Ignorance, epistemology and soteriology[1]
Part II

Vincent Eltschinger

For Jacques May

The first part of this essay (Eltschinger 2009) concentrated on the basic features and likely sources of Dharmakīrti's understanding of ignorance (*avidyā*). Against the Vaibhāṣikas, but with Vasubandhu the Kośakāra, Dharmakīrti defines *ig*norance as a "*counter-*" or "*anti-*knowledge," i.e., as a *cognition* that counteracts true (perceptual) knowledge (*vidyā*) by displaying contrary/erroneous object-supports and aspects (*viparītālambanākāra*). According to him, ignorance amounts to pseudo-perception (*pratyakṣābhāsa*), hence conceptual construction (*vikalpa*), superimposition (*samāropa*) and concealment (*saṃvṛti*). The core of Dharmakīrti's philosophy, the so-called *apoha* theory, provides an exhaustive picture of both ignorance as conceptuality and inference as a corrective (though conceptual) principle. This conception of ignorance, however, fails to account for the most dramatic form of the Buddhist ignorance, viz. its being responsible for defilements, rebirth and suffering. In

order to account for this eschatologically valued form of ignorance, Dharmakīrti equates *avidyā* with the personalistic false view (*satkāyadṛṣṭi*). Consistently enough, ignorance as *satkāyadṛṣṭi* is but a specialization or instantiation of ignorance as conceptuality insofar as the *satkāyadṛṣṭi* exhausts itself in one's superimposing such conceptual constructs as "self/I" (*ātman*, *aham*) and "one's own/mine" (*ātmīya*, *mama*) on reality. Both Dharmakīrti and his commentators evolved exegetical strategies in order to argue for the orthodoxy of this equation of ignorance with a false view (*dṛṣṭi*), which Vasubandhu clearly refuses in the *Abhidharmakośa* (but not in his commentary on the *Pratītyasamutpādasūtra*). As for the sources of Dharmakīrti's conception, they are very likely to consist of the *Pratītyasamutpādasūtra* and its numerous "idealistic" interpretations (*Yogācārabhūmi*, Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyā*). In the second part of this essay, I shall first inquire into Dharmakīrti's account of dependent origination (*pratītyasamutpāda*), viz. his interpretation of ignorance as the origin of defilements (craving, etc.), clinging and rebirth. I shall then turn to the philosophical core of this study by attempting to show how Dharmakīrti's views on ignorance and the two truths/realities provide the basic framework of his epistemological theory. This is tantamount to claiming that Dharmakīrti's epistemology, in locating ignorance and defining the cognitive means of opposing it and entering the path toward salvation, is Buddhistic in both its inspiration and its finality. As a consequence, his philosophy should cease to be regarded as a dry academic endeavour deviating from the spirit of Buddhism as a salvation system.

2.1. Dependent origination

2.1.1. In his account of the future Buddha's philosophical reflections on the eve of his career, Dharmakīrti presents the cause of suffering (*duḥkhahetu*) in the following way: "The cause [of suffering, i.e., of rebirth,] is attachment bearing upon the conditioning factors, [an attachment that is] due to the belief in self and one's own."[2]

---

[2] PV 2.135ac$_1$: *ātmātmīyagrahakṛtaḥ snehaḥ saṃskāragocaraḥ / hetuḥ* … *sneha = tṛṣṇā* according to PVP D56a7/P64a4 and PVṬ D117b3–4/P143b7;

According to Devendrabuddhi, craving proceeds from one's adhering to the painful conditioned factors that are intrinsically free from self and one's own, under the aspects of self and one's own.[3] This is tantamount to saying that defilements such as craving only occur once unreal aspects have been superimposed on *dharma*s, specifically on the five constituents one clings to, which lack these aspects entirely. While commenting on another passage, Devendrabuddhi claims that defilements such as desire (another equivalent for attachment and craving) proceed from one's superimposing aspects such as permanent, pleasurable, self and one's own on the impermanent, painful, selfless and empty constituents.[4] One may adduce here a huge number of passages presenting one and the same idea: The personalistic belief is responsible for one's superimposing contrary aspects such as self and one's own on the selfless and empty constituents.[5] As Dharmakīrti himself has it, "desire [arises] from the superimposition of another [i.e., unreal] nature on something (*dharma*) that does not have this nature."[6] PV 2.270 provides us with Dharmakīrti's most significant statement as to how craving takes place once unreal aspects have been as-

---

Śākyabuddhi (PVṬ D117b4/P143b7–8) unambiguously explains *gocara* as *viṣaya*.

[3] PVP D56b1/P64a5–6: *sdug bsṅal du gyur pa'i 'dus byas bdag daṅ bdag gi daṅ bral ba la bdag daṅ bdag gi'i rnam par mṅon par źen pas 'jug pa źes bya ba'i don to //.*

[4] PVP D60b2–3/P69a4–5: *mi rtag pa daṅ sdug bsṅal ba daṅ stoṅ pa daṅ bdag med pa'i phuṅ po rnams la rtag pa daṅ bde ba daṅ bdag daṅ bdag gir sgro btags nas 'jug pa 'dod chags la sogs pa de dag …*

[5] E.g., PVP D88a4–5/P101b4: *ñe bar len pa'i phuṅ po lṅa la gaṅ rtag pa daṅ bde ba daṅ bdag daṅ bdag gi rnam pa yod pa ma yin no //.* PVP D88a6/P101b5–6: *ñe bar len pa'i phuṅ po lṅa la rtag pa la sogs pa'i rnam par 'dzin pa'i śes pa yaṅ rnam pa med pa 'dzin pa can yin no //.*

[6] PV 2.196ab: *ātmāntarasamāropād rāgo dharme 'tadātmake /.* Devendrabuddhi explains (PVP D84a7–b1/P97a1–2): *'dod chags la sogs pa'i raṅ bźin du yaṅ 'gyur ba ma yin te / 'di ltar de bdag med can te / rtag pa daṅ bde ba daṅ bdag daṅ bdag gi daṅ bral ba'i yul du gyur pa'o // chos la ste phuṅ po la sogs pa'i raṅ gi ṅo bo la'o // bdag gźan sgro btags phyir te rtag pa daṅ bde ba daṅ bdag daṅ bdag gi'i raṅ bźin gźan du sgro btags pa'i rgyu'i phyir mṅon par źen pa'i mtshan ñid kyi chags pa skye bar 'gyur ro //.*

cribed to reality: "Having[, due to ignorance,][7] superimposed six-
teen unreal aspects, viz. 'lasting,' 'pleasant,' 'mine,' 'I,' etc., on the
four [Nobles'] Truths,[8] one experiences craving [for superimposed
objects such as delight, etc.]."[9] According to Devendrabuddhi and

---

[7] PVP D116a1/P134b2: *sgro btags nas ni mi śes pa'i phyir* …

[8] At least according to the Vaibhāṣikas, each of the four Nobles' Truths
is to be successively contemplated under four different aspects: the Truth of
suffering under the aspects "impermanent," "painful," "empty" and "self-
less;" the Truth of origin under the aspects of "(distant/material) cause" (as
a seed), "arising," "(serial) causation" and "(joint) condition;" the Truth of
extinction, under the aspects of "extinction," "calm," "excellent" and "salva-
tion;" the Truth of the path under the aspects of "path," "fitness," "access"
and "conducive to release" (AKBh 343,16–19 on AK 6.17c$_1$: *duḥkhaṃ catur-
bhir ākāraiḥ paśyaty anityato duḥkhataḥ śūnyato 'nātmataś ca / samudayaṃ
caturbhir hetutaḥ samudayataḥ prabhavataḥ pratyayataś ca / nirodhaṃ
caturbhir nirodhataḥ śāntataḥ praṇītato niḥsaraṇataś ca / mārgaṃ catur-
bhir mārgato nyāyataḥ pratipattito nairyāṇikataś ca /*. The sixteen aspects
are listed at PVP D62a3–7/P71a1–6). The AKBh records a lengthy discus-
sion pertaining to four different ways of interpreting these sixteen aspects
(see AKBh 400,1–401,17 on AK 7.13a, *Kośa* 7.30–39, Pruden 1988–1990:
IV.1110–1116). According to the fourth exegetical pattern, each of these as-
pects aims at counteracting (*pratipakṣa*) a particular false view (*dṛṣṭi*): The
aspects *anitya*, *duḥkha*, *śūnya* and *anātman* counteract the false views of
permanence, pleasurableness, one's own, and self; the aspects of *hetu*, *samu-
daya*, *prabhava* and *pratyaya* contradict the false views of the absence of
a cause, of a unique cause such as God or primordial matter (according to
AKVy 628,30–31), of an evolution of being, and of an intelligent creation;
the aspects *nirodha*, *śānta*, *praṇīta* and *niḥsaraṇa* oppose the false views that
release does not exist, that release is painful, that the bliss of *dhyāna*s is the
most excellent, and that liberation, because it is subject to falling again and
again, is not definitive; as for the aspects *mārga*, *nyāya*, *pratipad* and *nair-
yāṇika*, they respectively counteract the false views that there is no path, that
this is a wrong path, that there is another path, and that the path is subject
to retrogression; see AKBh 401,11–17, *Kośa* 7.38–39, Pruden 1988–1990:
IV.1115–1116. The explanations provided by Dharmakīrti's commentators
are too few to allow us to determine which interpretation, if any, they fa-
voured. Devendrabuddhi and Śākyabuddhi content themselves with listing
the four aspects superimposed on each of the last three Truths (see PVP
D115b6–7/P134a8–b2 and PVṬ D147b3–5/P182a8–b2). On the sixteen as-
pects, see Wayman 1980.

[9] PV 2.270: *sthiraṃ sukhaṃ mamāhaṃ cetyādi satyacatuṣṭaye / abhūtān
ṣoḍaśākārān āropya paritṛṣyati //*. Note PVṬ D147b5–7/P182b2–4: *sgro*

Śākyabuddhi, ignorance,[10] i.e., the false view of self, has one grasp aspects that are contrary to the real ones, i.e., superimpose an "I" on what is selfless and a "mine" on what is empty. But ignorance is also responsible for deluded persons taking momentary things to be lasting (*sthira*) or even unchangeably permanent (*kūṭasthanitya*),[11] or holding intrinsically painful things to be pleasurable, i.e., not to be under the sway of cankers (*sāsrava*) or dependent on causes (*hetuparatantra*) in each of their successive phases (*pratikṣaṇam*).[12]

2.1.2. According to Dharmakīrti and his commentators, the personalistic false view is the (principal) cause (*nidāna*), the origin (*yoni*,

---

btags nas ni yoṅs su sred ces bya ba'i tshig gis log par sgro 'dogs pa sṅon du soṅ ba can gyi sred pa ñid gsal bar bstan pa yin no // sgro 'dogs pa'i yul la 'jug pa'i sred pa de yaṅ sgro 'dogs pa'i rnam pa ñid yin la / sgro 'dogs pa'i rnam pa can gyi yul can gyi ñon moṅs pa daṅ ñe ba'i ñon moṅs pa thams cad ñid ma rig pa ñid yin pa … "And with the *pāda* (= PV 2.270d) *āropya paritṛṣyati*, [Dharmakīrti] clearly indicates craving, which presupposes erroneous superimposition. As for this craving, directed [as it is] to an object of superimposition, it also has the aspect of superimposition, and all the *kleśa*s and *upakleśa*s, which bear on an aspect of superimposition, are [nothing] but ignorance …"

[10] PVP D115b3–4/P134a4: *ma rig pa des kyaṅ sdug bsṅal la rtag pa źes bya ba'i rnam par 'dzin par byed do //*. PVP D115b6/P134a7–8: *re źig de ltar sdug bsṅal gyi bden pa la mi śes pa mi rtag pa la sogs pa'i rnam pa las phyin ci log tu sgro 'dogs pa yin no //*. See also PVṬ D147a1–2/P181b3–5.

[11] According to Devendrabuddhi, all that is produced and lasts more than one moment is permanent (PVP D115b4/P134a5–6: *skad cig ma las dus phyis gnas pa'i ṅaṅ tshul can du skyes pa thams cad rtag pa ñid do //*. To be compared with Vibh. 102 n. 1: *nityam iti vācye kṣaṇāt paraṃ sthāyī sarvo nitya ity arthaḥ /*). According to Śākyabuddhi, all that is either unchangeably permanent or lasts for at least a second moment is permanent (PVṬ D147a6–7/P182a2–3: *ther zug tu gnas pa'i rtag pa gaṅ yin pa daṅ skad cig ma gñis pa la sogs par gnas pa'i ṅaṅ tshul can dus gźan du gnas pa can gaṅ yin pa de thams cad ni 'dir rtag par 'dod pa yin gyi ther zug tu gnas pa ñid ni ma yin no źes de bstan par 'gyur ro //*).

[12] According to PVP D115b5/P134a6: *bde ba źes bya ba'i zag pa daṅ bcas pa ma yin pa'am skad cig ma re re la rgyu'i gźan gyi dbaṅ la[s] phyin ci log tu btags pa'o //*. *duḥkha*(*bhūta*) is regularly explained as *sāsrava* in PVP; see, e.g., PVP D57b7/P66a1 and PVP D58a3/P66a5.

prabhava), or the root (*mūla*)¹³ of all (kinds of) moral faults (*doṣa*), defilements (*kleśa*, *upakleśa*) or moral impurities (*mala*).¹⁴ Among the expressions denoting the fact that defilements such as desire originate from the false view of self, one also meets with "cause" (*kāraṇa*, alone or with preceding *utpatti°*, *pradhāna°*; *hetu*),¹⁵ "arising" (*jāti*, *utpatti*)¹⁶ and suffixal elements such as °*pūrvaka*, °*maya*,¹⁷ °*hetuka*, °*ja*, °*mūla*, or °*kṛta*. Defilements originate from the personalistic false view (*satkāyadarśanaja*, *'jig tshogs su lta ba'i raṅ bźin*), are (causally) preceded/accompanied by the false view of self or by the adherence to self and one's own (*bdag tu lta ba sṅon du soṅ ba can*, *ātmātmīyābhiniveśapūrvaka*), arise from the false view of self (*bdag tu lta ba las byuṅ ba*), or have ignorance for their cause (*avidyāhetuka*).¹⁸ They are all based on the beliefs in "I" and "mine" (*ṅar 'dzin pa daṅ ṅa yir 'dzin pa dag la gnas pa*) and arise in dependence on a mind that complies with the false view of self and one's own (*bdag daṅ bdag gir lta ba'i rjes su 'brel ba'i sems la ltos nas … 'gyur ba*).¹⁹

2.1.3. As we have seen, the belief in self and one's own is the cause of suffering, i.e., attachment bearing on the conditioning factors. In other words, ignorance is the cause of craving (*tṛṣṇā*), which

---

¹³ Respectively PV 1.223ab (*nidāna* gl. *pradhānakāraṇa* PVSVṬ 402,23–24), PV 2.211a, PVSV 111,11, PV 2.197ab₁ (*mūla* gl. *daṅ po'i rten* PVP D84b2/P97a4), PV 2.212c.

¹⁴ E.g., PV 2.197a (*doṣa*), PV 1.222a (*sarvāsāṃ doṣajātīnām*), PV 2.214d₁ (*sarvadoṣa*), PVSVṬ 401,24–25 and PVP D91a2/P105a5 ([*sarva*]*kleśa*), PVP D60a2–3/P68b4 (*ñon moṅs pa daṅ ñe ba'i ñon moṅs*), PV 2.212c (*malāḥ sarve*). On *upakleśa*, see also PVṬ D133a4–5/P164a4.

¹⁵ E.g., PVSVṬ 50,28 (*kāraṇa*), PVSVṬ 401,29 and PVP D91a2/P105a5 (*utpattikāraṇa*), PVSVṬ 402,23–24 (*pradhānakāraṇa*), PVSVṬ 401,21 (*hetu*).

¹⁶ E.g., PV 1.222b (*jātiḥ*), PVSVṬ 401,22 and 26 (*utpatti*).

¹⁷ Rendered in Tib. as *raṅ bźin* (*can*). But note PVṬ D137b3/P916b6: *raṅ bźin ni ṅo bo ñid dam rgyu yin no //*.

¹⁸ Respectively PVSV 111,19, PVP D93b1/P108a1 (on *raṅ bźin*, see above, n. 17), PVP D60a2–3/P68b2–3, PVSV 8,20, PVP D93a5/P107b5, PVSVṬ 401,24 and 25.

¹⁹ Respectively PVP D93b1–2/P108a1–2 and PVP D67b4/P77a6–7.

is nothing but the traditional sequence of dependent origination, where both function as the cause of suffering: As defilements, they give rise both to other defilements (e.g., *tṛṣṇā → upādāna*) and to act(ion)s (*kriyā*, e.g., *avidyā → saṃskāra*, or *upādāna → bhava*), the latter being in turn responsible for new foundations (*vastu*) of existence (e.g., *saṃskāra → vijñāna*, or *bhava → jāti*).[20] Insofar as they give rise to actions leading to new existential foundations, ignorance and craving[21] are the two causes of (re)birth ([*punar*] *janman*) and transmigration (*saṃsāra*),[22] which are the hallmarks of suffering.[23] Whereas Devendrabuddhi simply defines suffering

---

[20] See AK 3.27 and AKBh 134,26–135,3, *Kośa* 3.69, Pruden 1988–1990: II.407.

