Towards a Critical Edition of the *Nyāyamañjarī*

Kei KATAOKA*

The *Nyāyamañjarī*, as far as form is concerned, is a commentary which deals exclusively with the definition-*sūtra*s (*lakṣaṇasūtra*) of the *Nyāyasūtra*. It is a monument of learning with the unique status of a work of *śāstra* by someone of true philosophical mettle, but expressed in a language that has many of the qualities of the finest belletristic prose of the period. The author, Bhaṭṭa Jayanta, was a ninth-century Kashmirian scholar contemporary with King Śaṅkaravarman (reg. 883–902 CE), because in his play *Āgamaḍambara* Jayanta refers to himself as a minister of that king. Jayanta is one of those rarest of authors for whom we know all kinds of contextualizing historical details. Modern scholars have studied the *Nyāyamañjarī*, a compendium of philosophical ideas of Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā, Buddhism, Vyākaraṇa and other traditions, because it is a rich source for reconstructing the history of Indian philosophy between the seventh and the ninth centuries, the so-called "dark period" of the history of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika literature after Uddyotakara. Although some sections have the reputation of being beautifully expressed but not very original, others display both elegance of style and sophistication and originality of thought that is not just the result of rearranging "other men's flowers," as Jayanta's handsome opening verses, whether more out of modesty or out of convention, disingenuously proclaim. The sections on sentence-meaning (*vākyārtha*) and on the authoritativeness of all scriptures (*sarvāgamaprāmāṇya*) are perhaps good examples of this. The section edited by Graheli deals with Nyāya's refutation of *sphoṭa*, i.e., an indivisible linguistic unit from which the meaning bursts forth (*sphuṭ*), as a cause of understanding word-meaning (*padārtha*) and sentence-meaning (*vākyārtha*), and thus constitutes a prerequisite part of Jayanta's discussion on sentence-meaning.

The primary objective of Alessandro Graheli's monograph is to clarify the history of transmission of Bhaṭṭa Jayanta's *Nyāyamañjarī* (NM). The author focuses on the *sphoṭa* section, which is covered by eight manuscripts, including a larger proportion of important manuscripts than other sections.[1]

---

1. Cf. Graheli's comment about "Reasons for the choice of NM 6" on p. xvii: "… it dawned to me that some crucial yet mutilated manuscripts covered NM 6 but lacked other chapters of the NM;

He provides the material required to achieve his objective, i.e., first of all, an edition of the chosen section with critical apparatus of variant readings. Basically he has consulted two published editions and eight manuscripts in a thorough way. The result of his full collation of variant readings is separately available online. It is just one of the indications that the present book is the result of uncommonly painstaking work. I have checked several folios of a Malayāḷam manuscript (K) that has been consulted for this edition, and have confirmed that indeed the author correctly records all variants in detail. Critical readers who want to check the manuscripts can use as starting point his chapter "10 Foliation" (pp. 235–238), which thoroughly shows the exact places of each folio-break or page-break, i.e., where each folio or page of each manuscript or edition begins.

The critical apparatus of the present book is sophisticated in its selectiveness. It lists only significant readings lest they become lost among great quantities of minor errors. See the editor's comment on p. 120: "The critical apparatus records only those variant readings which are considered substantive, i.e., those which yield meaning in the immediate context. These have been selected from the full collation, which can be found at http://homepage. uniview.ac.at/alessandro.graheli."

Of course errors – in particular unique, random (silly) ones – are crucial in order to investigate the relationships between manuscripts. In appendix "11 Table of Errors" the author separately provides variant readings that evidence the relationship of each group, i.e., families in transmission. For example, 11.1 is titled "Conjunctive reading of the γ family" and 11.2 "Conjunctive readings of the β family." On the basis of these readings the author discusses the relationships of manuscripts in detail in the chapter titled "5 Genealogy of the manuscripts." The detailed arguments of Chapter 5 (pp. 69–112) culminate in a stemma on the last page (p. 112).[2] From there, too, one can see the importance of south Indian manuscripts (M and K) and the Śāradā manuscript (P) dated 1472 CE.

The author provides what one expects for a proper critical edition. Chapter 2 describes the published editions of NM in detail and Chapter 4 discusses their genealogy. The author's judgment accords with my own observation (Kataoka 2003) that only the two editions (Ga and Va) directly based on manuscripts are substantially important for reconstructing the text and that other editions can in principle be disregarded for editorial work. Chapter 3 gives us a detailed description of NM manuscripts.[3] Table 3.1 ("Inventory of located NM manuscripts") is a useful chart that shows which manuscript covers which among the twelve chapters of the NM. The author

for this reason, in order to develop a stemmatic method to edit the NM, the obvious choice was to focus on this very section of Jayanta's work."

