A Critical Edition of Bhaṭṭa Jayanta’s *Nyāyamaṇjarī*:
The Section on Kumārila’s Refutation of the *Apoha* Theory

Kei KATAOKA

The portion of the *Nyāyamaṇjarī* edited in the present article is Jayanta’s summary of Kumārila’s criticism of the Buddhist *apoha* theory. Dignāga (470–530 AD), Dharmakīrti (600–660 AD) and their followers such as Dharmottara (740–800 AD) hold that a word (*pada*) such as ‘cow’ denotes *anypāha* (exclusion of what is different), e.g. exclusion or negation of non-cows, and not a positive entity, e.g. a universal (*jāti*) such as cowness. Kumārila (600–650 AD) refutes Dignāga’s view in the *apoha* section of his *Mīmāṃsāsākavārttika*. Taking into consideration Buddhist rejoinders by Dharmakīrti and Dharmottara, Jayanta (840–900 AD) has further developed the brahmanical criticism of the *apoha* theory.

In the fifth *āhika* of his *Nyāyamaṇjarī*, after a brief introduction (NM II 3.7–5.14 in the Mysore edition), Jayanta first presents the Buddhist refutation of *jātis* or universals (NM II 6.2–14.13). There, a Buddhist opponent concludes that “words and concepts have exclusions as their objects” (NM II 14.13: *apohavivāyāk śabdāḥ vikalpaś ca*). This is followed by the present portion (NM II 14.15–21.15), in which Jayanta summarizes Kumārila’s criticism discussed in the *apoha* chapter of the *Mīmāṃsāsākavārttika*. That is then in turn followed by Buddhist rejoinders (NM II 21.18–29.4) and then by Jayanta’s final view (NM II 29.7–47.4). The Buddhist opponent sets forth ‘recent’ *apoha* theories developed by Dharmakīrti and Dharmottara and in response Jayanta establishes the brahmanical view that words denote external objects.

A good overview of the relevant portion (NM II 10.7–29.4) is given in Hattori 2006, “The *Apoha* Theory as Referred to in the *Nyāyamaṇjarī*”. Hattori worked on the basis of the two published editions that I refer to as S and M. An English
summary is also available in Shah 1997. An annotated Japanese translation of Kumārila’s *Mīmāṃsāsālokavārttika* by Hattori (1973, 1975) is also helpful for clarifying Jayanta’s procedure.

Jayanta’s *Nyāyamañjarī* is a commentary on Ākṣapāda’s *Nyāyasūtra*, in particular on the definition-sūtras (lakṣaṇasūtras) by which Ākṣapāda defines each of the sixteen pādārthas and their subordinate categories. Therefore, in theory at least, the present portion is also a part of his commentary on *Nyāyasūtra* 1.1.7 (āptopadesaḥ śabdāḥ), although the *apoха* theory is not directly relevant to the original sūtra. The sūtra does not presuppose the *apoха* theory at all.

It is remarkable that Jayanta inserted many periodically relevant discussions in his commentary on this sūtra. The entire commentary on 1.1.7, called śabdāparिकā or the examination of speech, extends from the third to the sixth āhnika, and covers more than one third of the *Nyāyamañjarī*, i.e. 554 pages of 1419 in the Mysore edition. Jayanta himself enumerates at the beginning the various subordinate topics in thirteen verses (NM I 412.14–414.17). The following is the list of the topics given by Jayanta (or, strictly speaking, by an opponent) as those which will be discussed in the examination of speech, modified by the present author into appropriate Sanskrit terms on the basis of Jayanta’s usage. (Jayanta’s list is not exhaustive. For example, the section called atharva-vedaprāmāṇya, I 614-629, is not listed.)

1. Speech does not touch external objects (arthāsamsarītiśva) I 415–419. II 3–47
2. Word-meanings (pādārtha) II 47–69
3. Relationships between words and meanings (śabdārthasambandha) I 591–603
4. Sentence-meanings (vākyārtha) II 69–142
5. The cause of understanding a sentence-meaning (vākyārthabodhekāraṇa) II 143–219
6. Eternity of sounds (śabdānityatā) I 513–572

Our section on apoха is subordinate to the first topic arthāsamsarītiśva. Buddhists claim that speech does not touch external objects. In the third āhnika Jayanta announces as follows: “By way of rejecting word-meanings such as universals, it is taught that speech does not touch an [external] object. This [Buddhist view] will be dismissed below [in the fifth āhnika]” (NM I 419.17–18: yā tu jāyadiśabādārthaparādarākanvarīmanad/ arthāsamsarītiśvatoceta [tocyeta] Lucknow ms.; tā proktā M) sā purastān niṣetesate/.). This announcement is later echoed in the beginning of the fifth āhnika: “It is stated that words do not touch [external] objects, because word-meanings that are real do not exist. This [Buddhist view] is now rebutted” (NM II 3.9–10: yad uktam vāstavaṣa śabdārtha-vidyāmānastvām arthāsamsarispīnaḥ śabdā iti, tat pratvitiṣyate).