[21] PVP D56a6/P64a3: *skye ba'i mtshan ñid can gyi sdug bsṅal gyi rgyu*; PVP D57b3/P65b4: *bdag daṅ bdag gi la chags pa'i mtshan ñid can gyi sdug bsṅal gyi rgyu*; PVP D115b6/P134a8: *sred pa'i mtshan ñid can sdug bsṅal gyi rgyu*; PVP D116a1/P134b3: *sred pa sdug bsṅal gyi rgyur gyur pa*; PVP D115b2/P134a2–3: *sdug bsṅal gyi rgyu ni sred pa yin no źes bstan zin to // de yaṅ ma rig pa las byuṅ ba …* According to Śākyabuddhi, craving is *kun nas 'chiṅ ba'i rgyu*, "the cause of bondage," and according to PVP D58b1/P66b4, attachment leads to *kleśa*s, *punarbhava* and *janmaparigraha*.

[22] Dharmakīrti's commentators provide us with various definitions of *saṃsāra*. (1) PVP D62b3–4/P71b2–3: *'khor bar 'khor bas na 'khor ba ste / skye ba daṅ 'chi ba'i rgyun no //*, to be compared with PVV 62,11–12: *janmamaraṇaprabandhaḥ saṃsāraḥ /*. (2) PVP D95b6/P110b3: (*bdag gir yoṅs su 'dzin pa*) *rtsom pa la sogs pa'i mtshan ñid can gyi 'khor ba …*, which Śākyabuddhi (PVṬ D138b6–7/P171a7–8) comments as follows: *bdag gir yoṅs su 'dzin pa la sogs pa rtsom pa la sogs pa'i mtshan ñid can gyi 'khor ba źes bya ba la bdag gi ñid du gzuṅ ba'i srid pa'i loṅs spyod kyi mtshan ñid can gyi dṅos po la mṅon par chags pa sṅon du soṅ ba can gyi 'dzin pa ni yoṅs su* (P om. *su*) *'dzin pa'o // rtsom pa ni mṅon par bsgrub pa'o //*. Tib. *mṅon par bsgrub pa* may translate either *abhinirhāra* (BHSD *s.v.*, 52b–53a) or (more surely) *abhisaṃskāra* (BHSD *s.v.*, 57b): Defining "[re]existence" (*bhava*) in the context of dependent origination, Vasubandhu (Vaibhāṣika definition, AKBh 132,20–21) says: *sa … paunarbhavikaṃ karmopacinoti …*, "he accumulates action(s) that is/are conducive to rebirth." Note also TSP Ś230,8–9/K184,21–22 (unidentified quotation): *cittam eva hi saṃsāro rāgādikleśavāsitam /*.

[23] PVṬ D148a1/P182b6: *ma rig pa daṅ sred pa ni sdug bsṅal gyi rgyu ñid yin te / phyin ci log pa'i raṅ bźin can źes bya ba'i don to //*. Suffering is also defined in terms of *duḥkhatātraya*. PVP D62b4/P71b3–4: *sdug bsṅal rnam pa gsum gyis dṅos sam brgyud pas sdug bsṅal ba yin no //*, which Śākyabuddhi, having named the three "painfulnesses" (PVṬ D120b5/

as (re)birth (*skye ba'i mtshan ñid can gyi sdug bsṅal*), Dharma-kīrti characterizes it as the constituents undergoing transmigration (*duḥkhaṃ saṃsāriṇaḥ skandhāḥ*).[24] It comes as no surprise, then, that Dharmakīrti declares that "as long as (s)he adheres to a self, the [person who experiences craving remains] in *saṃsāra*."[25] According to Devendrabuddhi, for whom "the personalistic false view is the cause of the connection (*pratisandhi*) to a new existence (*punarbhava*),"[26] "the [person] who is under the sway of the false view of self has the notion of pleasure (*sukhasaṃjñā*) with regard to suffering [and] will be connected to a new existence."[27] The link between the false view of self, attachment and rebirth can be summarized as follows: "Thus when there is adherence to a self, a multitude of [moral] faults such as attachment to one's own arise, and the attachment to a self causes [one] to take a [new existential] place (*sthāna*)."[28]

2.1.4. Let us consider now the genealogy[29] of defilements from the personalistic false view. As we shall see, Dharmakīrti provides a

---

P147b5), comments as follows (PVṬ D120b6–7/P147b5–7): (1) *duḥkhā vedanā* is suffering in a direct way as *duḥkhaduḥkhatā* (its causes and conditions being suffering in an indirect way); (2) *sukhā vedanā* is suffering in a direct way as *pariṇāmaduḥkhatā* (its causes and conditions being suffering in an indirect way); (3) *asukhāduḥkhā vedanā* is suffering in a direct way as *saṃskāraduḥkhatā* (its causes and conditions being suffering in an indirect way). On *duḥkhatātraya*, see Schmithausen 1977.

[24] Respectively PVP D56a6/P64a3 and PV 2.146c.

[25] PV 2.218cd (leaving *tena* untranslated): *tenātmābhiniveśo yāvat tāvat sa saṃsāre //.*

[26] PVP D85a6–7/P98a3–4: *'jig tshogs lta ba yaṅ srid par ñiṅ mtshams sbyor ba'i rgyur gyur pa …* Note also, referring to the *sahajaṃ satkāyadarśanam* (PV 2.200d), PVP D85b5/P98b2–3: *de yaṅ srid pa'i rgyu yin no //.*

[27] PVP D85a6/P98a3: *gaṅ la bdag tu lta ba yod pa de ni sdug bsṅal la bde ba'i 'du śes can yin te / yaṅ srid par mtshams sbyor bar 'gyur ro //.*

[28] PVP D58a7–b1/P66b3–4: *de ltar na bdag tu mṅon par źen pa yod na bdag gir chags pa la sogs pa'i skyon gyi tshogs 'jug par 'gyur źiṅ / bdag tu chags pas kyaṅ gnas yoṅs su len par byed do //.*

[29] "Genealogy" as a free rendering of Karṇakagomin's *krama* (lit. "sequence," "succession;" PVSVṬ 401,25–26: *kena punaḥ krameṇa doṣāṇāṃ satkāyadarśanād utpattiḥ /*).

coherent picture of the sequence *avidyā–(ṣaḍāyatana–sparśa–vedanā–)tṛṣṇā–upādāna–bhava–jāti*, although some items in his account have no explicit equivalent in the traditional twelve-membered chain of dependent origination. In Dharmakīrti's opinion, the false view of self may be held directly responsible for the rise of at least three factors: the notion of otherness, the belief in one's own, and attachment/craving. In an interesting statement, Dharmakīrti points out that "once [the notion of] a self exists, the notion of the other (*parasaṃjñā*) [arises, and] from this distinction between self and other [is born] grasping and aversion; bound to these two, all the moral faults arise."[30] For reasons that I shall explain below, I am inclined not to follow the traditional explanation that links grasping/attachment to (the notion of) the self and aversion to the notion of the other.[31] For the time being, let us leave this problem out of consideration and focus on the genealogy of otherness: "As long as the mind adheres to a self (*ātmeti*), [it has] the notion of a self (*ātmasaṃjñā*), and once this [notion] exists, all that [the mind] does not grasp in this way is [held to be] other."[32] In

---

[30] PV 2.219 (*āryā* metre): *ātmani sati parasaṃjñā svaparavibhāgāt parigrahadveṣau / anayoḥ sampratibaddhāḥ sarve doṣāḥ prajāyante //*. Delusion (*moha*), covetousness (*lobha*) and hatred/aversion (*dveṣa*) are traditionally held to be the three root-defilements (*mūlakleśa*) or roots of evil (*akuśalamūla*); see AK 5.20c and AKBh 291,8. Note, e.g., AK 5.48a₂b: *rāgotthā āhrīkyauddhatyamatsarāḥ.* "From out of lust there proceeds disrespect, dissipation, and avarice" (Pruden 1988–1990: III.843, *Kośa* 5.91). For definitions of *āhrīkya, auddhatya* and *matsara*, see AKBh 59,19–20 (Pruden 1988–1990: I.200, *Kośa* 2.170), AKBh 312,17 (Pruden 1988–1990: I.194, *Kośa* 2.161) and AKBh 312,16–17 (Pruden 1988–1990: III.842, *Kośa* 5.90). AK 5.48a₂b: *krodherṣye pratighānvaye.* "From out of hatred there proceeds envy and anger" (Pruden 1988–1990: III.843, *Kośa* 5.91). For definitions of *krodha* and *īrṣyā*, see AKBh 312,16 (Pruden 1988–1990: III.842, *Kośa* 5.90) and AKBh 312,19 (Pruden 1988–1990: III.842, *Kośa* V.90).

[31] PVP D95b1/P110b5–6: *bdag ñid du bzuṅ ba la yoṅs su 'dzin pa ni mṅon par chags pa'o // gźan ñid du rnam par phye ba la sdaṅ ba yin te / yoṅs su dor ba'o //.* PVV 87,15–16: *svaparavibhāgāc ca kāraṇāt svaparayor yathākramaṃ parigraho 'bhiṣvaṅgo dveṣaḥ parityāgas tau bhavataḥ /.*

[32] PVP D95a7/P110b4–5: *ji srid du blo bdag ces mṅon par źen pa de srid du bdag tu 'du śes pa daṅ de yod na de ltar mi 'dzin pa gaṅ yin pa de thams cad gźan yin no //.*

another statement, Dharmakīrti declares that "the false view of self generates the belief in one's own (*ātmīyagraha*)."[33] Persons deluded by the false view of self regard the constituents of being both as a self and as belonging to the self, but this feeling of property may well be extended beyond the constituents and range over parts of the world that have been posited as other than the self. The personalistic belief is responsible for yet another factor, which is variously termed "desire" (*rāga*), "craving" (*tṛṣṇā*), "grasping" (*parigraha*) or "attachment"/"love" (*sneha*), and clearly corresponds to the eighth link of dependent origination, i.e., craving. In spite of this functional equivalence, I am inclined not to consider these terms as (always) synonymous, and to believe that Dharmakīrti introduced a causal sequence between them, thus splitting the traditional eighth link into two. If I am correct, from the false view of self arises first attachment or love for the self and one's own, and then craving for the things that are regarded as beneficial or pleasurable to the self. This can be seen in the following stanza: "The one who sees a self has a constant love for this [self, thinking of it as] 'I.' Because of [this] love [for the self] he craves for the delights [of this self, and his] thirst conceals [from him] the drawbacks [of the things he deems conducive to these delights]."[34] Here, both Devendrabuddhi and Manorathanandin interpret "love" as "love for the self."[35] Whereas attachment is directed to the self (but bears upon the conditioned factors), craving is directed to the delights (*sukha*) of the self,[36] i.e., to the things that are deemed conducive to these delights,[37] or to impure (*sāsrava*) things that are (deemed) favourable (*anugrāhaka*) in that they are conducive to the delights (of the self).[38] Besides the frequent occurrence of expressions such

---

[33] PVSV 111,18: *ātmadarśanam ātmīyagrahaṃ prasūte /*.

[34] PV 2.217: *yaḥ paśyaty ātmānaṃ tatrāsyāham iti śāśvataḥ snehaḥ / snehāt sukheṣu tṛṣyati tṛṣṇā doṣāṃs tiraskurute //*. Note that Śākyabuddhi interprets *doṣa* as *jātijarāmaraṇa* (PVṬ D138b1/P170b8).

[35] PVP D95a6/P111a2, PVV 87,3.

[36] PVP D95a6/P111a2: *bdag gi bde la sred 'gyur …*

[37] PVV 87,3–4: *sukhasādhanatvenādhyavasitānāṃ vastūnām …*

[38] PVP D95b1/P111a4–5: *bde ba sgrub par byed pa ñid du ñe bar 'gro ba zag pa daṅ bcas pa'i dṅos po …* On *anugrāhaka*, see also PVSVṬ 402,8:

as *ātmasneha*,[39] *ātmātmīyasneha*[40] or even *satkāyasneha*,[41] we also find Devendrabuddhi's definition of *sneha*: "[We call] 'love' an inclination for self and one's own which presupposes the [afore-mentioned delusion]."[42] According to Dharmakīrti, self-love and attachment for what belongs (or ought to belong) to the self is in turn the cause of aversion (*pratigha*) and hatred (*dveṣa*): "Indeed, the one who, without grasping (*parigraha*), sees that there is neither I nor mine, does not love anything and, [being so] unattached, does not hate anything [either], for there is no [aversion] for that which does not hinder the self or one's own, nor for that which opposes the [said] hindrance."[43] One can show aversion or hatred only for that which hinders (< *uparodha*) or harms (< *pīḍā*) what has been taken as self and one's own:[44] "Hatred [arises] with regard to

---

ātmātmīyatvena tadanugrāhakatvena parikalpya …

[39] E.g., PVP D58a1–2/P66a3.

[40] PVP D57b3/P65b4. Love for self and one's own is said to be directed to the object that is clung to as self and one's own (*ātmātmīyatvābhiniviṣṭe viṣaye ātmātmīyasnehaḥ*, PVSVṬ 401,26–27).

[41] E.g., PVP D90b5/P104b7: *'jig tshogs la chags pa.*

[42] PVP D60a2/P68b2–3: *de sṅon du soṅ ba can gyi bdag daṅ bdag gir źen pa ni chags pa'o //.* Note also PVP D94b7/P109b4–5: *chags pa ni bdag tu mṅon par chags pa'o //* (maybe: *sneha ātmany abhiṣvaṅgaḥ*).

[43] PVSV 111,15–17: *na hi nāhaṃ na mameti paśyataḥ parigraham antareṇa kvacit snehaḥ / na cānanurāgiṇaḥ kvacid dveṣaḥ / ātmātmīyānuparodhiny uparodhapratighātini ca tadabhāvāt /.*

[44] According to PVSVṬ 402,12: *ātmātmīyatvena gṛhītasya ya uparodhaḥ pīḍā /.* Note also Devendrabuddhi's definition of *dveṣa* at PVP D60a2/P68b3: *de* (= *chags pa*) *sṅon du soṅ ba can rjes su chags pa'i yul la gnod par byed pa la mnar sems pa ni źe sdaṅ ṅo //.* "Hatred is maliciousness with regard to that which injures the object of attachment[, a maliciousness] that presupposes the [afore-mentioned love]." The Sanskrit original for Tib. *mnar sems pa* is unclear. I would conjecture *vyāpannacitta*, although, to the best of my knowledge, *mnar* (*ba*) is not attested as a translation of *vyāpanna*(/*vyāpāda*): *vyāpannacitta* = *gnod sems* at AKBh 251,10 and 12 on AK 4.81ac₁ ("de pensée méchante" in *Kośa* 4.178) as well as in the *Saṃcetanīyasūtra* quoted in AKVy 400,9–15 on AKBh 237,18. Jaini 2001:221: "The *kleśas* are like roots which produce as well as sustain an evil volition. *Abhidhyā, vyāpāda,* and *mithyādṛṣṭi* are not called roots, but are recognized as intensive states of the three roots of evil (*akuśalamūla*), viz. *lobha, dveṣa,* and *moha* respectively.

that alone which offers opposition (*pratikūlavartin*) by its hostility
to that which love for the self and one's own bears upon (*viṣaya-
bhūta*). Therefore, there is no hatred without love for the self and
one's own."[45] Dharmakīrti's unambiguous derivation of aversion
from love is the reason why I cannot agree with Devendrabuddhi's
and Manorathanandin's interpretation of PV 2.219b (*svapara-
vibhāgāt parigrahadveṣau*), which presupposes that what is other
than the self can only arouse hatred. In Dharmakīrti's eyes, that
which is other than the self gives rise to aversion only insofar as
it opposes love, but arouses craving as soon as it is regarded as
pleasurable to the self. Craving for the delights of the self and that
which is conducive to them generally implies one's running around
in search of pleasure. This is indeed the Vaibhāṣika definition of
the ninth link of dependent origination, appropriation or cling-
ing (*upādāna*),[46] and what Dharmakīrti obviously has in mind in
PV 2.218ab: "Seeing [but] qualities [to the things that he deems
pleasurable to the self], he craves [for them, thinking of them as
having to become] 'mine,' and appropriates (*upā√dā*) the means
[that are conducive] to them."[47] But Dharmakīrti also holds love
for the self to be the cause of the three different kinds of craving
that the oldest layers of Buddhist canonical literature have made
responsible for rebirth (*paunarbhavika*): craving for (future) exist-
ence (*bhavatṛṣṇā*), craving for sensual pleasures (*kāmatṛṣṇā*), and
craving for non-existence/annihilation (*vibhavatṛṣṇā*).[48] According

---

All evil volitions are essentially rooted in and spring from one or another of
these three basic passions (*mūlakleśa*)."

