

## Veṅkaṭanātha's Engagement with Buddhist Opponents in the Buddhist Texts he Reused

ELISA FRESCHI

INSTITUTE OF THE CULTURAL AND INTELLECTUAL HISTORY OF ASIA,  
AUSTRIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, VIENNA

elisa.freschi@oeaw.ac.at

### ABSTRACT

Veṅkaṭanātha (1269–1370) was the most important systematiser of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school of Vedānta. This article describes his use of Buddhist sources and shows how Veṅkaṭanātha reused Buddhist texts to a much more significant extent than his predecessors Yāmuna and Rāmānuja. The reused text-passages come mostly from the epistemological school of Buddhist philosophy (Dignāga, Dharmakīrti and his followers) but there are important exceptions, attesting that Veṅkaṭanātha was also aware of Buddhist schools such as the Vaibhāṣikas, of whom only little is preserved today. Given that Buddhist philosophy was no longer an active presence in South India at the time of Veṅkaṭanātha, his interest in it must be due to factors other than his polemical agenda. Perhaps, his project of enlarging Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta made him confront outsiders such as Buddhist thinkers and his intellectual interest in philosophy made him engage in a genuine confrontation with them.

### KEYWORDS

Veṅkaṭanātha/Vedānta Deśika, Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta, textual reuse, Dharmakīrti, Buddhist epistemology, Vaibhāṣika, Prakrit, Sanskrit philosophy

Veṅkaṭanātha (also known as Vedānta Deśika, traditional dates: 1269–1370<sup>1</sup>) was a polymath who wrote philosophical as well as religious and poetical works in several languages (Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhraṃśa, Maṇipravāḷa and Tamil). He constitutes a turning point in the history of Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta, being an intellectual figure who shaped this current as well as Śrī Vaiṣṇavism in general.

1. Neevel (1977, 14–16) has argued that the life-spans of the earliest teachers of Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta have been prolonged in order to connect them with each other. For more information on Veṅkaṭanātha, see Freschi 2016.

## 1. Buddhism in the works of Veṅkaṭanātha's and his predecessors

Scholars who are used to working on Kumārila or Jayanta know that Buddhist opponents are just as frequent as non-Buddhist ones, in the works and probably also in the lives of these authors. By contrast, by the time of Veṅkaṭanātha, Buddhism – which had been an important force in South India – had strongly declined, as far as we can say. More importantly, what still remained of Buddhism in South India (see section 4), had little or no connection with the Buddhists figuring in Veṅkaṭanātha's and his predecessors' works.

## 2. Veṅkaṭanātha and his predecessors

The two principal predecessors of Veṅkaṭanātha within what was later recognised as the Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta tradition are Yāmuna (tenth century) and Rāmānuja (eleventh century). Given the vanishing of Buddhists in South India, one would imagine that Buddhist opponents would appear less and less frequently in the works of these three authors, while the memory of Buddhism in South India vanished and while the real opponents changed, shifting from Buddhist to intra-Vedānta ones. However, by contrast, Veṅkaṭanātha quotes from far more Buddhist texts than Yāmuna and Rāmānuja. And this cannot be explained due to the fact that the latter two did not have the chance to do it.

### 2.1 Yāmuna's reuse of Buddhist texts and ideas

Not all the works of Yāmuna have survived in their complete form. His *Āgamaprāmāṇya*, which has been fully preserved, deals with the validity of the Pāñcarātra Āgamas. In this context, it would not have been out of place to deal with the invalidity of Buddhist texts, but Yāmuna decided not to.

#### 2.1.1 Stereotypic Buddhists

In the *Samvitsiddhi* (henceforth SSi) and the *Ātmasiddhi* (henceforth ĀSi), which are not completely preserved, the Buddhists are mentioned while dealing with *prakaṣa saugata* 'explicit Buddhists', and the ideas stereotypically associated with them, as opposed to *pracchanna* 'hidden' ones, that is, in the polemics against Advaita Vedāntins.

#### 2.1.2 Second-hand Buddhist quotes

There are, however, also a few instances of actual reuse of Buddhist texts, namely:

*sahopalambhaniyamād abhedo nilataddhiyoḥ* | (Dharmakīrti's PVin 1.54ab)<sup>2</sup>

'Due to the fact that they are necessarily perceived together, there is no difference between blue and the cognition of it.'<sup>3</sup>

2. Parallel versions of this statement can be found in PV 3.335 and PV 3.388.

3. All translations are purely indicative and not meant to be substitutes for the much more accurate ones which are already available, nor to establish a new translation in case no other one is available. Similarly, the edited texts available to me have not been modified.

*sahopalambhaniyamād abhedo nīlataddhiyoḥ* | (ĀSi ad 14)  
*sahopalambhaniyamān nānyo 'rthaḥ saṃvido bhavet* (SSi 416)

'Due to the fact that they are necessarily perceived together, the object cannot be different from [its] cognition'.

Here, the ĀSi passage is a case of a literal quotation<sup>4</sup> (Ce<sup>5</sup>), whereas the SSi one is a case of reference (Re) which generalises the same claim. However, they are by no means evidence of a direct reuse of Dharmakīrti by Yāmuna, since this PVin hemistich was very popular. More precisely, one finds it in many texts which Yāmuna may have known (in Śālikanātha's *Rjuvimālā* on the Br, in Vācaspati's *Bhāmatī* on the BrSūBh, in his *Nyāyakaṇikā* on Maṇḍana's *Vidhiviveka*, in Sucarita's *Kāśikā* on the ŚV).

Another example is the following one:

*avibhāgo 'pi buddhyātmā viparyāsītadarśanaiḥ* |  
*grāhyagrāhakaṣaṃvittibhedavān iva lakṣyate* || (PVin 1.44 or PV 3.353)

'Although the essence of cognition is partless, it is perceived as if it had a grasped-, grasper- and cognition-aspect in itself by those of deluded vision.'

*yathāhuḥ prakāṭāḥ*  
*avibhāgo 'pi buddhyātmā viparyāsītadarśanaiḥ* |  
*grāhyagrāhakaṣaṃvittibhedavān iva lakṣyate* || *iti* (ĀSi 416)

'As the explicit Buddhists say:

Although the essence of cognition is partless, it is perceived as if it had a grasped-, grasper- and cognition-aspect in itself by those of deluded vision.'

Again, this text is reproduced with an introduction referring to 'explicit' Buddhists and, again, it had already been quoted by Vācaspati in his commentary on the *Yogaśāstra*, 4.32, by Sucarita in his *Kāśikā* on ŚV śūnya 92 and by Jayanta, in the vijñānādvaita section of NM (Kataoka 2003, 294).

Summing up, there is no evidence of Yāmuna's direct acquaintance with Buddhist texts. He mentions Buddhists in a stereotypic way and reuses well-known Buddhist texts, probably second-hand.

## 2.2 Rāmānuja's reuse of Buddhist texts and ideas

Rāmānuja refers to Buddhists as *saugatas* in his Śrī Bhāṣya (henceforth ŚrīBh) ad 2.2.17–27. In his commentary on 2.2.17, he discusses four kinds of Buddhists and although he does not name them, one can recognise Sarvāstivādins or Vaibhāṣikas, Sautrāntikas (this group could also be identified as the Pramāṇavādins, given that only their epistemology is discussed), Vijñānavādins and, as a separate group, Śūnyavādins. The four descriptions are learned and interesting, but no textual material is used, perhaps because it was no longer available.

Next, in ŚrīBh ad 2.2.18–26, Rāmānuja rejects the Buddhist theory of momentariness through various arguments, among which there is also the argument from recognition (*pratyabhijñā*, see below, fn. 15).

4. For this term and the following one, see Freschi 2015b.

5. For this and the following symbols, see Steinkellner 1988 and Trikha 2012.

ŚrīBh 2.2.25 names Vaibhāṣikas and Sautrāntikas explicitly and discusses the contradictions Rāmānuja identifies between their ontology of momentary entities and their epistemology, which does not rule out real knowledge.

ŚrīBh ad 2.2.42 mentions the attitude of the Jina and the Sugata (the Buddha) in the context of discussing the validity of some schools contradicting the Veda. The final conclusion is that some of them, like the upholders of Yoga, Sāṅkhya, Pāśupata and Pāñcarātra, are conditionally acceptable, whereas others, like Jains and Buddhists, are not.

### 2.2.1 Stereotypic Buddhists

Like Yāmuna, also Rāmānuja uses the designation ‘hidden Buddhists’ (*pracchanna bauddha*) in his intra-Vedānta polemics, for instance in ŚrīBh ad 2.2.27.

A further instance of an attack against a stereotypically Buddhist position is the following:

*sarvaśūnyavādino brahmavyatiriktasarvavastumithyātavavādinaś ca svapakṣasthāpakapramāṇapāramārthyānabhyupagamād abhiyuktair vādānadhikāra eva pratipāditaḥ — adhikāro 'nupāyatvān na vāde śūnyavādinaḥ | iti. (Vedārthasaṅgraha no. 64, Raghavachar 1978, 53)*

‘The one who says that everything is empty and the one who says that apart from the *brahman* everything is in reality false, since they do not acknowledge the ultimate reality of the [very] means of knowledge which would establish their own position, have been taught by learned people in our school to have no eligibility to [take part] in a debate aiming at the establishment of the truth (*vāda*): “The Śūnyavādin has no eligibility [to take part] in a debate aiming at the establishment of the truth, since he does not have the instruments [to debate] (given that he denies even the validity of the instruments of knowledge)”.’

### 2.2.2 Second-hand Buddhist quotes

Beside the re-elaboration of Buddhist ideas devoid of textual material, I could detect in Rāmānuja’s works also one quotation at least, namely:

*sahopalambhaniyamād abhedo nilataddhiyoḥ | (PViñ 1.54ab)*  
*sahopalambhaniyamād abhedo nilataddhiyoḥ | (ŚrīBh ad 2.2.27)*

It is more than plausible that Rāmānuja here relies directly on Yāmuna’s reuse of the same passage.

Thus, also in Rāmānuja, I could not detect any evidence for a direct acquaintance with Buddhist texts, although the descriptions in ŚrīBh ad 2.2.17–26 may point to the fact that he was at least not completely disinterested in Buddhist philosophy.

## 2.3 Ātreya Rāmānuja’s reuse of Buddhist texts and ideas

Ātreya Rāmānuja is traditionally believed to have been born in Kāñcīpuram in the year 1220, to have been the fourth in a lineage of disciples started by Rāmānuja himself, and to have been Veṅkaṭanātha’s maternal uncle and his preceptor

6. Cf. Veṅkaṭanātha’s definition of *vāda*: *vītarāgakathā vādaḥ* ‘A debate is a discussion devoid of attachment [for one’s position]’ (*Nyāyapariśuddhi* 1.1.2).

(Ramanujachari and Srinivasacharya 1938, v). Several elements of Veṅkaṭanātha's systematisation of Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta can indeed be found already in Ātreya Rāmānuja's *Nyāyakuliśa* (henceforth NKu). Like other texts by Veṅkaṭanātha, the NKu focuses on various philosophical topics, rather than on a root text (like the ŚrīBh) or on a single topic (like the ĀP or, for instance, Maṇḍana Miśra's treatises). Further, the NKu is a Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta treatise and as such in a constant dialogue with the other schools of Vedānta, primarily with Advaita Vedānta, but, like in the case of Veṅkaṭanātha, other schools of Indian philosophy play a major role in it, namely Nyāya and Mīmāṃsā. This is also confirmed by the direct textual reuse of texts of the Mīmāṃsā (especially Kumārila's *Ślokavārttika*) and of the Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika (e.g., the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* or Udayana's *Nyāyakusumāñjali*) schools.<sup>7</sup>

As for his relation with Buddhist Pramāṇavāda philosophy, Ātreya Rāmānuja's approach seems close to Rāmānuja's, since one can find occasional mentions of Pramāṇavāda doctrines, but I could not identify any reuse of actual textual material. For instance, NKu, vāda 2, consists of a long discussion of intrinsic and extrinsic validity and discusses the Buddhist view among the other three alternatives on the issue, showing some familiarity with Pramāṇavāda ideas and terminology. However, no Buddhist textual material is actually present. Rather, Ātreya Rāmānuja stages a discussion among various speakers, among which are also Buddhist Pramāṇavādins, but his knowledge of their theses does not seem to reach beyond the level of a primer-like knowledge of the Pramāṇavāda theory of extrinsic validity, or of the theory of the self-luminosity (*svayamprakāśavāda*) of cognitions. By contrast, his discussion of the Naiyāyika and especially of the Mīmāṃsaka theories goes much deeper, so that, for instance, in the case of extrinsic validity the real opponents for Ātreya Rāmānuja are Naiyāyikas rather than Pramāṇavādins.

The following text passage is an instance of a direct mention of Buddhists in the NKu:

*yadi ca jñānasya svaprakāśatvam, anuvyavasāyavyavasāyayor avaiśeṣyaṃ syāt. [...] buddhā hi grāhakabhedād grāhyākārabhedam ātiṣṭhante. svarūpabhedas tv akiñcit-kara eva. itarathā dhārāvāhikabuddhiṣv api bhedaśādaprasaṅgāt. yadi ca paṭaparakāśo jñānam svaprakāśo 'pi, tadā katham jñānapaṭayor bhedas siddhyet. samvinnīṣṭhā hi no vastuvyavasthitayaḥ. samvid eva cen na bhidyate, katham vastubhedāḥ.* (Ramanujachari and Srinivasacharya 1938, 70, vāda 4)

'And, if the knowledge were self-illuminating, there would be no difference between cognition and meta-cognition of one's previous cognition (*anuvyavasāya*).<sup>8</sup> [...] In fact, Buddhists acknowledge that there is a difference between the *forms*, appearing in cognition, of the grasped [content] and of the grasping [cognition]. By contrast, the difference in the own nature is not important at all. For, if it were not so, there would be the undesired consequence of no difference at all also in the case of the cognitions deriving from the prolonged perception of the same

7. See the (incomplete, yet useful) index of the explicit mentions of authors and works in the NKu in Ramanujachari and Srinivasacharya 1938, 209–210.

8. The *anuvyavasāya* is the cognition through which one becomes aware of one's previous cognition, akin to Leibniz' apperception.

content.<sup>9</sup> And if the cognition which illuminates a cloth would also illuminate itself, then how could one establish the difference between cognition and cloth? For, according to us, the distinction among the real objects is based on their [distinct] cognitions. If the cognition is not distinguished, how could one distinguish the real objects?

