

A Critical Edition of Bhaṭṭa Jayanta's *Nyāyamañjarī* : The Section on Kumārila's Refutation of the *Apoha* Theory

Kei KATAOKA

The portion of the *Nyāyamañjarī* edited in the present article is Jayanta's summary of Kumārila's criticism of the Buddhist *apoha* theory. Dignāga (470–530 AD), Dharmakīrti (600–660 AD) and their followers such as Dharmottara (740–800 AD) hold that a word (*pada*) such as “cow” denotes *anyāpoha* (exclusion of what is different), e.g. exclusion or negation of non-cows, and not a positive entity, e.g. a universal (*jāti*) such as cowness. Kumārila (600–650 AD) refutes Dignāga's view in the *apoha* section of his *Mīmāṃsāslokavārttika*. Taking into consideration Buddhist rejoinders by Dharmakīrti and Dharmottara, Jayanta (840–900 AD) has further developed the brahmanical criticism of the *apoha* theory.

In the fifth *āhnika* of his *Nyāyamañjarī*, after a brief introduction (NM II 3.7–5.14 in the Mysore edition), Jayanta first presents the Buddhist refutation of *jātis* or universals (NM II 6.2–14.13). There, a Buddhist opponent concludes that “words and concepts have exclusions as their objects” (NM II 14.13: *apohaviṣayāḥ śabdāḥ vikalpāś ca*). This is followed by the present portion (NM II 14.15–21.15), in which Jayanta summarizes Kumārila's criticism discussed in the *apoha* chapter of the *Mīmāṃsāslokavārttika*. That is then in turn followed by Buddhist rejoinders (NM II 21.18–29.4) and then by Jayanta's final view (NM II 29.7–47.4). The Buddhist opponent sets forth ‘recent’ *apoha* theories developed by Dharmakīrti and Dharmottara and in response Jayanta establishes the brahmanical view that words denote external objects.

A good overview of the relevant portion (NM II 10.7–29.4) is given in Hattori 2006, “The *Apoha* Theory as Referred to in the *Nyāyamañjarī*”. Hattori worked on the basis of the two published editions that I refer to as S and M. An English

summary is also available in Shah 1997. An annotated Japanese translation of Kumāriḷa's *Mīmāṃsāsālokaṽrttika* by Hattori (1973, 1975) is also helpful for clarifying Jayanta's procedure.

Jayanta's *Nyāyamañjarī* is a commentary on Akṣapāda's *Nyāyasūtra*, in particular on the definition-*sūtras* (*lakṣaṇasūtras*) by which Akṣapāda defines each of the sixteen *padārthas* and their subordinate categories. Therefore, in theory at least, the present portion is also a part of his commentary on *Nyāyasūtra* 1.1.7 (*āptopadeśaḥ śabdah*), although the *apoha* theory is not directly relevant to the original *sūtra*. The *sūtra* does not presuppose the *apoha* theory at all.

It is remarkable that Jayanta inserted many peripherally relevant discussions in his commentary on this *sūtra*. The entire commentary on 1.1.7, called *śabdaparīkṣā* or the examination of speech, extends from the third to the sixth *āhnikā*, and covers more than one third of the *Nyāyamañjarī*, i.e. 554 pages of 1419 in the Mysore edition. Jayanta himself enumerates at the beginning the various subordinate topics in thirteen verses (NM I 412.14–414.17). The following is the list of the topics given by Jayanta (or, strictly speaking, by an opponent) as those which will be discussed in the examination of speech, modified by the present author into appropriate Sanskrit terms on the basis of Jayanta's usage. (Jayanta's list is not exhaustive. For example, the section called *atharva-vedaprāmānya*, I 614-629, is not listed.)

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Speech does not touch external objects (<i>arthāsaṃsparśitva</i>) | I 415–419, II 3–47 |
| 2. Word-meanings (<i>padārtha</i>) | II 47–69 |
| 3. Relationships between words and meanings (<i>śabdārthasaṃbandha</i>) | I 591–603 |
| 4. Sentence-meanings (<i>vākyārtha</i>) | II 69–142 |
| 5. The cause of understanding a sentence-meaning (<i>vākyārthabodhakāraṇa</i>) | II 143–219 |
| 6. Eternity of sounds (<i>śabdanityatā</i>) | I 513–572 |

7. Being stated by a reliable person (<i>āptoktatva</i>)	I 603–614
8. The Veda is man-made (<i>vedapauruṣeyatva</i>)	I 573–586
9. The author of the Veda (<i>vedakartṛ</i>)	I 586–590
10. Authoritativeness of scriptures (<i>āgamaṣrāmānya</i>)	I 629–649
11. Problems of the Veda (<i>vedadoṣa</i>)	I 649–667
12. Explanatory passages, etc., in the Veda (<i>arthavādādī</i>)	I 667–690
13. Meaning of the Veda (<i>vedārtha</i>)	I 691–702

Our section on *apoha* is subordinate to the first topic *arthāsaṃsparśitva*. Buddhists claim that speech does not touch external objects. In the third *āhnika* Jayanta announces as follows: “By way of rejecting word-meanings such as universals, it is taught that speech does not touch an [external] object. This [Buddhist view] will be dismissed below [in the fifth *āhnika*]” (NM I 419.17–18: *yā tu jātyādiśabdārthaparākarāṇavartmanā/ arthāsaṃsparśitocyeta (-tocyeta)* Lucknow ms.; *-tā proktā M) sā purastān niṣetsyate/*). This announcement is later echoed in the beginning of the fifth *āhnika*: “It is stated that words do not touch [external] objects, because word-meanings that are real do not exist. This [Buddhist view] is now rebutted” (NM II 3.9–10: *yad uktaṃ vāstavasya śabdārthasyāvīdyamānatvād arthāsaṃsparśinaḥ śabdā iti, tat pratividhīyate*).