2.   On pp. 82–83, Graheli argues against my earlier observation (in Kataoka 2011a) regarding the relationship between A and O. His argument that A is the apograph of O is indeed convincing. Thus, a future editor may disregard A, and be unburdened by its piles of silly mistakes.

3.   See also the author's article separately published in *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 40 (2012), "A Preliminary List and Description of the Nyāyamañjarī Manuscripts."

gives information not only on the eight manuscripts[4] that he consulted in the present edition but on nine other manuscripts as well. Graheli thus becomes the first to give scholars a comprehensive survey of available manuscripts of the NM. A future editor of a particular section of the NM can easily find which manuscript is available for the section in question. The author's skill in editorial work and typesetting, from which readers benefit through an impressive array of tables, figures, etc., helps us understand complicated details at a glance.

Chapter 1 titled "Bhaṭṭa Jayanta" surveys the author of the NM and his works. Graheli finely integrates relevant pieces of evidence that have been studied by various scholars in this field, such as Stein, Raghavan, Hegde, Dezső, and Slaje. His observations are beautifully illustrated in Figure 1.1 "Karkoṭa and Utpala dynasties up to Jayanta's time, Following Stein's reconstruction" and 1.2 "Hypothetical chronologies of Jayanta's patrilineage." Nor does Graheli forget to pay due attention to the role and location of the *sphoṭa* section in the entire *Nyāyamañjarī*. He gives a survey of "The contents of the NM" in 1.3 together with a convenient chart "Table 1.1: Structure and length of the NM." In appendix "14 A bird-eye view of commented sūtra-s" he gives us information regarding which part of the NM comments on which sūtra of the *Nyāyasūtra*.

The author explicitly speaks of the methodology of the present edition as follows (pp. 114–115): "Accordingly, in the present edition the text of α will be mainly reconstructed on the basis of readings found in ß, P and ɣ, according to the stemma. In most cases, this polytomy allows for a mechanical choice of the most likely reading. When ß, P and ɣ mutually disagree, confirmation can sometimes be found in the GBh. When the concerned passage is not glossed in the GBh, however, internal criteria such as *usus scribendi, lectio facilior/difficilior*, etc., will have to be adopted." The ß family comprises of two south Indian palm leaf manuscripts in Grantha-Malayāḷam script (M and K); P is the oldest available birch bark manuscript in Śāradā script; ɣ is the family of paper manuscripts either in Śāradā or Nāgarī script. Ga is the *editio princeps* by Gangadhara Shastri Tailanga published in 1895 and Va is K.S. Varadacharya's edition published in 1983. The stemma on p. 112 shows the tripartite tree from the archetype α: Graheli speaks of polytomy, because the stemma shows a node with more than two descendant lineages. Let me examine in the following how exactly his policy works out in his edition.

Case 1. The following case reveals the editor's methodology stated on p. 114, in particular with respect to the first among three policies: "In most cases, this polytomy allows for a mechanical choice of the most likely reading."[5]

---

4. Note that he also consults an old palm leaf manuscript of the *Granthibhaṅga* commentary (GBh) that he designates as J.

5. In the following quoted passages are transliterated into Roman from Devanāgarī for printing convenience. Half-*daṇḍa*s used by Graheli are replaced with commas. The first numbers are the running line numbers given by the editor; in round brackets page and line numbers are added. The symbol ◆ is a "separator of multiple elements occurring in a single note, in any apparatus" according to the editor (p. 123).

585–586 (225.1–2): *aśvakarṇaśabdo hi kvacid arthaprakaraṇavaśān nyagbhavadavayavaśaktitayā tiraskṛtāvayavārtho vastvantaravyaktau na sarvātmanāvayavārthābhāvaḥ |*

-*vayavārtho*-] M K ◆ -*vayavārtha*- P C S Q O V Ga Va

The received reading is -*vayavārtho*- of M and K, whereas other manuscripts and the two editions read -*vayavārtha*-. Graheli comments in footnote as follows: "The received reading is not supported by the stemma. The compound, -*vayavārthavastvantara*-, however, does not quite make sense; hence the deviation from the general policy adopted in this edition." It seems that Graheli makes it a rule that whenever P and the ɣ family (P C S Q O V) agree with each other he adopts their reading on the basis of the stemma, and not the reading of the ß family (M and K). Or he may mean that he intends to follow the rule of majority, in this case: P and ɣ versus ß. But in fact the stemma itself does not mechanically tells us which to adopt, as this example indicates. As the tripartite tree of the stemma on p. 112 shows, none of them is given a preference. Hence, there is no real imperative to follow "the general policy." As Graheli wisely decides in the end against what he believes his stemma commands, exercise of critical judgment remains indispensable for each case of variance between the witnesses.[6]