  [45] PVSVṬ 402,13–15: *ātmātmīyasnehaviṣayabhūtavirodhena yaḥ sthitaḥ
pratikūlavartī tatraiva dveṣaḥ | tasmān nātmātmīyasneham antareṇa dveṣa
iti |.*

  [46] AK 3.23cd: *upādānaṃ tu bhogānāṃ prāptaye paridhāvataḥ |.*

  [47] PV 2.218ab (*āryā* metre): *guṇadarśī paritṛṣyan mameti tatsādhanāny
upādatte |.*

  [48] PVP D79b3–4/P91a7–8: *de la sdug bsṅal kun 'byuṅ 'phags pa'i bden pa
gaṅ źe na | gaṅ sred pa 'di ni yaṅ srid par 'byuṅ ba can dga' ba'i 'dod chags
daṅ bcas pa de daṅ de la mṅon par dga' ba'i ṅaṅ tshul can | 'di lta ste 'dod pa'i
sred pa daṅ srid pa'i sred pa daṅ 'jig pa'i sred pa yin no źes gsuṅs so ||.* PVA
134,33–135,2: *uktaṃ hi bhagavatā tatra katamat samudaya āryasatyam |
yeyaṃ tṛṣṇā paunarbhavikī nandīrāgasahagatā tatratatrābhinandinī | yad*

to him, craving for sensual pleasures is to be interpreted as the actions (*pravṛtti*) of living beings to secure what they hold to be pleasurable (*sukhāpti*), whereas craving for annihilation refers to those of their actions that aim at avoiding suffering (*duḥkhānāpti*). This matches again perfectly with the Vaibhāṣika account of the tenth link of dependent origination, viz. *bhava* (literally "existence"), which is to be understood as the "act(ion) that results in future existence" (*bhaviṣyadbhavaphalaṃ karma*): *bhava* refers to the *act(ion)s* resulting in rebirth (*paunarbhavika*) that are accumulated by those who run around (under the sway of craving) in order to quench their thirst.[49] In these stanzas, Dharmakīrti brings together both meanings of *bhava*, i.e., action to secure the pleasures of the self, and the (future) existence that they inevitably lead to: "The cause [of suffering] is the longing for [re]existence, because human beings reach a specific [existential] place [and condition] due to [their] hope of obtaining it. The [afore-mentioned longing for existence] is [called] the desire for [re]existence. And since a living being [only] acts with the desire of obtaining pleasure and avoiding suffering, these two [i.e., craving for pleasure and craving for the avoidance of suffering,] are regarded as the desire for sensual pleasures and the desire for annihilation. And since love for the self is the cause [of it, this dual action] pertains to everything for [the living being] who has the notion of [something] pleasurable with regard to [something] unpleasurable. Therefore, craving is the basis of existence [i.e., the cause of bondage]."[50]

---

uta kā[m]atṛṣṇā bhavatṛṣṇā vibhavatṛṣṇā ceti … PVV 74,10–11: *nanūktaṃ bhagavatā tatra katamaḥ samudaya āryasatyaṃ paunarbhavikī nandīrāga-sahagatā tatratatrābhinandinī yad uta kāmatṛṣṇā bhavatṛṣṇā vibhavatṛṣṇā ceti* … For the Pāli text, see Vetter 1990: 87, n. 1.

[49] AKBh 132,19–21 (together with AK 3.24ab): *sa bhaviṣyadbhavaphalaṃ kurute karma tad bhavaḥ / sa viṣayāṇāṃ prāptihetoḥ paridhāvan paunar-bhavikaṃ karmopacinoti so 'sya bhavaḥ /.*

[50] PV 2.183a$_2$–185: *hetur bhavavāñchā parigrahaḥ / yasmād deśaviśeṣasya tatprāptyāśākṛto nṛṇām // sā bhavecchā ''ptyanāptīcchoḥ pravṛttiḥ sukha-duḥkhayoḥ / yato 'pi prāṇinaḥ kāmavibhavecche ca te mate // sarvatra cātmasnehasya hetutvāt sampravartate / asukhe sukhasaṃjñasya tasmāt tṛṣṇā bhavāśrayaḥ //.*

2.1.5. Although the standard formulation of dependent origina-
tion is traditionally held to range over three (Vaibhāṣika) or two
(Yogācāra, Sautrāntika) lifetimes,[51] at least some of its members
can also be seen at work on the much shorter sequence of a few
interdependent psychological events. According to Vasubandhu,
desire follows (*anuśete*, or: is connected to, *samprayukta*) a pleas-
ant sensation (*sukhā vedanā*), whereas aversion follows (or: is con-
nected to) an unpleasant sensation (*duḥkhā vedanā*).[52] Dharmakīrti
agrees with this commonsense statement.[53] Depending on wheth-
er a given tangible object (*spraṣṭavya*) is considered favourable
(*anugrāhaka*) or unfavourable to the self, the pleasant or unpleasant
sensations born from the contact between this object and the sense
faculties are conducive to the rise of defilements such as desire
or hatred.[54] This obviously conforms to the *pratītyasamutpāda* se-
quence linking a sensory basis (*āyatana*), contact (*sparśa*) between
the former and an object, sensation, and craving. But as we have
seen, to deem a given object favourable or unfavourable to the self
belongs to the personalistic false view. Note should be made here
that the erroneous aspects which the personalistic false view con-
sists of overlap in part with those traditionally called "wrong no-
tions" or "misconceptions" (*viparyāsa*), which amount to four[55] and

---

[51] For a useful overview, see Kritzer 1999: 67–72.

[52] AKBh 312,1–2: *trivedanāvaśāt trīṇi bandhanāni / sukhāyāṃ hi veda-
nāyāṃ rāgo 'nuśete ālambanasamprayogābhyām / duḥkhāyāṃ dveṣaḥ /*. AK
5.55ab + AKBh 316,6 and 8: *sukhābhyāṃ samprayukto hi rāgaḥ / sukhasau-
manasyābhyāṃ rāgaḥ samprayuktaḥ / dveṣo viparyayāt / duḥkhābhyām ity
arthaḥ / duḥkhena daurmanasyena ca /*.

[53] See PV 2.151c$_2$d: *rāgāder vikāro 'pi sukhādijaḥ /*, and the discussion
below.

[54] According to PVP D66a5–6/P75b5–6: *reg bya'i khyad par gyi don phan
'dogs par byed pa daṅ de las gźan pa'i rjes su byed pas bde ba'am sdug bsṅal
lam* (sic) *'dod chags la sogs pa skye ba daṅ rjes su mthun pa yin pa …*

[55] To take the impermanent as permanent, the painful as pleasant, the im-
pure as pure, and the selfless as a self (AKBh 283,5–7: *catvāro viparyāsāḥ /
anitye nityam iti / duḥkhe sukham iti / aśucau śucīti / anātmany ātmeti /*).
With the exception of the (im)pure, they correspond to the erroneous aspects
one superimposes on the Truth of suffering (see above, n. 8).

are regularly held to be caused by imagination (*saṅkalpa*).[56] Śānta-rakṣita and Kamalaśīla provide interesting materials regarding the rise of defilements from wrong notions. According to Śāntarakṣita, "defilements such as desire arise once [erroneous aspects] such as beautiful, one's own, lasting [or pleasant] have been superimposed on a woman, etc."[57] A little later, he says: "[A sensation] such as a pleasant or unpleasant [one] arises in the presence of a [sensory] object[, say a woman]. For those who despise [suspending] wisdom (*pratisaṅkhyāna*) [and] are subject to improper reflection, this [sensation] gives rise to defilements such as desire or hatred, which are [themselves] born from the ripening of a homologous latent tendency."[58] What does this amount to? The contact between an ob-

---

[56] On *saṅkalpa*, see May 1959: 181n. 586, PrP 451,9 ff., and the following excerpts: PVP D68a4–5/P77b8–78a1: *ci ste 'di la yaṅ kun tu rtog pa yaṅ yan lag ñid du rtog par 'gyur ba de'i tshe kun tu rtog pa yaṅ bdag daṅ bdag gi daṅ gtsaṅ ba daṅ bde ba la sogs pa'i miṅ can gyi mtshan ñid kyi sa bon yin no //.* PVP D67a3–4/P76b5–6: *gaṅ gis bud med 'ga' źig gi gzugs la sogs pa la kun tu rtog par byed ciṅ 'dod chags kyis gduṅs pa de ni …* TSP Ś666,25–667,9/ K547,8–9: *atītānāgate 'pi viṣaye saṅkalpavaśād abhivṛddhasukhādiviparyāsasya puṃsaḥ pratisaṅkhyānanivṛttau teṣāṃ rāgādīnāṃ prabalatvaṃ dṛśyate /.* MMK 23.1: *saṅkalpaprabhavo rāgo dveṣo mohaś ca kathyate / śubhāśubhaviparyāsān sambhavanti pratītya hi //.* PrP 452,4–5: *tatra hi śubham ākāraṃ pratītya rāga utpadyate / aśubhaṃ pratītya dveṣaḥ / viparyāsān pratītya moha utpadyate / saṅkalpas tv eṣāṃ trayāṇām api sādhāraṇakāraṇam utpattau /.* PVSVṬ 166,29–167,2 gl. *saṅkalpita* (PV 1.70d) as *āropita*. To sum up, *saṅkalpa* is the *bīja* of the wrong notions or, equivalently, of the erroneous aspects, which in turn form the bases (*āśraya < āśrita*) or conditions (*pratyaya < pratītya*) of the defilements; to put it as shortly as Candrakīrti, *saṅkalpa* is the common cause (*sādhāraṇakāraṇa*) for the rise of the defilements. On *saṅkalpa*, see also below, nn. 68 and 69.

[57] TS Ś1951ac/K1952ac: *śubhātmīyasthirādīṃś ca samāropyāṅganādiṣu / rāgādayaḥ pravartante …* "Pleasant" according to TSP Ś667,13–14/ K547,12–14 thereon: *ātmā*tmīyanityasukhādyākārān abhūtān evāropayanto 'ṅganādiṣu pravartante, na ca śubhādirūpā viṣayāḥ /.*

  *TSP_K with no equivalent of *ātmā*°.

[58] TS Ś1953–1954d₁/K1954–1955d₁ (leaving *tu* untranslated): *viṣayopanipāte tu sukhaduḥkhādisambhavāḥ / tasmāt samānajātīyavāsanāparipākajāḥ // rāgadveṣādayaḥ kleśāḥ pratisaṅkhyānavidviṣām / ayoniśomanaskāravidheyānām …* Note also PV 2.157ac: *sajātivāsanābhedapratibaddhapravṛttayaḥ / … rāgādayaḥ …* PVV 66,8–10: *sajātivāsanā*

ject and a sense faculty generates an affective sensation (pleasant, unpleasant, or neutral). People who do not devote themselves to meditative practices such as the contemplation of the loathsome (*aśubhabhāvanā*),[59] and are therefore under the sway of improper reflection, superimpose erroneous aspects on the object: that it is a women, of course, but also that she is attractive, desirable, (at least virtually) one's own, etc. Affective sensation as well as the superimposed aspects is in turn responsible for the actualization of the latent tendency of desire.[60] Commenting on his master's two stanzas, Kamalaśīla provides us with a more systematic account of the sequence at stake: "For such is the sequence [of events]: When an object is present, a pleasure born of the sense faculty arises. And for those who, in the absence of any [suspending] wisdom, abide in the improper reflection consisting of wrong notions such as self, this pleasure brings to maturity (*vipāka*) the latent tendency imprinted by previous desire, etc. From this [coming to] maturity, defilements such as desire arise. Therefore, the objects [themselves] are not directly the cause [of defilements]."[61] How should we un-

---

''*tmātmīyagrahamūlasya sajāteḥ* (Vibh. 66 n. 1: *satkāyadarśanasya*) *pūrva-pūrvābhyastasya rāgāder vāsanā 'parāpararāgādijanikāḥ śaktayas tāsāṃ bhedaḥ parasparatas tatra pratibaddhā pravṛttir janma yeṣām te tathā* … Here, *sajātivāsanā* is analysed as a genitive *tatpuruṣa*: "latent tendencies of the homologous [defilements which are rooted in the belief in self and one's own]." But according to Devendrabuddhi and Śākyabuddhi, the compound is to be analysed as a *dvandva* (PVṬ D123a2–3/P150b7): *sajāti* refers to the *satkāyadṛṣṭi* (*ātmātmīyadṛṣṭi* in PVP D68a6–8/P78a3–5) whereas the *vāsanā*(*bheda*) consists in the *pūrvarāgādyāhitabīja*.

[59] TSP Ś666,22–23/K547,6: *aśubhādipratisaṅkhyāna*. According to PVP D67a6–7/P77a1–2, *rāgādi* do not occur in those who have the *aśubhādisaṃjñā*. Note also Kamalaśīla's definition at TSP Ś666,23/K547,6–7: *aśubhādyālambanā rāgādipratipakṣabhūtā prajñā pratisaṅkhyānam /*, which may be compared with AKVy 389,13 on AKBh 226,13–14: *pratisaṅkhyānasya tat-pratipakṣabhāvanālakṣaṇasya*, where *tat* = *kleśa* (context: *nirvāṇa*). Note also AKBh 4,1 on AK 1.6ab₁: *duḥkhādīnām āryasatyānāṃ pratisaṅkhyānaṃ pratisaṅkhyā prajñāviśeṣaḥ* … (see also *Kośa* 1.8, and AKVy 16,4–7).

[60] On latent tendencies and their actualization, see Eltschinger 2009: 57–58, nn. 53–55.

[61] TSP Ś667,19–22/K547,26–548,2: *eṣa hi kramaḥ – viṣayopanipāte satīndriyajaṃ sukham utpadyate, tasmāc ca sukhāt pratisaṅkhyānavaikalye*

derstand this strong insistence on the responsibility of improper reflection in the rise of defilements?

2.1.6. That improper reflection[62] is closely connected with ignorance/personalistic belief and is part of the process leading to the rise of defilements can be easily substantiated.[63] The problem raised by the source materials is rather that they testify to contradictory views regarding the relationship between improper reflection and ignorance/personalistic belief. Some sources (mainly Yogācāra) introduce improper reflection in the definition of the personalistic belief, which is held to be the manner deluded people improperly consider the five constituents of being as self and

---

saty ātmādiviparyāsalakṣaṇāyoniśomanaskāre sthitānāṃ pūrvarāgādyāhitavāsanāparipāko bhavati, tato rāgādayaḥ kleśāḥ pravartanta iti na sākṣād viṣayāḥ kāraṇam /. Note also Prajñākaragupta's remarks while commenting on Dharmakīrti's polemics against a Materialist upholding medical ideas (PVA 122,22–23): *sukhādijo hi rāgādir na kaph[ā]dibhāvī / sukhaṃ ca kasyacit kathaṃcid upalabdham āntaravāsanāprabodhāt / tato na rāgādayo doṣebhya iti yuktam /.* Though Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla cannot be suspected of allegiance toward Vaibhāṣika thought, their views are reminiscent of an interesting passage in the AK(Bh), according to which a defilement arises out of three factors: first, its propensity (*anuśaya*) has not been eliminated; second, an object (*viṣaya*, *dharma*) that is conducive to the actualization of desire for sensual pleasures (*kāmarāgaparyavasthānīya*) is present and perceived (*ābhāsagata*); thirdly, an improper reflection occurs with regard to the said object. AK 5.34, together with AKBh 305,19–20: *aprahīṇād anuśayād viṣayāt pratyupasthitāt / ayoniśomanaskārāt kleśaḥ – tad yathā rāgānuśayo 'prahīṇo bhavaty aparijñātaḥ kāmarāgaparyavasthānīyāś ca dharmā ābhāsagatā bhavanti tatra cāyoniśomanaskāra evaṃ kāmarāga utpadyate /.*

[62] AKBh 54,23: *manaskāraś cetasa ābhogaḥ /.* AKVy 127,33–128,2 thereon: *manaskāraś cetasa ābhoga iti / ālambane cetasa āvarjanam / avadhāraṇam ity arthaḥ / manasaḥ kāro manaskāraḥ / mano vā karoty āvarjayatīti manaskāraḥ /.* PVSVṬ 50,29–51,12: *ayoniśa ityādy asyaiva samarthanam / yoniḥ padārthānām anityaduḥkhānātmādi / samyagdarśanapras[ū]tihetutvāt / taṃ śaṃsaty ālambata iti yoniśaḥ / yoniṃ yoniṃ manaskarotīti saṃkhyaikavacanād vīpsāyām* (Pā 5.4.43) *iti śaspratyayo vā / tathābhūtaś cāsau manaskāraś ceti yoniśomanaskāro nairātmyajñānam /.*

[63] On *ayoniśomanaskāra* and *avidyā*, see La Vallée Poussin 1913: 8–9, and especially Mejor 2001. On the improper reflection's conditioning and reinforcing *dṛṣṭi*s, see the passage of AN I.31 alluded to by Mejor (2001: 50 + n. 5); see also AKBh 5.32–33 in Mejor 2001: 51.

one's own.[64] Some materials regard improper reflection as caused by ignorance: this is the case of the Sūtra quoted in the AKBh, according to which, "depending on the eye and visible [objects,] an incorrect (*āvila*) reflection born of delusion (*mohaja*) arises."[65] Much more common seem to be sources viewing improper reflection as the cause of ignorance/personalistic belief: this is the case in a Sutta of the MN and two Suttas from the AN,[66] in the MS,[67] in the *Satyadvayanirdeśa*(*sūtra*) as it is quoted by Kamalaśīla in BhK 1,[68] and in the *Sahetusapratyayanidānasūtra* as it is quoted in AKVy 288,26–29 and used by Bhadanta Śrīlāta to demonstrate that ignorance (as the first link of dependent origination) has indeed a cause.[69] Having quoted and commented on various excerpts

---

[64] See Eltschinger 2009: 68–69, nn. 92 and 110.