While giving a summary of Kumārila’s criticism of the Buddhist *apoha* theory, Jayanta glosses in prose Kumārila’s verses of the *Mīmāṃsāslokavārttika*. Therefore it is important to trace parallel passages to the *Mīmāṃsāslokavārttika* in order to clarify the background of Jayanta’s ideas. This necessary procedure is followed in the present edition.

Jayanta explains Kumārila’s discussions in a lucid manner, as is often the case also in the other sections of the *Nyāyamañjarī*. Some of my previous articles have illustrated that Jayanta’s *Nyāyamañjarī* can be used as a kind of commentary on or introduction to the *Mīmāṃsāslokavārttika*, which, being composed in verse, is not easy to understand at a glance.

In this perspective, the present section is all the more important, for the oldest extant commentary on the *Mīmāṃsāslokavārttika*, the *Tātṭharyāṭikā* by

Umbeka, is not available for the *apoha* section. The Adyar manuscript (No. 67591, XX.N-2) that is the *codex unicus* used for the Madras edition of the *Tātparyatīkā* ends with the *sphoṭa* chapter. The same manuscript then continues with Jayamiśra's *Śarkarikā*, which covers the sections on *ākṛti*, *apoha*, *vana* and *saṃbandhākṣepaparihāra* (only upto v. 38). Furthermore, Sucaritamīśra's *Kāśikā* commentary published from Trivandrum in three parts (1926, 1929, 1943) stopped at the *saṃbandhākṣepa* (not *saṃbandhākṣepaparihāra*!) and thus does not cover *sphoṭa* and the following sections. Therefore, for the *apoha* section of the *Mīmāṃsāslokaivārttika* we only have the two brief commentaries published, i.e. Jayamiśra's *Śarkarikā* and Pārthasārathi's *Nyāyaratnākara*. Thus the present section of the *Nyāyamañjarī* provides one of the oldest known interpretations of Kumārila's verses on *apoha*⁽¹⁾.

Sources of the present edition

Bhaṭṭa Jayanta's *Nyāyamañjarī* has been published many times, as shown in the following list⁽²⁾.

- V *The Nyāyamañjarī of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa*. 2 parts. Ed. Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī Tailāṅga. Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, No. 10. Benares: E.J. Lazarus & Co., 1895, 1896.

-
- 1 Before Jayanta, Kamalaśīla (740–795 AD) provides a yet older interpretation of a certain number of Kumārila's verses on *apoha* in his commentary on Śāntarākṣita's *Tattvasaṅgraha*. As Frauwallner and other scholars have suggested, on the basis of close investigation of other sections such as the *atīndriyārthadarśiparīkṣā*, most probably Śāntarākṣita quotes there from the lost *Bṛhaṭṭīkā* and not from the *Mīmāṃsāslokaivārttika*. See Kataoka 2003a. Hattori (1973, 1975) misses this perspective and sometimes overcorrects the texts of the *apoha* section of the *Mīmāṃsāslokaivārttika* in favor of the readings as given in the *Tattvasaṅgraha*.
- 2 Pañcānana Tarkavāgīśa's edition published from Calcutta in 1939–1941, which covers the first *āhnika*, is not available to me.

- S *Nyāyamañjarī of Jayantabhattacharya*. 2 parts. Ed. Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla. Kashi Sanskrit Series, No. 106. Benares: Jaya Krishna Das Haridas Gupta, 1934, 1936.
- S² *Nyāyamañjarī of Jayantabhattacharya*. 2 parts. Ed. Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla (Part I), Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla and A. Madhvācārya Ādya (Part II). Kashi Sanskrit Series, No. 106. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1971, 1969.
- G *Nyāyamañjarī of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa with the Commentary of Granthibhaṅga by Cakradhara*. 3 parts. Ed. Gaurinath Sastri. Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, 1982, 1983, 1984.
- M *Nyāyamañjarī of Jayantabhattacharya with Ṭippaṇi — Nyāyasaurabha by the Editor*. Ed. K.S. Varadācārya. 2 vols. Mysore: Oriental Research Institute, 1969, 1983.
- N *Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's Nyāyamañjarī with Gujarati Translation*. 5 volumes. Ed. Nagin J. Shah. Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology, 1975, 1978, 1984, 1989, 1992.

Of these editions I consulted for the present section only V, the first published edition, and M, in which the eminent editor K.S. Varadācārya improved the text by consulting manuscripts. In addition I consulted two original manuscripts: A₁ from Allahabad that was allegedly consulted by M (but insufficiently), and K₁ from Kerala (Calicut) that has not been consulted by previous editors.

- A₁ A manuscript preserved in the Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Allahabad, No. 833/52. Devanāgarī. Paper. Complete. 660 folios.

K₁ A manuscript preserved in the Malayalam Department of the University of Calicut, No. 2602. Malayalam script. Palm leaf. 177 folios. Incomplete.

Other editions are basically copies of previous editions, as I have demonstrated in my previous research. Most of them are based on V either directly or indirectly, without consulting any manuscript. Naturally later editions often inherited wrong readings and mistakes of previous ones.