While giving a summary of Kumārila’s criticism of the Buddhist apoха theory, Jayanta glosses in prose Kumārila’s verses of the *Mīmāṃsāsālokavārttika*. Therefore it is important to trace parallel passages to the *Mīmāṃsāsālokavārttika* in order to clarify the background of Jayanta’s ideas. This necessary procedure is followed in the present edition.

Jayanta explains Kumārila’s discussions in a lucid manner, as is often the case also in the other sections of the *Nyāyamañjarī*. Some of my previous articles have illustrated that Jayanta’s *Nyāyamañjarī* can be used as a kind of commentary on or introduction to the *Mīmāṃsāsālokavārttika*, which, being composed in verse, is not easy to understand at a glance.

In this perspective, the present section is all the more important, for the oldest extant commentary on the *Mīmāṃsāsālokavārttika*, the Tātparyaṭīṭa by
Umbeka, is not available for the *apoha* section. The Adyar manuscript (No. 67591, XX.N-2) that is the *codex unicus* used for the Madras edition of the *Tattvārthābhāṣa* ends with the *sphota* chapter. The same manuscript then continues with Jayamāṇḍira’s *Śarkarikā*, which covers the sections on dhātu, *apoha*, vana and *sambandhākṣepaparipāhāra* (only up to v. 38). Furthermore, Sūcaratamīśra’s *Kāśikā* commentary published from Trivandrum in three parts (1926, 1929, 1943) stopped at the *sambandhākṣepa* (not *sambandhākṣepaparipāhāra*) and thus does not cover *sphota* and the following sections. Therefore, for the *apoha* section of the *Mimāṃsāśloka-vārttikā* we only have the two brief commentaries published, i.e. Jayamāṇḍira’s *Śarkarikā* and Pārthasārathī’s *Nyāyaratnakara*. Thus the present section of the *Nyāyamaṇḍira* provides one of the oldest known interpretations of Kumārila’s verses on *apoha*.[1]

**Sources of the present edition**

Bhaṭṭa Jayanta’s *Nyāyamaṇḍira* has been published many times, as shown in the following list.[2]


---

1 Before Jayanta, Kamalaśīla (740–785 AD) provides a yet older interpretation of a certain number of Kumārila’s verses on *apoha* in his commentary on Śāntarakṣita’s *Tattvasaṅgraha*. As Frawallner and other scholars have suggested, on the basis of close investigation of other sections such as the *aṭṭandriśārthakarṣiparipāhita*, most probably Śāntarakṣita quotes there from the lost *Bṛhaṭṭikā* and not from the *Mimāṃsāśloka-vārttikā*. See Kataoka 2003a. Hattori (1973, 1975) misses this perspective and sometimes overcorrects the texts of the *apoha* section of the *Mimāṃsāśloka-vārttikā* in favor of the readings as given in the *Tattvasaṅgraha*.

2 Pañcānana Tarkavāgīśa’s edition published from Calcutta in 1939–1941, which covers the first *dhīnaka*, is not available to me.
K. A manuscript preserved in the Malayalam Department of the University of Calicut, No. 2602. Malayalam script. Palm leaf. 177 folios. Incomplete.

Other editions are basically copies of previous editions, as I have demonstrated in my previous research. Most of them are based on V either directly or indirectly, without consulting any manuscript. Naturally later editions often inherited wrong readings and mistakes of previous ones.