[65] AKBh 135,13–14 and AKVy 288,30–31: *cakṣuḥ pratītya rūpāṇi cotpadyate āvilo manaskāro mohaja iti /.* Note also AKBh 135,7 (in a quotation): *avidyāhetukaś cāyoniśomanaskāraḥ /.*

[66] MN I.6 ff. (no. 2, *Sabbāsavasutta*). Here, the *ayoniso manasikāra* is held to be responsible for the rise (*uppajjhanti*) and the increase (*pavaḍḍhanti*) of the three cankers (*kāmāsava*, *bhavāsava* and *avijjāsava*), which are in turn responsible for the rise of false views (*diṭṭhi*) concerning personal identity in the past (*atītaṃ addhānam*), in the future (*anāgataṃ addhānam*) and in the present (*paccuppannaṃ addhānam*), such as *atthi me attā ti* and *na-tthi me attā ti*. On this passage, see Collins 1982: 118–119; for similar expressions of the *satkāyadṛṣṭi/sakkāyadiṭṭhi*, see Eltschinger 2009: 73–75. AN V.113 ff. (no. 61, *Avijjāsutta*) and V.116 ff. (no. 62 *Taṇhāsutta*). According to the *Avijjāsutta*, *ayonisomanasikāra* belongs to the eight aliments (*āhāra*) of *avijjā*; see Mejor 2001: 52–55.

[67] MS 2.20.9 (Lamotte 1973: I.34): *mṅon par źen pa'i rnam par rtog pa ni 'di lta ste / tshul bźin ma yin pa'i yid la byed pa las byuṅ ba'i 'jig tshogs la lta ba'i rtsa ba las byuṅ ba lta bar soṅ ba drug cu rtsa gñis daṅ mtshuṅs par ldan pa'i rnam par rtog pa gaṅ yin pa'o //.* See also Lamotte 1973: II.115.

[68] BhK 1.215[/525],7–14: *kathaṃ mañjuśrīḥ kleśā vinayaṃ gacchanti / kathaṃ kleśāḥ parijñātā bhavanti / mañjuśrīr āha / paramārthato 'tyantājātānutpannābhāveṣu (sic, <Tib, but °nabhā° ms) sarvadharmeṣu saṃvṛtyāsadviparyāsaḥ / tasmād asadviparyāsāt saṃkalpavikalpaḥ / tasmāt saṃkalpavikalpād ayoniśomanaskāraḥ / tasmād ayoniśomanaskārād ātmasamāropaḥ / tasmād ātmasamāropād dṛṣṭiparyutthānam / tasmād dṛṣṭiparyutthānāt kleśāḥ pravartante /.*

[69] *anyaḥ* in AKBh 135,12, Bhadanta Śrīlāta according to AKVy 289,23; AKBh 135,12–17: *anyaḥ punar āha / ayoniśo manaskāro hetur avidyāyā uktaḥ*

of the *Sūtra*, Yaśomitra comes to the conclusion of a circularity (*cakraka*), i.e., that improper reflection and ignorance condition each other.[70] This is indeed the position most clearly exhibited by the *Paramārthagāthā*s.[71]

To the best of my knowledge, Dharmakīrti alludes only twice to improper reflection in the context of the rise of defilements. Unfortunately, both statements are far from unambiguous. In PVSV 8,20–21, Dharmakīrti says that "[moral faults] such as desire presuppose [one's] adherence to self and one's own, for the rise of

---

sūtrāntare / sa cāpi sparśakāle nirdiṣṭaḥ / cakṣuḥ pratītya rūpāṇi cotpad-yate āvilo manaskāro mohaja iti / vedanākāle cāvaśyam avidyayā bhavita-vayam / avidyāsaṃsparśajaṃ veditaṃ pratītyotpannā tṛṣṇeti sūtrāntarāt / ataḥ sparśakāle bhavann ayoniśomanaskāro vedanāsahavartinyā avidyāyāḥ pratyayabhāvena siddha iti nāsty ahetukatvam avidyāyāḥ … See *Kośa* 3.71n. 4. The whole discussion starts with the Sthavira Vasubandhu's (AKVy 289,6: *sthaviro vasubandhur ācāryamanorathopādhyāya evam āha…*) claim that ignorance is not causeless on the basis of a *Sūtra* (the *Sahetu-sapratyayasanidānasūtra* according to AKVy 288,25–26; AKBh 135,7: *ayoniśomanaskārahetukā 'vidyoktā sūtrāntare /*). As quoted by Yaśomitra (AKVy 288,26–29), this *Sūtra* runs as follows: *avidyā bhikṣavaḥ sahetukā sapratyayā sanidānā / kaś ca bhikṣavo 'vidyāyā hetuḥ kaḥ pratyayaḥ kiṃ nidānam / avidyāyā bhikṣavo 'yoniśomanaskāro hetur ayoniśomanaskāraḥ pratyayo 'yoniśomanaskāro nidānam iti sūtre vacanāt /*. This passage is also quoted in PrP 452,7–9 (*avidyāpi bhikṣavaḥ sahetukā sapratyayā sanidānā / kaś ca bhikṣavo 'vidyāyā hetuḥ / ayoniśo bhikṣavo manaskāro 'vidyāyā hetuḥ / āvilo mohajo manaskāro bhikṣavo 'vidyāyā hetur iti*), but as coming from the *Pratītyasamutpādasūtra* (PrP 452,6 [but see n. 3 thereon], *Kośa* 3.70n. 3). Immediately after the quotation, Candrakīrti remarks (PrP 452,9): *ato 'vidyā saṅkalpaprabhavā bhavati /*. Note also Yaśomitra's (AKVy 289,1) reference to the *Pratītyasamutpādasūtra*. Mejor (2001: 61–65) has translated Vasubandhu's polemics against Śrīlāta (AKBh 134,20–25 and 135,7–27).

[70] AKVy 290,5–7: *tad etac cakrakam uktaṃ bhavati / ayoniśomanaskārād avidyā / avidyāyāś cāyoniśomanaskāra iti /*. This is, indeed, the position of the *Sahetusapratyayasanidānasūtra* (1. [*moha*] → *āvilo manasikāra* → *ayoniśomanaskāra* → *avidyā* → *tṛṣṇā* → *karman* → *cakṣus* [but also ear, nose, tongue, body and mind]; 2. *cakṣus* → *karman* → *tṛṣṇā* → *avidyā* → *ayoniśomanaskāra*); see above, n. 69, and Mejor 2001: 58 and 65–69 (Mejor's translation of the *Sūtra* from Tibetan and Chinese sources).

[71] *Paramārthagāthā* 20 (Wayman 1961: 170): *ayoniśomanaskārāt saṃmo-ho jāyate sa ca / ayoniśomanaskāro nāsaṃmūḍhasya jāyate //*.

all moral faults presupposes improper reflection."[72] A little later, he
refers to a "specific condition for the rise of desire, viz. improper
reflection *that consists in* the false view of self/viz. the false view of
self *and* improper reflection."[73] Commenting on the first passage,
Śākyabuddhi and Karṇakagomin clearly equate the personalistic
belief with improper reflection.[74] But commenting on the second
passage, they allow both a *dvandva* and a *karmadhāraya* analysis
of the compound *ātmadarśanāyoniśomanaskāra*.[75] Though I am
inclined to interpret these two passages as involving an equivalence
between the false view of self and improper reflection, I would like
to refrain from any conjecture regarding Dharmakīrti's position on
this issue.[76] In the same way, I would like to postpone any attempt
at organizing the above-mentioned (§2.1.5–6) psychological events
into a sequence of phases exhibiting their mutual relationships. At

---

[72] PVSV 8,20–21: *ātmātmīyābhiniveśapūrvakā hi rāgādayo 'yoniśoma-
naskārapūrvakatvāt sarvadoṣotpatteḥ |.*

[73] PVSV 10,11: *rāgotpattipratyayaviśeṣeṇātmadarśanāyoniśomanaskā-
reṇa yogāt |.*

[74] PVṬ *Je* D23b1–2/P28a1–2 = PVSVṬ 51,12–13: *ātmādijñānam ayoniśo-
manaskāras tatpūrvakatvāt sarvarāgādidoṣotpatteḥ |.*

[75] PVṬ *Je* D27a2–3/P32a5–7 = PVSVṬ 55,29–56,12: *ātmadarśanaṃ sat-
kāyadṛṣṭiḥ | nityasukhādiviparyāso 'yoniśomanaskāraḥ | dvandvasamāsaś
cāyam | ātmadarśanam evāyoniśomanaskāra iti viśeṣaṇasamāso vā |.*
Interestingly enough, Śākyabuddhi and Karṇakagomin explain "improper
reflection" as a "wrong notion such as permanent or pleasant," which match-
es perfectly Kamalaśīla's definition of "improper reflection" as "wrong no-
tion such as self." According to these authors, then, improper reflection and
wrong notions are conceptually equivalent. See above, n. 61.

[76] Lambert Schmithausen (personal communication) has drawn my atten-
tion to the possibility that in the first passage (PVSV 8,20–21), Dharmakīrti
may not be providing a logical justification, but rather a legitimation of his po-
sition by resorting to a more traditional phraseology involving a co-extensiv-
ity of the two concepts: "d.h. weil sie [bekanntermaßen] *ayoniśomanaskāra*
voraussetzen(, und dieser in nichts anderem besteht als eben dem *ātmātmīyā-
bhiniveśa*)." By interpreting the compound in the second passage (PVSV
10,11) as a *karmadhāraya*, one may, then, read the two passages as exhibiting
a homogeneous perspective.

the present state of research, such an attempt would only be idle speculation.[77]

2.1.7. Both wrong notions and the personalistic false view consist in the superimposition of erroneous aspects. Both are born of the actualization of a homogeneous latent tendency, which is the hallmark of conceptual construction. In other words, they are but conceptual constructs distorting both internal (the *upādānaskandhas*) and external reality. Dharmakīrti's understanding of the personalistic belief harmonizes perfectly well with his overall conception of ignorance as the concealing conceptuality. As for his commentators, they seem to be justified in holding the *satkāyadṛṣṭi* to be a part, a branch or a specific case of ignorance as a whole. That all conceptual constructs misrepresent reality, and sometimes are even deceiving from a practical point of view, does in no way mean that they are morally and (hence) eschatologically harmful. The su-

---

[77] To the best of my knowledge, no study has ever been dedicated to the issue of the Buddhist epistemologists' way(s) of dealing with the Abhidharmic *cittasamprayuktasaṃskāra*s. Their assent to Vasubandhu's treatment of them cannot be taken for granted. To adduce but one example: *saṃjñā* is classified as a *mahābhūmika*, and as such, should occur *together* with *vijñāna/citta/ manas*; but *niścaya*(*jñāna*), the Buddhist epistemologists' equivalent of *saṃjñā*, takes place *after* the sensory awareness (the latter giving rise to the *vāsanāprabodha* of the conceptual construct). In the present context, I think we should refrain from modelling the epistemologists' conception of ignorance and improper reflection on Bhadanta Śrīlāta's above-mentioned (see n. 69) elaborations on this topic. According to him, the improper reflection that is present at the moment of contact (*sparśakāle*) is the condition (*pratyaya*) for the ignorance that coexists with sensation (*vedanāsahavartiny avidyā*) and in turn gives rise to craving. On the contrary, an Arhat's unbiased (*aviparīta*) contact does not give rise to a defiled sensation (*kliṣṭā vedanā*), which in turn does not provide a condition for craving. As both Śrīlāta (at least Vasubandhu's Śrīlāta) and Yaśomitra describe it, Arhats do have sensations, but these do not generate craving, for only sensations that are accompanied by ignorance (*sāvidya*) give rise to craving (AKVy 290,13–15: *arhatām asti vedanā / na ca sā tṛṣṇāyāḥ pratyayībhavatīti / sāvidyaiva vedanā tṛṣṇā-pratyaya iti gamyate /*.) Śrīlāta adduces a reasoning (*yukti*) in order to make his point (AKBh 135,20–22): *kayā yuktyā / na hi niravadyā vedanā tṛṣṇāyāḥ pratyayībhavaty arhatāṃ na cāviparītaḥ sparśaḥ kliṣṭāyā vedanāyāḥ / na ca punar niravadyasyārhataḥ sparśo viparīta ity anayā yuktyā /*).

perimposition of ego-related aspects alone results in the rise of de-
filements and reinforces one's entanglement in *saṃsāra*. Dharma-
kīrti singles out this kind of harmful conceptual distortion as the
personalistic belief.[78]

2.2. Ignorance, inference, and the path toward salvation

2.2.1. Like most Indian systems of salvation, Buddhism traces hu-
man beings' unsatisfactory condition back to ignorance, and pre-
sents itself as a cleansing and illuminative therapy aimed at up-
rooting ignorance and the evils it is responsible for. Though the
Buddhist epistemologists do not (even pretend to) bring any doctri-
nal or practical innovation into traditional Buddhist soteriologies,
they lay strong emphasis on the means of valid cognition (*pramāṇa*)
as being instrumental in salvation. As is well known, Dignāga re-
duced the number of genuine *pramāṇa*s from three (perception, in-
ference, and scriptures [*āgama*]) to two (perception and inference).
At the present state of our knowledge about Dignāga, however, it
is difficult to estimate the extent to which non-epistemological, i.e.,
religious (*lato sensu*) considerations played a role in this episte-
mological reduction. If one cannot question Dharmakīrti's endor-
sement and consolidation of Dignāga's two-headed system as
far as the epistemology is concerned, one might still argue that
Dharmakīrti's religious ideas, as they are known to us, provided,
if not the basic framework, at least a strong additional motivation
for sticking to this epistemology. This two-headed system could,
after all, lay no claim to traditionally sanctioned authority before
Dignāga.[79] In my opinion, Dharmakīrti was deeply convinced that

---

[78] PVSV 110,20–21: *te* [= *doṣāḥ*] *vikalpaprabhavāḥ* /. PVSVṬ 398,23–25
thereon: *vikalpād ayoniśomanasikāravikalpāt prabhava utpāda eṣām iti vi-*
grahaḥ / tathā hy ayoniśomanaskāram antareṇa saty api bāhye 'rthe notpad-
yante rāgādayaḥ …

[79] According to Frauwallner (1959), Vasubandhu had already restricted
the number of *pramāṇa*s from three to two in his *Vādavidhi*. But this might
well be another case of Frauwallner's use of the *argumentum ex/a silentio*:
the fact that no fragment dealing with (*āpt*)*āgama* is available to us does not
mean that the original *Vādavidhi* did not address scripture as a third genuine
means of valid cognition. At any rate, Vasubandhu seems to acknowledge

perception and inference are enough both to shape and bring about the path to salvation and to provide the basic gnoseological features of the liberated yogin. To put it in a nutshell: Although it is conceptual in nature and thus belongs to ignorance, inference is the means through which perception, which is nothing but "knowledge," can be brought to function in its most genuine manner. Dharmakīrti's system is in a way analogous to Tathāgatagarbha patterns of thought: though polluted by (ultimately adventitious) false views and defilements, the condition of the liberated mind is already here at hand. To be more precise, perception is basically the same with regard to its operation and objects before and after the revolution of the basis (*āśrayaparivṛtti*). The only (but admittedly crucial) difference is that, at the completion of the path, it is no longer adulterated and contradicted by the counteracting cognitive factor called "ignorance." Correcting erroneous superimpositions of all kinds and substituting them with true/validated intellectual contents is the basic task of inference. Far from being a means of investigating the world and improving knowledge, inference aims first and fore-

---

three means of valid cognition in his AKBh (76,24–25: *pramāṇābhāvāt / na hi … pramāṇam asti pratyakṣam anumānam āptāgamo vā …*) as well as in VY 173,16–17: *mdor na rigs pa ni 'dir tshad ma rnam pa gsum po mṅon sum daṅ rjes su dpag pa daṅ yid ches pa'i gsuṅ ṅo //*). Buddhist eristic-dialectical treatises are at great variance concerning the number (and definitions) of the *pramāṇa*s: four (or five) in the *Hetuvidyā* Section of the YBh (see, e.g., HV [§3.2] 4*,15–16, where the last five items of the list defining *sādhana* must be considered as *pramāṇa*s because of their functional similarity (providing evidence [*yuktivāda*] for the *hetu*, see HV [§3.22] 5*,3–5): *sārūpyaṃ vairūpyaṃ pratyakṣam anumānam āptāgamaś ca*; to the best of my knowledge, the HV only uses the term *pramāṇa* with regard to *pratyakṣa*; therefore, the number of the *pramāṇa*s here is either five [or four if we consider that *sārūpya* and *vairūpya* occur once in a singular *dvandva* compound] or only one), four in the **Upāyahṛdaya/*Prayogasāra* (**pratyakṣam anumānam upamānam āgamaś ca*; see **UH 6,10–11 and 13,5 ff.*), three in Asaṅga's *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (which, maybe on the basis of the BoBh and the *Madhyāntavibhāga*, sets the standard number for all subsequent Yogācāra treatises), i.e., *pratyakṣa*, *anumāna* and *āptāgama* (see ASBh 152,27, 153,1 and 153,5).

most at discarding the erroneous superimpositions that ignorance
is ultimately responsible for.[80]

2.2.2. As we have seen, ignorance basically amounts to superim-
position, concealment/covering, conceptual construct and pseudo-
perception. As such, ignorance is of a cognitional character and
consists in an "anti-knowledge," in a mental event counteracting,
contradicting or conflicting with "knowledge." What does, then,
"knowledge" consist in? As we have seen, Dharmakīrti's com-
mentators define it as the "vision/perception of a real object"
(*bhūtārtha°/sadarthadarśana*), or the "grasping of a real object"
(*bhūtārthagrahaṇa*).[81] In these expressions, *darśana* and *grahaṇa*
hint at perception and direct cognition (*vijñāna*), two terms deno-
ting immediate sensory awareness of an object.[82] According to
Dharmakīrti, the nature of an object is undivided and amenable to
sense perception.[83] This is tantamount to claiming that a single act
of perception is enough to grasp this nature, and that it grasps it in
its entirety (*sarvātmanā*), in all its aspects (*sarvākāreṇa*), so that no
other means of valid cognition is needed for cognizing this nature
in a *positive* way (*vidhinā*): Perception leaves no part of this undi-
vided nature unknown, so that, say, inference or verbal knowledge
might be needed in order to gain access to it.[84] In other words, a
single perception grasps an object as selfless and momentary, or, to
be more precise, grasps a selfless and momentary thing.[85] This can,

---

[80] On the corrective function of inference, see Kellner 2004: 4–9.