Case 1 This is also the case in the present section on *apoha*. For example, the first published edition V reads:

*nanv apohaśabdārthapakṣe mahatīm kṛpānavṛṣṭim utsasarja
bhaṭṭaḥ.*

S (published in 1934) and its second edition S² (1971) read the same. G (1983) also reads the same. Bhattacharyya (1978:631), who bases himself on V, translates the line wrongly: “Kumārila Bhaṭṭa has *measured* his swords with the Buddhist hypothesis that a word denotes a negative general image.” (My emphasis)

M (1983), however, reads differently:

nanu! apohavādaviṣaye, mahatīm dūṣaṇavṛṣṭim utsasarja bhaṭṭaḥ.

N (1989) reads the same as M. The two manuscripts, however, read yet differently for the problematic portions emphasized above.

*nanv apohaśabdārthapakṣe mahatīm dūṣaṇavṛṣṭim utsasarja
bhaṭṭaḥ.*

Surely, Bhaṭṭa [Kumārila] released a big rainfall of criticisms on the [Buddhist] view that *apoha* (exclusion) is word-meaning.

The reading *krpāṇa* in VSS²G does not sound right, because the image “a big rainfall of swords” (*mahatīm krpāṇavrṣṭim*) is less fitting than “a big rainfall of criticisms” (*mahatīm dūṣaṇavrṣṭim*). M's reading *dūṣaṇa* is actually supported by the two manuscripts A₁K₁. Furthermore, Jayanta's concluding remark in § 11 *ityādi dūṣaṇaudāryam apohe bahu darśitam*, which echoes the opening remark at stake, supports *dūṣaṇa* and not *krpāṇa*.

However, in the other portion M's new reading *vādaviṣaye* in place of *śabdārthapakṣe* is neither supported by A₁ nor K₁. The phrase *apoha-śabdārthapakṣe*, on the other hand, is supported by Jayanta's usage in the beginning of § 6 (*kiñcāpohaśabdārthapakṣe*). From the viewpoint of Jayanta's usage, *apohavādaviṣaye* does not sound right. It seems to me that *apohavādaviṣaye* rather reflects modern colloquial Sanskrit.

Case 2 It is clear that M has improved the text considerably. The first edition V sometimes omits an entire line. For example in § 1.2, M reads:

tasyāpi hi sāmānyātmatvena apohasvabhāvatvāt. abhāvasya cābhāvāśrayatvānupapatteḥ. na ca śābaleyasāmānyam agonivṛtter āśrayaḥ.

The whole line is completely missing in V and also SS²G. But it is attested in A₁K₁ with minor differences. N reads exactly as M. Following the present edition, it can be translated as follows:

tasyāpi sāmānyatvenāpohasvabhāvatvād abhāvasyābhāvāśrayatvānupapatteḥ. na ca śābaleyasāmānyam agonivṛtter āśrayaḥ.

This is because that it is impossible that non-existence is the locus of [another] non-existence, for [an intermediate universal], too, essentially being a universal, is *apoha* (exclusion) in nature. And the universal of *śābaleya* cows is not the locus of the exclusion of the non-cow.

Case 3 A similar example is found in § 2, for which M reads:

*kin tu ya eva te kecid apohyā agorūpās turagādayaḥ tadagrahaṇe 'pi
tadaḥpoho durgraha eva. na ca teṣām ānanyāt grahaṇam*

Again the whole line that is attested in MN and A₁K₁ with minor differences is missing in V and SS²G as well. Following the present edition, it can be translated as follows:

*kin tu ya ete kecid apohyā agorūpās turagādayaḥ, tadagrahaṇe 'pi
tadaḥpoho durgraha eva. na ca teṣām ānanyād grahaṇam sambhavati.*

On the other hand, if some of such non-cows to be excluded—horse and so forth—are not comprehended, their exclusion also becomes impossible. And they cannot be comprehended, because they are infinite in number.

Case 4 The next passage in bold face from § 3 is missing not only in V (and SS²G) but also M (and N).

*kiñ ca ya ete **parasparavisadṛśasāmānyavācino gavāśvādīśabdā
ye ca viśeṣavācinaḥ karkādīśābaleyādīśabdāḥ***

Furthermore, these words, such as cow and horse, that express mutually different universals, and the words, such as *karka* and *sābaleya*, that express particulars . . .

Although M has improved the text to a considerable degree by consulting original manuscripts, it is possible for us to further improve the text as demonstrated in the preceding example. Above all, it is at the very least our duty to record in a critical apparatus what manuscripts actually read and whether the accepted readings are actually attested in manuscripts or merely the result of emendation or conjecture by the editor, without any direct manuscript support. This due process in text criticism is lacking in previous editions. M occasionally reports variant readings in footnotes, but it is clear that these are not exhaustive.

Case 5 The present section on *apoha* contains abstract arguments concerning negation and even negation of negation such as *agovyāvṛtti* or “exclusion of a non-cow”. Editorial work is difficult when it comes to the problem of the presence or absence of negative particles. For example, V reads:

*na hy evam upapadyate asābaleyo bhavatīti gauḥ kiṃ tu śābaleya iti.
śābaleyavyāvṛttir hi goṣv api bāhuleyādiṣv asti.*

Based on this text and his imagination, Bhattacharyya (1978:632) translates as follows:

If the Buddhists accept the above suggestion then a cow cannot be logically distinguished from the exclusion of the other of Śābaleyas. In other words, we fail to draw a distinction between a cow and non-non-Śābaleya since Śābaleya is only not non-Śābaleya. Other cows such as Bāhuleya, etc., are non-Śābaleya but they are not non-cows.

SS²G read the same. M, however, reads differently, adding negatives and a negative noun:

*na hy evam upapadyate, asābaleyo **na** bhavatīti gauḥ, kin tu śābaleya
'śābaleya iti. asābaleyavyāvṛttir hi goṣv api bāhuleyādiṣv asti.*

Although M improved the text to a certain degree, it is not yet sufficient, because the clauses *kin tu śābaleya 'śābaleya iti* and *asābaleyavyāvṛttir hi goṣv api bāhuleyādiṣv asti* do not make sense. N, which normally follows M, reads them differently, clearly being aware of the textual defects of M.