Case 1 This is also the case in the present section on apoha. For example, the first published edition V reads:

\[
\text{nānu apohāsabdārthapakṣe māhatīm krpaṇavrśtim utasarjā bhaṭṭāḥ.}
\]

S (published in 1934) and its second edition S² (1971) read the same. G (1983) also reads the same. Bhattacharyya (1978:631), who bases himself on V, translates the line wrongly: "Kumāra Bhaṭṭa has measured his swords with the Buddhist hypothesis that a word denotes a negative general image." (My emphasis)

M (1983), however, reads differently:

\[
\text{nānu! apohāvādavisaye, māhatīm dusānaavrśtim utasarjā bhaṭṭāḥ.}
\]

N (1989) reads the same as M. The two manuscripts, however, read yet differently for the problematic portions emphasized above.

\[
\text{nānu apohāsabdārthapakṣe māhatīm dusānaavrśtim utasarjā bhaṭṭāḥ.}
\]

Surely, Bhaṭṭa [Kumārila] released a big rainfall of criticisms on the [Buddhist] view that apoha (exclusion) is word-meaning.
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The reading krpaṇa in VSSG does not sound right, because the image "a big rainfall of swords" (māhatīm krpaṇavrśtim) is less fitting than "a big rainfall of criticisms" (māhatīm dusānaavrśtim). M's reading dusāna is actually supported by the two manuscripts A₁K₁. Furthermore, Jayanta's concluding remark in § 11 iyādi dusānaudāryam apoke bahu darśitam, which echoes the opening remark at stake, supports dusāna and not krpaṇa.

However, in the other portion M's new reading vādavisaye in place of sabdārthapakṣe is neither supported by A₁ nor K₁. The phrase apoha-sabdārthapakṣe, on the other hand, is supported by Jayanta's usage in the beginning of § 6 (kiṣcāpohasabdārthapakṣe). From the viewpoint of Jayanta's usage, apohavedavisaye does not sound right. It seems to me that apoha-vādavisaye rather reflects modern colloquial Sanskrit.

Case 2 It is clear that M has improved the text considerably. The first edition V sometimes omits an entire line. For example in § 1.2, M reads:

\[
\text{tasāyāpi hi sāmānyatmatena apohasabhāvatoḥ abhāvasya cābhāvārāyutvānupatṭeḥ na ca sābaleyasāmānyam agoniṃśoḥ dārayaḥ.}
\]

The whole line is completely missing in V and also SS²G. But it is attested in A₁K₁ with minor differences. N reads exactly as M. Following the present edition, it can be translated as follows:

\[
\text{tasāyāpi sāmānyatvendapohasabhāvatoḥ abhāvasyābhāvārāyutvānupatṭeḥ na ca sābaleyasāmānyam agoniṃśoḥ dārayaḥ.}
\]

This is because that it is impossible that non-existence is the locus of [another] non-existence, for [an intermediate universal], too, essentially being a universal, is apoha (exclusion) in nature. And the universal of sābaleya cows is not the locus of the exclusion of the non-cow.

Case 3 A similar example is found in § 2, for which M reads:
Case 5  The present section on apoha contains abstract arguments concerning
negation and even negation of negation such as agovyārtti or "exclusion of a non-
cow". Editorial work is difficult when it comes to the problem of the presence or
absence of negative particles. For example, V reads:

na hy evam upapadyate asābaleyo bhavatiti gauḥ kiṃ tu sābaleya iti.
sābaleyaṁyārttir hi goṣu api bāhuleyādiṣu asti.

Based on this text and his imagination, Bhattacharyya (1978:632) translates
as follows:

If the Buddhists accept the above suggestion then a cow cannot be
logically distinguished from the exclusion of the other of Śābaleyas. In
other words, we fail to draw a distinction between a cow and non-non-
Śābaleya since Śābaleya is only not non-Śābaleya. Other cows such as
Bāhuleya, etc., are non-Śābaleya but they are not non-cows.

SSG read the same. M, however, reads differently, adding negatives and a
negative noun:

na hy evam upapadyate, asābaleyo na bhavatiti gauḥ, kiṃ tu sābaleya
śābaleya iti. asābaleyaṁyārttir hi goṣu api bāhuleyādiṣu asti.

Although M improved the text to a certain degree, it is not yet sufficient,
because the clauses kiṃ tu sābaleyaśābaleya iti and asābaleyaṁyārttir hi goṣu
api bāhuleyādiṣu asti do not make sense. N, which normally follows M, reads
them differently, clearly being aware of the textual defects of M.

na hy evam upapadyate, "asābaleyo na bhavatiti gauḥ" kiṃ tu "śābaleya "
asābaleya na bhavatī iti. asābaleyaṁyārttir hi goṣu api bāhuleyādiṣu
nāsti.
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This text could have the intention that Bhattacharyya presupposes. N seems to follow G, M reads the same except that it reads nañaśīpaddānām instead of nañaśīśabdānām. It also divides the sentence as follows, just as N:

pratīśedhavācīnām ca nañaśīpaddānām kā vārtā—atra na bhavatīti? neti ko ‘rthaḥ?