Case 2. The previous example suggests that we may as well adopt the readings of the ß family in similar cases. See, for example, the following:

607–608 (228.6–7): *prayatno vṛddhair ādhīyate |*
-*dhīyate*] -*sthīyate* M K

The majority of witnesses read *ādhīyate* "(an effort) is applied," whereas the ß family reads *āsthīyate* "(an effort) is resorted to." We find the latter usage in Kumārila's *Tantravārttika ad* 2.2.6 (Ānandāśrama first ed., 486.26): *tatrāvaśyaṁ prayatnāntaram āstheyam*. See also Vācaspati's *Bhāmatī ad* 2.3.1 (Nirṇayasāgar ed., 578.17): *tatparihārāya prayatnāntaram āstheyam ity arthaḥ*. It is probably the case that the more difficult reading *āsthīyate* was later changed to the easier reading *ādhīyate*. Thus, the rule *lectio difficilior* applies to this case.

Case 3. In the following case, too, probably we had better adopt the reading of the ß family.

610 (229.2): *viṣavad viṣāśaṅkāyā api tatkāryahetutvāt | śaṅkā hi nāma buddhiḥ |*
viṣāśaṅkāyā] ◆ *viṣāśaṅkayā* P ◆ *viṣaśaṅkāyā* M K

The majority support *āśaṅkā*, whereas the ß family supports *śaṅkā*. The immediately following line that includes the word *śaṅkā* supports the latter reading. Furthermore, a similar usage is found in Maṇḍana's *Vidhiviveka*

---

6.   Incidentally, it is probably better to put a *daṇḍa* after -*vyaktau*, because the sentence that has *aśvakarṇaśabdo* as its subject ends there.

(Stern ed., pp. 106–109): *śaṅkāviṣeṇāpi maraṇadarśanāt*. Jayanta must have been familiar with Maṇḍana's usage, as will be shown below regarding this analogy of snakebite. We can conclude that the ß family retains the original reading in this case.

Case 4. The following case is subtle but can probably be regarded in the same manner.

> 602–603 (227.5–228.1): *dadhy atra madhv atra iti tathāvidhapadarūpā-*
> *darśane 'pi tadarthasampratyaya ity uktaṁ,*
> *-pada-*] om. M K

The majority read *tathāvidhapadarūpa*, whereas the ß family reads *tathāvidharūpa*. It is probably the case that *pada* was added later to clarify Jayanta's intention. But as a result the expression, which must mean "the same word-form" or "the same thing that has a word as its form," has become a bit clumsy. The simple reading *rūpa*, i.e., *śabdasvarūpa*, is sufficient to convey the meaning "the same form." In this case an explanatory insertion probably took place in the course of transmission.

Case 5. In the following case, too, preference should be given to the ß family.

> 538–539 (217.2–3): *citrādibuddhayas tarhi dṛṣṭāntā iti cet, bāḍham,*
> *vākyārthabuddhir api nirbhāgā iṣyata evāsmābhiḥ, buddhīnāṁ*
> *nirākāratvena sarvāsām anavayavatvāt |*
> *-m anavayavatvāt*] *-m abhyupagatatvāt* M K

From the Naiyāyika perspective, the logical steps run as follow:

1. Cognition of a picture does not illustrate that cognition of a sentence-meaning has no division.
2. Because cognition of a sentence-meaning, too, has no division.
3. Because
   3.1 (P and ɣ): all cognition has no division (*anavayavatvāt*) inasmuch as it is formless.
   3.2 (ß): we hold (*abhyupagatatvāt*) that all cognition is formless.

The Naiyāyikas hold that cognition always lacks internal image or form. This theory of *nirākāratva* logically leads to another view that all cognition, including cognition of a sentence-meaning, lacks any division (*nirbhāga*). It is, therefore, redundant to repeat the point "no division" in the last passage (3). For this reason, I prefer *abhyupagatatvāt* (3.2) to *anavayavatvāt* (3.1).

Case 6. In the following case GBh indeed confirms our assumption that the ß family sometimes retains the original reading.