*na hy evam upapadyate, “asābaleyo na bhavatīti gauḥ” kin tu “śābaleyāḥ
asābaleyāḥ **na bhavati**” iti. asābaleyavyāvṛttir hi goṣv api bāhuleyādiṣv
nāsti.*

N's readings seem to be the editor's independent conjectures. Neither A₁ nor K₁ supports N. The Kerala manuscript K₁ reads as follows:

*na hy evam upapadyate—asābaleyo na bhavatīti gauḥ. kin tv **asābaleyo na bhavatīti śābaleya** iti. asābaleyavyāvṛttir hi **na** goṣv api bāhuleyādiṣv asti.*

For it is not possible [to construe] in this way: "A cow is what is not not a *śābaleya* cow." Rather [it is appropriate to construe as follows]: "A *śābaleya* cow is what is not not a *śābaleya* cow." This is because the exclusion of a non-*śābaleya*-cow is not relevant with regard to *bāhuleya* cows, etc., even though they are cows.

This text perfectly expresses the sense that N's editor, Nagin Shah, wished to bring out in a slightly different form.

Case 6 Similarly, a confusing argument of negation is troublesome in the following case. In § 9, Jayanta asks his opponents about the meaning of a negative *nañ*. V reads:

pratiṣedhavācināṃ ca nañādiśabdānāṃ kā vārtā atra na bhavatīti neti ko 'rthaḥ

Bhattacharyya (1978:638) translates this as follows:

How do you account for the negative particles 'not' (*nañ*), etc.? In the sentence "It does not exist" what is the meaning of the particle 'not'.

S and S² read the same. G kindly segments the line as follows:

pratiṣedhavācināṃ ca nañādiśabdānāṃ kā vārtā? atra na bhavatīti, neti ko 'rthaḥ?

This text could have the intention that Bhattacharyya presupposes. N seems to follow G. M reads the same except that it reads *nañādiḥpadānām* instead of *nañādiḥabdānām*. It also divides the sentence as follows, just as N:

*pratiṣedhavācinām ca nañādiḥ**padānām** kā vārtā—atra na bhavatīti?
neti ko 'rthaḥ?*

Consulting the two manuscripts, I reconstruct the text as follows:

*pratiṣedhavācinām ca nañādiḥabdānām kā vārtā. **ana** na bhavatīti neti
ko 'rthaḥ.*

How do you explain the words such as NOT that express negation?
What is the meaning [of the sentence]: 'NOT is not non-NOT'?

The most problematic is *ana*, for which the previous editions unanimously read *atra*. The reading *atra na bhavati* probably assumes a common example of a negative sentence such as *atra ghaṭo na bhavati*. However, both manuscripts A₁ and K₁ read *ana*. Furthermore the structure is the same as in other examples. Compare the present line (§ 9) with other examples of word-analyses in § 1.2 and § 8:

§ 9 : *ana na bhavatīti neti*

§ 1.2: *aśābaleyo na bhavatīti śābaleya iti*

§ 8 : *anaḥpoḥo na bhavatīty aḥpoḥaḥ*

Thus the whole line is asking the meaning of a negative *NA* which could be analyzed, according to the theory of *aḥpoḥa*, as “not non-NOT” (*aNA na bhavati*), just as “cow” is analyzed as “not non-cow”. The word *ana*, though it certainly looks strange at first glance, is in fact the reading most appropriate in the present context.

Case 7 After refuting *samudāya* or aggregate in § 1.3, Jayanta refutes in § 1.4 *samudāyins* or individuals, such as individual cows, that the opponents might insist to be the loci of negation or the elements to be negated, e.g. in the case of the “non-cow” (*a-go*). But all editions read as follows in the concluding part:

iti samudāyo 'pi na tadāśrayaḥ.

But the reading *samudāya* does not fit the present context, where Jayanta is talking about individuals (*samudāyinām ca svalakṣaṇānām . . .*). Both of the manuscripts A₁K₁ read *samudāyino* instead of *samudāyo*:

*iti samudāyino 'pi na *tadāśrayaḥ.*

**tadāśrayaḥ*] A₁; *tadāśrayāḥ* K₁

Therefore, neither are individuals the loci of the [exclusion of non-cows].

Probably deluded by the wrong reading, Hattori (2006:59) misses the point of § 1.3 (refutation of *samudāya*) and § 1.4 (refutation of *samudāyins*) and summarizes Jayanta's view as follows:

Again, if it had as its locus the totality (*samudāya*) of all cows, the “negation of non-cows” would not be comprehended as long as not all cows were known.

His summary corresponds in particular to the following portion of M (II 15.13–16.2) and S (277.27–29):

*samudāyinām ca svalakṣaṇānām deśakālādibhedenānantyāt vargī-
karaṇam puruṣāyusaśatenāpi na sakyakriyam iti samudāyo 'pi na
tadāśrayaḥ.*

However, as is clear from the correct reading *samudāyino*, what is directly refuted by the present argument concerning the impossibility of classifying countless individual cows is *samudāyins* and not *samudāya*. Following the present edition, the whole passage can be translated as follows:

*samudāyinām ca svalakṣaṇānām deśakālādibhedenānantyād vargī-
karaṇam puruṣāyusaśatenāpi na śakyakriyam iti **samudāyino** 'pi na
tadāśrayaḥ.*

Even for hundreds of human lives, it is impossible to classify individual particulars, because they are infinite in number due to the difference of place, time and so forth. Therefore, neither are individuals the loci of the [exclusion of non-cows].