Consulting the two manuscripts, I reconstruct the text as follows:

pratīśedhavācīnām ca nañaśīśabdānām kā vārtā. ana na bhavatīti neti ko ‘rthaḥ.

How do you explain the words such as NOT that express negation?
What is the meaning [of the sentence]: ‘NOT is not non-NOT’?

The most problematic is ana, for which the previous editions unanimously read atra. The reading atra na bhavati probably assumes a common example of a negative sentence such as atra ghaṭo na bhavati. However, both manuscripts A, and K, read ana. Furthermore the structure is the same as in other examples. Compare the present line (§ 9) with other examples of word-analyses in § 1.2 and § 8:

§ 9 : ana na bhavatīti neti
§ 1.2: aśābaleya na bhavatīti śābalya iti
§ 8 : anapoke na bhavatīti apokeḥ

Thus the whole line is asking the meaning of a negative NĀ which could be analyzed, according to the theory of apoka, as “not non-NOT” (aANA na bhavati), just as “cow” is analyzed as “not non-cow”. The word ana, though it certainly looks strange at first glance, is in fact the reading most appropriate in the present context.
However, as is clear from the correct reading samudāyino, what is directly refuted by the present argument concerning the impossibility of classifying countless individual cows in samudāyīnas and not samudāya. Following the present edition, the whole passage can be translated as follows:

samudāyino ca svalakṣaṇāṇāṁ desākālādibhedenānantaṁ vargākaraṇaṁ puruṣāyaṣaṣṭāṇāṁ na sākyākriyam iti samudāyino 'pi na tadāśrayah.

Even for hundreds of human lives, it is impossible to classify individual particulars, because they are infinite in number due to the difference of place, time and so forth. Therefore, neither are individuals the loci of the [exclusion of non-cows].

Case 8 The next example is difficult to judge at a first glance. V reads (304.27–28):

\[ \text{athāśuddivedīśeṣoddhoṣaraḥ hitam āgūryaṁ vyavachchedayam ucyate} \]

Bhattacharyya (1978:635) translates this as follows:

Now, the Buddhists may take up a new line of defence. If they hold that the term 'cow' denotes only an exclusion of non-cow but does not make mention of a horse as the distinct object to be excluded . . . (My emphasis)

S and S' correct āgūryaṁ to āgūryaṁ. G reads as SS'. M reads āgūryaṁ instead of āgūryaṁ and reads as follows (II 18.11):

\[ \text{athāśuddivedīśeṣoddhoṣaraḥ hitam āgūryaṁ vyavachchedayam ucyate} \]

Here it is clear that ddhoṣa must be a typographical error for dghoṣa. N
Abbreviations and conventions
For the abbreviations and conventions used in the present edition, see my previous editions of selected portions of the Nyāyamañjarī, Kataoka [2003b] [2004] [2005] and [2007a].
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न्यायम्‌नरी।
अध्यात्मत्थपक्षःधृष्टानि।

[0 उपोहातः]
नन्योऽध्यात्मत्थपक्षः महति द्रष्ट्र्वृहिदिकसर्ववर्त्तं भूतः।

[1 अध्यात्मत्थाष्ट्रः]
तथा ह्योऽध्यात्मः हेम्मक्षिपुर्ववर्त्तं उच्यते। न चायायः स्वतत्ततरमयम्
बंडत्र्विरवर्त्तं माय। तद्यमनवाश्वितो याहीत्त्वः। कश्च तस्य अरण्
इस्तं बिन्यमम्।