> 555 (219.6): *kāryāntarāya rathāvayavāḥ prabhavantīti cet,*
> *kāryāntarāya*] M K GBh ♦ *kāryāntarāya rathād* P C S V O Ga Va
> ♦ *kāryāntarāya rathe* Q

Graheli correctly adopts the simpler reading, primarily because GBh supports it. This case indicates that there may be more cases in which the ß family retains original readings even when GBh is not available and even when there is no other argument for choosing between readings.[7]

Case 7. We can extend our investigation to situations where fewer manuscripts are available, in particular those where the evidence of M is lacking.

> 4–5 (127.6–7): *padavākyaśravaṇe ca sati padārthavākyārthasampratyayo bhavatīti te evātra nimittam* |
> *ca*] om. K Va ◆ n.a. M Q

As the editor mentions in the previous footnote and helpfully recalls here as well, M and Q are not available for this passage. Therefore, among eight manuscripts and two editions ("M K P C S O Q V Ga Va" noted by the editor on top of the critical apparatus) 6 manuscripts and 2 editions are available for the line in question. Here the most important stemmatic opposition lies between K and P. The stemma does not provide a mechanical solution for this kind of choice. One has to judge by oneself whether the omission is original (i.e. existed in archetype α) or not. In this case I prefer the omission, against the final judgment of the editor, because it is more likely that the conjunction *ca* is added later in the transmitting process. Had *ca* existed in the archetype α, it is unlikely that it would have been omitted by K whether intentionally or by mistake.

Case 8. Another similar, but slightly different, case is found in the following.

> 13–14 (129.5–6): *sphoṭasya ca nityatvena nāptapraṇītatvam* |
> *ca*] om. K O ◆ n.a. M P Q

Here the oldest Śāradā manuscript P is not available. Therefore, the stemmatic opposition lies between K and the γ family minus O.[8] In this case, however, the editor retains *ca* because of the support from GBh, which has a *pratīka* "*sphoṭasya ca nityatveneti*" as noted in a separate entry of the apparatus. In general, Graheli seems to give much weight to GBh (whose edition is carefully re-checked by the editor against Jaisalmer manuscript JTGB 386),[9] because the author Cakradhara and the Jaisalmer manuscript of GBh predate all available manuscripts of NM. I agree with the editor's decision to retain *ca*, not just because of the support from GBh, but also because some conjunction word is expected in this context and furthermore because it is easily conceivable that K simply missed it by mistake. Of course the fact that the Jaisalmer manuscript of GBh is the oldest testimony does not justify an unconditional preference for GBh readings against witnesses of NM. GBh (corrected with JTGB 386)

---

7. This is probably the case for 438 (*aprāmāṇiko*] *apramāṇṇako* M K), 453 (*ca*] om. M K), 489 (*paṭādibuddhiṣu*] *paṭādiṣu* M K), 510 (*-bhedābhedāv anu-*] *bhedābhedam anu-* M K), 516 (*eva ca*] om. M K), 531 (*hi*] om. M K), 540 (*nirbhāgau*] *niravayavau* M K), and 547 (*hi*] ◆ om. M K), where the ß family (M and K) reads differently from other manuscripts.

8. O inherits K's reading here by contamination. See section 5.5.4 "Traces of contamination in O" on p. 109.

9. See p. 118: "Shah's edition of the GBh has been thoroughly counter-checked with the codex unicus, J, and corrected if strictly required."

is not necessarily the final judge. One needs to evaluate the weight of readings in each case. Indeed the editor himself elsewhere rejects the reading of GBh when no NM manuscript supports it.[10]

Generally speaking, however, the importance of GBh is unassailable, especially when it accords with ß and/or P. See the editor's comment on pp. 118–119: "Although Shah's edition is outstanding, in the course of the edition of NM 6.1 rare instances of better readings in JTGB 386 were spotted and implemented in this apparatus. These were mostly cases in which Shah was influenced in his emendations of JTGB 386 by the *vulgata* of the NM text, while the readings in ß and P actually confirmed those of JTGB 386 and disproved Shah's emendations."[11]

Case 9. Conjunctive readings that suggest contamination from K to O (not reflected in figure 5.15) are collected by the editor on pp. 109–110. Another case listed there, too, may require reconsideration:

> 60–61 (137.4–5) (cf. also section 5.5.4 on p. 109): *saṃskārasya saha-caradarśanādyāhitaprabodhasya sataḥ smaraṇamātrajanmani nirjñāta-sāmarthyasyendriyeṇa saha vyāpārābhāvāt* |
>
> *-mātra-*] om. K O ◆ n.a. M P Q
>
> *nirjñāta-*] *jñāta-* K O[ac] ◆ n.a. M P Q