As for the *sahopalambhaniyama* (see sections 2.1.2 and 2.2.2), it is mentioned by Ātreya Rāmānuja, but as part of his Vedāntic argumentation concerning the *sāmānādhikarāṇya* ‘commonness of substrate’ of the elements of Upaniṣadic sentences such as ‘Thou are that’ (*tat tvam asi*).<sup>10</sup>

### 3. Veṅkaṭanātha’s reuse of Buddhist texts and ideas

The situation changes dramatically with Veṅkaṭanātha, whose engagement with Buddhist ideas and also texts is apparent.

The following is just a selection of the contexts in which Veṅkaṭanātha discusses Buddhist philosophical topics, often using Buddhist philosophical terminology, grouped according to their general topic:<sup>11</sup>

#### 1. Epistemology:

- parataḥ prāmāṇya* (SM ad 1.1.5, Viraraghavacharya and Nainaracarya 1971, p. 74<sup>12</sup>)
- vedabauddhāgamaprāmāṇya* ‘epistemic validity of the Vedas and of the Buddhist Sacred Texts’ (TMK 3.59, SM ad 1.1.6, Viraraghavacharya and Nainaracarya 1971, p. 99, ŚD 14)
- saṃvid* ‘cognitions’ (TMK 1.13)
- bādha* ‘subsequent invalidating cognition’ (TMK 3.47)

9. That is, given that, e.g., the prolonged perception of the same object generates a series of cognitions all having the same content, if the distinction were based on the own nature, then these cognitions would end up being the same cognition, which is unacceptable, given that cognitive acts are believed to be instantaneous.
10. See NKu, vāda 7, Ramanujachari and Srinivasacharya 1938, 130, 135.
11. All references to the *Tattvamuktākālāpa* (henceforth TMK) in this list include its autocommentary, the *Sarvārthasiddhi* (SS). The Buddhist schools of Mādhyamika, Yogācāra, Sautrāntika and Vaibhāṣika are also dealt with in Veṅkaṭanātha’s *Paramatambhaṅga*, which I cannot directly access, as it is in Maṇipravāḷa.
12. This discussion might have been directly influenced by Ātreya Rāmānuja’s one, see section 2.3, as a rapid inspection of the opening of the two texts immediately shows, but, as the same inspection shows, Veṅkaṭanātha did not limit himself to repeating his teacher’s investigation and freely elaborated further on the subject:  
*atra kila vādivipratipattyaḥ saṃśayaḥ. jñānānām hi prāmāṇyāprāmāṇye dve api svata iti sāmkyāḥ. dve api parata iti naiyāyikāḥ. aprāmāṇyaṃ svataḥ, prāmāṇyaṃ parata iti bauddhāḥ. prāmāṇyaṃ svataḥ, aprāmāṇyaṃ parata iti mīmāṃsakāḥ. tatra tāvat: svābhāvikatvam ubhayaḥ virodhān nopapadyate | katham hy anyānapekṣasya viparītātmasambhavaḥ ||* (NKu, vāda 2, Ramanujachari and Srinivasacharya 1938, 17)  
*iha tāvat prāmāṇyam aprāmāṇyam cety ubhayaṃ svata iti sāmkyāḥ. ubhayaṃ parata iti vaiśeṣikādayaḥ. aprāmāṇyaṃ svataḥ, prāmāṇyaṃ parata iti bauddhāḥ. tadviparyayaṇa mīmāṃsakā itī catvāraḥ pakṣāḥ. tatra ubhayaṃ svata itī pakṣas tāvan na sambhavati, virodhāt. na hi viruddham ubhayaṃ ekasya svabhāvasyāt. (SM ad 1.1.5, Viraraghavacharya and Nainaracarya 1971, 67)*  
 Veṅkaṭanātha discusses the issue of extrinsic validity also in the TMK (see SS ad TMK 4.101), but there the target is a Naiyāyika.

- *bhrānti* 'error' (TMK 4.13)
- *sahopalambhaniyama* 'necessity of co-perception' (TMK 4.20–26; *Nyāyasiddhāṅjana* (henceforth NSA) ad 3, *Vīrarāghavācārya* 1976, 11–12; Mikami n.y., section 0.2.2.2; *Nyāyapariśuddhi* 1.1.7)<sup>13</sup>
- *ākārasamarpaṇa* 'casting one's aspect [onto cognition]' (TMK 4.27)<sup>14</sup>
- *nirvikalpapratyakṣa* 'non-conceptual perception' (TMK 4.33)
- *apoha* 'exclusion' (a theory of linguistic meaning) (TMK 5.475)
- *yogipratyakṣa* 'perception of the yogins' (intellectual intuition) (NSA, *Vīrarāghavācārya* 1976, 80)
- *prapañcamithyātva* 'falsity of the proliferation' (TMK 3.59–60)

## 2. Ontology:

- *avayavāvayavibhāva* 'relation between parts and whole' (TMK 1.21)
- *kṣaṇikatva* 'momentariness' (TMK 1.25–31)<sup>15</sup>
- *dharmadharmibhāva* 'relation between property and property-bearer' (TMK 1.9)
- *śūnyatā* 'emptiness' (TMK 4.28)
- *śabda* 'sound' (TMK 5.21)
- *parimāṇa* 'measure' (TMK 5.46)
- *aṇutucchatva* 'non-existence of atoms' (TMK 5.46)<sup>16</sup>
- *saṃyoga* 'contact' (TMK 5.52)

13. See sections 2.1.2, 2.2.2 and 2.3.

14. Here, a Sautrāntika opponent is present. The discussion regards the fact that cognition (*jñāna*) cannot assume the form of the previous moment (*kṣaṇa*).

15. Here the discussant is a Mādhyamika. The discussion covers pp. 31–37 of Srinivasachar and Narasimhachar 1933, and one can identify some of its leading thoughts already in ŚrīTBh ad 2.2.17–27, especially insofar as both passages focus on momentariness (*kṣaṇikatva*) and use against it the argument of recognition (*pratyabhijñā*):

*anusmarāṇaṃ pūrvānubhūtavastuviṣayaṃ jñānam; pratyabhijñānam ity arthaḥ, tad evedam iti, sarvaṃ vastujātaṃ atītakālānubhūtaṃ pratyabhijñāyate; na ca bhavadbhīḥ jvālādiṣv iva sādṛśyanibandhano 'yam ekatvavyāmoha iti vaktuṃ śakyam; vyāmuhyato jñātur ekasyānabhyupagamāt. (ŚrīTBh ad 2.2.24)*

*tad iyaṃ pramitiḥ satī pratyabhijñā pūrvāparakālavartiviṣayaṃ sādhayati. [...] nanu sa iti dhīḥ smṛtiḥ, ayam ity anubhavaḥ, nirantarotpattēḥ jvālākṣaṇeṣv iva tayoṛ bhedāgraha iti, tan na; samānādhikarānabodhāt. (SS ad TMK 1.25)*

Nonetheless, Veṅkaṭanātha continues his way, discussing the case of silver-nacre and other issues which are not present in the corresponding ŚrīTBh passage.

16. The treatment of this topic might have been directly influenced by Rāmānuja's discussion of it:

*kṣaṇikatvavādibhir abhyupetā tucchād utpattiḥ, utpannasya tucchatāpattiś ca na sambhavatīty uktam [...] tatprasāṅgena tābhyāṃ saha tucchatvena saugatīḥ pariṇāyitasyākāśasyāpi tucchatā pratikṣipyate. ākāśe ca nirupākhyatā na yuktā; bhāvarūpatvenābhyupagatatprthivyādivat ākāśasyāpi abādhitapratīṣiddhatvāviśeṣāt. [...] na ca prthivyādyabhāvamātram ākāśa iti vaktuṃ śakyam; vikalpāsahatvāt. prthivyādeḥ prāgabhāvaḥ, pradhvaṃsābhāvaḥ, itaretarābhāvaḥ, atyantābhāvo vā ākāśaḥ. (ŚrīTBh ad 2.2.22–23)*

Nonetheless, it is immediately clear that Veṅkaṭanātha's presentation follows his own path: *bauddhāḥ khalv ākāśadhāturūpatvād ākāśasya ca tucchatvād anūnāṃ parimitiḥ tucchārūpāṃ abhidadhati. ākāśapariṇatvam evānūnāṃ parimitiḥ; ākāśaṃ cābhāvarūpatayā tuccham eva. (SS ad TMK 5.46)*



—*jāti* ‘universals’ (TMK 5.114)

### 3. Uncategorized:

—*mukti* ‘emancipation’ (TMK 2.75)

—*citta-caitta* ‘mind and mental factors’ (TMK 5.69)

It is thus immediately evident that Veṅkaṭanātha had a distinct interest in Buddhist philosophy, and especially its ontological and epistemological aspects. In some cases, one can detect the influence of a predecessor of Veṅkaṭanātha (see the footnotes to the list<sup>17</sup>). However, Veṅkaṭanātha’s decision to reuse and deepen discussion of the Buddhist-related passages by his predecessors is in itself an indication of his distinct interest in the topic.

The following scheme is a list of instances of mentions of Buddhists by Veṅkaṭanātha, in a decreasing level of precision:

- Proper names: Dharmakīrti (*dharmakīrtiprabhṛtibhiḥ*, ŚD 65, Aṇṇāṅgarācārya 1940, p. 240; and see section 3.3.1), Prajñākara (see section 3.3.5), Sugata (TMK 1.25, ŚD 34)
- Names of specific currents: *madhyamabauddha* (ŚD 9, beginning); *mādhyamika* (SM ad 1.1.5 Viraraghavacharya and Nainaracarya 1971, 63; ŚD 2 (jijñāsānupapatti), Anandacharlu Vidyāvinod 1903, 9; ŚD 9 (kathānadhikāra), beginning; SS ad TMK 1.18, ad 1.24, ad 1.25, ad 3.34, ad 3.58, ad 3.59, ad 4.20 and ad 4.33; *Nyāyaparīśuddhi* 1.1.7; PMBh 24); *sautrāntika* (*Paramatabhaṅga* (henceforth PMBh) chapter 24); *śūnyavādin* (SS ad TMK 2.75, ŚD 9, beginning); *vaibhāṣika* (ŚD 14, NSA ad 6, see section 3.3.6, SS ad TMK 1.7, see section 3.4; PMBh 24); *yogācāra* (SM ad 1.1.5 Viraraghavacharya and Nainaracarya 1971, 63; SS ad TMK 1.13, ad 3.59, ad 4.13, ad 4.33; ŚD 14; PMBh 24)
- Generic names: *bauddha* (SM ad 1.1.5, Viraraghavacharya and Nainaracarya 1971, 63, 67; ad 1.1.6, Viraraghavacharya and Nainaracarya 1971, 99; ŚD 14 and ŚD 38; SS ad TMK 3.59, and ad 5.52, TMK 5.46 and SS thereon; NSA, Virarāghavācārya 1976, 80); *saugata* (SM ad 1.1.2, Viraraghavacharya and Nainaracarya 1971, 36; ad 1.1.3, Viraraghavacharya and Nainaracarya 1971, p. 43; ad 1.1.4, Viraraghavacharya and Nainaracarya 1971, 49; ŚD 9, beginning; SS ad TMK 1.21, ad 1.31, ad 3.47, ad 3.59, ad 4.33, ad 5.46, ad 5.76; NSA, Virarāghavācārya 1976, 8)
- Generic names with a possibly pejorative nuance: *bāhya* (SM ad 1.1.5, Viraraghavacharya and Nainaracarya 1971, 63)

### 3.1 Stereotypic Buddhists

Like Yāmuna, Veṅkaṭanātha also implements at times a stereotypic use of Buddhists. If we go back to the list in section 3, it is evident that some of these mentions are neutral, whereas *bāhya*, and perhaps also *śūnyavādin*, can have a derogatory nuance. This nuance is strongly perceivable in the following cases:

17. For more details on Veṅkaṭanātha’s reuse of his predecessors, see Freschi 2017.



1. *pracchannabauddha* (ŚD 1, v. 3d; SS ad TMK 3.48), *pracchannasaukata* (SS ad TMK 4.51): 'hidden Buddhists'
2. *saugatānām iva pracchannasaugatānām api kathāyām anadhikāra iti. vedārthasaṅgrāhe ca spaṣṭam āha — sarvaśūnyavādinō brah-mavyatirikṭtasarvavastumithyātvaṇvādināś ca svapakṣasthāpaka-pramāṇapāramārthyānabhyupagamād abhiyuktair vādānadhikāra eva pratipāditāḥ — adhikāro 'nupāyātvaṇ na vāde śūnyavādināḥ | iti.* (ŚD 9, beginning, quoting from Rāmānuja, see above, section 2.2.1)

'Like the Buddhists, also the hidden Buddhists do not have the eligibility to participate in a discussion. In the *Vedārthasaṅgrāha* [Rāmānuja] said it explicitly: "The one who says that everything is empty and the one who says that apart from the *brahman* everything is in reality false, since they do not acknowledge the ultimate reality of the [very] means of knowledge which would establish their own position, have been taught by learned people in our school to have no eligibility to [take part] in a debate aiming at the establishment of the truth (*vāda*): "The Śūnyavādin has no eligibility [to take part] in a debate aiming at the establishment of the truth, since he does not have the instruments [to debate] (given that he denies even the validity of the instruments of knowledge)".'

3. *bauddhagandhin* (NSA, Vīrarāghavācārya 1976, 111)  
'Those who smell like Buddhists'. The commentary on the NSA explains 'Those who say falsities' (*mṛṣāvādina ity arthaḥ*).
4. *yogācārādayo hi svapnādinidarśanena sarvapratyayānām pratyayatvenāyathārthatvaṁ sādhyanti; sarvatrāsiddham ca yathārthatvaṁ pratiśedhyaṁ pratipadyante; tān uddiśyāṁ prayogaḥ syāt; piśācānām piśācabhāṣayaiva hy uttaraṁ deyam.* (SS ad TMK 4.13)  
'The Yogācāras and the other [thinkers similar to them] establish, by pointing at the case of dream and similar [erroneous cognitions], that all cognitions, insofar as they are cognitions, do not correspond to [their] external object. And they teach that correspondence to the external object is in all cases unestablished [and, thus] needs to be rejected. Having them in mind, there is this statement: To the demons one must answer in demonic language.'
5. *ahetukavināśavāde tu saugatacārvākādisauhārdodgārāprasāṅgaḥ* (ŚD, V (bādhitānuvṛtti-bhaṅgavāda), ll. 25–6)  
'If, by contrast, one says that destruction occurs without a cause, there is the undesirable consequence of pouring out affection for Buddhists, Materialists and [other groups unsuitable for friendship].'
6. *anyathā mādhyamikavijayaprasaṅgāt* (SS ad TMK 2.74 and almost identical in SS ad TMK 1.25 and SS ad TMK 4.20)  
'For, otherwise there would be the undesirable consequence of the victory of the Mādhyamikas!'
7. *iti mādhyamikamatāpātāḥ* (SS ad TMK 1.25)  
'In this way one ends up in the opinion of the Mādhyamikas.'