[1.1 गोस्वलक्षणम्]
न तावद्वस्तळक्षणमान्यः। तस्य विकल्पमभूमितमाभवात्।

2 महति द्रष्ट्र्वृहिदिकसर्ववर्त्तं] Nyāyamanājārīgranthihbhāngā 132.3–7: महति (तीर्थी) [कृपा] श्रृविशिष्टम्। तपाहि भृगु आह— अगातिनिवृश्चि: सामान्यं वाच्यं ये: परिकलितम्। तेन वस्तव्य: तैलकपियेऽयौहितिगिरा स्वूक्तम।[भवान्तरत्र्वभूशः हि पुरस्तात् प्रतिपादित: तथा बाचविनिवृश्चितम् भावः कारत्तकाराय: इति] इत्यत्त्रारतिदित्तात्।
4 Cf. Ślokaśārttikā apoha 2: नवान्तरत्र्वभूशः हि पुरस्तात्तर्वपिपादित:। तत्तःत्रांतिनिवृश्चितस्माभायः क इति कारायाय:।
8 Cf. Ślokaśārttikā apoha 3.1ab: नेदो दस्याभारस्त्याविविष्यो निविकल्पनानात्।
[1.2 शाब्देश्यत्वादि]
नाथ्यान्तरसामान्यं शाब्देश्यत्वादि तदस्रयः। तस्यापि सामान्यः  
व्यावहार्याः सामान्यगौगृतमृतस्त्रयाः। न च शाब्दे  
व्यावहार्याः सामान्यगौगृतमृतस्त्रयाः। तद्भवन्त: प्रतिपदः।  
न द्वेषायुपायाये अपावये न भवतीति गोऽ। फिन्नात्स्कालयो  
न भवतीति शाब्देश्यय इति। शाब्देश्ययावृत्तिपरि न जोग्याणि  
बाहुलयादिव्यति।

[1.3 शाब्देश्ययावृत्तिक्षणसमुदायः]
अथ शाब्देश्ययावृत्तिक्षणसमुदायमोगौगृतन्यताः  
मृतस्त्रयाः, सो  
उपपान्तमान एव, सामुदायिक्षितेऽरैश्रेष्ठ तथ्यानुपत्तनात।

2. Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 3cd-4: तथा च शाब्देश्ययादिसामान्यप्रखङ्गः।  
शाब्देश्ययावृत्तियं हि न सामान्यं परस्यात्। न बैक्षिमित्रेऽरै  
हन्तयानात्माप्तात् भवते॥

3. Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 5cd: न शाब्देश्ययावृत्तिक्षणसमुदायः।  
शाब्देश्ययावृत्तिक्षणसमुदायः ।

4. Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 6ab: निपुण्याः बाहुलयादिव्यति।  
मृतस्त्रयाः सो  
उपपान्तमान एव, सामुदायिक्षितेऽरैश्रेष्ठ तथ्यानुपत्तनात।

2. तस्याः … सिवृतुवतः: [MA; Ki; om. V 2 तस्याः: [MA; M*; A; Ki;  
तत्त्वाय हि म 3 सामान्याः: [Ki; सामान्याः: [MA; 3 स्वभावः: [MK;  
स्वभावः: [B; A; 3 स्वभावः: [M*; Ki; 2 स्वभावः: [M;  
सामान्याः: [MA; 4 सामान्याः: [MA; 2 सामान्याः: [MA; 3 प्रविषयाः: [MA; Ki;  
प्रविषयाः: [V 5 न भवती: [MA; 3 प्रविषयाः: [V 6 किन्नात्स्कालयो  
न भवतीति शाब्देश्यय इति [KI; किन्नात्स्कालयो 5 किन्नात्स्कालयो  
भवतीति इति [MA; Ki; 5 किन्नात्स्कालयो 6 अ।  
किन्नात्स्कालयो [MA; Ki; 5 किन्नात्स्कालयो [V 6 न [KI; om. MVA; 9 अथ  
MA; 2 तस्याः: [MK; 

[1.4 समुदायिन:]
समुदायिन: च स्वलक्षणाय देशाकालिकसदनात्मकयथिकरः  
पु-  
रायुपायायार्थात् निपूण्याः: मेवः। तरसमाहिता च।  

[1.5 उपसार्यः]
तस्मात्सारसार्येऽरुपिः परिश्रमः किमपि मून्तामोगृतृते  
रथिकरणम्बिन्तः तद्। तत्र गोऽदेशवेच। तस्मिन्नेुकृते  
विनु-  
गौगृतवृत्तिक्षणायाय्याः।

2. Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 9cd: न प्रत्येकेऽरुपिः, न समुदायिनिः।  
5. Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 10: तस्मात् दुहुः प्रत्येके परिश्रमिः।  
गौगृतवृत्तिक्षणम् स्वादू गोऽकर्षनयः नातिक तत॥

9. Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 67-68ab: अन्याः सत्यात्मकः, तथे सत्यात्मकः  
भवते। कल्पायेत्ते, ते अर्थे परमेव ते कल्पितोऽरुप च।  
11. नापि वर्गिकरणमिति।] See 3.3 in this edition: वर्गिकरणकार्य ; च; but  
cf. Nyāyamāyādīgraha gibhaṇja 132.9: न च वर्गिकरणेन निनिषिधिति।  
11. Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 72: अपोगारायणि चाचादीन्यात्मकयथिकरः। न  
निनिषिधिताः शाक्तविकरणोऽपि न सिद्धिः॥

2. द्विविपण: [MV; क्र; ब्रविपण: [M*; क्र; गोऽ: [A; 3 समुदायिन:  
A; Ki; सामुदायिन: [MV; 3 तदस्रयः: [MV; Ki; तदस्रयः: [Ki; 5 प्रतिपियः  
परिसराः [MV; Ki; प्रतिपियः परितिनिः: [A; 5 मुः: [Ki; 5 मुः: [MV;  
2 गौगृतवृत्तिकः [A; Ki; 2 गौगृतवृत्तिकः [MV; 6 वा [MV; Ki; 6 गौगृतवृत्तिकः  
7. करमेत: [MV; Ki; करमेत: [MV; Ki; करमेत: [MV; Ki; करमेत: [MV;  
9 किमपि … [MV 4 सामान्यः: [MA; Ki; 5 किमपि … [MV; 
9 किमपि … [KV; Ki; om. (eyepkip) 9 वा [KI; 9 वा [KI; 9 वा [KI;  
10. द्विविपण: [MA; Ki; द्विविपण: [M*; द्विविपण: [MV; Ki; द्विविपण: [MV;  
9 नापि [MV; 9 नापि [MV;  सापि [A; 11 ब्रविपण: [MV  
11 ब्रविपण: [MV;  

[192]
अष्ठादश  न विधिप्रचलिता  भवन्ते  गृहान्ते, किन्तै  व्याख्याफूँ देवीति  तेनामाग्यि  व्याख्याकुम्भेन  सैव  वार्तित  नेवारी  विकर्ते। कनिष्ठफोलो हिवर्षीवर्तुरु अकरते। नखिलक्षेपेन  च  न किन्तै  ब्रह्मवास इति  सकललोकायतोत्सावप्रसङ्गः।

[3 पयाय्य्य्णवयसः]
किन्तै य एते  परस्परिसमाहितमाधिभाषिनो गवागाभिविधाय यो च विशेषवाचनः का कंदिवायालेयायायायः, ते सर्ये  एवाविशेषाचिन्ताविशेषाचिन्तायः।

[3.1 अपोहभेदाभावः]
अपोहभेदाधिरो इति  वैत। न  अपोहानां  भेदभावात्। भिषामन्ये वा वस्तुनिर्देशेऽवा  वस्तुनिर्देशसः।

6 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 42: भिषामान्यवचनम्  विशेषवचनाः। ते सर्वे  भवेः। पयाय्य्य्य्याचाधो माफळता।
10 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 43ab: ननु  भेदवाहाराण्योः  प्रसङ्गः। न न नयस्ते।
10 अपोहानां  भेदभावात्] Nyāyamājīgranthibhaṅga 132.9-10: अपोहानां  भेदभावात्। अभावपदलोचित्वभावः।
10 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 46: यदि  वा  भिषामान्यात्  वस्तुनिर्देशांवाचनाः।
अवस्थिते  व्याख्यानत्वायक्यात्  न तथा।

1 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 43cd: सामान्यवाच्यात्  वेदन्तमार्गम्  सर्वभावात्।
2 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 44: भिषाने  मया  वस्तुनिर्देशानामवाचनात्  परस्यारम।
अस्किमन्यवाचनात्  न  कैल्यानिविज्ञानं।
3 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 45: सन्तुष्टवाच्यानामविशेषविशेषार्थात।
अवस्थिते  व्याख्यानात्  न  तथा।
6 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 48ab: तेनेवार्यभेदानामवाचनायेव  न नयस्ते।
7 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 51: अथे  वा  विशेषवचने  वस्तुदाच्यायः। तथा
सति। भिषामान्यालोचित्वात्  न तथा।
10 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 47ab: ननु  भावान्याभेदः  भेदे  दोषोऽवचनेत्।
भवतं प्रभुपालं श्रेष्ठं तद् श्रुतम् भवति। भातो हृदी न मुखः।