I prefer the simpler reading without *mātra*. In this case, no *pratīka* is available in GBh. And the important manuscripts M and P are likewise unavailable, so that the manuscript evidence is not strong enough here. See the editor's comment on p. 128: "Due to the unavailability of P and M, the stemma is in this section less dependable. In their absence, the most reliable manuscripts are K and C." Thus, one has to judge independently the weight of readings found in K and C in the present case. It is conceivable that *mātra*, which is indeed expected here, was later inserted. Less likely is the opposite scenario wherein *mātra* would have been omitted by K. The usage *smaraṇajanmani* is found in GBh (p. 54, ll. 5–6) though in another context. In fact the wavy underline indicates that the editor is not sure of the adopted reading.[12]

As for *nirjñāta*, it is indeed likely, as the editor judges, that K missed it, because the previous word (*janmani*) confusingly ends with *ni*. Jayanta's own usage also supports *nirjñāta* rather than *jñāta*.[13]

---

10. 65 (138.2): *-pyadhikaṃ*] *-pyabhyadhikam* GBh; 82 (141.1): *-dakṣa-*] *-kṣama-* GBh.

11. I had the same problem when I edited Kumārila's *Ślokavārttika*, as noted in Kataoka 2011b: Part I, xxxix, n. 23: "But note that there is always the possibility that editors may have changed the reading of the quoted passage, *pratīka* or gloss in question in accordance with a published edition of a *mūla* text."

12. See his comment on p. 121: "When the reconstructed text is uncertain, the lemma in this apparatus is marked by a wavy underline. This indicates that the reading of the archetype could not be identified with reasonable certainty and that there exists an alternative to the chosen reading which could [*sic*] justified on the basis of the stemma or because of other reasons such as better philosophical sense, adherences to internal criteria such as the *usus scribendi*, etc."

13. Va II 536.14: *kāryotpattau nirjñātasāmarthyaṃ*; 579.13: *dṛṣṭāntadharmiṇi nirjñātaśaktiḥ*; 582.17: *nirjñātaśaktir*. It would have been helpful if Graheli has included this kind of parallel usage in the apparatus of testimonia, especially in cases where the adopted reading in question is uncertain.

Editorial work cannot be reduced to the mere recording of variant readings found in manuscripts. In fact various devices of segmentation, such as intentional dissolution of *sandhi*, punctuation with half-*daṇḍa*s, *daṇḍa*s, double-*daṇḍa*s, and line-breaks, are similarly important in order to produce a readable edition. See the editor's comment in this regard on p. 116: "In the attempt to represent Jayanta's work and its textual transmission as faithfully as possible, but at the same time as intelligibly as possible, I made an extensive use of double *daṇḍa*-s, *daṇḍa*-s, half *daṇḍa*-s, blanks (i.e., graphical separation between letters) and even *sandhi* breaks. These should be understood as increasingly subtler textual separators." With regard to the larger segmentation, the editor states on p. 116: "The segmentation of the text into sections and paragraphs as found in any of the previous editions was not fully satisfactory, so a new structure and segmentation of the text is proposed here. The Sanskrit headings are formulated with the intention to capture the gist of the argumentation in the section, using the closest possible wording to Jayanta's own."

Editorial diligence with regard to textual segmentation is perhaps especially important for a philosophical text of this kind, in which *pūrvapakṣa* and *uttarapakṣa* frequently shift. Graheli's work is exemplary in this respect. Of course one should not forget that Varadācārya, the excellent editor of a previous edition (Va), had already done much to indicate meaningful units by giving Sanskrit headings to each section. Graheli has continued in this spirit and further improved the quality of textual divisions.

Case 10. For example, in the opening section (7.1), Graheli regards the entire paragraph as a single unit, whereas Varadācārya divides it into three parts probably regarding the middle part (*kiṁ punar idaṁ padaṁ nāma kiṁ ca vākyam iti*) as a question from the *pūrvapakṣa*. But as Graheli does, it is probably better to connect *kiṁ ca vākyam iti* with *uktam atra* and understand the line as one sentence: "With regard to this [question]—what is this thing called word and what is [this thing called] sentence, it is already taught that a word is a collection of phonemes and that a sentence is a collection of words."