8. *evam iha yādavaprakāśīyas saṃgrahaḥ —*  
*vedo 'nṛto buddhakṛtāgamo 'nṛtaḥ prāmāṇyam etasya ca tasya cānṛtam |*  
*boddhānṛto buddhiphale tathānṛte yūyaṃ ca bauddhās ca samānasamśadaḥ ||*  
*iti* (SS ad TMK 3.59; almost identical, but with *yādavaprakāśa* instead of *yādavaprakāśīya* as author, in ŚD 14)

‘And in this way there is on this topic that short statement of the followers of Yādavaprakāśa:<sup>18</sup> “The Vedas are untrue, the Buddhist Sacred Texts are untrue, the validity of these (the Vedas) and of those (the Buddhist Sacred texts) is untrue. The knower is untrue and so are the cognition and [its] fruit. And [in this way] you and the Buddhists are on the same company!”’

9. *anyathā saugatādayo 'pi vaiyātyāt [...] caityavandanādikaṃ dharmam eva [...] upakṣipeyuḥ* (SM ad 1.1.3)

‘Otherwise, also the Buddhists and [other non-orthodox thinkers such as the Jainas], out of their boldness, [...] could say that the veneration of a *stūpa* and similar [religious acts] are dharma [...]!’

10. *mādhyaṃikopadiṣṭair eva tarkaiḥ* (SS ad TMK 3.58)

‘through reasonings taught by the very Mādhyaṃikas’.

11. *iti pralobhanamātram [...] kūṭayuktibhis [...]* (SS ad TMK 4.33)

‘This is only seduction [by the Buddhists]. [...] Through cheating reasonings [...]’.<sup>19</sup>

Here it is clear that to resemble a Buddhist is something to be avoided. Points 5–8 even use it as the undesirable consequence which would occur if one would insist on a certain position. Note, however, that in the last cases (9–11) something else is hinted at, that is, the Buddhist positions are recognised as seductive and rhetorically powerful,<sup>20</sup> so that one needs to be warned against them.

Anyway, until now Veṅkaṭanātha’s position reproduces the biases of Yāmuna’s one.

### 3.2 Second-hand Buddhist quotes

As a first example of second-hand Buddhist quotes, one can find in Veṅkaṭanātha the same passage already identified in Yāmuna (see section 2.1.2) and Rāmānuja (section 2.2.2):

*sahopalambhaniyamād abhedo nīlataddhiyoḥ |* (PVin 1.54ab)

*ataḥ*

*sahopalambhaniyamād abhedo nīlataddhiyoḥ | iti* (SS ad TMK 1.8, ; identical in TMK

18. A (possibly Bhedābhedaśāstrin) Vedāntin whose works are lost, apart from fragments, and who, according to hagiographies, has been the first teacher of Rāmānuja before this turned to Yāmuna. Oberhammer collected fragments and other materials about him in Oberhammer 1997 (where this fragment and the other quotation of Yādavaprakāśa in SS ad TMK 3.61 went, however, not noted, see Oberhammer 1997, 10).

19. For a discussion of this passage, see section 3.3.2.

20. The same attitude was already present in previous Brahmanical authors, such as Kumārila Bhaṭṭa (see TV ad 1.3.1–4).

ad 4.20 and PMBh 8<sup>21</sup>)

na ca

sahopalambhaniyamān nīlatadādhārāder abhedah (Nyāyasiddhañjana ad 3, Virarāghavācārya 1976, 11, Mikami n.y. section 0.2.2.2)

'Nor is it the case that, due to the fact that they are necessarily perceived together, there is no difference between blue and its substrate.'<sup>22</sup>

Apart from Veṅkaṭanātha's immediate predecessors, the verse had been quoted also by Vācaspati in his commentary on YS 4.14,<sup>23</sup> and in the next example it will be shown that Vācaspati was most probably among Veṅkaṭanātha's sources of Buddhist quotes.

In the following case, the divergence between Veṅkaṭanātha's interpretation of a verse by Dharmakīrti and its original, soteriological, context is striking:

nirupadravabhūtārthasvabhāvasya viparyayaḥ ||

na bādhāyatnavattve 'pi buddhes tatpakṣapātataḥ | (PV 1.221 and PV 2.210cd–211ab)

'From what is contrary to that which is devoid of afflictions (i.e., *nirvāṇa*), which is the real object, and which is the essence |

There is no obstruction, even if efforts are made, since the mind takes sides with that (i.e. the Buddhist path).'<sup>24</sup>

uktaṃ ca bāhyair eva

anupaplavabhūtārthasvabhāvasya viparyayaḥ |

na bādhāyatnavattve 'pi buddhes tatpakṣapātataḥ || iti (SM ad 1.1.5, Virarāghavacharya and Nainaracarya 1971, 74)

'And it has been said by the very outsiders (*bāhya*, the Buddhists who do not accept the Veda): "Through errors (*viparyaya*) no subsequent invalidating cognition [arises] for the own nature of the referent (*artha*)<sup>25</sup> of a physical entity (*bhūta*), which is free from disturbances, even if [it is looked for] with effort, since the cognition (*buddhi*) is fallen into this direction (*pakṣa*) (i.e., because a cognition is naturally inclined towards knowledge)'<sup>26</sup>.'

21. I depend here on Srinivasa Chari 2011 since I cannot read the original Maṇipravāla of the PMBh.

22. A further mention of the *sahopalambhaniyama* can be found in the *Nyāyapariśuddhi*, 1.1.7.

23. I refer to the *Yogasūtra* as conceived by later commentators such as Vācaspati. This does not amount to a statement concerning the separate existence of a *Yogasūtra* independently from the *Yogabhāṣya*.

24. There are multiple interpretations of *nirupadravabhūtārthasvabhāvasya* in Dharmakīrti's commentators, who read it as *dvandva*, *karmadhāraya* or *tatpuruṣa*. For further details on this discussion, see Pecchia 2015. A slightly different translation of the same verse as found in PV 1.221 is found in Eltschinger 2007, 232–233. I am grateful to Cristina Pecchia for having discussed this translation with me. I remain the only one responsible for its shortcomings.

25. *artha* is — in Veṅkaṭanātha's interpretation of the verse — puzzling, since one would rather expect: 'for a cognition'. The *Sūṣmārthaṭīkā* commentary on the SM seems to share this interpretation: 'for the own nature of a concept means "for the reality of a fixed cognition" ' (*bhūtārthasvabhāvasya yathāvasthitajñānatattvasya*). Here and below underlined passages come from the text commented upon.

26. *Sūṣmārthaṭīkā*: 'Since [a cognition] is fallen into this direction: since each cognition as for the

yat tad anyatra yuṣmābhir uktam —  
 anupaplavabhūtārthasvabhāvasya viparyayaḥ |  
 na bādho yatnavattve 'pi buddhes tatpakṣapātataḥ || (SS ad TMK 1.8)

‘That which is said by you in a different place, namely:

“Through errors (*viparyaya*) no subsequent invalidating cognition [arises] for the own nature of a concept (*artha*) which is free from disturbances, even if [it is looked for] with effort, since the cognition (*buddhi*) is fallen into this direction (*pakṣa*) (i.e., because a cognition is naturally inclined towards knowledge).”

Again, the above verse was already very well-spread and a direct, non-Buddhist source for Veṅkaṭanātha can be identified in Vācaspati, who reuses this verse in his commentary on SK 64. The dependence on Vācaspati is plausible and confirmed also by the wording of the verse, identical in Veṅkaṭanātha and Vācaspati, and by the fact that both Vācaspati and Veṅkaṭanātha attribute the verse to *bāhyas*. More importantly, Veṅkaṭanātha’s understanding corresponds to Vācaspati’s and not to Dharmakīrti’s. In fact, the verse is found in PV 1, within a description of the Buddhist path, and is then repeated within the *Pramāṇasiddhi*, i.e., the book of the PV dedicated to the discussion of the four noble truths and, thus, to soteriology, where it explains that there is no coming back once one has taken the path of Buddhahood. By contrast, both Vācaspati and Veṅkaṭanātha reuse the verse in an epistemological context, as an evidence of the fact that even the Buddhist *Pramāṇavādins* did in fact accept *svataḥ prāmāṇya* ‘intrinsic validity’ of cognitions.

Thus, these correspondences between Vācaspati and Veṅkaṭanātha suggest that the latter did not go back directly to the PV. Thus, as with Yāmuna, some Buddhist texts are just common shared knowledge. It remains open to further enquiry whether these divergent interpretations are an evidence of the fact that these authors no longer had access to commentaries on Dharmakīrti, including his own.

However, a little doubt can be raised against this reconstruction because of the *anyatra*, ‘in another place’, in the SS passage. In fact, the SS ad TMK 1.8 quotes first the *sahopalambhaniyama* passage and then the *anupaplava* one, and introduces the latter with ‘What you said in another place’, which could hint at the fact that Veṅkaṭanātha was aware of the fact that the latter verse came from a different work and perhaps even knew that it came from a different context.

A further example of second-hand Buddhist textual reuse is found again in the SS ad TMK:

avibhāgo 'pi buddhyātmā viparyāsitadarśanaḥ |  
 grāhyagrāhakaśaṃvittibhedavān iva lakṣyate || (PVin 1.44, Steinkellner 2007 or PV 3 (*pratyakṣa*) 353)

‘Although the essence of cognition is partless, it is perceived as if it had a grasped-, grasper- and cognition-aspect in itself by those of deluded vision.’<sup>27</sup>

content penetrates into its own nature. Even if the content is denied, no one says “I did not have any cognition” ’ (*tatpakṣapātata iti. sarvasyā api buddher viṣayāpekṣayā svarūpe 'bhiniveśāt. viṣayaniśedhe 'pi, na me jñānam jātam iti hi na kaścid āha*).

27. A German translation is available in Vetter 1966, where the verse is identified as PVin 1.45 (on the problem of the numbering of verses, see Steinkellner 2007, xlviii).

*etena*

*avibhāgo hi buddhyātmā viparyāsitadarśanaḥ |*  
*grāhyagrāhakaṣaṃvittibhedavān iva lakṣyate ||*  
*iti pralapitam pratyuktam.* (SS ad TMK 4.20; identical in PMBh 8<sup>28</sup>)

'In this way the prattle "Although the essence of cognition is partless, it is perceived as if it had a grasped-, grasper- and cognition-aspect in itself by those of deluded vision" has been answered.'

Apart from the minor variation (*hi* instead of '*pi*'), the verse is found also in the *Nyāyamañjarī* and, more importantly, in Yāmuna's *Ātmasiddhi* (see above, section 2.1.2).

### 3.3 Direct knowledge of Pramāṇavāda Buddhists in Veṅkaṭanātha?

#### 3.3.1 Dharmakīrti: Attributed quotation

I have shown that some quotes of Dharmakīrti can be interpreted as depending on another author. However, it is most likely that this explanation does not apply in the following case:

*pakṣadharmas tadaṃśena vyāpto hetus tridhaiva saḥ |*  
*avinābhāvānīyamād dhetvābhāsās tato 'pare ||* (*Hetubindu*, v. 1)

'The inferential reason is a characteristic of the locus, included [in another characteristic, namely in the *dharmin*,<sup>29</sup>] as a part of it. It (inferential reason) is of three types [only], |

because the invariable concomitance is restricted to these three [only]. What is different than that is a fallacious reason ||'<sup>30</sup>

*āha ca dharmakīrtir hetubindau*  
*pakṣadharmas tadaṃśena vyāpto hetus tridhaiva saḥ |*  
*avinābhāvānīyamād dhetvābhāsās tato 'pare ||* (SS ad TMK 1.9)

'And Dharmakīrti in the *Hetubindu* said:

The reason is a characteristic of the locus, included [in another characteristic, namely in the *probandum*,] as a part of it. It (reason) is of three types [only], |  
 because the invariable concomitance is restricted to these three [only]. What is different than that is a fallacious reason ||'

28. I depend here on Srinivasa Chari 2011 since I cannot read the original *Mañipravāla* of the PMBh.

29. The second half of the verse is relatively clear, whereas *vyāpto tadaṃśena* (already present in Dignāga's definition) is much less transparent. Steinkellner (see next fn.) interprets it as meaning that the inferential reason is 'included by another characteristic' (*umfaßt von [einer anderen Beschaffenheit]*). My tentative interpretation above is that the inferential reason (for instance, smoke in 'This hill has fire because it has smoke') is present in the locus (e.g., the hill) and is included also in the *probandum*, the thing to be proved (e.g. fire).

30. For a German translation and discussion, see Steinkellner 1967, 33, 81–83 and (on the identical verse in the *Pramāṇavārttika*), Steinkellner 2013a, 4 and Steinkellner 2013b respectively. The present translation is based on the revised one by Steinkellner.

In fact, the same verse is present also in Dharmakīrti's PV 1.1 (svārthānumāna), but Veṅkaṭanātha himself attributes it to the *Hetubindu*.<sup>31</sup> The verse is of key importance for Buddhist logic and epistemology, since it improves on Dignāga's definition of the logical reason (*hetu*) in a valid inference. Therefore, it is frequently quoted by Buddhist Pramāṇavādins (it is found, for instance, in Durvekamiśra's *Dharmottarapradīpa*, a subcommentary on Dharmottara's *Nyāyabinduṭīkā* on Dharmakīrti's *Nyāyabindu*). However, it is not found at all among Viśiṣṭadvaitins. Even more surprising is the frame, which, if compared to the previous ones, seems to show a direct acquaintance with a certain author and text.