Case 8 The next example is difficult to judge at a first glance. V reads (304.27–28):

athāśvādiviśeṣodghoṣarahitam āgorūpyam vyavacchedyam ucyate

Bhattacharyya (1978:635) translates this as follows:

Now, the Buddhists may take up a new line of defence. If they hold that the term 'cow' denotes only an exclusion of non-cow but does not make **mention** of a horse as the distinct object to be excluded . . . (My emphasis)

S and S² correct *āgorūpyam* to *agorūpyam*. G reads as SS². M reads *agorūpaṃ* instead of *agorūpyam* and reads as follows (II 18.11):

*athāśvādiviśeṣo**ddho**ṣarahitam agorūpaṃ vyavacchedyam ucyate*

Here it is clear that *ddhoṣa* must be a typographical error for *dghoṣa*. N

correctly reads *dghoṣa*. The Kerala manuscript K₁, however, reads instead:

athāśvādiviṣeṣonmeṣarahitam agorūpaṃ vyavacchedyam ucyate

If you say that it is non-cow devoid of the appearance of individuals such as horses that is to be excluded, . . .

Here K₁ has *viṣeṣonmeṣa* ('the opening or appearing of a particular') instead of *viṣeṣodghoṣa* ('proclamation of a particular'). Jayanta's usage actually supports *unmeṣa* in reference to *viṣeṣa*. See, for example *Nyāyamañjarī* I 288.4–6:

*tad ihāpi "yat kṛtakam tad anuṣṅam" iti sāmānyataḥ paricchedān na tadānīm **analonmeṣa** iti siddho 'nvayaḥ.*

Then, here, too, a positive cooccurrence is established, for fire does not appear at that point because it is ascertained in a general form that whatever is produced is not hot.

This usage of *unmeṣa* in reference to *sāmānya* and *viṣeṣa* suffices for us to accept *unmeṣa* and not *udghoṣa* in the present line under discussion. Here the word *unmeṣa* triggers the image that a particular such as an individual horse appears all at once in one's mind just as an eye opens or a flower blossoms in a flash.

One can also take into consideration the fact that in Śaiva theology, which was already active in Kashmir in Jayanta's time, the notion of *unmeṣa* extends its meaning from the physical 'opening of the eye' to metaphorical meanings of various kinds, such as more soteriological 'opening of one's inherent capacity'. (For the Kashmirian usage of *unmeṣa*, see, e.g. A. Sanderson, "History through Textual Criticism.", in *Les Source et le Temps*, IFP/EFEO, 2001, p. 37.) For Kashmirians in Jayanta's period and later, the phrase *viṣeṣonmeṣa* probably does not sound odd, though it might have been strange for his predecessors.

Abbreviations and conventions

For the abbreviations and conventions used in the present edition, see my previous editions of selected portions of the *Nyāyamañjarī*, Kataoka [2003b] [2004] [2005] and [2007a].

Acknowledgment

First of all I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Masaaki Hattori for his article published in 2006, which inspired me to select the present portion for edition. I am indebted to the following libraries and institutes for giving me permission to consult manuscripts: The Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Allahabad; the Malayalam Department of the University of Calicut, Calicut. Last but not least I am much obliged to Prof. Arlo Griffiths and Prof. Harunaga Isaacson for their comments on my final draft. (The present research is supported by the Grant-in-Aid for young Scientists(B))

Bibliography

- Tātparyaṭīkā:* *Ślokavārttikavyākhyā Tātparyaṭīkā of Uṣṇveka Bhaṭṭa*. Ed. S.K. Rāmanātha Śāstrī. Rev. K. Kunjuni Raja & R. Thangaswamy. Madras: University of Madras, ²1971
- Mīmāṃsādarśanam:* *Jaiminimīmāṃsā-Sūtrapāṭhaḥ*. Ed. Kevalānanda Sarasvatī. Wai: Prājña Pāṭhaśālā Maṇḍala, 1948.
- Mīmāṃsāślokavārttika:* For the text of the *apoha* section of the *Mīmāṃsāślokavārttika* quoted in the apparatus, I prepared my own edition on the basis of the two published editions by C. Kunhan Raja (1946) and Dvārikadāsaśāstrī (1978), Hattori's text (1973, 1975), and two manuscripts preserved in the British Library, San Ms I.O. 3739 (=No. 7976) and 1449b (=No. 2149). I also consulted a manuscript of

- Sucaritamiśra's *Kāśikā* preserved in the Adyar Library, No. 38.G.5-5, 63359, TR 66-5.
- Śarkarikā*: *Ślokaṅkārikā (Śarkarikā) of Bhaṭṭaputra-Jayamiśra*. Ed. C. Kunhan Raja. Madras: University of Madras, 1946.
- J.V. Bhattacharyya 1978: *Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's Nyāya-Maṅjarī, the Compendium of Indian Speculative Logic*. Vol. 1. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass
- Hattori, Masaaki 1973: "Mīmāṃsāślokaṅkārikā, Apohavāda-shō no Kenkyū (Jō)." *Memoirs of the Department of Literature, Kyoto University*, 14, 1-44.
- 1975: "Mīmāṃsāślokaṅkārikā, Apohavāda-shō no Kenkyū (Ge)." *Memoirs of the Department of Literature, Kyoto University*, 15, 1-63.
- 2006: "The *Apoha* Theory as Referred to in the *Nyāyamaṅjarī*." *Acta Asiatica (Bulletin of the Institute of Eastern Culture)* 90, 55-70.
- Kataoka, Kei 2003a: "Kumārila's Critique of Omniscience." *Indo Shisōshi Kenkyū*, 15, 35-69.
- 2003b: "Critical Edition of the *Vijñānādvaitavāda* Section of Bhaṭṭa Jayanta's *Nyāyamaṅjarī*." *The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture* 144, 318(115)-278(155).
- 2004: "Critical Edition of the *Āgamaprāmāṇya* Section of Bhaṭṭa Jayanta's *Nyāyamaṅjarī*." *The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture* 146, 222(131)-178(175).
- 2005: "Critical Edition of the *Īśvarasiddhi* Section of Bhaṭṭa Jayanta's *Nyāyamaṅjarī*." *The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture* 148, 350(79)-297(132).