न च वर्धाभूमिदेवी स्वयम् विभवक्ष्य। यो हि सङ्करोणां
संस्कृताराधणिः न भेदते पार्योत, स दृष्टिभिन्नम् संबंधिततिवा
व्याप्तार्थोऽर्थात् च केवलः।

अनुपमानि वा बुद्ध। यथाइते भवत्तेविभविधिमत्वम्, अनु
प्रबोधकानां तदेकतेन भवितम्तम्। तथा हि गवायोयनांप्रे
हन व्ययायमानान्योजानां अनशाय हस्यायो द्विषाणुतल्या
भृः यो भवितम्। असाधारणस्तवोऽग्निः गवा वायो अन्वरे

1. "भवतं प्रभुपालं" | Nyāyamājāra-granthibhaṅga 132.10-11: अप्रहेमतिन नै। केशविडु आगोरोधी दृष्टां केशविडु अन्वरेह अग्निः।

2. Cf. Ślokavārttikā apoha v. 47cd: स्वयम् विभवक्ष्य। केमत्राभिनयान्तिवा॥
3. Cf. Ślokavārttikā apoha v. 48cd: न हि स्वयम् विभवक्ष्य। केमत्राभिनयान्तिवा॥
4. Cf. Ślokavārttikā apoha v. 52: स्वयम् विभवक्ष्य। केमत्राभिनयान्तिवा॥
5. Cf. Ślokavārttikā apoha v. 50: स्वयम् विभवक्ष्य। केमत्राभिनयान्तिवा॥
6. Cf. Ślokavārttikā apoha v. 53cd: केमत्राभिनयान्तिवा॥
7. Cf. Ślokavārttikā apoha v. 53ab: केमत्राभिनयान्तिवा॥

1. "भवतं प्रभुपालं" | K1; "तद्या" | M1; "भवतं" | V1; "भवतं" | A1; "भवतं प्रभुपालं" |
2. "भवतं प्रभुपालं" | V1; "भवतं प्रभुपालं" | A1; "भवतं प्रभुपालं" |
3. "भवतं प्रभुपालं" | M1; "भवतं प्रभुपालं" | M1; "भवतं प्रभुपालं" |
4. "भवतं प्रभुपालं" | M1; "भवतं प्रभुपालं" | M1; "भवतं प्रभुपालं" |
5. "भवतं प्रभुपालं" | M1; "भवतं प्रभुपालं" | M1; "भवतं प्रभुपालं" |
6. "भवतं प्रभुपालं" | M1; "भवतं प्रभुपालं" | M1; "भवतं प्रभुपालं" |
7. "भवतं प्रभुपालं" | M1; "भवतं प्रभुपालं" | M1; "भवतं प्रभुपालं" |
8. "भवतं प्रभुपालं" | M1; "भवतं प्रभुपालं" | M1; "भवतं प्रभुपालं" |

0
अयोध्याधिपतियोंके वर्तमान रूप के अनुसार, तत्त्वज्ञानी यहीं यह स्वीकार करते हैं। यहाँ वर्तमानकारण विरिन्दा नहीं है। न ही साच्चमयमानिस्थापितमेकताओं का समावेश है।

[3.4.2 न गोसामान्यतिप्रतिपन्न]
अथ गोसामान्यमोगोप्रतिपन्न सिद्धि:त, तद्व ड्युरामिनरताभयम्— अगोप्रतिपन्न गोसिद्धि:। गोसिद्धि च विषयी वस्तुप्रतिपन्नसिद्धि:त।

[3.5 उपसनार]
तत्सत्त्वाविष्टव्यथिन निरर्थिनमुखमुखावताः तत्र देवोपशेषभेद:। सिद्धिः।

[4 अपोहनस्त्रकार]
अर चालुक्य: सामान्यमृत्युवायोहरूकञ्जित विषेशपताका। न विज्ञानश्व तदनन्तरक्तवात्वायवातः। सामान्यपत्रा तु तेषां मृत्य्युप्रत्यावर्त्तव्यपिं्दम्। कथ वाक्वाप्नाबावधाने। कथे वा त्रिपुराणोऽयोगिद्विराजनिततः इति विरिन्दा। श्राब्ध: स्तातः।