### 3.3.2 Dharmakīrti: Unattributed quotations

Other quotations from Dharmakīrti are found again in the SS ad TMK. The next one discusses the ontology of individual things and their attributes and aims at showing that there is no separate substance apart from its attributes:

*nānopādhyupakārāṅgaśaktyabhinnātmano grahe || 52 ||*  
*sarvātmanopakāryasya ko bhedaḥ syād anīścitaḥ |* (PV 1 (svārthānumāna) 52cd–53ab, Gnoli 1960, 29)  
*dharmopakāraśaktinām bhede tās tasya kiṃ yadi |*  
*nopakāras tatas tāsām tathā syād anavasthitiḥ ||* (PV 1 (svārthānumāna) 54, Gnoli 1960, 30)

'When this [thing], which is not distinguished from its potencies — which make it possible for it to carry its many attributes —,<sup>32</sup> is seized through its whole nature, which of the many attributes could remain undetermined?'

'When the potencies, which carry the attributes, are different [than the thing], why are they its [potencies], given that it (the thing) does not carry them? In this way, there would be an infinite regress (since one would need further potencies to carry the potencies which carry the attributes).'<sup>33</sup>

*yat tu bauddhair uktam —*  
*dharmopakāraśaktinām bhede tās tasya kiṃ yadi |*  
*nopakāras tatas tāsām tathā syād anavasthitiḥ ||*  
*nānopādhyupakārāṅgaśaktyabhinnātmano grahe |*  
*sarvātmanopakāryasya ko bhedaḥ syād anīścitaḥ || iti ||*  
*tad api mandam* (SS ad TMK 1.8, Aṇṇaṅgarācārya 1941, 8)

'As for what has been said by the Buddhists, by contrast, namely "When the potencies, which carry the attributes, are different [than the thing], why are they its [potencies], given that it (the thing) does not carry them? In this way, there would be an infinite regress (since one would need further potencies to carry

31. Gnoli (1960, 1) argues on the basis of Uddyotakara that the verse was by Dignāga originally, so that Veṅkaṭanātha's attribution might yield further support to the hypothesis that Dignāga's works were already lost in Sanskrit by his time. See also *infra*, section 3.3.3. For a more nuanced version of Gnoli's claim see Steinkellner 2013b, 14 and the study by Frauwallner cited therein.

32. Frauwallner interprets *upādhi* as *dharma* (Frauwallner 1932, 254, fn. 2).

33. The passage is fraught with difficulties, most of all regarding the complex relationship between *upādhi*, *dharma*, *śakti* and *upakāra*. I have relied on Frauwallner's German translation in Frauwallner 1932, where the verses are numbered as PV 1.54a–55a and 56.

the potencies which carry the attributes). [For,] when this [thing], which is not distinguished from its potencies — which make it possible for it to carry its many attributes —, is seized through its whole nature, which of the many attributes could remain undetermined?”, that too is stupid.’

PV 1.52cd–53ab, together with the preceding and following śloka, are found also in Vācaspati's NVTṬ ad NS 1.1.4 (and in the *Vādarahasya* or *Udayananirākaraṇa* attributed to Ratnakīrti). PV 1.54 has been quoted in NM 2. Therefore, one can imagine that these verses circulated among non-Buddhist authors. It is thus difficult to determine whether Veṅkaṭanātha had a direct access to Dharmakīrti's text or to one of the other texts quoting it. In favour of the latter possibility speaks the fact that the verses were apparently well-known, but against it speaks the fact that I could not find the sequence 52cd–53ab–54 in any of the possible sources.

*tasmād vaidharmyadr̥ṣṭānte neṣṭo 'vaśyam ihāśrayaḥ |*  
*tadabhāve ca tan neti vacanād eva tadgateḥ ||* (PV 1 (svārthānumāna) 26, Gnoli 1960)<sup>34</sup>

‘Therefore, regarding the example according to dissimilarity, we do not assume the necessity of a [real] substratum with reference to [the reason], since already from the statement “and if this is missing, the [other one] is not” one recognises [the negative concomitance].’<sup>35</sup>

*evam api hi brūtha*  
*tasmād vaidharmyadr̥ṣṭānte neṣṭo 'vaśyam ihāśrayaḥ |*  
*tadabhāve ca tan neti vacanād eva tadgateḥ || iti* (SS ad TMK 1.30)

‘You say in fact so:

Therefore, regarding the dissimilar example, we do not assume the necessity of a [real] substratum with reference to [the reason], since already from the statement “and if this is missing, the [other one] is not” one recognises [the negative concomitance].’

The same passage is quoted in the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa*, par. 2 (Yogīndrānanda 1968, 302), which discusses it in its original context, i.e., that of the discussion about the *kevalānvayin hetu* ‘inferential reason based only on positive concomitance’. By contrast, Veṅkaṭanātha takes the text out of context and uses it within his discussion of momentariness, so that no indirect confirmation of a second-hand reuse of this passage through the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa* can be detected.

And, again in the SS ad TMK:

*vikalpo 'vastunirbhāsād asaṃvādād upaplavaḥ* (PVin 1.33ab, Steinkellner 2007)

‘The conceptualisation is an error, because it does not conform [to the object] since in it no real object appears.’

*tasyāṃ yad rūpaṃ ābhāti bāhyam ekam ivānyataḥ |*

34. Cf. also PVin's prose after PVin 2.71: *ata eva vaidharmyadr̥ṣṭānte 'vaśyam ihāśrayo neṣṭaḥ* (Steinkellner 2007). See also Steinkellner 2007, xlvi for the previous misidentification of this passage as a separate *kārikā* in PVin 2.

35. My translation depends on the English translation present in Prets 1999, 338 and on the German translation in Steinkellner 1979, 135, which is based on the Tibetan alone and thus identifies this passage in the PVin as *kā* 74ab, see fn.34.



vyāvṛttam iva nistattvaṃ parikṣānaṅgabhāvataḥ (PV 1 (svārthānumāna) 77, Gnoli 1960)

‘In regard to that, the form which appears as one [and] external and as if excluded from the other [forms], is unreal, since it is not part of a [correct] examination.’<sup>36</sup>

yat punar āhuḥ:

vikalpo ‘vastunirbhāsād asaṃvādād upaplavaḥ

iti

tasyāṃ yad rūpaṃ ābhāti bāhyam ekam ivānyataḥ |

vyāvṛttam iva nistattvaṃ parikṣānaṅgabhāvataḥ ||

iti tad apy asiddhahetukaṃ pralobhanamātram, vikalpaviśayāvastutve samīcīnayuktyabhāvāt. (SS ad TMK 4.33)

‘As for what they (the Buddhist Pramāṇavādins?) say, namely:

“The conceptualisation is an error, because it does not conform [to the object] since in it no real object appears.

[And]

In regard to that, the form which appears as one [and] external and as if distinguished from the other [forms], is unreal, since it is not part of a [correct] examination,” that is also merely a seduction whose logical reason is unestablished, because there is no right reason for the unreality of the objects of conceptual cognitions.’

Noteworthy is the condemnation of the Buddhist thought along with the acknowledgement of its powerful seduction (see also section 3.1).

As for Veṅkaṭanātha’s source, he clearly attributes both quotes to the same author. If he is reusing Dharmakīrti second-hand, the easiest solution for Veṅkaṭanātha would have been to have the same two quotes already paired in his source. However, although the first verse is quoted relatively frequently, I could find the second one only in one source. This has indeed, also the first verse, but not immediately preceding it.

More in detail, the PVin verse is quoted also in Śrīdhara’s *Nyāyakandalī* commentary on the *Prāśastapadabhāṣya* on the *Vaiśeṣika Sūtra* (guṇapadārtha, Jetly and Parikh 1991, 448, No. 168), in Rāmakaṇṭha’s *Nareśvaraparikṣāṭikā* (kāṇḍa 1, ad 5, Shastri 1926, 23, where also the first word of 1.33c is quoted) and in Abhayadevasūri’s *Tattvabodhavidhāyini* on Siddhasena Divākara’s *Sammatitarkaprakaraṇa* (kāṇḍa 2, caturtha vibhāga, jñānamīmāṃsā, Saṃghavī and Dośi 1980–1985, 500, 511<sup>37</sup>) (for all these locations, see Steinkellner 2007). I could only locate the PV verse in the *Nyāyakandalī* (guṇapadārtha, Jetly and Parikh 1991, 448, No. 169). The two verses are not found directly after one another, as in Veṅkaṭanātha, so that Veṅkaṭanātha might have taken both from the *Nyāyakandalī*, but needed to look for them within the manuscript.

36. Frauwallner adds that the Tibetan translation of the last compound tells that it is due to the fact that it is not able to lead to an effect (Frauwallner 1932, 267, fn. 2).

37. In Abhayadevasūri, however, the reading is in both cases *viśaṃvādād* instead of *asaṃvādād*. If the manuscripts are reliable, it is thus less likely that Veṅkaṭanātha had this text as his source.

If the *Nyāyakandalī* (dated to 991) were not the direct source of Veṅkaṭanātha, the presence of the PVin verse also in Rāmakaṇṭha and Abhayadevasūri, who both lived in the eleventh century, testifies to the fact that at least the PVin verse had been frequently reused and that there could thus be a further intermediate source for Veṅkaṭanātha.

### 3.3.3 Dignāga

The following case is more doubtful than the one discussed in section 3.3.1, since no precise source is mentioned:

*grāhyadharmas tadaṃśena vyāpto hetus* (Dignāga, *Hetumukha*, cf. Frauwallner 1982, 840)

‘The reason is a characteristic of what is grasped, included in a part of it.’<sup>38</sup>

*anye 'pi*

*grāhyadharmas tadaṃśena vyāpto hetur iti*

‘And also others [say]

“The reason is a characteristic of what is grasped, included in a part of it”.

Here the lack of whatever indication regarding the source seems to suggest that Veṅkaṭanātha has known this text only indirectly, perhaps because it was lost very early in the whole of South Asia (today, only fragments are preserved).<sup>39</sup>

### 3.3.4 Context of the reuses in sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.3

More important than the literality of the reuse and perhaps also of the mention of a specific work is the fact that there is a real difference between these cases and the ones from Yāmuna discussed in sections 2.1.2 and 2.2.2, insofar as Veṅkaṭanātha appears to be more interested in a real philosophical discussion of Buddhist ideas. For instance, the context in which the reuse in sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.3 takes place is that of the discussion about *dharma* ‘property’ and *dharmin* ‘property possessor’ within the Buddhist and Advaita critique of *dravya* ‘substance’. The critique by Buddhists can be summarised as follows: If a *dharma* has no qualities, it cannot be seized, if it has some, there is a regressus ad infinitum, since also these qualities will need further qualities in order to be seized. Veṅkaṭanātha’s reply is that *dharma*s are indeed needed and that even Buddhists agree on this need, since they mention them in the case of inferences. Next, and immediately before the preceding quotations, Veṅkaṭanātha says:

*satyam, kālpanikahetusādhya dharmadvārā anumānapravṛttiḥ, pāramparyeṇa tu svalakṣaṇaviśrāntī bhāktam anumānaprāmāṇyam iti hi bauddhānām rahasyam. tattvagatyā caturvidhānām api teṣāṃ dharmadharmaibhāvaḥ kṣepyaḥ.*

‘The following is the secret of the Buddhists: “It is true [*dharma*s are needed, for], the inference works through a postulated *dharma* of the *probandum* and of the inferential reason. But the validity of inference is [only] secondary, insofar as it indirectly rests on the ultimate particular.” The relation of *dharma* and *dharmin*

38. For a discussion of *aṃśa* and *grāhya* in this passage, see Pind 2009, 134.

39. Unfortunately, I could not even understand where Frauwallner could find this Sanskrit fragment in the essay on Dignāga included in Frauwallner 1982.

should instead be refused for all these four [alleged categories]<sup>40</sup> from the point of view of reality.'

The point is: How can one cognise without the *dharma-dharmin* ontology? The 'secret of the Buddhists', according to Veṅkaṭanātha, is that they assume this ontology, though secondarily, in the sense that they claim that, on a higher level, it has to be rejected.

It is within a similar discussion of the *dharma-dharmin* ontology that the NSA adaptively reuses the *sahopalambhaniyama* fragment (see above, section 3.2).

### 3.3.5 Prajñākaragupta's school

The other nominal mention of a specific Buddhist author (apart from the mention of the Buddha himself as Sugata) regards a certain Prajñākara. The name itself could either refer to a commentator on Dharmakīrti, known as Prajñākaragupta and dated through relative chronology to 750–810,<sup>41</sup> or to the commentator on the first nine chapters of Śāntideva's *Bodhicāryāvatāra*, known as Prajñākaramati and dated to the end of the first millennium through the presence of his name among the examiners at Vikramaśīla. The context, as will be seen immediately below, and the general appreciation of Veṅkaṭanātha for the Buddhist Pramāṇavādins, incline me towards the first option, although at the end I will present an element possibly hinting at Prajñākaramati. In both cases, however, what remains constant is Veṅkaṭanātha's attempt to better understand the Buddhist doctrine of liberation and of the modification which causes liberation:

*ukto mārgas tadabhyāsād āśrayaḥ parivartate* || PV 2.205ab (*pramāṇasiddhi*)  
*prāg eva mārga uktāḥ tasyābhyāsād āśrayasya cittasantānasyālayasya vā*  
*parisuddhatvaṁ bhavati.* (PVA ad PV 2.205ab)

'The path has already been said. Through its exercise, the basis is transformed ||<sup>42</sup>

The path has already been said before. Through the exercise of it the basis, that is the series of psychic elements or the receptacle-consciousness is purified.'

*vāsanocchedamātraṁ tu baudhaikadeśikāḥ. tatra sarvajñānasantānaikatāpattiḥ*  
*syān na veti vibhāgaḥ. tatra tatprakriyāpariccheda evottaram. dhisantānapraṇāśaṁ tu*  
*prajñākaramatasthāḥ. tatrāntimasyārthakriyāvīrahād asattve tatpūrveṣāṁ api tathā iti*  
*śūnyatāvatāraḥ.* (SS ad TMK 2.75)

'The simple interruption of the [latent] tendencies (*vāsanā*) is, by contrast, the [release according to] one part of the Buddhists. In this regard, the distinction [among the Buddhists] is whether ultimately there is a single consciousness flux consisting of all cognitions or not. Among these [two options], the final answer is that [release] only consists of the interruption of the production of those [latent tendencies]. By contrast, the ones engaged in the view of Prajñākara [consider release to be] cessation of the series of cognitions. At this point, due to the absence of the causal efficiency of the last [moment of the consciousness series], there is no more [consciousness series]. And due to that also the

40. See section 3.4.

41. This chronology has been proposed by Motoi Ono, see Moriyama 2014, 2.

42. For a German translation and discussion of this hemistich, see Vetter 1990, 105.

[moments] previous to the last are similarly [absent]. Thus, emptiness occurs.'