- 2007a: “Critical Edition of the *Śāstrārambha* Section of Bhaṭṭa Jayanta's *Nyāyamañjarī*.” *The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture* 150, 204(123)–170(157).
- 2007b: “Was Bhaṭṭa Jayanta a Paippalādin?” *The Atharva-veda and its Paippalādaśākhā. Historical and Philological Papers on a Vedic Tradition*. Ed. A. Griffiths & A. Schmiedchen. (Indologica Halensis XI) Aachen: Shaker Verlag, 313–327.
- Shah, Nagin J. 1997: *A Study of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's Nyāyamañjarī. A Mature Sanskrit Work on Indian Logic*. Part III. Ahmedabad.

Synopsis

- 0 upodghātaḥ
- 1 apohasyāśrayaḥ
- 1.1 gosvalakṣaṇam
- 1.2 śābaleyatvādi
- 1.3 śābaleyādisvalakṣaṇasamudāyaḥ
- 1.4 samudāyinaḥ
- 1.5 upasaṃhāraḥ
- 2 apohyagrahaṇāsambhavaḥ
- 3 paryāyatvaprasaṅgaḥ
- 3.1 apohabhedābhāvaḥ
- 3.2 nādhārabhedena
- 3.3 nāpohyabhedena
- 3.4 na gopratīṣedhena
- 3.4.1 na gosvalakṣaṇapratīṣedhena
- 3.4.2 na gosāmānyapratīṣedhena
- 3.5 upasaṃhāraḥ
- 4 apohanaparakāraḥ

- 5 apoho 'pohyād vilakṣaṇo 'vilakṣaṇo vā
- 6 vyavahāravipralopaprasaṅgaḥ
- 7 sajjñeyādiśabdāḥ
- 8 apohaśabdasya vācyam
- 9 anyaśabdasya vācyam
- 10 pratibhāmātram
- 11 upasaṃhāraḥ

न्यायमञ्जरी । अपोहशब्दार्थपक्षदूषणम् ।

[0 उपोद्घातः]

नन्वपोहशब्दार्थपक्षे महतीं दूषणवृष्टिमुत्ससर्ज भट्टः ।

[1 अपोहस्याश्रयः]

तथा ह्यपोहो नाम व्यावृत्तिरभाव उच्यते । न चाभावः स्वतन्त्रतया घटादिवदवगम्यते । तदयमन्याश्रितो ग्रहीतव्यः । कश्च तस्याश्रय इति चिन्त्यम् । 5

[1.1 गोस्वलक्षणम्]

न तावद्गोस्वलक्षणमाश्रयः, तस्य विकल्पभूमित्वाभावात् ।

2 महतीं दूषणवृष्टिं] *Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga* 132.3-7: महती (तीं) [कृपा]णवृष्टिमिति । तथाहि भट्ट आह — अगोनिवृत्तिः सामान्यं वाच्यं यैः परिकल्पितम् । गोत्वं वस्त्वेव तैरुक्तमगोऽपोहगिरा स्फुटम् ॥ भावान्तरमभावो हि पुरस्तात् प्रतिपादितः । तत्राऽश्वादिनिवृत्त्यात्मा भावः क इति कथ्यताम् ॥ इत्यादि ।

4 Cf. *Śloka-vārttika apoha* v. 2: भावान्तरमभावो हि पुरस्तात्प्रतिपादितः । तत्राश्वादिनिवृत्त्यात्माभावः क इति कथ्यताम् ॥

8 Cf. *Śloka-vārttika apoha* v. 3ab: नेष्टो ऽसाधारणस्तावद्विषयो निर्विकल्पनात् ।

2 °शब्दार्थपक्षे] VA₁K₁; °वादविषये M; °विषये M^{gha} 2 दूषण°] MA₁K₁; कृपाण° V 2 °त्ससर्ज भट्टः] MVK₁; °त्समसर्ज भव्यः A₁ 4 तथा ह्य°] MVK₁; तथाप्य° A₁ 4 उच्यते] A₁K₁; इष्यते MV 4 °तन्त्रतया] MVK₁; °तनुतया A₁ 5 घटादि°] A₁K₁; घट° MV 5 ग्रहीतव्यः] K₁; वक्तव्यः MVA₁ 8 °द्गोस्व°] MA₁K₁; °द्गोः स्व° V 8 °श्रयः, तस्य] MVK₁; °श्रयः, तस्य अश्र° M^{gha}; °श्रयस्य तस्याश्र° A₁

[1.2 शाबलेयत्वादि]