[81] See Eltschinger 2009: 41–42, n. 6.

[82] AK 1.16a: *vijñānaṃ prativijñaptiḥ*; AKBh 11,7: *viṣayaṃ viṣayaṃ prati
vijñaptir upalabdhir vijñānaskandha ity ucyate /.* AKVy 38,24: *upalabdhir
vastumātragrahaṇam /.*

[83] PV 1.43: *ekasyārthasvabhāvasya pratyakṣasya sataḥ svayam /*; PVSV
26,4: *eko hy arthātmā / sa pratyakṣaḥ …*

[84] PV 1.45: *dṛṣṭasya bhāvasya dṛṣṭa evākhilo guṇaḥ /*; PVSV 26,5–6: *tasya
pratyakṣeṇaiva siddheḥ sarvākārasiddheḥ / tadanyasyāsiddhasyābhāvāt /*;
PVSV 26,9–11: *tasmāt pratyakṣe dharmiṇi tatsvabhāvasākalyaparicchedāt
tatrānavakāśā pramāṇāntaravṛttiḥ syāt /*; PVSVṬ 121,17–18: *pratyakṣadṛṣṭāt
svabhāvāt ko 'nyaḥ /.* Through perception, bare particulars are grasped in
their entire true nature (*dṛṣṭasarvatattva* PVSV 26,14).

[85] PVSV 43,8–11: *nāpi svalakṣaṇasyānityatvādyabhāvaḥ / yasmān nā-*

of course, be traced back to Dharmakīrti's "Sautrāntika" assumption that a perceptual awareness results directly from a real thing's causal efficiency. According to a well-known statement, "experts in reason(ing) hold that [for a given thing] to be a graspable [object] consists in being a cause capable of casting (*arpaṇa*) [its own] aspect into cognition."[86] That real things cast their own aspect into the consciousness, thus giving rise to perceptual awareness, is the basic meaning of the description of this awareness as arising by the force of something real (*vastubalapravṛtta*). Dharmakīrti makes it especially clear in the following statement: "The property of a [perceptual] cognition is to grasp an object; [as for] this [object, it] is grasped as it is, and it generates this [cognition of itself] through [its truly] existing nature. Such is the nature [of the cognition and of the object]."[87] Devendrabuddhi (as well as Śākyabuddhi and Kamalaśīla) exhibits the rationale behind Dharmakīrti's (provisio-

---

nityatvaṃ nāma kiṃcid anyac calād vastunaḥ / kṣaṇapratyupasthāna-dharmatayā tasya tathābhūtasya grahaṇād etad evaṃ bhavaty anityo 'yam anityatvam asyeti vā /. "Neither does the bare particular lack impermanence, etc., for what we call 'impermanence' is nothing other than the transient entity [itself. But] this is so because [those who see the last phase* of a continuum] grasp such an [entity] as having the property of being present [during only one] phase, [and thus say, ascribing properties]: 'This is impermanent,' or: 'This has impermanence'."

    *The last phase (*antyakṣaṇa*) is defined in the following way by Śākya-buddhi and Karṇakagomin (PVṬ *Je* D48a7/P56b8 = PVSVṬ 95,30): *sadṛśakṣaṇāntarāpratisandhāyī kṣaṇo 'ntyakṣaṇaḥ* … "The last phase [of an entity] is the phase which is not connected with a new (*antara*) similar phase." According to PVSVṬ 184,5–6, PVSV 43,8–11 answers the objection formulated in PVSV 42,11–12: *svalakṣaṇe cānityatvādya-pratīter atādrūpyam / teṣāṃ cāvastudharmatā /.* "And since one does not cognize impermanence, etc., in the bare particular, [the bare particular] does not have this nature[, viz. impermanence, etc.], and [hence im-permanence, etc.] are not properties of [real] entities." Note also PVSV 21,4–6: *sa eva hi bhāvaḥ kṣaṇasthitidharmā 'nityatā vacanabhede 'pi dharmidharmatayā nimittaṃ vakṣyāmaḥ /.*

[86] PV 3.247b$_2$d: *grāhyatāṃ viduḥ / hetutvam eva yuktijñā jñānākārārpa-ṇakṣamam //.* See Hattori 1968: 53.

[87] PV 2.206–207a$_1$: *viṣayagrahaṇaṃ dharmo vijñānasya yathāsti saḥ / gṛhyate so 'sya janako vidyamānātmaneti ca // eṣā prakṛtiḥ* … See also be-low, §2.2.6 and n. 136.

nal) position as follows:[88] "When he is asked about the property of
a cognition, the one who accepts that a cognition really grasps an
object must answer that the property of a [perceptual] cognition
is to grasp an object (= PV 2.206ab$_1$). [And] if the property of all
the cognitions possessing an object is to grasp an object, then they
grasp [their] objects as they [really] are, (…) under an aspect such
as impermanence, not under an unreal aspect. For in this way, if
it is rationally established that a cognition cognizes (*viṣayīkaroti*)
an object as it [really] is, that which is not cognized in this way is
due to an external[89] or internal[90] adventitious cause of error, just as
the [erroneous] cognition of a snake in the case of a rope in a dark
place abundant in/suitable for snakes. Therefore, to grasp the real
aspect of an object is the nature of a cognition. If on the contrary
(*atha ca*) [its] nature were to grasp [an object] erroneously, then it
would not have the property of grasping any object [at all]. Because
in this way the object would not be as the cognition cognizes [it],
and because [the cognition] would not cognize the object as it [re-
ally] is, cognitions would be devoid of object, (…) [and] hence all
entities would be unestablished (…) Therefore, the one who accepts
a relationship between object and object-possessor has to hold that
the property of a cognition is to grasp an object, [and] thus the
nature of this [cognition] is to grasp the real aspect of an object.
That which is other than this [i.e., unreal,] is produced by a [purely]
adventitious condition."[91] This argument draws a sharp delineation

---

[88] In an introductory statement, Śākyabuddhi reminds his audience that
the following argument does not match Dharmakīrti's final, Yogācāra po-
sition in epistemological matters. PVṬ D133b2–3/P164b3–5: *don dam par
rnam par śes pa ni don 'dzin par 'dod pas źes bya ba la / don dam par rnam
par śes pa don 'dzin pa ñid ni ma yin te / gzuṅ ba ma grub pa'i phyir ro // 'on
kyaṅ re źig phyi rol gyi don yod par 'dod pa gaṅ yin pa des 'di ltar 'dod par
bya'o źes bstan pa'i phyir de skad du brjod pa yin no //.*

[89] PVṬ D133b3–4/P164b5: *phyi rol lam źes bya ba ni 'dra ba gźan daṅ
gźan 'byuṅ ba la sogs pa'i 'khrul par byed pa'i rnam pa'o //.* See below, nn.
116 and 139.

[90] Tib. *cig śos* = Skt. *itara*, lit. "other [than external]."

[91] PVP D87b5–88a4/P101a2–b3: *rnam par śes pa'i chos kyaṅ gaṅ źe na /
źes dris pa na don dam par rnam par śes pa ni don 'dzin par 'dod pas rnam
śes yul 'dzin pa'i chos śes brjod par bya'o // gaṅ gi tshe rnam par śes pa yul*

between non-erroneous cognitions, which result directly from their objects' causal efficiency, and erroneous cognitions, which result from a cause of error (*bhrāntinimitta*, *pratyaya*). Whereas the former are termed *vastubalapravṛtta*, true (*bhūtārtha*), and (being the mind's) nature, the latter, which arise, among other factors, from the latent tendencies of erroneous conceptual constructs,[92] are de-

---

can du gyur pa thams cad kyi chos yul 'dzin pa yin pa de'i tshe / mi rtag (D *rtag*: P *rtag rtag*) *pa la sogs pa'i rnam pa gaṅ gis … yul yod pa de bźin du 'dzin 'gyur gyi med pa'i rnam pas ni ma yin no // de de ltar na śes pa don ji lta ba bźin du yul du byed par rigs pas thob pa na / de ltar na* (D *na*: P om. *na*) *rtogs pa ma yin pa gaṅ yin pa de ni phyi rol lam cig śos glo bur ba'i 'khrul pa'i rgyu mtshan gyis yin te / dper na sbrul du 'dris pa'i phyogs mi gsal bar thag pa la sbrul gyi* (D *gyi*: P *mi*) *śes pa lta bu'o* // de bas na yul gyi rnam pa yod pa 'dzin pa gaṅ yin pa de ni sems kyi raṅ bźin no // ci ste yaṅ log par 'dzin pa ñid raṅ bźin yin pa de'i tshe yul 'dzin pa'i chos ma yin no // de ltar na ji ltar śes pas yul du byed pa de ltar don de ma yin źiṅ ji ltar don de yin pa de ltar yul du byed pa ma yin pa'i phyir / śes pa dag yul med pa can du 'gyur bas … de ltar na dṅos po thams cad ma grub pa yin te … de bas na yul daṅ yul can gyi dṅos po 'dod pa ñid kyis rnam par śes pa'i chos yul 'dzin pa yin par brjod par bya'o // de ltar na 'di'i raṅ bźin ni yaṅ dag pa'i yul gyi rnam pa 'dzin pa yin no // de rnam pa gźan du 'gyur ba gaṅ yin pa de ni glo bur gyi rkyen gyis byas pa ñid yin no //.*

* Vibh. 82 n. 4: *mandamandaprakāśe sarpopacite pradeśe /.*

Note also TSP Ś1056,21–1057,5/K872,27–873,7: *tathā hi − viṣayaviṣayi-bhāvam icchatā cittaṃ viṣayagrahaṇasvabhāvam abhyupeyam, anyathā viṣayajñānayor na viṣayaviṣayibhāvaḥ / arthagrahaṇasvabhāvatvenāṅgī-kriyamāṇe yas tasya svabhāvas tenaivātmano 'ṃśo 'rthas tena gṛhyata iti vaktavyam / anyathā katham asau gṛhītaḥ syāt / yady asatākāreṇa gṛhyeta tataś ca viṣayaviṣayibhāvo na syāt / tathā hi − yathā jñānaṃ viṣayīkaroty arthaṃ na tathā so 'rthaḥ, yathā so 'rtho na tathā taṃ viṣayīkarotīti nir-viṣayāṇy eva jñānāni syuḥ / tataś ca sarvapadārthāsiddhiprasaṅgaḥ / tas-mād bhūtaviṣayākāragrāhitā 'sya svabhāvo nija iti sthitam / bhūtaś ca svabhāvo viṣayasya kṣaṇikānātmādirūpa iti pratipāditam etat / tena nair-ātmyagrahaṇasvabhāvam eva cittaṃ* nātmagrahaṇasvabhāvam /.*

* TSP$_K$ reads *eveti tan* against TSP$_Ś$ and TSP$_{Tib}$ *eva cittaṃ*; both the Jaisalmer ms and the Pāṭan ms read *eve¹ cittaṃ*. On this passage of the TSP, see McClintock 2010: 213−214.

92 PVṬ D133b4/P164b5−6: *cig śos źes bya ba ni naṅ gi bdag ñid can gyi phyin ci log gi rnam par rtog pa'i bag chags źes bya bas bslad pa'o //.* In an etymologizing vein, Devendrabuddhi explains *āgantuka* as follows (PVP D89a5/P103a2): *rkyen gźan gyi rgyu mtshan las 'oṅs pa ñid yin pa'i phyir*

scribed as *avastubalapravṛtta*, as not agreeing with (means of) valid cognition (*pramāṇasaṃvādin*) and as adventitious (*āgantu[ka]*). According to Dharmakīrti's followers, this delineation only holds good provided perceptual cognitions cognize their objects in their real aspects.

Claiming that a perceptual cognition grasps the real aspect of an object[93] is tantamount to saying that it grasps aspects such as impermanence or selflessness.[94] As Kamalaśīla nicely puts it, "it is firmly established that the intrinsic nature of the [mind] is to grasp the real aspect of an object; but it has been explained [earlier] that the real nature of an object consists of [its being] momentary, selfless, etc.; therefore, the mind has the grasping of selflessness for its nature."[95] In other words, the nature of the mind is to perceive reality/the true nature (*tattvadarśana*) of things.[96] And granted that selflessness is the true nature of things, the mind turns out to be nothing other than discernment (*vipaśyanā*) itself,[97] which Śākyabuddhi defines as wisdom (*prajñā*) bearing upon selfless-

───────────

(**pratyayāntaranimittād āgatatvāt*). Erroneous cognitions and defilements are due to *raṅ daṅ rigs mthun pa'i ñe bar len pa'i rgyu* (PVP D89a5–6/P103a2–3; **svasamānajātīyopādānakāraṇa*; note PVṬ *Je* D251b6/P299a4–5 = PVSVṬ 400,30–431,9: *upādānabalabhāvīti vitathavikalpavāsanābalabhāvi*).

[93] PVP D87b7/P101a6: *yul gyi rnam pa yod pa …*; PVP D88a3/P101b2 = PVP 89a1/P102b3: *yaṅ dag pa'i yul gyi rnam pa …*

[94] PVP D88b3–4/P102a3–4: *mi rtag pa la sogs pa'i rnam pa yod pa'i yul …*; PVP D87b6/P101a4 = PVP D90a4/P104a4: *mi rtag pa la sogs pa'i rnam pa …*; PVP D89a6/P103a3: *bdag med pa …*; PVP D89b3/P103a8: *bdag med pa ñid …*

[95] TSP Ś1057,2–5/K873,5–7: *bhūtaviṣayākāragrāhitā 'sya svabhāvo nija iti sthitam / bhūtaś ca svabhāvo viṣayasya kṣaṇikānātmādirūpa iti pratipāditam etat / tena nairātmyagrahaṇasvabhāvam eva cittam …* For the context of this statement, see above, n. 91.

[96] PVP D87a7/P100b3: *sems kyi raṅ bźin ni de kho na ñid mthoṅ ba'i bdag ñid can yin …* (PVṬ D133a3–4/P164a2–3: *de kho na ñid mthoṅ ba'i bdag ñid can yin gyi źes bya ba ni dṅos po ji lta ba bźin du gnas pa'i 'dzin pa'i* bdag ñid can źes bya ba'i don to*)

   *Cf. PVV 82,14: *yathāvasthitavastugrahaṇam*; PVP D89b1/P103a6: *sems ni ṅo bo ñid kyis de kho na ñid mthoṅ ba'i bdag ñid can yin …*

[97] PVP D90a1/P103b8: *raṅ bźin yaṅ lhag mthoṅ yin …*

ness.[98] This "Sautrāntika" epistemology forms the background of Dharmakīrti's well-known allusion to the canonical topos of the mind's being radiant (*prabhāsvara*) by its very nature (*prakṛtyā*). "Radiant" is to be understood as "having the nature of grasping [entities] as they really are" (*yathābhūtagrahaṇasvabhāva*), or "consisting in the perception of reality/the true nature [of things]" (*tattvadarśanasātmaka*).[99] "Knowledge" is nothing but direct perceptual awareness, i.e., the mirror-like mind grasping the true nature of real entities.[100]

What can be regained from Dharmakīrti's understanding of "knowledge" seems to mirror a significant shift from the ideas held by his Yogācāra predecessors. Defining a threefold ignorance, the YBh declares its antidotes (*vipakṣa*) to be the insights born of audition, reflection and (mental) cultivation.[101] In his PrSVy, Vasubandhu defines "knowledge" as the insight born of reflection and (mental) cultivation.[102] Dharmakīrti assents, of course, to the fact that ignorance can only be eliminated by the practice of the path and its three (or at least two) successive types of insight. But according to him, soteric practice does not aim at developing entirely new cognitive modalities, but rather, at freeing from all counteracting factors a type of cognition that has already been here at hand.