Va p. 143	Graheli pp. 127–128
ucyate—kim atra nirūpaṇīyam? *yadanantaraṁ hi yad bhavati tat tasya nimittam* | *padavākyaśravaṇe sati padārthavākyārthasaṁpratyayo bhavatīti te eva tatra nimittam* || *kiṁ punar idaṁ padaṁ nāma? kiṁ ca vākyam iti* | *uktam atra varṇasamūhaḥ padam, padasamūho vākyam iti* ||	*ucyate, kim atra nirūpaṇīyam* | *yadanantaraṁ hi yad bhavati tat tasya nimittam* | *padavākyaśravaṇe ca sati padārthavākyārthasaṁpratyayo bhavatīti te evātra nimittam* | *kiṁ punar idaṁ padaṁ nāma kiṁ ca vākyam ity uktam atra varṇasamūhaḥ padaṁ padasamūho vākyam iti* ||

Case 11. In the following, however, I prefer Varadācārya's division.

Va p. 144	Graheli p. 129
tasmād anityānāṁ varṇānām eva vācakatvaṁ pratiṣṭhāpanīyam | parākaraṇīyaś ca sphoṭa iti || [varṇā evārthapratyāyakā iti pratijñā] tad ucyate—gakārādivarṇāvagame ...	*tasmād anityānāṁ varṇānām eva vācakatvaṁ pratiṣṭhāpanīyaṁ parākaraṇīyaś ca sphoṭa iti tad ucyate | gakārādivarṇāvagame ...*

As Varadācārya probably understands correctly, here the Vaiyākaraṇa opponent claims that Naiyāyikas, if they follow their final view of impermanence of language (*śabdasyānityatvam*), have to maintain that impermanent phonemes alone and not *sphoṭa* are the causal unit that expresses meaning. In other words, the grammarian points out that the theory of *sphoṭa* cannot be accommodated in the Naiyāyika system. To this the Naiyāyika gives a reply saying *tad ucyate*. Therefore, the division of paragraphs found in Va is more appropriate.

Case 12. In the apparatus of testimonia Graheli gives relevant parallel passages found in other texts both before and after Jayanta.[14] For example, on p. 131, he quotes from Maṇḍana's *Sphoṭasiddhi* and Vācaspati's *Tattvabindu*. In his comment on ll. 23–24 on the same page he observes as follows regarding *samastāḥ pratipādayeyur vyastā vā*: "Vācaspati uses respectively *pratyeka* and *milita* to present the same dilemma (TB, 64, 9–10), while Maṇḍana uses the words *pratyeka* and *samudāya* (SphS, 100, 14–16). The use of the words *vyasta* and *samasta* seems to be specific of the NM."

Kumārila, however, uses the words *ekaśas/pratyekam/prativarṇam/ avayavaśas* and *sarveṣu/saṅghāte/samastasya/samudāye* in ŚV *sphoṭa* vv. 86–93. Furthermore, Kumārila uses the exact words *vyasta* and *samasta* repeatedly in ŚV *vākya*, when discussing *padārtha*s conveying a *vākyārtha*. See, for example, *aikaikaśye/vyastasya* and *samastānām/sāmastyena/ sāmastye* (101cd–103); *samastavyastayor* (226); *gośuklādipadānāṁ tu samastavyastabhāvinām* (227). Note that this structure parallels *varṇa*s conveying a *padārtha*. Indeed, this underlying connection between the set of *varṇa* and *padārtha* and that of *padārtha* and *vākyārtha* is confirmed by Jayanta's usage of *sattāyaugapadya* found on p. 133, where Graheli quotes ŚV *vākya* 7cd–8ab as a testimony. Thus, Jayanta's usage of *vyasta* and *samasta* is probably based on Kumārila's usage and not necessarily specific to the NM although the exact wording is found in ŚV *vākya* and not ŚV *sphoṭa*. This example also suggests that Kumārila was one of the most important sources for Jayanta and that close attention must be paid to Kumārila in order to understand Jayanta's educational and academic background. In the present situation, however, we are still at a primitive stage in the critical

---

14.   For the editor's view of testimonia, see "6.3.2 The apparatus of the testimonia" on p. 119. See also my observation in note 13.

philological study (edition) of ŚV and NM and in the understanding of their philosophical arguments.[15] A full comparison between ŚV *sphoṭa* and NM *sphoṭa* can be made as next step on the basis of Graheli's edition, which already gives a lot of information regarding parallel arguments in ŚV *sphoṭa*.

Case 13. The analogy of false snakebite is referred to by Jayanta in the following, for which the editor prefers to divide the phrase as *alīkā hi daṁśādayaḥ*.

