The Transmission of Manorathanandin’s Vṛtti and Its Related Texts

Like other works belonging to the Pramâṇa school, the PVV has only come down to us in a codex unicus, here referred to as V\textsubscript{Zh}. The colophon attests that Vibhūticandra was the copyist, and it can be reconstructed that the copy was made at the beginning of the 13th century.\footnote{See the notes on Vibhūticandra (pp. 40 f.) and the description of V\textsubscript{Zh} at pp. 106 ff. below.} Modern records bear no trace of the PVV before Sānkṛtyāyana's discovery of the manuscript, in 1936. Since then the work has undergone three different printed editions, each of them carried out by Indian scholars and printed in India. They are Sānkṛtyāyana’s editio princeps (henceforth V\textsubscript{R}), which appeared as an Appendix to JBORS 24–26 during the years 1938–1940; Dwarikadas Shastri’s 1968 edition brought out by the Varanasi publisher Baudda Bharati (V\textsubscript{S–0}), its most recent (third) edition having appeared in 1994 (V\textsubscript{S}); and the 1989 edition of Ram Chandra Pandeya issued by the Delhi publisher Motilal Banarsidass (V\textsubscript{Pa}). These printed editions constitute the third phase of diffusion of the PVV, after the first one in its place of origin and the subsequent one in Tibet.\footnote{For a few remarks, see the paragraph "Readers of the Vṛtti and the Context of Its Transmission", pp. 49 f. above.}

The PVV and its related texts are thus available, nowadays, in different versions, which reflect various editorial practices. An examination of them, which follows here, concerns only a small portion of the text; conclusions regarding it, of course, are not automatically valid for other parts, which from the beginning of their transmission on may have been subject to a different sort of treatment.

Vibhūticandra’s Manuscript Copy (V\textsubscript{Zh})

Our uncertainty about the date of composition of the PVV makes it impossible to establish the time span between the text composed by the author and the manuscript in which it is contained. However, considering the 11th century as a reasonable terminus post quem for Manorathanandin’s floruit, it is plausible
that $V_{Zh}$ was quite close to the copy, or copies, containing the author's version of the text.

$V_{Zh}$ presents an accurate and almost flawless text, which reflects the accuracy and competence with which it was copied; furthermore, it suggests that the exemplar available to Vibhūticandra was in good material conditions and that its text was trustworthy. The testimony of the manuscript, then, is of primary importance for the constitution of our editions. The part of the manuscript that I have examined does not exhibit any evidence of Vibhūticandra's possible intervention in the text—whether, in dubious cases, he left the text as he had it in his exemplar or emended it by conjecture. Further, the corrections between the lines and in the margins of the manuscript show that Vibhūticandra carefully emended the text after copying it. The nature of his emendations suggests that the version of the text preceding the corrections was not due to lacunae in his exemplar. For example, the omission of the passage that appears in the lower margin of folio 14v and is to be inserted between sambhavāt and sambhāvyamānatvāt, at the end of line 4, can be easily explained as due to a saut du même au même. It is thus very likely that Vibhūticandra revised his copy against the exemplar he had replicated, and not against a second one. The content and features of the glosses (see pp. 50 ff. above) do not offer any explicit hint concerning Vibhūticandra's attitude towards the text. They suggest, however, that he kept the PVV text clearly distinct in his mind from other sources available to him, for he took notes from the latter, and did not change the PVV. Thus, it is reasonable to think that Vibhūticandra faithfully copied the text as transmitted from the exemplar available to him, and did not intervene editorially; furthermore, given the above chronological assumptions, the copy $V_{Zh}$ may be quite close to Manorathanandin's original text.

The Printed Editions of the PVV

*Sāṅkṛtyāyana's Editio Princeps*

Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana, born Kedarnath Pande (1893–1963), was the editor of the *editio princeps* of the PVV. He well represents the very active and engaged

---

3 See Zacchetti 2005: 139 f. for the interesting case of a gloss which shows the attitude of some ancient editors of the *Guang zan jing*.

4 For a brief account of Sāṅkṛtyāyana's life and works, see Machwe 1978. Florin Deleanu (2006: 63, n. 1) has listed other important bibliographical references. Another aspect of Sāṅkṛtyāyana's personality, that of errant philosopher, is highlighted in Consolaro 2013, and Alaka