---

[98] PVṬ D134b3/P166a1: *lhag mthoṅ ba yin la źes bya ba bdag med pa la* (D *la*: P *la bya ba*) *dmigs pa'i śes rab bo*. Discernment is described in BhK 1.219,23–220,4 as *sarvadharmaniḥsvabhāvatālambana*, and defined in BhK 3.5,17–20 as follows: *bhūtapratyavekṣaṇā ca vipaśyanocyate / bhūtaṃ punaḥ pudgaladharmanairātmyam / tatra pudgalanairātmyaṃ yā skandhānām ātmātmīyarahitatā / dharmanairātmyaṃ yā teṣām eva māyopamatā /*. For a French translation, see Lamotte 1987: 340. On *vipaśyanā/prajñā*, see Eltschinger 2009: 57–58 (§1.2.5) and nn. 26–27.

[99] PVP D89a5/P103a1: *'od gsal te / yaṅ dag pa ji lta ba bźin du 'dzin pa'i raṅ bźin yin no //*; TS Ś3434ac₁/K3435ac₁: *prabhāsvaram idaṃ cittaṃ tattvadarśanasātmakam / prakṛtyaiva sthitam …*

[100] On this point, see Eltschinger 2005: 190–192.

[101] YBh 206,6–7: *śrutamayyāś cintāmayyā bhāvanāmayyāś ca prajñāyā vipakṣeṇa trayaḥ paryāyā yathākramaṃ yojyante /.*

[102] PrSVy 9a1: *bsams pa daṅ bsgoms pa las byuṅ ba'i śes rab ni rig pa źes bya'o //.*

2.2.3. Contrary to "knowledge," which, qua perception, is a cog-
nition that is free of conceptual construction (*kalpanāpoḍha*) and
non-erroneous (*abhrānta*),[103] the realm of ignorance is coextensive
with conceptuality and error. "Error," however, is not necessar-
ily synonymous with "unreliability" (*visaṃvāda, visaṃvāditva*):
Whereas "erroneous" is to be said of any cognition that does not
arise from and hence display a bare particular, "unreliable" denotes
those cognitions that are not conducive to a successful practical
interaction with the particulars (or, as Dharmottara will say, that do
not allow one to reach/obtain [*pra√āp*] the concrete particular).[104]
All conceptual constructs are erroneous by their very nature and
origin, but some of them are reliable (and hence valid cognitions,
pramāṇa),[105] whereas others are not. Śākyabuddhi and Karṇa-
kagomin have an opponent ask the following question: "[But] if
every conceptual construct is simply erroneous, why [do you hold]
conceptual constructs such as [being] impermanent or selfless [to
be] valid cognitions, but not conceptual constructs such as [being]

---

[103] PVin 1.4ab₁ ≈ NB 1.4: *pratyakṣaṃ kalpanāpoḍham abhrāntam* … On
kalpanāpoḍha, see Funayama 1992; on *abhrānta*, see Funayama 1999.

[104] See Krasser 1995. Note also TSP Ś479,23–24/K392,7: *avisaṃvāditvaṃ
cābhimatārthakriyāsamarthārthaprāpaṇaśaktiḥ /.* "'Being non-deceptive'
means the efficacy to realize the attainment of the object which is appropri-
ate for the fulfilment of a desired purpose." Translation Funayama 1999: 79.
On the differences between Dharmottara's and Kamalaśīla's interpretations
of *abhrānta*, see Funayama 1999: 80–81.

[105] PV 2.5a: *vyavahāreṇa prāmāṇyam* … "Epistemic validity [is known]
through practical activity." Most important in this connection is the case of
inference. PVin 2 46,5–8 (including PVin 2.1cd): *tad etad atasmiṃs tad-
grahād bhrāntir api sambandhataḥ pramā // svapratibhāse 'narthe 'rthā-
dhyavasāyena pravartanād bhrāntir apy arthasambandhena tadavyabhi-
cārāt pramāṇam /.* "Die (Schlußfolgerungserkenntnis) ist wegen der Ver-
bindung [mit dem Gegenstand] eine gültige Erkenntnis (*pramā*), obgleich
sie wegen des Erfassens von etwas als etwas, was es nicht ist, Irrtum ist.
(Das heißt:) Obwohl sie Irrtum ist, weil sie in der Weise auftritt, daß sie ihr
eigenes Erkenntnisbild, das nicht der (wirkliche) Gegenstand ist, als [die-
sen Gegenstand] bestimmt, ist sie als mit dem Gegenstand verbundene (den-
noch) gültige Erkenntnis." Translation Steinkellner 1979: 26–27. See also PV
3.55–63.

permanent?"[106] Dharmakīrti's answer is as follows: "And since all this is an error due to the latent tendencies imprinted by [previous] perceptions of the particulars themselves, [those] conceptual constructs whose arising is [indirectly] bound to these [particulars] are reliable with regard to the thing [itself] although they do not display it, just like the error [consisting] of [cognizing] a gem [is reliable] with regard to the radiance of that gem. [But] others [such as permanence] are not [reliable with regard to the thing itself] because, (…) disregarding (*parityajya*) the conformity[107] with the specific [property] as it has been perceived, they superimpose another[, erroneous] specific [property] by [arbitrarily] grasping any sort of universal (*kiṃcitsāmānya*). [These conceptual constructs are as unreliable with regard to the thing itself] as the notion of a gem [is unreliable] with regard to the radiance of a lamp."[108] Inasmuch as they do not display bare particulars and owe their existence to latent tendencies, all conceptual constructs are error. Some of them, however, are valid cognitions: Because the aspect they ascribe to the thing exists in it,[109] and because they are indirectly related (*pratibaddha*) to the bare particular, they are reliable with regard to the thing itself, i.e., allow a successful practical interaction with it.[110] Other conceptual constructs are not valid cognitions: because

---

[106] PVṬ *Je* D95b3–4/P112a8–b1 ≈ PVSVṬ 183,9–10: *yadi mithyārtha eva sarvo vikalpaḥ kasmāt … anityānātmādivikalpāḥ pramāṇaṃ nityā[di] vikalpās tu neti …*

[107] PVṬ *Je* D96a3/P113a1 = PVSVṬ 183,23–24: *anusaraṇaṃ niścayaṃ parityajya …*

[108] PVSV 43,2–7: *sarvaś cāyaṃ svalakṣaṇānām eva darśanāhitavāsanākṛto viplava iti tatpratibaddhajanmanāṃ vikalpānām atatpratibhāsitve 'pi vastuny avisaṃvādo maṇiprabhāyām iva maṇibhrānteḥ / nānyeṣām / … yathādṛṣṭaviśeṣānusaraṇaṃ parityajya kiṃcitsāmānyagrahaṇena viśeṣāntarasamāropād dīpaprabhāyām iva maṇibuddheḥ /.* On *maṇibhrānti*, see Krasser 1991: 65–66n. 121.

[109] PVṬ *Je* D95b6–7/P112b4–5 ≈ PVSVṬ 183,16–17: *anityādirūpasya vastuni vidyamānatvāt …*

[110] PVin 2 48,1–5 (together with PVin 2.7a): *ata eva prāmāṇyaṃ vastuviṣayaṃ dvayoḥ pratyakṣānumānayoḥ, arthakriyāyogyaviṣayatvād vicārasya / sukhaduḥkhasādhane jñātvā yathārhaṃ pratipitsavo hi kiṃcit parīkṣante prekṣāpūrvakāriṇaḥ, na vyasanitayā /.* "Eben daher bezieht sich

they superimpose an aspect that is not found in the thing itself,[111] and because what they ascribe to it is not even indirectly related to it,[112] they are unreliable with regard to the thing itself, i.e., are deceiving in practice.

2.2.4. In our philosophers' linguistic usage, however, "error" (*bhrānti*) quite often occurs as a shorter term for "unreliable cognition," and is equated with "wrong notion" or "misconception" (*viparyāsa*). A similar semantic shift can be observed in connection with "superimposition" ([*sam*]*āropa*), no longer used in the general sense of conceptuality and concealment, but in the sense of a mistaken identification barring determinate cognition (*niścaya*). *In the present context*, "error," "superimposition" (both in this specialized meaning), "wrong notion," and "lack of determinate cognition" can be considered to be equivalent. Two kinds of situation are responsible for the rise of error: the presence of a cause of error (*bhrāntinimitta*)[113] and the lack of the causal conditions needed for determinate cognition (*niścayapratyayavaikalya*).[114] Together with Śākyabuddhi, we may consider the cause of error as twofold: The internal cause of error consists in the latent tendency of a contrary conceptual construct (*viparītavikalpavāsanā*);[115] as for the external cause of error, it is most often exemplified as the arising of ever new similar phases (*sadṛśāparāparotpatti*) in a continuum,[116]

---

die Gültigkeit der beiden, Wahrnehmung und Schlußfolgerung, auf das Wirkliche, denn eine prüfende Erkenntnis hat ein Objekt, das fähig ist einen Zweck zu erfüllen. Vernünftig handelnde Leute, die (auch nur) ein wenig abwägen, (tun dies), wenn sie die Mittel für Lust und Leid (einmal) erkannt haben, aus der Absicht, [diese] nach Vermögen zu erreichen, aber nicht aus [bloßer] Neigung." Translation Steinkellner 1979: 29 (slightly modified).

[111] PVṬ *Je* D96a1/P112b7 ≈ PVSVṬ 183,20–21: *teṣāṃ* [= *nityādivikalpānām*] … *vastuny avidyamānasyaivākārasya samāropāt /.*

[112] PVṬ *Je* D96a4/P113a2 ≈ PVSVṬ 183,26–27: *pāramparyeṇāpi … apratibaddhatvāt /.*

[113] PV 1.44a, PVSV 26,15, and *passim*.

[114] PVSV 26,19.

[115] See above, n. 92.

[116] PVSV 26,20–21; *sadṛśāparotpatti* at PVṬ *Je* D61a3/P72a2 = PVSVṬ 122,10–11, PVṬ *Je* D61a5/P72a5 = PVSVṬ 123,8–9; note also PVṬ *Je*

D61b4/P72b5 = PVSVṬ 123,27–28: *sadṛśasya dvitīyasya kṣaṇasyotpattyā bhrāntinimittena* … See also above, n. 89. Locus classicus for *sadṛśāparotpatti* is PVSV 21,6–9: *tāṃ punar asya kṣaṇasthitidharmatāṃ svabhāvaṃ svahetor eva tathotpatteḥ paśyann api mandabuddhiḥ sattopalambhena sarvadā tathābhāvaśaṅkāvipralabdho na vyavasyati sadṛśāparotpattivipralabdho vā /*. Translated according to Śākyabuddhi's explanation (PVṬ *Je* D46b2–47a1/P54b6–55a6): "However, although (s)he experiences this property of lasting [only] one phase[, a property which is] the nature of the [entity] since [this entity] is produced such [i.e., momentary,] by its own cause, a [person] of weak intellect fails to determine [it in the same way as (s)he has just experienced it; this failure occurs] either [because this person,] due to having perceived the existence [of this entity at one phase, is] mistaken by the supposition that it permanently (*sarvadā*) exists in this [very] way, or [because this person is] mistaken by the rise of a new (*apara*) phase similar [to the former one]." According to Śākyabuddhi's interpretation (PVṬ *Je* D47b6–48b1/P56a6–57a1), the first cause of error (*vipralambhanimitta*) is proper to the outsiders (*tīrthika*) professing the doctrine of non-momentariness (*akṣaṇi-kavāda*), and points to their internal *kudṛṣṭyabhiniveśavāsanābīja (or else: *anādikudṛṣṭyabhiniveśabīja), which is reinforced by the false views propagated by wrong treatises (*kuśāstradṛṣṭi). As for the second cause of error, it is aimed at explaining why the Buddhists, who follow sound reasoning and scripture (*yuktyāgama*) professing momentariness, still do not ascertain momentariness upon perceiving the real entity. Karṇakagomin's explanation (PVSVṬ 91,23) of *mandabuddhi* is worth noticing: *anādisaṃsārābhyastayā nityādirūpāvidyāvāsanayā mandā buddhir yasya* … "Whose intellect is [made] weak by the latent tendency, repeated [and reinforced] in the beginningless *saṃsāra*, of ignorance in the form of [mistaken aspects] such as 'permanent'." This ignorance (or rather, its latent tendency) being the internal cause of error, the two causes mentioned by Dharmakīrti point to external causes of error (*bāhyam api bhrāntibījam*, PVSVṬ 91,27). Note also PVSV 100,4–7 = PVin 2 82,7–9: *tam asya mandāḥ svabhāvam ūrdhvaṃ vyavasyanti / na prāk / darśane 'pi pāṭavābhāvād iti tadvaśena paścād vyavasthāpyate / vikāradarśaneneva viṣam ajñaiḥ /*. "Weak[-minded people] identify this [transient] nature of the [entity only] later [i.e., at the time of the interruption of the continuum, but] not before [i.e., at the time of the existence of the entity], because even though they [directly] experience [this nature], they lack [intellectual] sharpness. Therefore, [this transient nature] is ascertained [only] later on account of this [determination], just as ignorant [persons identify a poisonous substance that they have seen only] by experiencing a [morbid] affection [such as over-salivation]." See also Steinkellner 1979: 98. Note Karṇakagomin's explanation of *mandāḥ* in PVSVṬ 366,27: *ā saṃsāram avidyānubandhān mandāḥ* … This explanation is borrowed from Dharmottara's PVinṬ *Dze* D249b5/P301b3–4: *'khor ba ji srid par ma rig*

which leads to the superimposition of aspects such as permanent (*nitya*), enduring (*sthira*), and non-momentary (*akṣaṇika*).[117] Be it internal or external, this cause of error impedes determinate cognition (*niścayapratirodhin*, °*vibandhaka*).[118] The lack of (conceptual) habitus (*abhyāsa*) is most often quoted as being among the conditions that, when lacking, prevent determinate cognition from arising.[119] Just as determinate cognition bears upon one specificity (*bheda*) or aspect (*ākāra*) of a previously cognized particular, wrong notion superimposes one partial erroneous/contrary aspect (*aṃśasamāropa*)[120] and associates (< *samyojyeta*, PV 1.44b) another, i.e., a false quality (*guṇa*; glossed as *rūpa*, *dharma*),[121] to the thing. As Dharmakīrti himself has it, "though it has been perceived as distinct from all [other entities], an entity is not [necessarily] recognized in this way [i.e., in all its aspects], because an obstruction (*vyavadhāna*) to [the recognition of] a certain specificity [such as momentariness] may occur."[122] Determinate cognition (*niścaya*, °*jñāna*, °*manas*) and superimposition (*samāropa*, °*jñāna*; *āropamanas*) are mutually exclusive and stand in a relationship of mu-

---

pa daṅ rjes su 'brel pa źan pa … Note also the various interpretations of the fact that the determinate cognition arises only at the time of *pravāhaviccheda*: (1) PVṬ *Je* D227a3−4/P263b7−8: *mthoṅ ba'i dus su ṅes pa yod pa ma yin te / ma rig pa'i mun pa ñid kyi phyir daṅ gźan rgyun 'dra ba skye ba'i phyir ro // mthoṅ ba gsal ba med pa'i phyir ro //*. (2) PVSVṬ 366,28−29: *na darśanakāle 'dhyavasāyo 'sti / avidyā(sāma)rthyāt sadṛśāparotpattyā ca darśanapāṭavasyābhāvāt /*. (3) PVinṬ *Dze* D249b6−7/P301b5: *ma rig pa daṅ ldan pa'i źan pa rnams la mthoṅ ba gsal ba med pa'i phyir ro //*. Here again, both Śākyabuddhi and Karṇakagomin suggest that the absence of *niścaya* proceeds from an internal (ignorance) and an external (the rise of a new similar phase) cause.

   [117] See also above, §2.1.1. and n. 11.

   [118] PVSV 26,14, PVṬ *Je* D61a5/P72a5 = PVSVṬ 123,8.

   [119] PVṬ *Je* D61b2−3/P72b3 = PVSVṬ 123,21. On *niścayapratyaya*s, see Kellner 2004: 19−32.

   [120] PV 1.50a; PVSV 27,22−28,1: *ākārasamāropa*; PVṬ *Je* D62b3/P73b6 = PVSVṬ 125,28−29: *tadviparītākārasamāropī viparyāsaḥ*.

   [121] PV 1.44b, PVṬ *Je* D64b7/P76a8−b1 = PVSVṬ 131,11, PVV 306,6.

   [122] PVSV 28,13−14 (leaving *hi* untranslated): *na hi sarvato bhinno dṛṣṭo 'pi bhāvas tathaiva pratyabhijñāyate / kvacid bhede vyavadhānasambhavāt /*.

tual annulment (*bādhyabādhakabhāva*):[123] When aspects such as lasting, endowed with a self (*sātmaka*), or unconditioned (*akṛtaka*) are superimposed, (real) contrary aspects such as impermanent/ momentary, selfless (*nirātmaka*), or conditioned (*kṛtaka*) are not made the objects of determinate cognitions.[124]

2.2.5. According to Dharmakīrti, the function (*vyāpāra*) and aim (*phala*, *artha*) of inference[125] (*anumāna*, *liṅga*, *sādhana*) as a means of valid cognition is not to cognize something in a positive way (*vidhinā*) or to determine the nature of an entity (*vastusvabhāvaniś-caya*),[126] but to rule out, negate, or exclude (*vyavaccheda*, *niṣedha*, *pratiṣedha*, *nivṛtti*, *apoha*) unreliable superimpositions and wrong

---

[123] PV 1.49ab: *niścayāropamanasor bādhyabādhakabhāvataḥ /*; PVSV 28,16–17: *samāropaniścayayor bādhyabādhakabhāvāt /.*

[124] *niścitākāra*s: *kṛtakatva* (PVSVṬ 124,26 and 125,23–24), *anityatva* (PVSV 26,5), *kṣaṇikatvādi* (PVSVṬ 130,28), *kṣaṇikatvānātmādi* (PVSVṬ 124,12), *asthira* (PVSVṬ 129,28), *nirātmaka* (PVSVṬ 129,28); *samāropitā-kāra*s: *sthira* (PVSV 28,11, PVSVṬ 122,12), *sātmaka* (PVSV 28,11), *sthiti* (PVSV 26,21), *akṛtaka* (PVSVṬ 125,23–24), *nityādi* (PVSVṬ 124,13 and 125,24).

