PROLEGOMENA

Scope, Methodology, and Aims of the Present Edition

The texts presented here represent a critical edition of Manorathanandin’s Vṛtti on kk. 190–216 of the Pramāṇasiddhi chapter of Dharmakīrti’s Pramāṇavārttika, the related glosses by Vibhūticandra and the corresponding kārikās as they can be reconstructed from the Vṛtti. For the sake of brevity, I shall refer to these texts as ‘our section’ of the PVV and the texts related to it, or otherwise as the ‘edited texts’.

It is part of philological work to investigate both the history of a text’s transmission and the ambient textual culture, which latter calls, among other things, for delineating the main features of editorial practice common in the geographical and cultural areas where a text circulated and was transmitted.1 Doing so helps to assess the extant versions of a text and the results that can be realistically achieved with a text critical work. An analysis of the printed editions of our texts will show that each of them presents questionable readings and diverges from the others, without documenting the editorial choices that went into establishing the texts. Working on a critical constitution of the texts to be translated and explained is thus a practical necessity. By returning—aware of the import of the textual transmission—to the manuscript from which the printed editions derive, and by benefitting from the scholarship on Indian philosophical literature that has accumulated within the last decades, it is possible to establish the text of Manorathanandin’s Vṛtti that circulated

1 See Pasquali 1952: 123: “Il miglior editore di un autore latino trasmesso in codici medievali o postmedievali sarà colui che, quanto il suo autore e la sua lingua e i suoi tempi e la lingua dei suoi tempi, altrettanto bene conosca il Medioevo o l’umanesimo.”—“The best editor of a Latin author transmitted in medieval or post-medieval codices will be the one who knows the Middle Ages or Humanism as well as he knows his author, his language, his time and the language of his time.” G. Pasquali adds that such an editor is an ideal that nobody can perfectly embody, but that everyone should strive to approximate (“Un critico siffatto è un ideale che nessuno può incarnare in sé perfettamente, ma al quale ognuno ha il dovere di cercare di avvicinarsi.”). Sheldon Pollock has recently remarked: “Textual criticism on Indian texts needs to be revised. Such a revision presupposes a better understanding than we currently possess of how texts were transmitted in premodern India.” (2011: 424).
at the beginning of the second millennium of the Christian era in Northern India. The reason for this broad spatial and temporal specification is that the filter of the transmission is simply imponderable, given the absence of any other attestation than that of a manuscript (and certainly not the author’s autograph copy).

Supplementing the critical edition of the PVV is an *edition of the glosses* that Vibhūticandra wrote in the margins of his PVV manuscript. In the process of editing the PVV, it is of course necessary to distinguish such glosses from corrections to the PVV, which also appear in the margins. The identification of the marginal texts as either glosses or corrections is based on an examination of their context-related meaning and of graphical signs, which may appear either in the main textual body or in the margins of the manuscript. This procedure calls, in addition, for linking the marginal notations to the pertinent PVV passage—an undertaking which, given the non-autonomous nature of any text that is a follow-on to another text, is an essential part of the edition of the glosses. The testimony of reference texts is of great help here, as well as in the case of the PVV, because both Manorathanandin and Vibhūticandra often used previous commentarial material.

Furthermore, when editing the PVV, it is inevitable that one will be confronted with *PV kārikās*. Manorathanandin did not quote the kārikās as separate textual units, but embedded them word by word in his prose, usually rearranging them syntactically; therefore, as Sāṅkṛtyāyana’s edition shows, it is possible to extract them from the PVV and reconstruct the underlying version as it was known and understood by Manorathanandin. As it is often impossible to establish, however, based on the PVV alone, the precise wording and word order of the kārikās, it is necessary to have recourse to other sources that systematically transmit the PV text, either as direct witnesses of the work or within further commentaries on the PV itself.

With regard to the text that one adduces from the PVV, we have to assume that Manorathanandin may have “edited” the version(s) of the text transmitted to him so as to accord with his interpretation of it, and that Vibhūticandra (and others in the line of the text’s transmission) may have intervened within the text while copying it. For commentaries, in general, reflect a stage in the transmission of their *mūla* text in which deliberate interventions on the part of the commentators cannot be excluded. Moreover, the extant copies of the commentaries bear witness to both unintentional and possibly intentional interventions on the part of the copyists, who may have manipulated the text of their exemplar(s) based on their own knowledge of it, and on other sources at their disposal as well. However, because of their distinctive compositional structure, commentaries appear to have been more resistant to occasional