A very close parallel is found, in an analogous discussion of various interpretations of *mukti*, in Veṅkaṭanātha's autocommentary on the NSA:

*dhisantānapraṇāśamuktivādiprajñākaramatam āha jñānālikalayeti. samastālika-  
viṣayajñānasantānoccheda ity arthaḥ.*

'With the words the destruction of unreality [as conceived by] cognition he (the author of the main text, i.e., Veṅkaṭanātha himself) states the opinion of Prajñākara, who said that release is the cessation of the series of cognitions. This means that [release] is the interruption of the flux of all cognitions having as content something false'. (Vīrarāghavācārya 1976, 252)

The main problem with Dharmakīrti's PV 2.205ab (above) lies in the interpretation of the referent of *āśraya* 'basis': does it refer to the *ālayavijñāna* 'receptacle consciousness', to the *cittasantāna* 'series of thoughts' or to another psychic element?<sup>43</sup> Dharmakīrti himself does not say much on this topic, since *santāna* is mentioned in PV 2.189 as cause of *ṭṭṣṇā*, but no further elaborations are found in his works. Thus, Veṅkaṭanātha appears to be aware of the problem and of the disagreement among Dharmakīrti's commentators. His decision to resort to Prajñākaragupta could be explained insofar as Dharmakīrti himself would not have been enough and Devendrabuddhi's commentary might have already been lost (today, only the Tibetan is extant). More importantly, Prajñākaragupta is the only one among the commentators on Dharmakīrti who really founded a school (Moriyama 2014, 3), so that Veṅkaṭanātha's mention of people following him is completely appropriate.

A further hint of Veṅkaṭanātha's interest for the Buddhist doctrine of liberation and of the *cittasantāna* can be detected in his NSA, where he quotes a verse on the same topic.<sup>44</sup> The same verse is also quoted in Prajñākaramati's commentary on Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra*.

*tad uktam —  
yasminn eva hi santāne āhitā karmavāsanā |  
phalaṃ tatraiva badhnāti kārpaṣe raktatā yathā ||  
iti (Pañjikā ad Bodhicaryāvatāra 9.73cd, Vaidya 1960, 222-223)  
yat punar āhuḥ  
yasminn eva hi santāne āhitā karmavāsanā |  
phalaṃ tatraiva badhnāti kārpaṣe raktatā yathā ||  
iti, tad apy asat (Vīrarāghavācārya 1976, 188-189)*

'As for what they say, namely "In whatever series the latent tendencies of one's karma are put, their fruit bears only in the same [series], as the redness in cotton [is caused by the latent presence of red in its seed]", that too is not true.'<sup>45</sup>

43. The background of this problem is summarised in Vetter 1990, 105, fn. 1. An ampler discussion of Dharmakīrti's position and of Prajñākaragupta's interpretation is found in Franco 1997, 80-83, Eltschinger 2005 and Pecchia 2015, 297-307.

44. The verse is also quoted at the beginning of the Jaina section of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*. The source remains untraced.

45. My translation modifies only slightly Mikami's one (Mikami n.y., section 2.2.5.2). If Srinivasa Chari 2011 accurately reproduces the PMBh text, the same verse or a version thereof is found also in the PMBh, chapter 10 (on the *Vaibhāṣikas*).

3.3.6 *Jñānaśrīmitra and Ratnakīrti*

The following instance has in common with the cases discussed in sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.5 that the text does not seem to have been reused by other non-Buddhist authors prior to Veṅkaṭanātha, but that — given that, as in the case discussed in section 3.3.3 he does not give any indication about the source — he might nonetheless be reusing it only second-hand. The content of the reuse is the so-called *sattvānumāna*, ‘inference about (the momentariness of) existence’, which is found already in Dharmakīrti’s *Pramāṇaviniścaya* and *Hetubindu* (5.18)<sup>46</sup> and then in Śāntarakṣita’s *Tattvasaṅgraha*, vv. 352–357,<sup>47</sup> and in Ratnakīrti’s *Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhi*, but also in Vācaspati’s *Nyāyakaṇikā*.<sup>48</sup> However, all these texts report with minor variations this form:

*yat sat tat kṣaṇikaṃ yathā ghaṭaḥ santaś cāmī vivādāspadībhūtāḥ padārthā iti*  
(Ratnakīrti, third sentence of his *Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhi*)

‘Whatever exists, is momentary, like a pot, and these items about which we discuss exist [hence, they are momentary].’

In other words, they agree in saying that everything (*pakṣa*) is momentary (*sādhya*), like the pot (*dṛṣṭānta*). By contrast, in Veṅkaṭanātha we find a form of the argument which I could only detect (among the authors prior to Veṅkaṭanātha<sup>49</sup>) in *Jñānaśrīmitra*:

*yat sat tat kṣaṇikaṃ yathā jaladharaḥ santas tu bhāvā ime* | (v. 2 a of *Jñānaśrīmitra*, *Kṣaṇabhaṅgādhyāya* 1, Thakur 1987, 1).

‘Whatever exists, is momentary, like a cloud, and these items exist [hence, they are momentary].’

*yathāhuḥ* —

*yat sat tat kṣaṇikaṃ yathā jaladharaḥ santaś ca bhāvā iti. yad akṣaṇikaṃ tad avastu yathā khasūnam. akṣaṇikatve cāmīṣaṃ tadvad asattvaprasaṅga iti bhāvaḥ.* (SS ad TMK 1.25)

‘As it has been said: “Whatever exists, is momentary, like a cloud, and the items exist [hence, they are momentary].” The intention is that what is not momentary is not real, like a flower in the sky. And if these [entities] were not momentary, there would be the undesired consequence of their non-existence, like in its (of the flower in the sky) case.’

46. See Oetke’s discussion and analysis of these reuses in Oetke 1993. On the *sattvānumāna* see the groundbreaking Steinkellner 1968 and Yoshimizu 1999 (which focuses on the prehistory of the argument and contains further bibliographical indications, in fn. 2). For Dharmottara’s contribution to the discussion, see Sakai 2010, which is summarised and developed in regard to its influence on *Jñānaśrīmitra*’s discussion in Sakai 2013.

47. This reuse is discussed in Sakai 2010, appendix II.

48. *yat sad dṛśyam adṛśyam vā tat sarvaṃ kṣaṇikaṃ iti*, NK 1978, p. 93

49. The *Sarvadarśanaśaṅgraha* (1924 p. 26) reports the full v. 2 of *Jñānaśrīmitra* and introduces it with *tad uktaṃ jñānaśrīyā*, thus showing that its author might have had a direct access to the text. This also implies that the presence of the verse in the *Sarvadarśanaśaṅgraha* does not presuppose that it was widely known, nor does it presuppose an intermediate source which could have been also Veṅkaṭanātha’s one.

In Jñānaśrīmitra and Veṅkaṭanātha, the example is different and it has shifted from the ordinary pot to a cloud, perhaps *metri causa* (so Stcherbatsky 1993, fn. 1), or perhaps because clouds are a clear example of something rapidly changing. The fact that Veṅkaṭanātha does not mention the source might mean that he reused the text second-hand, but his immediately following elaboration (for which I did not find any immediate model in Buddhist literature) shows that he was conversant with the topic and able to think along its lines.

The passage is found also in the NSA, interestingly enough in a form which is almost identical with Ratnakīrti's one (and thus dissimilar from Vācaspati's one):

yat sat tat kṣaṇikam, yathā ghaṭaḥ, santaś cāmī bhāvā  
ity api na (Vīrārāghavācārya 1976, 27)

'Even the argument 'Whatever exists, is momentary, like a pot, and these entities exist [hence, they are momentary]' does not [hold]'<sup>50</sup>

Veṅkaṭanātha (and his two commentators) does not name his source, but the context is that of a discussion about momentariness, whose obvious upholders are Buddhist philosophers. Also in this case, the discussion is deep and informed and momentariness is negated on the basis of the argument from recognition (*pratyabhijñā*), until the final reversal of the Buddhist argument:

praty anumānāni ca — vigītā pratyabhijñā svaviśaye pramā; abādhitabuddhitvāt.  
svalakṣaṇabuddhivat. sā hi svaviśaye pramāiva asmākam, vaibhāṣikasyāpi. yat sat  
na tat kṣaṇikam; yathā sampratīpannam nityam. santaś cāmī bhāvā iti. (NSA ad 6,  
Vīrārāghavācārya 1976, 35–37)

'And the counter-inferences: The recognition about which we discuss is, in regard to its content, a means of knowledge, because its cognition is not subsequently invalidated, like the cognition of the particular. And this is, in regard to its content, knowledge, for us as also for the Vaibhāṣika. Whatever exists, that is not momentary, like the permanent [truths] which have been rightly cognised [by the Buddhists].<sup>51</sup> And these things exist [hence, they are not momentary].'

Note that at least in this case the label 'Vaibhāṣika' seems to be used in a way different than the standard one in Buddhist studies, since Vaibhāṣikas are generally believed, since at least the time of Tibetan historiographies, to be a sub-sect of the Sarvāstivādins, whereas the position here represented by Veṅkaṭanātha is rather akin to that of the Sautrāntikas.

### 3.4 Non-Pramāṇavāda quotes

The situation becomes much more complicated in the case of the only acknowledged reuse of a non-Pramāṇavāda Buddhist text I could locate. In fact, here I could not identify Veṅkaṭanātha's source, which might have been not in Sanskrit and might be lost, so that an evaluation of Veṅkaṭanātha's understanding of the text he reused is seriously impaired.

50. Cf. the translation in Mikami n.y., section 0.3.2.2.1.

51. The commentary and the subcommentary add an identical comment: 'the permanent [truths] which have been rightly cognised: the rest [of the sentence] is "which have been taught by the Buddha"' (*sampratīpannam nityam iti. buddhopadiṣṭam iti śeṣaḥ*, Vīrārāghavācārya 1976, 37).

The place of the reuse is Veṅkaṭanātha's SS ad TMK 1.8:<sup>52</sup>

*evam āhur vaibhāṣikāḥ —  
nirādhārā nirdharmakāś ca rūpādayaś catvāraḥ padārthāḥ. te  
cakṣurādyekaikendriyagrāhyāḥ iti.* (Vīrarāghavācārya 1973, 14)

'So said the Vaibhāṣikas:

"The categories are four, beginning with the visible, [and] they are without support and without characteristics. They are perceivable by only one sense-faculty [respectively], beginning with the sight (for the visible) and so on."

The text appears not to conform to what we know about Buddhist scholasticism, where the *skandhas* beginning with *rūpa*, and the perceivable contents, also beginning with *rūpa*, are instead five. Some further light can however be derived from what follows in the SS:

*vātsīputrās tu śabdādīn pañca vaibhāṣikā viduḥ | śabdātmānaś caturṣv eva kecid ity  
apare 'bruvan ||*

'Others say, by contrast, that the Vātsīputras [among the] Vaibhāṣikas know five [categories] beginning with *śabda* [and] that [the sensibilia] consisting in *śabda* [are present] exactly within the four [categories].'

The identification of Vātsīputras and Vaibhāṣikas, repeated in Nṛsiṃhadeva's *Ānandadāyini*, a subcommentary on Veṅkaṭanātha's autocommentary on the TMK, is unheard of and possibly just wrong. By contrast, if the *Ānandadāyini* is right, the four categories meant could be the sensibilia (*rūpa* 'colour', *rasa* 'taste', *gandha* 'smell', *sparsa* 'touchable quality'), with the exception of *śabda* 'sound', which is described also in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, 2.22 as penetrating the aggregates of molecules and as non-existing independently of them.

I could not locate a source for the seeming quote (see above), but Nṛsiṃhadeva writes:

*evam āhur iti tattvasā(ga)rādigrantha iti śeṣaḥ. nirādhārā iti dharmapakṣaḥ.  
nirddharmakā iti dharmipakṣaḥ. kecid tu rūpādaya ityuktyā dharmapakṣaḥ eva.  
dharmipakṣas tu — atthi rūāieṇa eam ghayatti akkhabheādo | ityādibhir ukta upalakṣya  
ity āhuḥ. asti rūpādikena ekaṃ grhyate akṣabhedāt | iti tadarthaḥ.*

'So said: the continuation of the [sentence] is "in the book [called] Tattvasā(ga)ra,<sup>53</sup> etc.". Without support [is tantamount to] the side of the characteristics (i.e., the categories are not characteristics which pertain to a substance). Without characteristics [is tantamount to] the side of the characteristic-bearer (i.e., the categories are not characteristic-bearers to which characteristics accrue). Others, by contrast, state that by saying [the categories] beginning with the visible, only the side of the characteristics [is expressed]. The side of the characteristic-bearer is secondarily characterised through [expressions] such as *atthi rūāieṇa eam ghayatti akkhabheādo*, which means: *asti rūpādikena ekaṃ grhyate akṣabhedāt* "there is a single [sensible item] [and] it is grasped as visible, etc., due to the difference among the sense-faculties".

52. I am grateful to Lawrence McCrea, who suggested that I look at Srinivasachar and Narasimhachar 1933, 24–25 and thus helped me in locating the following occurrence.

53. This passage contains what seems a conjecture by the editors: *tattvasā(ga)rādigrantha*.



According to Potter, Nṛsiṃhadeva lived around 1740 and commented upon three other philosophical works by Veṅkaṭanātha. In the Sanskrit Preface to Srinivasachar and Narasimhachar 1933, he is however described as having been 'born in the succession of teachers of Rāmānujācārya, whose unique receptacle of devotion are the feet of the venerable best of the teachers Vedānta Deśika, and who wrote several treatises and is known also with the name of Doḍḍayācārya'.<sup>54</sup>

A Doḍḍayācārya (spelt Doddayācārya) or Rāmānujadāsa is recorded by Potter as having been active around 1590, so that if he was the teacher of the author of the *Ānandadāyini* it is plausible that Potter confounded in his entry about Nṛsiṃhadeva two authors, namely an earlier Nṛsiṃharāja — author of the *Ānandadāyini* and of a commentary on Veṅkaṭanātha's *Śatadūṣaṇi* — and the later Nṛsiṃhasūri — to whom S. Dasgupta attributes other Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta works, namely the *Śarīrabhāvādhikaraṇavicāra* and the *Tatkratunyāyavicāra* (Dasgupta 1940, 131).