[125] Note should be made that inference is itself strictly of a conceptual na-ture, and as such is basically on the side of error and ignorance. An infer-ence indeed mobilizes two properties (*dharma*, a *probans* [*sādhanadharma*, *hetu*, *liṅga*] and a *probandum* [*sādhyadharma*]) that are thought to belong to a single property possessor (*dharmin*, or "subject"). Both of these two pro-perties are universals (*sāmānya*) unduly ascribing a single unitary aspect to the many. At the same time, these two different properties are tied to one and the same subject, thus unduly dividing the indivisible. To unify the many (the seed of the use of universals*) and divide the undivided (the seed of co-reference [*sāmānādhikaraṇa*]**) are indeed the two main psychological operations giving rise to conceptual constructs.

    *According to PVṬ *Je* D101a6/P119a4 and D101a7/P119a5: *spyi'i tha sñad kyi sa bon …* (*sāmānyavyavahārabīja*); the psychological genesis of universals is presented in a nutshell in PV 1.82.

    **According to PVṬ *Je* D101b4/P119b3: *gźi mthun pa ñid …* [*kyi*] *sa bon* (*sāmānādhikaraṇyabīja*); the psychological genesis of co-reference is presented in a nutshell in PV 1.83. See also Eltschinger 2009: 59–62 (§1.2.10).

[126] Resp. PVSV 27,10 and PVSV 28,20.

notions:[127] "Superimpositions endowed each with its own cause are
as many as the alien natures (*parabhāva*) [wrongly ascribed] to the
[entity]. In that they exclude these [superimpositions], the means of
valid cognition [named 'inferences'] can therefore be useful. But
these [inferences,] aiming (°*phala*) [as they do] at the exclusion [of
superimpositions,] are not employed in order to cognize a [sup-
posedly still] uncognized part of the entity, because this [part has
already been] perceived, and because an indivisible [entity] cannot
be perceived in a partial way (*ekadeśena*)."[128] Dharmakīrti spells
out the same argument in the following three stanzas: "[If] the un-
divided (*eka*) nature of an object is in itself perceptible, which other
unperceived part [of it] would there be left for [further positive]
investigation by the [other] means of valid cognition [i.e., by infe-
rence]? [There would be none,] if another [unreal] quality were not
associated [with this nature] due to [some] cause of error, just like
the aspect of silver [is associated] with a conch-shell due to one's
observing a similarity of colour [between them]. Therefore, all the
qualities of the perceived entity are perceived, [but] due to some
error, they are not determined. Thus one undertakes an [inferen-
tial] proof [in order to determine what the error has left undetermi-
ned]."[129] To be more precise, inferences, like conceptual constructs
and words, perform both a direct, positive (< *vidhinā*, *vidhirūpeṇa*)

---

[127] *vyavacchedaphala* (PVSV 26,24); *samāropavyavaccheda* (PVSV
27,13; 27,14); *vyavacchedakṛt* (PVSV 27,10); *anyavyavaccheda* (PVSV
27,14); *vyavacchedaviṣaya* (PVSV 28,9; PV 1.56a); *anyavyavacchedavi-
ṣaya* (PVSVṬ 127,10); *anyasamāropavyavacchedaphala* (PVSV 31,12–13);
samāropapratiṣedhaphala (PVSVṬ 124,16); *bhrāntinivṛttyartham* (PVSV
31,12); *apohagocara* (PV 1.48d; PVSV 28,19); *apohaviṣaya* (PV 1.47a); *an-
yāpohaviṣaya* (PVSV 31,13). See Kellner 2004: 4–9.

[128] PVSV 26,22–27,2: *yāvanto 'sya parabhāvās tāvanta eva yathāsvaṃ
nimittabhāvinaḥ samāropā iti tadvyavacchedakāni bhavanti pramāṇāni
saphalāni syuḥ / teṣāṃ tu vyavacchedaphalānāṃ nāpratītavastvaṃśapra-
tyāyane pravṛttis tasya dṛṣṭatvāt / anaṃśasya caikadeśena darśanāyogāt /.*

[129] PV 1.43–45: *ekasyārthasvabhāvasya pratyakṣasya sataḥ svayam / ko
'nyo na dṛṣṭo bhāgaḥ syād yaḥ pramāṇaiḥ parīkṣyate // no ced bhrāntini-
mittena saṃyojyeta guṇāntaram / śuktau vā rajatākāro rūpasādharmya-
darśanāt // tasmād dṛṣṭasya bhāvasya dṛṣṭa evākhilo guṇaḥ / bhrānter niścī-
yate neti sādhanaṃ sampravartate //.*

and an indirect (< *arthāt*), negative function.[130] In its positive func-
tion, inference aims at the conceptual determination of those as-
pects of the perceived particular that have escaped determination
(*aniścitaniścaya*).[131] But inference *ipso facto* negates the concep-
tual constructs wrongly ascribed to the perceived entity, and such
is its indirect function. In this respect, inference does not differ
from words and concepts, which refer simultaneously to positive
intellectual constructs and indirectly exclude other, unfitting con-
structs. It is hardly surprising, then, that Dharmakīrti repeatedly
describes inference, too, as the exclusion of another (*anyāpoha*):
Inference aims at determination, but to determine amounts to
holding off superimposition (*samāropaviveka*), i.e., to excluding
another, superimposed aspect. That inference *always* presupposes
a wrong notion is the point at stake in the following discussion:
"[Objection:] The [inferential] determination of [something pre-
viously] uncognized does not necessarily presuppose a wrong no-
tion, as [in the case of one] suddenly (*akasmāt*) knowing from [the
presence of] smoke [that there is] fire [in a certain place], for in
this case, the [previous] superimposition of the absence of fire (*an-
agni*) [in this place] is not possible. Therefore, [inference] does not
always (*sarvatra*) exclude [a previous superimposition]. [Answer:]
(…) In this case too, the [person] who sees this [spot] lacks a deter-
minate cognition of its nature [i.e., of this spot's indeed possess-

---

[130] This is made especially clear by Karṇakagomin, who regularly (e.g.,
PVSVṬ 124,14, 124,22, 124,24, 125,14, 125,15, 125,21, 126,9) adds *vidhinā/
vidhirūpeṇa* after words denoting *niścaya* or *adhyavasāya*, and *arthāt* after
words denoting *vyavaccheda*, etc. Interestingly enough, close comparison
with the PVṬ reveals that this is never done by Śākyabuddhi. Commenting
on PV 1.45d (*sādhanaṃ sampravartate*), Karṇakagomin (PVSVṬ 124,21–
22) says: *tanniścayārthaṃ sādhanam anumānaṃ vidhirūpeṇaiva pravartate
…*, whereas Śākyabuddhi (PVṬ *Je* D62a2/P73a4) has: *sgrub pa źes bya ba
'khrul pa sel bar byed pa'i rjes su dpag pa rab tu 'jug pa yin /*. For a similar
observation, see Kellner 2004: 5n. 3.

[131] Note, e.g., PVSVṬ 184,8–11 (with no equivalent in PVṬ): *tena praty-
akṣeṇa svalakṣaṇe gṛhyamāṇe 'nityatvaṃ gṛhītam eva kevalaṃ bhrānti-
nimittasadbhāvād aniścitam / atas tanniścayamātre 'numānavyāpāras / tena
tanniścaya eva svalakṣaṇe 'nityatvapratītir iti siddham /.*

ing fire. And] why [does he lack it]? Because of a wrong notion![132]
And [insofar as] this [person] determines this place as free of [fire]
(*tadviviktena rūpeṇa*) through a cognition that does not presume
[by any means] that fire exists [there], how can it be said [that this
person is] not mistaken (*aviparyasta*)? And a [person] who would
neither superimpose this aspect nor doubt [the existence of fire]
would [certainly] not resort to an inference (*liṅga*) in order to know
that [there is fire in this place]."[133]

2.2.6. We are now in a position to grasp one of the fundamental
trends of Dharmakīrti's philosophy. Perception provides an unme-
diated and unbiased access to reality, especially to the so-called
*vastudharma*s (impermanence, selflessness, painfulness, empti-
ness), those ultimately real aspects that entities themselves cast into
the consciousness. But ignorance (qua conceptuality and conceal-
ment) first has us ascribe erroneous intellectual constructs to reality,
both by unifying the many and by dividing the indivisible. Second,
ignorance (especially as the personalistic false view) has us fail to
identify, recognize, or determine the entities' real aspects by super-
imposing contrary qualities. Now, aspects such as self, pleasure, or
one's own are the root causes of craving, appropriating, acting and
finally being reborn, i.e., suffering. From this perspective, the value
of inference as a correcting, error-eliminating principle cannot be
overestimated. In a very interesting passage in PV 3, Dharmakīrti
clearly connects error, its elimination by inference, and the (yogic,
i.e., Buddhist) strengthening of an (inferentially based) conceptual
habitus: "Because of the error that is due to the [immediate] occur-

---

[132] I.e., because this person grasps this place as identical with a spot wi-
thout fire.

[133] PVSV 27,15–28,1: *nanu nāvaśyaṃ viparyāsapūrvaka evāpratītaniścayo
bhavati / yathā 'kasmād dhūmād agnipratipattiḥ / na hi tatrānagnisamāropaḥ
sambhāvyate / tan na sarvatra vyavacchedaḥ kriyate / … tatrāpi taddarśinas
tatsvabhāvāniścayaḥ / kutaḥ / viparyāsāt / sa ca taṃ pradeśaṃ tadviviktena
rūpeṇa niścinvann agnisattābhāvanā*vimuktayā buddhyā katham avipary-
asto nāma / tadākārasamāropasaṃśayarahitaś ca tatpratipattau na liṅgam
anusaret /.*

  *On *bhāvanā*, see Gnoli 1960 (= PVSV): 27–28n. 22. This passage has
  also been translated and discussed by Kellner (2004: 10–19).

rence of a new (*apara*) similar [phase, someone] fails to see [i.e., determine] the difference [between two phases as long as the continuum is not interrupted; this person thus] lacks the [determinate] knowledge of a certain [aspect like impermanence, although (s)he has grasped it perceptually (…) But if the continuum is interrupted by an interval of non-existence,] it is indeed without [resorting to any] inference that down to a child, [any] person determines, upon seeing the rise of a new (*uttara*) [phase of light] disconnected [from the preceding one], that the light [of a lamp], etc., is perishable. [Or,] failing to see the effect [of an entity] because of the interval [implied by the causal process], an ascertainer [can also], due to dullness (*apāṭava*), be mistaken with regard to [this entity's very] capacity [to bring about its effect,] although it is inherent to the entity [itself]. It is in order to remove just this [kind of error] that inference is [so] minutely described. [As for] those of great understanding, they determine all aspects [of an entity] by [just] seeing [it]."[134] The intimate connection between inference and the search for the structure of ultimate reality and hence soteriology is emphasized in the following statement by Dharmakīrti: "The differentiation between the *probandum* and the *probans* is used by/allows wise people to penetrate ultimate reality."[135] In determining

---

[134] PV 3.104ac and 105–107: *kvacit tad aparijñānaṃ sadṛśāparasambhavāt / bhrānter apaśyato bhedam … // tathā hy aliṅgam ābālam asaṃśliṣṭottarodayam / paśyan paricchinatty eva dīpādiṃ nāśinaṃ janaḥ // bhāvasvabhāvabhūtāyām api śaktau phale 'dṛśaḥ / anānataryato moho viniścetur apāṭavāt // tasyaiva vinivṛttyartham anumānopavarṇanam / vyavasyantīkṣaṇād eva sarvākārān mahādhiyaḥ //*. See PVP D162b6–163b5/P189a7–190b1 and PVV 148,19–149,17. Note that both Devendrabuddhi and Manorathanandin analyze the compound *asaṃśliṣṭottarodayam* as a *bahuvrīhi*. Whereas Devendrabuddhi does not elaborate on *mahādhiyaḥ*, Śākyabuddhi (PVṬ D178a6/P219b7) explains: *blo gros chen pos źes bya ba ni dbaṅ po las 'das pa'i don mthoṅ ba'o* (**mahādhiya ity atīndriyārthadarśinaḥ*), and Manorathanandin (PVV 149,16), more convincingly: *mahādhiyo viparītavyavasāyānākrāntapratyakṣā yoginaḥ*.

[135] PV 1.86bd: *sādhyasādhanasaṃsthitiḥ / paramārthāvatārāya vidvadbhir avakalpyate //*. Skt. *saṃsthiti* is not entirely clear, but must be semantically near *vyavasthāna* (PV 1.85). Manorathanandin explains *saṃsthiti* (PV 3.214, 3.315, 3.319, 4.15, 4.64) as *vyavasthā* (PVV 182,25, 213,14–15, 214,22, 419,11–12, 437,3), "settlement, establishment; statute; fixed rule." On

what had remained unidentified and hereby excluding wrong no-
tions, inference indeed restores, still on a purely conceptual level,
the most fundamental features of reality. The sequence linking the
obliteration of perception and an inference's corrective function is
outlined by Dharmakīrti in a highly suggestive statement of PV
2: "The property of [all] cognition is to grasp an object; this [ob-
ject] is grasped as it [really] is [i.e., as impermanent, etc.], and it
generates this [cognition of itself] by [its] real nature. And such
is [the object's and the cognition's original] nature [i.e., that the
object generates a cognition that grasps it as it really is, and that
the cognition grasps a real aspect of the object. But] on account of
another cause [i.e., on account of a cause of error], the [mind] shifts
(*skhalat*) from this [inherently veracious nature, superimposing
such erroneous aspects as permanence on the object,] and becomes
uncertain, requiring a [cognitive] condition for the removal [of this
state], like the cognition of a piece of rope [as a snake]."[136] There
is little doubt that the condition alluded to here, explained by De-
vendrabuddhi as "a means of valid cognition annulling error,"[137]
is none other than inference. And given the soteriological context
(description of the final revolution of the basis, *āśrayaparivṛtti*) in
which this statement occurs, it is no less obvious that Dharmakīrti
holds that this condition provides the first impetus toward estab-
lishing the mind (*vijñāna*, i.e., perception), at the completion of the
path, in its genuine radiant condition. Taking Dharmakīrti's epis-
temological interpretation of the mind's *natural* radiance seriously,
but also his insistence on perception's non-erroneousness and its
giving access to the ultimate structure of reality, we are left with
no other possibility than to hold perception before and after the
āśrayaparivṛtti to be one and the same with regard to its content
and operation. As we have seen, ignorance as "anti-knowledge"

---

avatāra, see BHSD *s.v.*, 71[a].

[136] PV 2.206–207: *viṣayagrahaṇaṃ dharmo vijñānasya yathāsti saḥ |
gṛhyate so 'sya janako vidyamānātmaneti ca || eṣā prakṛtir asyās tan nimit-
tāntarataḥ skhalat | vyāvṛttau pratyayāpekṣam adṛḍhaṃ sarpabuddhivat ||.*
See above, §2.2.2 and n. 87.