> 180–181 (159.5–160.1): *alīkā hi daṁśādayaḥ satyamaraṇakāraṇaṁ bhavanti* |
> 609–610 (229.1–2): *alīkā hi daṁśādayaḥ satyamūrcchāhetavo ye 'trodāhṛtās te tathā na bhavanti, viṣavad viṣāśaṅkāyā api tatkāryahetutvāt* |

The editor carefully comments on each line as follows:

> 180: The example can also be understood as a compound, *alīkāhidaṁśādayaḥ*, "false (*alīka*) snake (*āhi*) bites, etc. (*daṁśādayaḥ*)"
> 609: Or, as a compound, *alīkāhidaṁśādaya*, "false (*alīka*) snake (*āhi*) bites, etc. (*daṁśādayaḥ*")). See line 180.

First of all, *āhi* should be corrected to *ahi*. For *alīka-ahi-daṁśa*, see Maṇḍana's *Brahmasiddhi* (Kuppuswami Sastri ed.), which runs as follows:

> 7.17–18: *kalpito 'pi cāhidaṁśo maraṇakāryāya kalpate* |
> 14.14: *tathā mithyāhidaṁśo maraṇahetuḥ* |

It is clear that Jayanta's wording *alīka-ahi-daṁśa* echoes Maṇḍana's phrases *mithyā-ahi-daṁśa* and *kalpito ... ahi-daṁśaḥ*. These parallels show that we should not divide Jayanta's phrase in the manner that Graheli has preferred in his edition. See also Maṇḍana's *Vidhiviveka* (Stern ed.):

> 105–109: *kārako 'py ahidaṁśo jñānam apekṣata iti cet* | *naivam, jñānasyaiva tatra kāraṇatvāt, śaṅkāviṣeṇāpi maraṇadarśanāt* |

Jayanta's familiarity with Maṇḍana's works is another reason to prefer printing the text as *alīkāhidaṁśādayaḥ* rather than *alīkā hi daṁśādayaḥ*.

As examined in detail above, Graheli has executed his editorial task in a painstaking and methodical manner which maximally facilitates following scholars to proceed further: collecting as many available manuscripts as possible, recording and investigating details of manuscripts and editions, arranging the text and various kinds of apparatus in an intelligible way, and even developing his own Devanāgarī font.[16] My partial disagreement regarding the selection of readings in certain cases was possible solely because the editor has provided the necessary pieces of evidence and carefully

---

15. ŚV *sphoṭa* still needs to be critically edited on the basis of manuscripts, while Sucarita's commentary of the *sphoṭa* chapter so far remains entirely unpublished.

16. See his comment on p. 115: "None of the available Devanāgarī fonts fully filled the desired requirements in terms of range of ligatures. Moreover, behind many Devanāgarī fonts there is a certain lack of awareness of the historical relation between typography and the Nāgarī script found in manuscripts. The development of a new font, Manohar.ttf, was thus undertaken for the specific needs of this book."

recorded all details that he noticed. Only this kind of critical edition allows scholarship to even begin to formulate arguments. Graheli's thoroughness sometimes leads him to go beyond the scope of the 6th chapter that he edits here. He records colophons of manuscripts found in the end of each chapter in chapter "12 Internal divisions of interesting manuscripts," and these shed useful light on the transmission of manuscripts. As a whole the book is a treasure of information and will be a pilot boat for future studies of the NM in particular and the theory of *sphoṭa* in general.[17] Beyond doubt his editorial work will become a model for future scholars in our field. I wish that I had had the book under review at my disposal before I started my own efforts towards editing this text. It would have spared me a lot of time and energy invested in partially fruitless manner.[18]

Corrigenda

page.line	incorrect > correct
viii.24	*satyopayatā > satyopāyatā*
viii.25	*paramārthikatvam > pāramārthikatvam*
ix.7	*saṁskarāt > saṁskārāt*
ix.7	*saṁskārotpatter analaukikatvam > saṁskārotpatter nālaukikatvam*
ix.15	*lokavyavahārāprādhānyatvam iti > lokavyavahārāprādhānyam iti*
ix.22	*viśeṣana > viśeṣaṇa*
159.4	*satyopayatā > satyopāyatā*
159.10	*prakṛtipratyā > prakṛtipratyayā*
159.11	*viśīṣṭo > viśiṣṭo*
160.6	*paramārthikatvam > pāramārthikatvam*
188.6	*saṁskarāt > saṁskārāt*
188.6	*saṁskārotpatter analaukikatvam > saṁskārotpatter nālaukikatvam*
201.1	*lokavyavahārāprādhānyatvam iti > lokavyavahārāprādhānyam iti*
205.5	*viśeṣana > viśeṣaṇa*
208.16	*viraṇāni > vīraṇāni*
228.12	*ve 'vagamyate > vo 'vagamyate*
230.27	*khaṇḍikopadhyāya > khaṇḍikopādhyāya*
275.27	Taishei > Taisei
279.32	*ucyate > manyate*
280.11	*viśayo > viṣayo*
280.12	*pthivy > pṛthivy*
280.14	*pthivy > pṛthivy*