नाप्यवान्तरसामान्यं शाबलेयत्वादि तदाश्रयः, तस्यापि सामान्य-
त्वेनापोहस्वभावत्वादभावस्याभावाश्रयत्वानुपपत्तेः । न च शाबलेय-
सामान्यमगोनिवृत्तेराश्रयः । तद्धशाबलेयनिवृत्तेराश्रयतां प्रतिपद्येत ।
5 न ह्येवमुपपद्यते—अशाबलेयो न भवतीति गौः । किन्त्वशाबलेयो
न भवतीति शाबलेय इति । अशाबलेयव्यावृत्तिर्हि न गोष्वपि बा-
हुलेयादिष्वस्ति ।

[1.3 शाबलेयादिस्वलक्षणसमुदायः]

अथ शाबलेयादिस्वलक्षणसमुदायमगोव्यावृत्तेराश्रयं ब्रूयुः, सो
10 ऽप्यघटमान एव, समुदायिव्यतिरेकेण तस्यानुपलम्भात् ।

2 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 3cd-4: तथा च शाबलेयादिरसामान्यप्रसङ्गतः ॥
शाबलेयादिरूपं हि न सामान्यं परस्परम् । न चैकमितरेषां वस्तत्रानन्तार्थता
भवेत् ॥

3 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 5cd: न शाबलेयविज्ञानमगोव्यावृत्तिबन्धनम् ॥

4 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 6ab: निवृत्त्या बाहुलेयादेस्तद्विज्ञानं प्रवर्तते ।

9 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 8cd-9ab: समुदायो ऽपि नैतेषामगोव्यावृत्तिबन्ध-
नम् ॥ सर्वोपलब्धौ तद्विद्विर्व्यासज्यैवं प्रसज्यते ।

2 तस्या° ... °निवृत्तेराश्रयः] MA₁K₁; om. V 2 तस्यापि] M^{sha}A₁K₁;
तस्यापि हि M 3 सामान्यत्वेना°] K₁; सामान्यात्मत्वेना° MA₁ 3 °स्व-
भावत्वा°] MK₁; °स्वभावा° A₁ 3 °भावस्या°] M^{sha}K₁; °भावस्य चा°
M; °भावस्य च A₁ 4 °सामान्यमगो°] MA₁; °सामान्यं गो° K₁ 4 प्र-
तिपद्येत] MA₁K₁; प्रतिपद्यते V 5 न भवतीति] MA₁K₁; भवतीति V
6 किन्त्वशाबलेयो न भवतीति शाबलेय इति] K₁; किन्तु शाबलेयो ऽशाबलेय
इति M; किन्तु शाबलेयो शाबलेय इति A₁; किन्तु शाबलेय इति V 6 अ-
शाबलेयव्या°] MA₁K₁; शाबलेयव्या° V 6 न] K₁; om. MVA₁ 9 अथ]
MA₁; अथ वा VK₁ 9 ब्रूयुः] MVK₁; om. A₁

[1.4 समुदायिनः]

समुदायिनां च स्वलक्षणानां देशकालादिभेदेनानन्त्याद्वर्गीकरणं पु-
रुषायुषशतेनापि न शक्यक्रियमिति समुदायिनो ऽपि न तदाश्रयः ।

[1.5 उपसंहारः]

तस्मात्सर्वसाधारणं प्रतिपिण्डं परिसमाप्तं किमपि नूनमगोनिवृत्ते- 5
रधिकरणमभिधातव्यम् । तच्च गोत्वमेव । तस्मिन्नङ्गीकृते वा किम-
गोव्यावृत्तिकल्पनायासेन ।

[2 अपोह्यग्रहणासंभवः]

अपि च न केवलमाश्रयाभावात्तदग्रहणम् । किन्तु य एते केचिद-
पोह्या अगोरूपास्तुरगादयः, तदग्रहणे ऽपि तदपोहो दुर्ग्रह एव । 10
न च तेषामानन्त्याद्ग्रहणं संभवति । नापि वर्गीकरणनिमित्तमेषां

2 Cf. *Ślokaṽrttika apoha* v. 9cd: न प्रत्येकं भवेदेषा, न समस्तेष्वशक्तिः॥

5 Cf. *Ślokaṽrttika apoha* v. 10: तस्मात्सर्वेषु यदूपं प्रत्येकं परिनिष्ठितम् ।
गोबुद्धिस्तन्निमित्ता स्याद् गोत्वादन्यच्च नास्ति तत् ॥

9 Cf. *Ślokaṽrttika apoha* vv. 67-68ab: अगावो ऽश्वादयश्चेत्, स्युस्ते ऽप्य-
भावात्मकाः पुनः । कर्काद्यपेक्षया, ते ऽपि तथेत्येवं न गम्यते ॥ किमपोह्यं च
वापोहो, गोपिण्डेष्वेवमेव च ।

11 नापि वर्गीकरणनिमित्तं] See 3.3 in this edition: वर्गीकरणकारणं च; but
cf. *Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga* 132.9: न च वर्गीकरणे निमित्तमिति ।

11 Cf. *Ślokaṽrttika apoha* v. 72: अपोह्यानपि चाश्वादीनेकधर्मान्वयाद्विना । न
निरूपयितुं शक्तिस्तत्रापोहो न सिध्यति ॥

2 °द्वर्गीकरणं] MVK₁; °ञ्च वर्गीकरणं M^{gha}; °ञ्च गो° A₁ 3 समुदायिनो]
A₁K₁; समुदायो MV 3 तदाश्रयः] MVA₁; तदाश्रयाः K₁ 5 प्रतिपिण्डं
परिसमाप्तं] MVK₁; प्रतिपिण्डपरिसमाप्त A₁ 5 नून°] K₁; नूतन° MVA₁
6 °गोनिवृत्तेर°] A₁K₁; °गोव्यावृत्तेर° MV 6 वा] MVK₁; न M^{gha}A₁
7 °यासेन] MVK₁; °यासः M^{gha}; °यागोजा A₁ 9 किन्तु ... °नन्त्याद्ग्रह-
णं] MA₁K₁; om. V(eyeskip) 9 य एते] K₁; य एव ते MA₁ 10 °दपोह्या]
MA₁K₁; °दयोग्या M^{ka} 11 नापि] MVK₁; सापि A₁ 11 वर्गीकरण°]
MVK₁; वशीकरण° A₁