Having thus reasonably established that the author of the *Ānandadāyini* lived around the end of the sixteenth century and that he was closely connected with Veṅkaṭanātha, his Vaibhāṣika reference seems detailed enough to appear as a reliable indication of a continuity of familiarity with the same sources within Veṅkaṭanātha's school. Unfortunately, I could not locate the source of the Prakrit passage. However, the Vaibhāṣika are traditionally connected with the explicit choice of only Sanskrit as medium, so that nothing in Prakrit has ever been attributed to them. This state of affairs, together with the additional identification (in the same passage) of the Vātsīputrīyas with a group of Vaibhāṣikas, seems to indicate that the attribution to Vaibhāṣikas was either imprecise or plainly wrong.<sup>55</sup> The real referents of this passage might, instead, be a group of Sarvāstivādins, given that they appear to have also written in Prakrit.<sup>56</sup>

### 3.5 Veṅkaṭanātha's sources

The main problem in the interpretation of the findings above is: Who are Veṅkaṭanātha's sources? Did he have independent access to the Buddhist texts he quoted directly or not? We can distinguish between some sure intermediate sources, i.e., Yāmuna and Rāmānuja, and some less sure ones.

As for the former, Yāmuna and Rāmānuja are Veṅkaṭanātha's standard sources, even when quoting texts he was directly acquainted with, such as the *Mahābhārata*.<sup>57</sup> Still, in this case Yāmuna and Rāmānuja are not enough, since they reuse little Buddhist textual material, as seen above. Thus, even if Veṅkaṭanātha

54. *śrīmannigamāntaguruvārāraṇabhaktyekadhaṇasya doḍḍayācāryāparanāmadheyasya anekaprabandha-nirmātuḥ rāmānujācāryasya vidyāvamśajāḥ nṛsiṃhadevaḥ*. (Srinivasachar and Narasimhachar 1933, *Bhūmikā*, p. iii)

55. I am grateful to Vincent Eltschinger and Shoryu Katsura for having discussed this topic with me. The PMBh chapters on the Vaibhāṣikas and on the Sautrāntikas as depicted in Srinivasa Chari 2011 do not throw any light on this issue.

56. In case the *Ānandadāyini* is on a false track, instead, one might remember that in the *Dharmakandha* and the *Śaṅgītiparyāya* there can be traced 'potentially early stages in the development of this fivefold classification [...]'. This passage then includes references to four of the five groups: material form (*rūpa*), thought (*citta*), thought concomitants (*caitta*), and dissociated factors (*cittaviprayukta*)' (Willemsen, Dessein and Cox 1989, 233). See also *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* 2.23. I plan to study further this passage in the future.

57. For instance, in SM, Viraraghavacharya and Nainaracarya 1971, 38, Veṅkaṭanātha reuses passages of the *Mahābhārata* brought together by Yāmuna in Yāmuna's version, although the

reused some Buddhist passages second-hand, he had to make an explicit effort to find them in authors outside his cultural milieu.

Further possible intermediate sources are Bhāsarvajña's *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa*, Vācaspati, Śrīdhara and Śrīharṣa, who have been widely influential authors in Indian philosophy. Although Veṅkaṭanātha was clearly interested in the Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika schools, I could not find any direct evidence of Veṅkaṭanātha's acquaintance with the *Nyāyakandalī*, nor with the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa*, which is a brilliant book, but most probably did not reach great popularity among Classical Indian philosophers. By contrast, in the case of Vācaspati, a case of second-hand reuse of a Buddhist text which most probably occurred via Vācaspati has been detected and discussed above, section 3.2. As for Śrīharṣa, one would not have expected Veṅkaṭanātha to necessarily have known and reused his works, since Śrīharṣa was an Advaitin and a skeptic, but there is a case which points to a direct borrowing:

*pūrvasambandhaniyame hetutve tulya eva nau |  
hetutattvabahirbhūtasattvāsattvakathā vṛthā ||* (KKKh 1, sūnyavāda, v. 5, Panta and  
Vaijāpurakara 1961—62, 24; Jhā 1970, 36)

'Since for both of us being a cause consists in a necessary connection [of the effect] with something preceding [it] |

the discussion on whether [the cause] exists or not, which lies outside the reality of the cause, is meaningless ||'

*yad atra mādhyamikamatasthair ucyate:  
pūrvasambandhaniyame hetutve tulya eva nau |  
hetutattvabahirbhūtasattvāsattvakathā vṛthā || iti* (SS ad TMK 1.32)

'As for what has been said in this regard by people who engage in the opinion of the Mādhyamikas:<sup>58</sup>

"Since for both of us being a cause consists in a necessary connection [of the effect] with something preceding [it] | the discussion on whether [the cause] exists or non-exists, which lies outside the reality of the cause, is meaningless ||"

Why does Veṅkaṭanātha attribute this verse, for which we do not have other sources and which harmonises perfectly with Śrīharṣa's style, to the Mādhyamikas? The first and more straightforward explanation regards the fact that the passage is part of an examination of Buddhist ideas within the KKKh. Moreover, Veṅkaṭanātha may be pointing to the fact that Śrīharṣa's own scepticism brings him (too) close to the Mādhyamika positions, so that *mādhyamikamatasthaiḥ* would mean 'by those who [in fact] are of [the same] opinion as the Mādhyamikas'.

The acquaintance of Veṅkaṭanātha with Śrīharṣa is further confirmed by a case unrelated with the topic of the present paper and discussed by Srinivasa Chari (1961, 26) and also mentioned by Markus Schmücker (forthcoming, section 0.4, fn. 45), namely an epistemological passage on the establishment of all instru-

verses are not close to each other in the *Mahābhārata* and their connection entails a syntactical problem.

58. Please note, as in the case of Prajñākaragupta's followers (section 3.3.5), the use of '*matastha*' to denote the adherents of a school.

ments of knowledge in worldly usage found in ŚD vāda 9 (Aṇṇāṅgarācārya 1940, 77), which reuses KKKh, pariccheda 1 (Śukla 1999, 6–7).

### 3.6 Conclusion on Veṅkaṭanātha's interest for Buddhist authors and ideas

I have already discussed elsewhere (Freschi 2015a) how Sanskrit authors of the second millennium tend to silently (i.e., without acknowledging the reuse) reuse textual material belonging to their own school. In this sense, marking a passage as extraneous to one's body of thought is a way to dissociate oneself from it.

Thus, it is not surprising that Buddhist textual material is in one way or another identified as extraneous. However, the way this identification is performed is very significant. Going back to the list (in section 3) of Veṅkaṭanātha's mention of Buddhist schools and authors, it is interesting to note that the a priori charges (discussed in section 3.1) regard either generic Buddhists or 'Mādhyamikas', whereas the more specific he gets, the more Veṅkaṭanātha really engages with his Buddhist opponents of the past and even the charges become more precise. Incidentally, it might be worth noticing that *saugata* and *bauddha* do not only refer to Buddhists in general. For instance, Veṅkaṭanātha refers to the Vaibhāṣikas with whom he discusses in SS ad TMK 5.21 about the nature of the *padārthas* just as *saugatas*.

Thus, precise references are rare and, therefore, all the more meaningful, since it appears that Veṅkaṭanātha specifies his sources only where he has a specific interest. And the few precise references all regard Buddhist Pramāṇavāda authors.<sup>59</sup> Further, most real quotes are from Pramāṇavāda texts.

This finding also harmonises with the ample number of discussions of epistemological topics (see above, section 3) among Veṅkaṭanātha's discussions of Buddhist topics. The indication of Veṅkaṭanātha's interest for Pramāṇavāda authors further increases if one considers that the only precise reference to Buddhist authors occurs outside the precinct of epistemological topics (they regard an ontological topic, *dharmadharmibhāva*, and a soteriological one, *mukti*, respectively), but still concern Pramāṇavāda authors.

#### 3.6.1 The problem of availability

More concretely, one might wonder how Veṅkaṭanātha could access these texts, given that the Buddhist community had vanished from South India, and given that I could not trace any indication of the presence of Pramāṇavāda in Tamil Nadu after the seventh century and that even before that, the evidence is scant.<sup>60</sup> This evidence is in fact mainly based on the biographies of some Pramāṇavādins (like Dharmakīrti, who is described by Tibetan historians like Bu ston as having been born in the South, perhaps exactly in Tamil Nadu, see Eltschinger 2007,

59. Veṅkaṭanātha may be thinking of Pramāṇavāda authors in particular while using appellations such as 'Mādhyamika' or 'Yogācāra', e.g., in SS ad TMK 4.33. An explicit reference to Dharmakīrti's school is found in ŚD 65 (Aṇṇāṅgarācārya 1940, 240), where *dharmakīrtiprabhṛti* is opposed to the name of other sources, such as *gauḍapādahariprabhṛti*, *saugatālokāyatikādi* and *cārvāka*.

60. By contrast, there is strong evidence of the presence of Pāli Theravāda Buddhists in Tamil Nadu (see Gunawardana 1979, 262–271 and Kieffer-Pülz 2000, section 5) and also evidence of the presence of Mahāyāna Buddhists (Gunawardana 1979, 271).

25–28)<sup>61</sup> and on the poem *Maṇimēkalai*, in which some have detected the influence of Śaṅkarasvāmin's *Nyāyapraveśa*.<sup>62</sup> To the first point, however, it must be noted that the same historians describe Dharmakīrti as having been born in a Brahmanical family, and as having studied in the North (see again Eltschinger 2007, 26), so that his birth in Tamil Nadu does not tell much about the actual diffusion of Pramāṇavāda in that region. As for the *Maṇimēkalai*, it seems<sup>63</sup> to re-elaborate in its 29th chapter topics which are clearly derived from the *Nyāyapraveśa* (see Dhruva 1987, xiii–xvi). This was a popular manual and has been used also by other authors,<sup>64</sup> so that the fact that the author of the *Maṇimēkalai* knew it does not necessarily imply that they or their audience were particularly familiar with Pramāṇavāda in general.

Even Veṅkaṭanātha's own connection to Kāñcīpuram (he seems to have been born in a suburb of this city and to have received his early education there, see also above, section 2.3), which used to be a Buddhist centre, might not be of major help, since we do not have direct evidence of the presence of an institutionalised Buddhist community in Kāñcīpuram close to Veṅkaṭanātha's time, not to speak of a library (see Schalk and Vēluppiḷai 2002a, sections 4.1.2.4 and 4.1.2.5).

If it is hard to prove that Veṅkaṭanātha still had access to a Buddhist library, and given that Vaiṣṇava libraries focused on non-Buddhist texts,<sup>65</sup> another possibility worth exploring is that he could have accessed to Buddhist manuscripts through a non-Buddhist collection. For instance, the Jaina communities often host ample libraries entailing also non-Jaina texts,<sup>66</sup> and a Jaina community has

61. I wish to express my gratitude to Kiyotaka Yoshimizu for some interesting conversations on Dharmakīrti in South India. Unfortunately, after Xuanzang and Yijing (who were in South Asia in the seventh century), no further Chinese pilgrim came to South India and we therefore lack their accurate historical and geographical descriptions. Tibetan historians were, by contrast, so far away that it is difficult to judge of the exactness of their reports when it comes to South India. I am grateful to Dan Lusthaus for having discussed the reports of Chinese pilgrims with me.

62. On the complex problem of the attribution of the *Nyāyapraveśa*, see Dhruva 1930, xii, where A.B. Dhruva, notwithstanding the title of his edition, attributes the *Nyāyapraveśa* to Śaṅkarasvāmin and, more conclusively, Tucci 1928 and Tucci 1931.

63. Since I do not read Tamil, I rely completely on secondary literature on the *Maṇimēkalai*, especially Monius 2001 – which is silent on the *Nyāyapraveśa* –, Schalk 1997 and Vēluppiḷai 2002, sections 4.1.2.2 and 4.1.2.4.2. On the oddities of the *Maṇimēkalai* treatment of Buddhist logic see also Suryanarayana Sastri 1961, which points to the extraordinary amount of space dedicated to fallacies and to the lack of distinction between *svārtha* and *parārtha anumānas*.

64. 'But if the *Nyāyapraveśa* was not written by Dīnnāga, as has been wrongly assumed, it is quite certain that it expounds theories that must have had, at least for some time, a wide circulation. This is proved by the fact that Yuang Chuang translated it into Chinese, while another great Chinese scholar, to whom we owe some fundamental works of exegesis, upon the most important *sāstras* of the Mahāyāna, viz. K'uei-chi (632–82), commented on it. Moreover, we have some evidence that the theories expounded in the *Nyāyapraveśa* were accepted even by the non-Buddhist philosophical schools. If we take, for instance, the *Mādhara-vṛtti*, see wee that in the commentary on *kārikā* 5 the list of the *ābhāsas* corresponds to that given in the *Nyāyapraveśa* [...], which is strictly peculiar to this book, while it does not occur either in Dīnnāga or in Dharmakīrti' (Tucci 1931, 278).

65. On the texts which should be found in a Vaiṣṇava library according to the *Paṇḍara Saṃhitā* and on a library attached to the temple of Śrī Rāṅganātha Svāmin in Śrīraṅgam, see Madhavan 2013, 137–139. I am grateful to Marion Rastelli for pointing out this reference.

66. Although I could not gain specific information concerning Jaina libraries in Tamil Nadu, some

never disappeared from Tamil Nadu.<sup>67</sup> A last possibility would be that within Veṅkaṭanātha's school Buddhist texts were actually stored, although they had not frequently been read by his predecessors (see also above, section 2.3).

In any case, Veṅkaṭanātha was probably driven by a specific intellectual interest, in order to actively look for Buddhist Pramāṇavāda texts and even find them.

#### 4. Buddhism in South India 1000–1500: a short overview

Although I am not an expert on the history of Buddhism of South India and must therefore rely on other scholars' expertise, it seems clear that:

- Already at the time of the Chinese pilgrim Xuanzang (beginning of the seventh century), Buddhism was declining in Tamil Nadu.<sup>68</sup>
- Buddhism flourished for a longer period in Kāñcī,<sup>69</sup> but this does not appear to have led to the establishment of a centre comparable to Nālandā, and Buddhist thinkers traditionally believed to have originated from this area rather migrated to the North (such as Dharmapāla and Dharmakīrti, about whom also see section 3.6.1) or to China (such as Bodhidharma).
- Chronicles from Śrī Laṅkā testify that even at the time of Vijayabāhu IV (1271–1273) precious gifts were sent to monks in Coḷa and Paṇḍu,<sup>70</sup> so that a community of Theravāda monks must have been present there.<sup>71</sup> However, it seems that these Pāli ācariyas were more in touch with close and far-away Buddhist communities (like the *saṅgha* in Śrī Laṅkā and

---

general information concerning Jaina libraries and collections can be read in Cort 1995. On Jainism in South India, see also Ramaswami Ayyangar and Seshagiri Rao 1922, which contains some scattered information also on the influence of Jainas in Tamil Nadu and on the presence of Jaina books in that area. Emmrich 2011 is a mine on information on the historiography of Jainism in Tamil Nadu and has some remarks on the role of the Jainas as 'educators' of the Tamils in Tamil literary histories (2011, 617–618). Unfortunately, in this connection no libraries are mentioned.