[137] PVP D89a2–3/P102b5–6: *rkyen la ltos pa yin te | de ltar … 'khrul pa
gnod pa can gyi tshad ma la ltos pa daṅ bcas pa yin no ||.*

neither impedes nor obliterates perception itself, but is responsible for subsequent errors and superimpositions. The main difference between cognition before and after the *āśrayaparivṛtti*, i.e., between cognition-*cum*-ignorance and cognition-*sine*-ignorance, does not pertain to perception itself, or, as Dharmakīrti himself would have it, to the nature of the mind, but to the subsequent treatment of perceptual data. Inference is responsible for bringing out the intellectual contents that correct erroneous superimpositions; it makes determinate cognition possible, and further, endows the yogin with true conceptual counterparts of the entities' real aspects. In other words, inference sets the path in motion[138] that will first enable the yogin to determine the real aspects of entities upon perceiving them,[139] and then free his mind from all those adventitious factors that counteracted perception. To the best of my under-

---

[138] Note PVṬ *Je* D252a1–2/P299a8–b1 = PVSVṬ 401,12–13: *pramāṇāny anityādibhūtākāragrāhīṇi pratipakṣamārgam āvahanti /.*

[139] Note, e.g., PVṬ *Je* D70b4–5/P83a4–5 = PVSVṬ 142,15: *yathā yogināṃ buddhipāṭavād darśanamātreṇa kṣaṇikatvādiniścayaḥ /.* That perception as such does not differ between ordinary people (*pṛthagjana*) and yogins is also Karṇakagomin's opinion in two interesting statements. (1) PVSVṬ 91,24–25: *yogināṃ saty api sadṛśadarśane mandabuddhitvābhāvāt kṣaṇikatvaniścayo bhavati …* "The yogins do determine momentariness because, though [their perceptual] experience is the same [as that of ordinary persons], they lack [this] being of weak intellect." (2) PVSVṬ 92,19–21: *mandabuddhir* (PVSV 21,7) *iti / tena bāhyādhyātmikavipralambhanimittasadbhāvāt pṛthagjanānāṃ* [*na*] *niścayaḥ / yogināṃ tu saty api sadṛśadarśane paṭubuddhitvān niścayo bhavaty eva /.* "By 'of weak intellect,' [Dharmakīrti means the following:] Because of the presence of both external [i.e., the rise of a new similar phase, etc.,] and internal [i.e., ignorance,] causes of error, ordinary persons fail to determine [momentariness in the same way as they have experienced it], but the yogins, though [their perceptual] experience is the same [as that of ordinary persons], do indeed determine [momentariness] because they are of sharp intellect." According to Karṇakagomin, then, perception itself does not differ between those who have reached the *darśanamārga* and those who have not; what indeed differs is the degree of their intellectual sharpness, the increase of which can only be due to the habitus (*abhyāsa*) or cultivation (*bhāvanā*) that comes along the path. On the context of these statements and the issue of internal as well as external causes of error, see above, n. 116; on *abhyāsa* as a condition for determinate cognitions to arise, see Kellner 2004: 19–32.

standing, the perception of the liberated saint is to be equated with the *paramārthikapramāṇa* that Dharmakīrti touches upon at the end of PVin 1.[140]

I do not intend to claim, in contrast to most scholars and the textual evidence, that Dharmakīrti's inference has only soteriological meaning and relevance. By pointing out Dharmakīrti's insistence upon the *vastudharma*s in his treatment of both perception and inference, and by putting to the fore the corrective function of inference, I would like to emphasize the fact that Dharmakīrti never lost sight of soteriology in his elaborations on epistemology. According to him, there is at least one set of cases (the most important ones indeed) in which the use of inference coincides with, or impinges upon, the precincts of the wisdom born of rational reflection (*yukticintāmayī prajñā*).[141] The wisdom born of rational reflection traditionally consists (at least in connection with the so-called *upapattisādhanayukti*) in an analysis carried out on the basis of the means of valid cognition. This holds true of the Buddhist epistemologists, according to whom rational reflection basically aims at bringing out intellectual contents that have been thoroughly examined and made immaculate by means of valid cognition (*pramāṇaparidṛṣṭārtha*, *pramāṇapariśuddhārtha*), i.e., by inference.[142] Though still strictly conceptual in nature, these contents (the *vastudharma*s again) "co-function" as the antidote (*pratipakṣa = nairātmyadarśana*, etc.) to the cause of suffering, i.e., ignorance in the form of personalistic belief. Most ordinary people may

---

[140] PVin 1 44,4–5*: cintāmayīm eva tu prajñām anuśīlayanto vibhramavivekanirmalam anapāyi pāramārthikapramāṇam abhimukhīkurvanti /.* On this passage, see Krasser 2004: 142–144 and Eltschinger 2005: 155–158. That liberated perception comes about through the yogin's initially resorting to inferences is clear. How it can be equated with omniscience remains, however, obscure. But does not Dharmakīrti himself term "unfathomable" (*acintya*) the cognition of (liberated) yogins and the Buddha's omniscience? PV 3.532d: *acintyā yogināṃ gatiḥ //*; SAS 94: *bcom ldan 'das kyis don thams cad thugs su chud pa ni bsam gyis mi khyab ste / rnam pa thams cad du śes pa daṅ brjod pa'i yul las 'das pa'i phyir ro //.*

[141] PVin 1 27,9.

[142] On the *cintāmayī prajñā* in the Buddhist epistemologists, see Eltschinger 2010.

well show no interest at all for evolving determinate cognitions of momentariness and selflessness. But to the Buddhist yogin still in the stage of being an ordinary person, investigating the most intimate structure of reality by means of inferences is the first significant step towards the path of vision and liberation.

References

Abbreviations

BHSD   Franklin Edgerton: *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. Volume II: Dictionary. Delhi 1970: Motilal Banarsidass.

D   Jikido Takasaki/Zuiho Yamaguchi/Noriaki Hakamaya: *sDe dge Tibetan Tripiṭaka bsTan 'gyur preserved at the Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo*. Tokyo 1977–1981.

ms   Manuscript

P   Daisetz T. Suzuki: *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition, Kept in the Library of the Otani University, Kyoto*. Tōkyō/Kyōto 1957: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute.

s.v.   *sub voce*

Tib   Tibetan

Primary sources

AK(Bh) – Prahlad Pradhan: *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu*. Patna 1975: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 8).

AKVy – Unrai Wogihara: *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā, the Work of Yaśomitra*. Tokyo 1989: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store (The Publishing Association of Abhidharmakośavyākhyā).

AN – R. Morris/E. Hardy/M. Hunt/C.A.F Rhys Davids: *Aṅguttara Nikāya*. 6 volumes. London 1885–1910: The Pali Text Society.

ASBh – Nathmal Tatia: *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣyam*. Patna 1976: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 17).

BhK 1 – First *Bhāvanākrama* (Kamalaśīla). Pp. 497/187–539/229 in Giuseppe Tucci: *Minor Buddhist Texts*. Delhi 1986: Motilal Banarsidass.

BhK 3 – Giuseppe Tucci: *Minor Buddhist Texts, Part III: Third Bhāvanā-krama*. Roma 1971: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente (Serie Orientale Roma 43).

HV – *Hetuvidyā* Section of the *Yogācārabhūmi*. Hideomi Yaita: *Three Sanskrit Texts from the Buddhist Pramāṇa-Tradition: The Hetuvidyā Section of the Yogācārabhūmi, the Dharmottaraṭippanaka, and the Tarkarahasya*. Narita 2005: Naritsan Shinshoji (Monograph Series of Naritasan Institute for Buddhist Studies 4). The Sanskrit text of the HV can be found on pp. 98/1*–124/27*.

MMK – See PrP.

MN I – V. Trenckner: *The Majjhima-Nikāya*. Vol. 1. London 1935: Pali Text Society.

MS – See Lamotte 1973: I.

NB(Ṭ) – Th. I. Ščerbatskoj: *Nyāyabindu. Buddijskij učebnik'' logiki soči-nenie Dharmakirti I tolkovanie na nego Nyāyabinduṭīkā sočinenie Darmottary*. Osnabrück 1970: Biblio Verlag.

Pā – Pāṇini (*Aṣṭādhyāyī*).

PrP – Louis de La Vallée Poussin: *Madhyamakavṛttiḥ: Mūlamadhyama-kakārikās* (*Mādhyamikasūtras*) *de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*. Delhi 1992: Motilal Banarsidass.

PrSVy – *Pratītyasamutpādavyākhyā* (Vasubandhu). D no. 3995, *Chi* 1b–61a, P no. 5496, *Chi* 1–71a.

PV 1–4 – Yūsho Miyasaka: Pramāṇavārttika-kārikā (Sanskrit and Tibetan). *Acta Indologica* 2 (1971–1972), pp. 1–206. See also PVV; for PV 2–3, see also PVA; for PV 1, see also PVSV; for PV 2.131cd–285, see also Vetter 1990. My numbering of the verses in PV 2 follows that of Vetter.

PVA – Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana: *Pramāṇavārttikabhāṣyam or Vārtikālaṅ-kāraḥ of Prajñākaragupta* (*Being a Commentary on Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttikam*). Patna 1953: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

PVin 1–2 – Ernst Steinkellner: *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścaya, Chapters 1 and 2*. Beijing/Vienna 2007: China Tibetology Publishing House/Austrian Academy of Sciences Press (Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region 2).

PVinṬ – *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā* (Dharmottara). D no. 4229, *Dze* 1b1–*Tshe* 178a3/P no. 5727, *Dze* 1b1–*We* 209b8.

PVP – *Pramāṇavārttikapañjikā* (Devendrabuddhi). D no. 4217, *Che* 1–326b4/P no. 5717, *Che* 1–390a8.

PVSV – Raniero Gnoli: *The Pramāṇavārttikam of Dharmakīrti. The First Chapter with the Auto-Commentary*. Roma 1960: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente (Serie Orientale Roma 23).

PVSVṬ – Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana: *Karṇakagomin's Commentary on the Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti of Dharmakīrti*. Kyōto 1982: Rinsen Books Co.

PVṬ – *Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā* (Śākyabuddhi). D no. 4220, *Je* 1b1–*Ñe* 282a7/P no. 5718, *Je* 1b1–*Ñe* 348a8. Unless otherwise stated, all references to the PVṬ belong to *Ñe*.

PVV – Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana: Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika with Commentary by Manorathanandin. Published as an appendix to the *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 24–26 (1938–1940).

SAS – F.I. Ščerbatskoj: *Tibetskij perevo'' sočinenij Saṃtānāntarasiddhi Dharmakīrti i Saṃtānāntarasiddhiṭīkā Vinītadeva*. Delhi 1992: Motilal Banarsidass.

TS(P) – K = Embar Krishnamacharya: *Tattvasaṅgraha of Śāntarakṣita With the Commentary of Kamalaśīla*. 2 vols. Baroda 1984: Oriental Institute.

*UH – **Upāyahṛdaya/*Prayogasāra*. Giuseppe Tucci: *Pre-Dignāga Buddhist Texts on Logic from Chinese Sources*. Baroda 1929: Oriental Institute (Gaekwad Oriental Series 49).

Vibh. – Vibhūticandra's notes to PVV. See PVV.

VY – Jong Cheol Lee: *The Tibetan Text of the Vyākhyāyukti of Vasubandhu*. Tōkyō 2001: The Sankibo Press (Bibliotheca Indologica et Buddhologica 8).

YBh – *Yogācārabhūmi*, or, followed by page/line numbers: V. Bhattacharya: *The Yogācārabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga*. Calcutta 1957: University of Calcutta.

Secondary sources

Collins 1982 – Steven Collins: *Selfless Persons. Imagery and thought in Theravāda Buddhism*. Cambridge/New York 1982: Cambridge University Press.

Eltschinger 2005 – Vincent Eltschinger: Études sur la philosophie religieuse de Dharmakīrti: 2. L'*āśrayaparivṛtti*. *Journal Asiatique* 293/1 (2005), pp. 151–211.

Eltschinger 2009 – Vincent Eltschinger: Ignorance, epistemology and soteriology – Part I. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 32/1–2 (2009 [2010]), pp. 39–83.

Eltschinger 2010 – Vincent Eltschinger: Studies in Dharmakīrti's Religious Philosophy: 4. The *Cintāmayī Prajñā*. Pp. 553–591 in Piotr Balcerowicz (ed.): *Logic and Belief in Indian Philosophy*. Delhi 2010: Motilal Banarsidass.

Frauwallner 1959 – Erich Frauwallner: Dignāga, sein Werk und seine Entwicklung. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 3 (1959), pp. 83–164.

Funayama 1992 – Toru Funayama: *A Study of kalpanāpoḍha. A Translation of the Tattvasaṃgraha vv. 1212–1263 by Śāntarakṣita and the Tattvasaṃgrahapañjikā by Kamalaśīla on the Definition of Direct Perception.* Kyoto 1992: Zinbun Kagaku Kenkyūsho, Kyōto University.

Funayama 1999 – Toru Funayama: Kamalaśīla's Interpretation of 'Non-Erroneous' in the Definition of Direct Perception and Related Problems. Pp. 73–99 in Shoryu Katsura (ed.): *Dharmakīrti's Thought and Its Impact on Indian and Tibetan Philosophy. Proceedings of the Third International Dharmakīrti Conference* (*Hiroshima, November 4–6, 1997*). Vienna 1999: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Philologisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 281).

Jaini 2001 – Padmanabh S. Jaini: On the Ignorance of the Arhat. Pp. 167–179 (= Chapter 9) in Padmanabh S. Jaini: *Collected Papers on Buddhist Studies.* Delhi 2001: Motilal Banarsidass.

Kellner 2004 – Birgit Kellner: Why Infer and not just Look? Dharmakīrti on the Psychology of Inferential Processes. Pp. 1–51 in: Shoryu Katsura/Ernst Steinkellner (eds.): *The Role of the Example* (*dṛṣṭānta*) in *Classical Indian Logic.* Vienna 2004: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien Universität Wien (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 58).

Kośa – Louis de La Vallée Poussin: *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu.* 6 vols. Bruxelles 1980: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises (Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques 16).

Krasser 1991 – Helmut Krasser: *Dharmottaras kurze Untersuchung der Gültigkeit einer Erkenntnis – Laghuprāmāṇyaparīkṣā.* Teil 2: Übersetzung. Vienna 1991: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 7).

Krasser 1995 – Helmut Krasser: Dharmottara's Theory of Knowledge in his *Laghuprāmāṇyaparīkṣā. Journal of Indian Philosophy* 23 (1995), pp. 247–271.

Krasser 2004 – Helmut Krasser: Are Buddhist Pramāṇavādins non-Buddhistic? Dignāga and Dharmakīrti on the impact of logic and epistemology on emancipation. *Hōrin: Vergleichende Studien zur japanischen Kultur* 11 (2004), pp. 129–146.

Kritzer 1999 – Robert Kritzer: *Rebirth and Causation in the Yogācāra Abhidharma.* Vienna 1999: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien Universität Wien (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 44).

La Vallée Poussin 1913 – Louis de La Vallée Poussin: *Bouddhisme, études et matériaux. Théorie des douze causes*. Gand 1913: Librairie scientifique E. van Goethem (Université de Gand, Recueil de travaux publiés par la Faculté de philosophie et des lettres 40).

Lamotte 1973 – Étienne Lamotte: *La Somme du Grand Véhicule d'Asaṅga* (*Mahāyānasaṅgraha*). 2 vols. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1973: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste (Publications de l'IOL 8).

Lamotte 1987 – Étienne Lamotte: Le troisième Bhāvanā-krama de Kamalaśīla. Traduction de la version tibétaine. Pp. 336–353 in Paul Demiéville: *Le Concile de Lhasa, une controverse sur le quiétisme entre bouddhistes de l'Inde et de la Chine au VIIIᵉ siècle de l'ère chrétienne*. Paris 1987: Collège de France, Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises (Publication de l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises 7).

May 1959 – Jacques May: *Candrakīrti: Prasannapadā Madhyamakavṛtti. Douze chapitres traduits du sanscrit et du tibétain, accompagnés d'une introduction, de notes et d'une édition critique de la version tibétaine*. Paris 1959: Adrien Maisonneuve (Collection Jean Przyluski 2).

McClintock 2010 – Sara L. McClintock: *Omniscience and the Rhetoric of Reason. Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla on Rationality, Argumentation, and Religious Authority*. Boston 2010: Wisdom Publications (Studies in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism).

Mejor 2001 – Marek Mejor: Controversy on the mutual conditioning of *avidyā* and *ayoniśomanas*(*i*)*kāra* in Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa*. *Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies* 4 (2001), pp. 49[/292]–78[/263].

Pruden 1988–1990 – Leo M. Pruden: *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam by Louis de La Vallée Poussin*. English Translation by Leo M. Pruden. 4 vols. Berkeley 1988–1990: Asian Humanities Press.

Ś = Swami Dwarikadas Shastri: *Tattvasaṅgraha of Ācārya Shānta-rakṣita with the Commentary 'Pañjikā' of Shri Kamalshīla*. 2 vols. Varanasi 1981: Bauddha Bharati (Bauddha Bharati Series 1).

Schmithausen 1977 – Lambert Schmithausen: Zur buddhistischen Lehre von der dreifachen Leidhaftigkeit. Pp. 918–931 in Wolfgang Voigt (ed.): *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Supplement III,2 (XIX. Deutscher Orientalistentag). Wiesbaden 1977: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Steinkellner 1979 – Ernst Steinkellner: *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniś-cayaḥ. Zweites Kapitel: Svārthānumānam*. Teil II: Übersetzung und Anmerkungen. Vienna 1979: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens 15).

Vetter 1990 – Tilmann Vetter: *Der Buddha und seine Lehre in Dharma-kīrtis Pramāṇavārttika. Der Abschnitt über den Buddha und die vier edlen Wahrheiten im Pramāṇasiddhi-Kapitel*. Vienna 1990: Arbeits-kreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien Universität Wien (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 12).

Wayman 1961 – Alex Wayman: *Analysis of the Śrāvakabhūmi Manuscript*. Berkeley/Los Angeles 1961: University of California Press.

Wayman 1980 – Alex Wayman: The Sixteen Aspects of the Four Noble Truths and Their Opposites. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 3/2 (1980), pp. 67–76.

JIABS

Journal of the International
Association of Buddhist Studies

JIABS

Journal of the International
Association of Buddhist Studies

Articles

Indian Buddhist metaethics

Contributions to a panel at the XVth Congress of the International
Association of Buddhist Studies, Atlanta, 23–28 June 2008

Guest editor: Martin T. Adam

Miracles and superhuman powers in South and Southeast Asian Buddhist traditions

Contributions to a panel at the XVth Congress of the International
Association of Buddhist Studies, Atlanta, 23–28 June 2008

Guest editor: David V. Fiordalis