postulate the translator's reliance on a version of the Sanskrit text different than that in our manuscript. Typically, the addition in the Tibetan (in bold in the table below) repeats an expression present in the previous sentence (underlined), for instance:

- | | |
|---|---|
| f. 39b2: samdigdhe rthe yato hetur ucyate tato vyastah pramāṇena nirākṛto 'nāśrayo hetor nna sa pakṣo | (D41a7, P48b1): gang gi phyir gtan tshigs the tshom za ba'i don la brjod pa de'i phyir bsal ba tshad mas bzlog pa ni <u>gtan tshigs kyi rten ma yin la</u> / gtan tshigs kyi rten ma yin pa gang yin pa de yang phyogs ma / yin te / |
| f. 75b7: tasya bhāvas tāratamyam prakarṣaḥ tena tāv indriya-viṣayāv atiśayavantau kuryād api | (D79b6, P94a8): de'i ngo bo ni ches cher te <u>rab tu gyur pa'o</u> // rab tu gyur pa des yul dang dbang po de gnyis la khyad par byed pa yang yin no// |
| f. 90a7: svahetūnām sākalyaniyatam apratibandho niyato yas tasyābhāvāt* katham abhāvo | (D94a3, P111b2): rgyu rnam tshang par nges pa dang gegs byed pa med par <u>nges pa</u> gang yin pa de med pa'i phyir ro // ci ltar nges pa med ce na / |

ii. Clearly qualifying as the translator's additions are cases where the Tibetan provides additional verse lines when a verse is partially cited in the Sanskrit (or not cited at all), or has a longer excerpt than the one in the Sanskrit version. For instance (the cited passage appears in italics and the addition in Tibetan is marked in bold):

- f. 37b2: *asmābhir ucyate kaiścit* (D39b6, P45b8): *gnas skabs 'ga' yis 'dod 'gyur dang // de ni de yis rtogs bya'ang yin // zhes bya ba la sogs kho bo cag gis brjod do //*

In the same vein, longer excerpts are frequently found in Tibetan when the beginning of a prose passage in the *Pramāṇa-viniścaya* is cited to refer to the text portion starting with these words. For instance:

- f. 51a6: *tan na | yatrāpīyādeḥ prakrāntatvād* (D54a2, P63a7): *de ni ma yin te / gang la thun mong ma yin pa'i phyir zhes bya ba la sogs pa'i skabs yin pa'i phyir ro //*

iii. Examples of complete sentences without correspondence in the Sanskrit text that appear to be additions (rather than translations of a part of the Sanskrit text missing in our manuscript) are:

- f. 32a7: between “...teṣv” and “arthaḥ...” (D34b4, P39b7): *gzhan yang ji lta bur gyur pa zhig ce na /*
- f. 112a3: between “...sarvvasyeti” and “yadi...” (D123a1, P144a3): *'dis ni rjes su 'gro ldog gi nye bar sbyor ba bstan to //*

iv. One case, on the other hand, seems better explainable as the translation of a passage omitted in our Sanskrit manuscript in the passage commenting on PVin 3 17,3–4: *api ca dvayor api sambhavāvirodha etad evaṃ syāt /* (Tib. *gzhan yang gnyi gar yang srid pa mi 'gal na de de ltar 'gyur gyi*). The gloss on “*etad*” is found in both the Sanskrit and Tibetan of PVinT,³⁵ but the gloss on “*evaṃ syāt*” is found only in the Tibetan.

- f. 20b5: between “...anyataratvam” and “anyathā...” (D22a7, P25b7): *de ltar 'gyur gyi zhes bya ba ni grub par 'gyur gyi'o //*

³⁵ Both D and P have the reading *de ltar zhes bya ba* for *etad iti*, which should be corrected to *de zhes bya ba*.

v. Additional words in the Tibetan are indicative in certain cases of a mistaken reading of our Sanskrit manuscript. For instance:

f. 3a2: *tasmāt tadviṣṭa_m** (D3b3, P4a5): des na de ni khyad par **med** pa yin no //

Emendation: *tasmāt tad aviṣṭam*

f. 35b7–8: *ataḥ kramavatīm api siddha-
[35b7]tveṣṭim nivarttayaty
avadhāraṇam iti yukta_m |* (D38a4, P44a1): des na nges par gzung ba ni rim gyis kyang grub pa **dang bsgrub par bya ba** nyid du 'dod pa sel bar byed pa yin no zhes 'thad pa yin no //

Emendation: ... *api siddhatvasādhyatveṣṭim*³⁶...

³⁶ In the preceding sentence, *grub pa dang bsgrub par bya ba nyid du* translates *siddhatvasādhyatva*.