67. The importance, continuance through time and at times the royal support of the Jaina community in Tamil Nadu can be inferred from the many Jaina inscriptions found in this area from approximately the second or first century BCE throughout the twentieth century. Many of these inscriptions mention grants to temples or to individual teachers, although I could not find explicit mentions of libraries and of their possible use by non-Jains. For a discussion of Jaina inscriptions in Tamil Nadu see Guérinot 1908 and especially Joseph 1997, which summarises and discusses the results of several works, like Ekamparanatan and Sivaprakasam 1987 and Desai 1957 (which I could not directly access).
68. Xuanzang claims that there were nonetheless more than one hundred monasteries with circa 10,000 monks (see Kieffer-Pülz 2000, section 5 and Gunawardana 1979, 262), but Schalk argues that this piece of information must derive from hearsay, since Xuanzang did not have the time to actually visit so many monasteries.
69. Kieffer-Pülz refers to 'over 800 Buddha images' in Kāñcīpuram, which are dating from the seventh to the fourteenth century (2000, section 5). Gunawardana refers to a Javanese fourteenth century record about a monk living in Kāñcī 'who wrote a panegyric in praise of the Javanese king Hayam Wuruk' (Gunawardana 1979, 263).
70. See Kieffer-Pülz 2000, section 5. I am grateful to Petra Kieffer-Pülz for her precious assistance concerning Buddhism in South India, including sending me scans of the relevant portions of Gunawardana's book.
71. On the Pāli tradition of Buddhism in Tamil Nadu under the Cōḷas see Schalk and Vēluppiḷai2002b, section 5.1.7.

the one in Burma)<sup>72</sup> than with non-Buddhist Tamils: 'We know that they were also endured in Nākaṭṭiṇam during the Cōḷa period, but they were evidently secluded, because they left no traces in the documents produced by the Cōḷa establishment' (Schalk and Vēluppiḷai 2002b, section 5.1.1).

- Also the harbour for Śrī Laṅkā, Nagapaṭṭiṇam, was a Pāli Theravāda Buddhist centre,<sup>73</sup> and the so-called 'Chinese Pagoda' testifies of the presence of Chinese pilgrims.

Furthermore, perhaps starting from the twelfth century, Buddhism in Tamil Nadu progressively evolved into a syncretism with Śaivism, or a devotionalism focusing on Avalokiteśvara.<sup>74</sup> Gunawardana even speculates that the last Buddhists might have moved to 'more favourable surroundings in nearby countries like Sri Lanka' (Gunawardana 1979, 262). Buddhism's lack of importance in the intellectual arena of Tamil Nadu is also testified to by the fact that Jainas are much more frequently attacked and criticised by Śaiva and Buddhist authors (see Schalk 2013, 33 for an interesting discussion of this aspect).

As for the Vaiṣṇava-Buddhist confrontations which happened before the time of the Vaiṣṇava authors dealt with in the next sections, Schalk notices that:

There was an intensive intra-religious<sup>75</sup> polemic between Śaivas and Vaiṣṇavas, but the inter-religious polemic between Vaiṣṇava āḷvārs and Buddhists never reached the proportions of that between Caiva [Śaiva] nāyaṇmār and Buddhists. The Vaiṣṇava anti-Buddhist written sources are few, but nevertheless sharp and uncompromising in their formulations. (Schalk and Vēluppiḷai 2002b, section 1.3.2)

## 5. A possible interpretation of the data

The above data point to the tentative conclusion that Veṅkaṭanātha had managed to gather an independent knowledge of Pramāṇavāda texts and authors. Why?

There are no political reasons for this, given that Buddhist opponents were no longer a sociological problem. As seen above, section 4, the last trends of Buddhism to disappear from Tamil Nadu were probably not interested in preserving or promoting Pramāṇavāda. Thus, the possibility that Veṅkaṭanātha's engagement with Pramāṇavāda depends on an actual acquaintance with Buddhists or with a living memory of them in the stories of a teacher is extremely faint.

72. On the contacts between the *saṅgha* in Tamil Nadu and in Śrī Laṅkā, see Gornall 2014, 519–525 and Monius 2001, 126. Kieffer-Pülz (2005, especially 175) analyses an eleventh century controversy about the legitimacy of drinking alcohol which shows how the debate between the community in Tamil Nadu and the one in Śrī Laṅkā presupposes the awareness of belonging to the same religious community. Basing his conclusions also on Monius 2001 and Liyanagamage 1978 (the latter of which I could not access), Gornall can thus write: 'Despite this differentiation of the *saṅgha* along regional lines, it is clear that Cōḷa monks interacted heavily with their Sinhala-speaking counterparts' (2014, 520).

73. On Nagapaṭṭiṇam and in general on the presence of Pāli Theravāda Buddhists in South India, see Gunawardana 1979, 262–271.

74. On this syncretism, see Schalk 2011. The last Tamil Buddhist document is in fact an inscription displaying a syncretic form of Buddhism and Śaivism (see Vēluppiḷai 2002, section 5.7) and dated to the thirteenth century.

75. Schalk considers Śaivism and Viṣṇuism as belonging to the same religion. This topic will not be dealt with in the present study.



The reasons for Veṅkaṭanātha's engagement can thus only be intellectual. It appears that Veṅkaṭanātha was curious to know and discuss the views of his Buddhist opponents.<sup>76</sup>

Since no direct reason for engaging with Buddhist opponents could be detected, and other reasons need to be looked for, allow me a final thought: This interest could be connected with the fact that Veṅkaṭanātha had a different agenda from that of Yāmuna and Rāmānuja. In my reconstruction, this different agenda aimed at the construction of an *aikaśāstrya* 'unity of the teaching', encompassing first of all Pūrva and Uttara Mīmāṃsā (see Freschi 2016). Buddhism was not really part of this single *śāstra*, but this attitude still made Veṅkaṭanātha aware of what had been thought also outside his school, since the latter was no longer a closed one. In fact, his school had been identified by Veṅkaṭanātha with God's own *śāstra*, thus potentially encompassing whatever is right. And this entailed also the need to communicate with all other systems.

### Acknowledgements

This article has been discussed in an online session on Academia.edu, and I would like to express my gratitude to its participants, whose suggestions led to several improvements and to further ideas. These are: Jean-Luc Chevillard, Eugen Ciurtin, Whitney Cox, Alastair Gornall, Petra Kieffer-Pülz, Shaji George Kochuthara, Marco Lauri, Dan Lusthaus, Elena Mucciarelli and Péter Dániel Szántó. I am also thankful to Kiyotaka Yoshimizu, Lawrence McCrea, Cristina Pecchia and Shoryu Katsura for discussing specific elements of this article with me, and to Vincent Eltschinger for his careful reading of an earlier draft and suggesting the shift of a section. Last, I am grateful to Hugo David for a further careful reading of the article and for his useful suggestions and to Peter Harvey for further useful remarks and corrections. Research for this article has been financed within the FWF M-1437 and FWF V-400 projects.

### Abbreviations

ĀP	Yāmuna's <i>Āgamapramāṇya</i>
ĀSi	Yāmuna's <i>Ātmasiddhi</i>
Br	Prabhākara's <i>Brhatī</i>
BrSūBh	Śaṅkara's <i>Brahmasūtrabhāṣya</i>
KKKh	Śrīharṣa's <i>Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā</i> , see Panta and Vaijāpurakara 1961–62 and Jhā 1970
NK	Vācaspati's <i>Nyāyakaṇikā</i> on Maṇḍana's <i>Vidhiviveka</i> , see Gosvāmī 1978
NKu	<i>Nyāyakulīśa</i> , see Ramanujachari and Srinivasacharya 1938
NM	Bhaṭṭa Jayanta's <i>Nyāyamañjarī</i> , see Varadācārya 1969, 1983
NSA	Veṅkaṭanātha's <i>Nyāyasiddhāñjana</i> , see Vīrarāghavācārya 1976
PMBh	Veṅkaṭanātha's <i>Paramatabhaṅga</i> , see Srinivasa Chari 2011

76. I am grateful to Marco Lauri, who pointed out that a similar, purely intellectual interest was present also within discussions of Arabic grammar, where grammarians discussed theories whose exponents were no longer active, just for the intrinsic interest of their views.



PV	Dharmakīrti's <i>Pramāṇavārttika</i> , see Gnoli 1960 for the <i>svārthānumāna</i> chapter
PVĀ	Prajñākara Gupta's <i>Pramāṇavārttikālaṅkāra</i> on PV, see Sāṅkṛtyāyana 1953
PVin	Dharmakīrti's <i>Pramāṇaviniścaya</i> , see Steinkellner 2007
ŚD	Veṅkaṭanātha's <i>Śatadūṣaṇī</i> , see Aṇṇaṅgarācārya 1940
SK	<i>Sāṅkhyakārikā</i>
SM	Veṅkaṭanātha's <i>Seśvaramīmāṃsā</i> , see Viraraghavacharya and Nainaracarya 1971
ŚrīBh	Rāmānuja's <i>ŚrīBhāṣya</i>
SS	Veṅkaṭanātha's <i>Sarvārthasiddhi</i> on the TMK, see Aṇṇaṅgarācārya 1941
SSi	Yāmuna's <i>Samvitsiddhi</i>
ŚV	Kumārila's <i>Ślokavārttika</i> , see Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī 1926-9
TMK	Veṅkaṭanātha's <i>Tattvamuktākālāpa</i> , see Aṇṇaṅgarācārya 1941
YS	<i>Yogasūtra</i>

## Bibliography

- Anandacharlu Vidyāvinod, Viśārada, ed. 1903. *Śatadūṣaṇī* [by Vedānta Deśika] with the commentary entitled *Caṇḍamāruta* by Śrīman-Mahācārya. Calcutta: Asiatic Society, Baptist Mission Press.
- Aṇṇaṅgarācārya, Prativādi Bhayaṅkara, ed. 1941. *Tattvamuktākālāpaḥ Sarvārthasiddhisamavetaḥ* [both by Veṅkaṭanātha]. Śrīmadvedāntadeśikagranthamālā Vedāntavibhāga 3. Madras: Libartī mudranālaya.
- Aṇṇaṅgarācārya, Prativādi Bhayaṅkara, ed. 1940. *Śatadūṣaṇī* [by Veṅkaṭanātha]. Śrīmadvedāntadeśikagranthamālā. Kañcivaram.
- Cort, John E. 1995. 'The Jain knowledge warehouses: Traditional libraries in India'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 115(1): 77–87. <https://doi.org/10.2307/605310>
- Dasgupta, Surendranath. 1940. *A History of Indian Philosophy*. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Desai, Pandurang Bhimarao. 1957. *Jainism in South India and some Jaina epigraphs*. Sholapur: Jaina Samskṛti Samrakshaka Sangha.
- Dhruva, Anandshankar Bapubhai, ed. 1987. *Nyāyapraveśa of Diṇnāga. With Commentaries of Haribhadra Sūri and Pārsavadeva. Critically Edited with Notes and Introduction*. 2nd (1st Baroda 1930). Bibliotheca Indo Buddhica 41. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.
- Ekamparanatan, E. and C. K. Sivaprakasam. 1987. *Jaina inscriptions in Tamilnadu: a topographical list*. Madras: Research Foundation for Jainology.
- Eltschinger, Vincent. 2005. 'Études sur la philosophie de Dharmakīrti (II). *L'āśrayaparivṛtti*'. *Journal Asiatique* 293(1): 151–211.
- . 2007. *Penser l'Autorité des Ecritures. La polémique de Dharmakīrti contre la notion brahmanique orthodoxe d'un Veda sans auteur. Autour de Pramāṇavārttika I.213-268 et Svavṛtti*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Emmrich, Christoph. 2011. 'The ins and outs of the Jains in Tamil literary history'. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 39: 599–646.
- Franco, Eli. 1997. *Dharmakīrti on Compassion and Rebirth*. Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.

- Frauwallner, Erich. 1932. 'Beiträge zur Apohalehre. I Dharmakīrti. Übersetzung'. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 39: 247–285 (repr. Frauwallner 1982, 367–405).
- . 1982. *Kleine Schriften*. Edited by Gerhard Oberhammer and Ernst Steinkellner. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Freschi, Elisa. 2015a. 'Quotations, References, etc. A glance on the writing habits of a late Mīmāṃsaka'. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 43(2–3): 219–255.
- . 2015b. 'The reuse of texts in Indian Philosophy. Introduction'. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 43(2–3): 85–108.
- . 2016. 'Veṅkaṭanātha'. In *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy – Indian Philosophy*. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/>.
- . 2017. 'Reusing, adapting, distorting? Veṅkaṭanātha's reuse of Rāmānuja, Yāmuna and the Vṛttikāra in his commentary ad PMS 1.1.1'. In *Adaptive Reuse of Texts, Ideas and Images in Classical India*, edited by Elisa Freschi and Philipp A. Maas. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Gnoli, Raniero, ed. 1960. *The Pramāṇavārttikam [of Dharmakīrti]: the first chapter with the autocommentary*. Roma: Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Gornall, Alastair. 2014. 'How many sounds are in Pāli? Schism, identity and ritual in the Theravāda saṅgha'. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 42(5): 511–550. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-014-9221-z>
- Gosvāmī, Mahāprabhuḷāla, ed. 1978. *Vidhiviveka of Śrī Maṇḍana Mīśra with the commentary Nyāyakaṇikā of Vācaspati Mīśra*. Vārāṇasī: Tara Publications.
- Guérinot, A. 1908. *Répertoire d'Épigraphie Jaina. Précédé d'une Esquisse de l'Histoire du Jainisme d'après les Inscriptions*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Gunawardana, R.A.L.H. 1979. *Robe and Plough. Monasticism and Economic Interest in Early Medieval Sri Lanka*. The Association of Asian Studies: Monographs and Papers 35. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Jetly, J.S. and Vasant G. Parikh, eds. 1991. *Nyāyakandalī being a commentary on Praśastapādabhāṣya, with three sub-commentaries*. Varodara: Oriental Institute.
- Jhā, Navikanta, ed. 1970. *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhāḍya [of Śrīharṣa] with Śāṅkarī [commentary] by Śāṅkara Mīśra and Tattvabodhinī [Hindī commentary] by Svāmī Hanumānasasī Śaṭṣāstrī*. Kāśī Saṃskṛta Granthamālā 197. Vārāṇasī: Chowkhamba.
- Joseph, P.M. 1997. *Jainism in South India*. Thiruvananthapuram: The International School of Dravidian Linguistics.
- Kataoka, Kei. 2003. 'Critical edition of the Vijñānādvaitavāda section of Bhaṭṭa Jayanta's Nyāyamañjarī'. *The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture* 144: 318(115)–278(155).
- Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. 2000. 'Die buddhistische Gemeinde'. In *Der Buddhismus I. Der indische Buddhismus und seine Verzweigungen*. Edited by Heinz Bechert, Chap. II.3, 281–402. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- . 2005. 'Die Klassifizierung des Alkoholverbots in der buddhistischen Rechtsliteratur der Theravādin'. In *Dickicht der Gebote. Studien zur Dialektik von Norm und Praxis in der Buddhismusgeschichte Asiens*. Edited by Peter Schalk (editor-in chief) et al., 153–223. Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- Liyanagamage, A. 1978. 'A forgotten aspect of the relations between the Sinhalese and the Tamils: The Upasakajanalankara. A re-examination of its date and authorship and its significance in the history of South India and Ceylon'. *The Ceylon Historical Journal* 25(1–4): 95–142.
- Madhavan, Chithra. 2013. *Sanskrit education and literature in ancient and medieval Tamil Nadu. An epigraphical study*. New Delhi: D.K. Agencies.