---

17.   For scholars who want to know the content and structure of Jayanta's argument on *sphoṭa*, Graheli's table of contents (pp. vii–x) is most helpful.

18.   For almost a decade I have been the only one, at least in terms of publications, who worked on critically editing the *Nyāyamañjarī* based on manuscripts. During that period I did not have sufficient information on how many manuscripts are available for the sections I was editing and how good their readings were, let alone their internal relationships.

280.40   *adhiktya > arthikṛtya*

280.41   *draṣṭavyā > draṣṭavyā*

281.14   *evaṃ lakṣaṇako > evaṃlakṣaṇako*

281.19   *dṣṭānta > dṛṣṭānta*

281.27   *dharmiṇiy > dharmiṇy*

281.33   *vimśya > vimṛśya*

281.51   *asat > asat-* (hyphenation)

282.14   *ativyapakaṃ > ativyāpakaṃ*

282.17   *tatparīkṣārtham > tatparīkṣārtham*

282.32   *tad vyutpādanārtham > tadvyutpādanārtham*

282.34   *dṛṣṭānta > dṛṣṭānta*

283.24   *cārthapatteḥ > cārthāpatteḥ*

283.28   *aviṣeṣa > aviśeṣa*

284.4   *bhāvānn aviśeṣaḥ > bhāvān nāviśeṣaḥ* (Va is incorrect)

284.21   *prayatnānanantarīyakatvād > prayatnānantarīyakatvād*

284.41   *abhidhataḥ > abhidadhataḥ*

285.5   *apannasya > āpannasya*

285.11   *upagramya > upakramya*

Minor comments

p. 138: The heading of 8.1.6 "*vyutpattipakṣe 'navasthāprasaṅgaḥ*" does not capture the content properly, because it is not the *anavasthā* that is problematic in this section. I would put a heading like "*vyutpattiprakāro na samādhānam.*"

p. 228: For *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* 1.1.16 and Śabara's commentary thereon, see the critical edition, Kataoka 2007. The Ānandāśrama ed. reading of the *sūtra* "*varṇāntaram avikāraḥ*" is there emended to "*śābdāntaraṃ vikāraḥ.*" See also the reading of the *Śābarabhāṣya* edited there, which is different from that of the Ānandāśrama edition in some places.

Bibliography

Graheli, Alessandro

    2012   "A Preliminary List and Description of the Nyāyamañjarī Manuscripts," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 40, pp. 317–337.

Kataoka Kei

    2003   "Critical Edition of the *Vijñānādvaitavāda* Section of Bhaṭṭa Jayanta's *Nyāyamañjarī*," *The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture* 144, pp. 115–155.

    2007   "A Critical Edition of *Śābarabhāṣya* ad 1.1.6–23: *Śabdanitya-tvādhikaraṇa*," *The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture* 152, pp. 29–79.

2011a   "A Critical Edition of Bhaṭṭa Jayanta's *Nyāyamañjarī*: The Buddhist Refutation of *jāti*," *The Memoirs of the Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia* 160, pp. 1–43.

2011b   *Kumārila on Truth, Omniscience, and Killing* (2 parts), Vienna, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI, S. (ed.)

1984   *Brahmasiddhi*: *Brahmasiddhi by Acharya Maṇḍanamiśra with Commentary by Śaṅkhapāṇi*, Delhi, Sri Satguru Publications.

STERN, Elliot M. (ed.)

1988   "Vidhiviveka: Vidhivivekaḥ of Maṇḍanamiśra with Commentary, Nyāyakaṇikā, of Vācaspatimiśra, and Supercommentaries, Juṣadhvaṅkaraṇī and Svaditaṅkaraṇī, of Parameśvaraḥ, Critical and Annotated Edition: the Pūrvapakṣaḥ," dissertation submitted to the University of Pennsylvania.