1 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 58: साच्चमय सिद्धि:त, न वस्तु: कथं पुनः। यदि प्रत्येकैः, नायोगानन्यतात: भवेत।
2 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 61: समुद्रायावताः नारियोगानन्यतात: समुद्रायावताः। यदि प्रत्येकैः न बैसेन निम्नं भूमिः।
3 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 62ab: नायोगानन्यतात तत्समान्तं नायोगानन्यतात:।
4 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 84cd: सिद्धिः गौरी, अपोहाबाः भवाहाकर्तरुः।
5 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 83: सिद्धिः गौरी, अपोहाबाः भवाहाकर्तरुः।
6 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 84cd: तत्सिद्धिः गौरी, अपोहाबाः भवाहाकर्तरुः।
7 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 58cd: यदि प्रत्येकैः, नायोगानन्यतात: भवेत।
8 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 63cd-64: यदि सामान्यमृत्यु तेषां मृत्युः, न वात्तुता। कथ वाक्वाप्नाबावधाने। कथे वा मृत्युप्रत्यावर्त्तव्यपिं्दम्।
9 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 64cd: गौरी, अपोहाबाः भवाहाकर्तरुः।
10 Cf. Ślokavārttika apoha v. 64cd: गौरी, अपोहाबाः भवाहाकर्तरुः।

— 187 — (26)
[5 अपोहों सपोडळिण्यां दिनिण्यां वा] अपोहात्मनेष तुरागदेवयां सपोहं, स तस्मा दिनिण्यां सन्थया वा। वैद्यनाये तय्य भावता भवेत्। अवैद्यनाये तु यादेव एवागीस्तादुष्क्र एव तद्पोह ईति गौरयनागी: स्वातः।

[6 व्यवहारविधेनेत्रप्रसङ्गः] किमापोहात्र मधुरपक्षे नीलोपल्लतिमित्यादी विशेषविनीतमयभावसाबानाधिकाराध्येकेव विद्युत्योजना। न ख्यात्तस्मिन्ते द्योरपोहयोष्टुति रुपस्यते। न तथेकृिष्ठोद्दि यज्ञ तयोष्टुति: स्वल्कशानेश्वारधेर्याक्तमित्यादि चारणाबावत। न च दुःसितित वाचितसि।

2 Cф. Ślokāvṛttika apoha v. 97: अभावमिच यों भावः स वैद्यनायेकसि। भवए एव चेतन, नो च वैद्यनायेक ब्रह्मत्॥

2 तस्मा दिनिण्यां | Nyāyaśāstrinārāṇī śāstra 132.14: तस्मा दिनिण्यां विद्युत्योजना।

6 Cф. Ślokāvṛttika apoha vv. 115-116c: अपोहात्मनायव यदि तद्दुर्विन्यासेऽदत्ति तद्दुर्विन्यासेऽनन्ति। न द्योरपोहयोष्टुति रुपस्यते।

7 Cф. Ślokāvṛttika apoha v. 118ab: समानाधिकृतयं च न विभक्तादिरोहसि।

9 Cф. Ślokāvṛttika apoha v. 119: न च चारणारणं चतुर्वादः 2 नृपस्य नासिते। आचार्यमानन्दसार्याः श्रद्धाः।

9 न च चृतितित वाचितित | Nyāyaśāstrinārāṇī śāstra 132.14-15: न च दुःसितित वाचितित।

2 अपोहात्रमिच | VK1; अपोहात्रमिचम | MA1; 2 तुरागदेवयां | MVK1; तुरागदेवयां भवेत् | VA1; K1; भवेत् म | 4 एवागातसात् | A1; K1; एवागातसात्। ततः | MV 6 नीलोपल्लति | K1; नीलोपल्लति | MVA1; 7 दिनिण्यां | em.; दिनिण्यां MV; दिनिण्यां A1; किमानमये K1; 8 न तथेकृिष्ठोद्दि | K1; न चेतन: | MV; तद्बच्च: M4 A1 8 यज् | MVK1; यज् A1
प्रमादेन ।

[10 प्रतिभामात्रम्]
यथेव प्रतिभामात्र वाचार्य इति कल्पतम् ।
पदार्थाः 5 पि तथेवस्तु किमप्रमोहङ्ग्रेषण वः ॥

[11 उपसांहरः]
इत्यादि दृष्णावर्यमपोहेः बुद्ध दलितम् ।
अतः अध्यात्ममित्र वदेदुः सौगताः कथम्॥

— 182 — (31)
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