- Mikami, Toshihiro (n.y.). 'Nyāyasiddhānjana of Vedānta Deśika. An annotated translation'. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Tokyo. Available through the website of the University of Tokyo as pdf.
- Monius, Anne E. 2001. *Imagining a Place for Buddhism. Literary Culture and Religious Community in Tamil-Speaking South India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moriyama, Shinya. 2014. *Omniscience and Religious Authority: A Study on Prajñākaragupta's Pramāṇavārttikālaṅkārahāṣya ad Pramāṇavārttika II 8–10 and 29–33*. Berlin and Zürich: LIT.
- Neevel, Walter G. Jr. 1977. *Yāmuna's Vedānta and Pāñcarātra: Integrating the Classical and the Popular*. Harvard Dissertations in Religion. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.
- Oberhammer, Gerhard. 1997. *Materialien zur Geschichte der Rāmānuja-Schule III. Yādavaprakāśa, der vergessene Lehrer Rāmānujas*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Oetke, Claus. 1993. *Bemerkungen zur buddhistischen Doktrin der Momentanheit des Seienden: Dharmakīrtis Sattvānumāna*. Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.
- Panta, Śrīkṛṣṇa and Govinda Narahari Vaijāpurakara, eds. 1961–62. *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhāḍya Kavītārīkacūḍāmaṇi-Śrīharṣapraṇītaṃ svargīyapaṇḍita Śrī Caṇḍīprasādasukula-viracita Bhāṣā[Hindī]anuvādayutam. Acyutagrānthamālā, kha vibhāga 1. Kāśī: Acyutagrānthamālākāryālaya*.
- Pecchia, Cristina. 2015. *Dharmakīrti on the cessation of suffering*. Leiden: Brill.
- Pind, Ole Holten. 2009. 'Dignāga's philosophy of language. Dignāga on *anyāpoha*. *Pramāṇasamuccaya* V. Texts, Translation, and Annotation'. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Vienna. url: othes.univie.ac.at/8283/1/ 2009-12-03\_0507516.pdf.
- Prets, Ernst. 1999. 'Dharmakīrti's refutation of Kevālānvayin and Kevālavyatirekin reasons in the light of the Naiyāyikas' View'. In *Dharmakīrti's Thought and Its Impact on Indian and Tibetan Philosophy. Proceedings of the Third International Dharmakīrti Conference. Hiroshima, November 4–6, 1997*. Edited by Shoryu Katsura, 333–340. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Raghavachar, S.S., ed. 1978. *Vedārtha-Saṅgraha of Śrī Rāmānujācārya*. [Sanskrit Text and] *English Translation*. Mysore: Sri Ramakrishna Ashrama.
- Ramanujachari, R. and K. Srinivasacharya, eds. 1938. *Nyāyakulīśa or The Lightning-Shaft of Reason by Ātreya Rāmānuja*. Edited with Introduction and Notes. Annamalai University Philosophy Series 1.
- Ramaswami Ayyangar, M. S. and B. Seshagiri Rao. 1922. *Studies in South Indian Jainism*. Madras: Hoe.
- Sakai, Masamichi. 2010. 'Dharmottaras Erklärung von Dharmakīrtis *kṣaṇikatvānumāna: Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā* zu *Pramāṇaviniścaya* 2 vv. 53–55 mit Prosa'. Unpublished PhD thesis, Vienna: University of Vienna. url: http://othes.univie.ac.at/9623/.
- . 2013. 'A study of Dharmottara's theory of Momentariness: The problem of the inferential reason – existence (*sattva*) – in the *Sattvānumāna* (in Japanese)'. *Indotetsugaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 20(3): 77–93.
- Sāmbaśiva Śāstri, K., ed. 1926–9. *The Mīmāṃsāślokaivārttikam with the commentary Kāśikā* [by Sucarita Mīśra]. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series XC and XCIX. Trivandrum.
- Samghavī, Sukhalāla and Becaradāsa Doṣī, eds. 1980–1985 (saṃvat) [=1924–1931]. *Ācārya Śrī Siddhasena Divākaraṇītaṃ Saṃmatī-tarkaparakaraṇam [...] śrīmad Abhayadevasūrinirmitayā Tattvabodhavidhāyinyā vyākhyayā vibhūṣitam*. Gujarāta Vidyāpīṭha. Amadāvāda [=Ahmedabad]: Gujarātapurātattvamandira.

- Sāṅkṛtyāyana, Rāhula, ed. 1953. *Pramāṇavārttikabhāṣyam or Vārtikālaṅkāraḥ of Prajñākaragupta (Being a Commentary on Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārtikam)*. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Schalk, Peter, ed. 1997. *A Buddhist woman's path to enlightenment: proceedings of a workshop on the Tamil narrative Manimekalai*, Uppsala University, May 25-29, 1995. Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- . 2011. 'Canon rejected. The case of Pauttam among Tamils in pre-colonial Tamilakam and Īlam'. In *Kanonisierung und Kanonbildung in der asiatischen Religionsgeschichte*, edited by Max Deeg, Oliver Freiberger, and Christoph Kleine, 233-257. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- . 2013. 'Buddhism among Tamils. An introduction'. In *Buddhism among Tamils. Part 3. Extension and Conclusion*, edited by Peter Schalk (editor-in chief) and Astrid Van Nahl, 21-57. Uppsala: Uppsala University Library.
- Schalk, Peter (editor-in-chief) and Ālvāppillai Vēluppillai (co editor), eds. 2002a. *Buddhism among Tamils in Pre-Colonial Tamilakam and Īlam. Part 1. Prologue. The Pre-Pallava and the Pallava Period*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum 19. Uppsala: Uppsala University Library.
- Schalk, Peter (editor-in-chief) and Ālvāppillai Vēluppillai (co editor), eds. 2002b. *Buddhism among Tamils in Pre-Colonial Tamilakam and Īlam. Part 2. The Period of the Imperial Cōlar. Tamilakam and Īlam*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum 20. Uppsala University Library.
- Schmücker, Marcus. Forthcoming. *Die Bedeutung der Zeit (kāla) als Substanz (dravya) in der Gotteslehre Veṅkaṭanāthas*.
- Shastri, Madhusudan Kaul, ed. 1926. *The Nareśvaraparikṣā of Sadyojyotiḥ, with commentary by Rāmakaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa*. The Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies XLV. Srinagar: Kashmir Pratap Steam Press.
- Srinivasa Chari, S.M. 1961. *Advaita and Viśiṣṭādvaita; a study based on Vedānta Deśika's Śatadūṣaṇī*. London and Madras: Asia Publishing House.
- . 2011. *Indian Philosophical Systems: a critical review based on Vedānta Deśika's Paramatambhaṅga*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Srinivasachar, D. and S. Narasimhachar, eds. 1933. *Tattvamuktākālāpa and Sarvārthasiddhi [both by Veṅkaṭanātha] with the Ānandāyini [by Nṛsiṃhadeva] and the Bhāvaprakāśa [by Abhinava Raṅganātha Brahmatantra Parakālamahādeśika]*. Vol. I. Mysore: Government Branch Press.
- Stcherbatsky, Fedor Ippolitovich. 1993. *Buddhist Logic*. 3rd (1st Leningrad 1930). Vol. I. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Steinkellner, Ernst. 1967. *Dharmakīrti's Hetubinduḥ. Teil II. Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Hermann Böhlau Nachf.
- . 1968-1969. 'Die Entwicklung des Kṣaṇikatvānumānam bei Dharmakīrti'. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ost-Asiens* 12-13: 361-377.
- . 1979. *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścayaḥ. Zweites Kapitel: Svārthānumānam. Teil II. Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- . 1988. 'Methodological remarks on the constitution of Sanskrit texts from the Buddhist Pramāṇa-Tradition'. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 32: 103-129.
- . ed. 2007. *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścaya. Chapters 1 and 2. Critically edited*. Beijing and Vienna: China Tibetology Publishing House and Austrian Academy of Sciences.

- . 2013a. *Dharmakīrtis frühe Logik. Annotierte Übersetzung der logischen Teile von Pramāṇavārttika 1 mit der Vṛtti I. Introduction, Übersetzung, Analyse.* Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series XXIXa. The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- . 2013b. *Dharmakīrtis frühe Logik. Annotierte Übersetzung der logischen Teile von Pramāṇavārttika 1 mit der Vṛtti II. Introduction, Anmerkungen, Anhänge etc.* Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series XXIXb. The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Śukla, Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla, ed. 1999. *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhāḍya of Śrīharṣa with five commentaries.* Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 82. Varanasi.
- Suryanarayana Sastri, S.S. 1961. 'Buddhist logic in the Mañimēkalai'. In *Collected Papers of Professor S.S. Suryanarayana Sastri*, edited by T.M.P. Mahadevan, chap. 38, 357–362. 2nd (1st 1930 JIH IX.3, 330–336). Madras: University of Madras.
- Thakur, Anantalal, ed. 1987. *Jñānaśrīmitranibandhāvali.* Vol. V. Tibetan Sanskrit Work Series. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Trikha, Himal. 2012. *Perspektivismus und Kritik. Der epistemische Pluralismus der Jainas angesichts der Polemik gegen das Vaiśeṣika in Vidyānandins Satyaśāsanaparīkṣā.* De Nobili Research Library 36. Wien: De Nobili.
- Tucci, Giuseppe. 1928. 'Is the Nyāyapraveśa by Dinnāga?' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 60(1): 7–13.
- . 1931. 'Notes on the Nyāyapraveśa by Śaṅkarasvāmin'. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 63(2): 381–413.
- Vaidya, Parashuram Lakshman, ed. 1960. *Bodhicaryāvatāra of Śāntideva with the Commentary Pañjikā of Prajñākaramati.* Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 12. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.
- Varadācārya, K. S., ed. 1969, 1983. *Nyāyamaijārī of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa with Ṭippaṇi—Nyāyasaurabha by the Editor.* Vol. 2. Mysore: Oriental Research Institute.
- Vēluppillai, Ālvāppillai. 2002. 'The significance of a damaged Tamil Pautta inscription from Tiruccōpuram of the thirteenth century'. In *Buddhism among Tamils in Pre-Colonial Tamilakam and Īlam. Part 2. The Period of the Imperial Cōlar. Tamilakam and Īlam*, edited by Peter Schalk and Ālvāppillai Vēluppillai, chap. 5.7, 662–666. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum 20. Uppsala: Uppsala University Library.
- Vetter, Tilmann. 1966. *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścayaḥ. 1. Kapitel: Pratyakṣam. Einleitung, Text der Tibetischen Übersetzung, Sanskritfragmente, deutsche Übersetzung.* Wien: Hermann Böhlaus Nachf.
- . 1990. *Der Buddha und seine Lehre in Dharmakīrtis Pramāṇavārttika. Der Abschnitt über den Buddha und die vier edlen Wahrheiten im Pramāṇasiddhi-Kapitel. Eingeleitet, ediert und übersetzt.* 2nd. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 12. Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.
- Vīrarāghavācārya, Uttamūr T., ed. 1973. *Srimad Vedānta Deśika's Tattva Mukta Kalapa and Sarvartha Siddhi with Sanskrit Commentaries* [by Śrīnivāsācārya and Varadarāmānujārya]. Ubhayavedāntagranthamālā. Śrīnilaya.
- . ed. 1976. *Nyāya Siddhāṅjana by Vedānta Deśika with two old commentaries* [Saraḷaviśadavyākhyā by Śrīraṅgarāmānujaśvāmi and Ratnapetīkā by Śrīkāñcī Kṛṣṇatātayārya, including a Ṭippaṇa by the editor]. Ubhayavedāntagranthamālā. [Madras].
- Virarāghavacharya, Uttamur T. and Nainaracarya, eds. 1971. *Seśvaramīmāṃsā-Mīmāṃsāpaduka, Seswara Mimamsa and Mimamsapaduka* [by Veṅkaṭanātha]. Madras: Ubhaya Vedanta Granthamala.

- Willemen, Charles, Bart Dessein and Collett Cox. 1989. *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism*. Handbuch der Orientalistik. Zweite Abteilung, Indien 11. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill.
- Yogīndrānanda, ed. 1968. *Śrīmad ācārya Bhāsarvajñapraṇītasya Nyāyasārasya svopajñam vyākhyānam Nyāyabhūṣaṇam. ṣaḍdarśanaprakāśanagranthamālā* 1. Vārāṇasī: ṣaḍdarśanaprakāśana pratiṣṭhānam.
- Yoshimizu, Chizuko. 1999. 'The development of sattvānumāna from the refutation of a permanent existent in the Sautrāntika tradition'. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 43: 231–254.