किञ्चिदस्ति । अश्वादयश्च न विधिरूपतया भवन्मते गृह्यन्ते, कि-
न्त्वन्यव्यवच्छेदेनैवेति तेषामपि व्यवच्छेदग्रहणे सैव वार्तेति नेदानीं
विकल्पैः क्वचिदपोहो विषयीकर्तुं शक्येत । निर्विकल्पेन च न कश्चि-
द्व्यवहार इति सकललोकयात्रोत्सादप्रसङ्गः ।

5

[3 पर्यायत्वप्रसङ्गः]

किञ्च य एते परस्परविसदृशसामान्यवाचिनो गवाश्चादिशब्दा ये च
विशेषवाचिनः कर्कादिशाबलेयादिशब्दाः, ते सर्व एवापोहवाचि-
त्वाविशेषात्पर्यायाः स्युः ।

[3.1 अपोहभेदाभावः]

10

अपोहभेदाददोष इति चेत् । न, अपोहानां भेदाभावात् । भिद्यमानत्वे
वा स्वलक्षणवदेषां वस्तुत्वप्रसक्तिः ।

6 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 42: भिन्नसामान्यवचना विशेषवचनाश्च ये । सर्वे
भवेयुः पर्याया यद्यपोहस्य वाच्यता ॥

10 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 43ab: ननु भेदादपोहानां प्रसङ्गो ऽयं न युज्यते ।

10 अपोहानां भेदाभावात्] *Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga* 132.9–10: अपोहानां
भेदाभावात् । अभावरूपत्वादिति भावः ।

10 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 46: यदि वा भिद्यमानत्वाद् वस्त्वसाधारणांशवत् ।
अवस्तुत्वे त्वनानात्वात्पर्यायत्वान्न मुच्यते ॥

1 °दयश्च न] A₁; °दयश्च MVK₁ 1 गृह्यन्ते] M^{gha}A₁K₁; न गृह्यन्ते M
V 2 °च्छेदेनैवेति] MVK₁; °च्छेदोनैवेति A₁ 2 व्यवच्छेद°] MVA₁K₁;
व्यवच्छेद° M^{ka} 2 सैव] MVK₁; सेव A₁ 3 शक्येत] K₁; शक्यते MV
A₁ 4 °हार इति] MVA₁; +++++ K₁ 4 °लोकयात्रो°] K₁; °यात्रो°
MVA₁ 4 °प्रसङ्गः] MVK₁; °सङ्गः A₁ 6 परस्पर° ... कर्कादि°] K₁;
om. MVA₁ 6 गवाश्चादि°] em.; गवात्वादि° K₁ 8 °वाचित्वा°] MVK₁;
°वादित्वा° M^{ka}A₁ 10 अपोहभे°] VA₁K₁; अपोहभे° M 10 °दाददो-
ष] MVA₁; °दादोष K₁ 10 इति चेत्] MVA₁; +++++ K₁ 10 भेदा°]
MVK₁; भदा° A₁ 10 भिद्यमानत्वे] MVK₁; भिद्यमानत्व A₁

भवत्पक्षे ऽपि सामान्यवाचित्वाविशेषात्पर्यायत्वं समानो दोष इति चेत् । न, सामान्यानां विधिरूपत्वात्परस्परसंकररहितस्वभावतया नानात्वावगमात् । अपोहास्त्वभावमात्ररूपाविशेषान्न परस्परं भिद्यन्ते ।

[3.2 नाधारभेदेन]

5

कर्कादिशाबलेयाद्याधारभेदादपोहभेद इति चेत् । न, तेषामाधारत्वस्य निरस्तत्वात् । आधारभेदेन वा तद्भेदाभ्युपगमे प्रतिस्वलक्षणमपोहभेदप्रसङ्गः । ततश्च सामान्यात्मतास्य हीयेत ।

[3.3 नापोह्यभेदेन]

अथापोह्यभेदेनापोहभेदमवधार्य पर्यायता पराणुद्यते, तदप्यसारम् ।

10

- 1 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 43cd: सामान्यापोहकूस्या चेद्वस्तुमात्रे समं तव ॥
 2 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 44: भिद्यन्ते मम वस्तुत्वात्सामान्यानि परस्परम् । असंकीर्णस्वभावानि न चैकत्वं वितन्वते ॥
 3 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 45: संसृष्टैकत्वनानात्वविकल्परहितात्मनाम् । अवस्तुत्वादपोहानां तव स्याद्भिन्नता कथम् ॥
 6 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 48ab: तेनैवाधारभेदेनाप्यस्य भेदो न युज्यते ।
 7 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 51: भेदे वा प्रतिपिण्डं स्यादगोऽपोहस्, तथा सति । सामान्यं शाबलेयादेरिति नेष्टं प्रसिध्यति ॥
 10 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 47ab: ननु चापोह्यभेदेन भेदो ऽपोहस्य सेत्स्यति ।

1 सामान्य°] K₁; सामान्यमात्र° MVA₁ 1 °र्यायत्वं] MVK₁; °र्यायत्वे A₁
 1 समानो] MVK₁; समान° A₁ 2 °रूपत्वात्प°] MVK₁; °रूपत्वाप° A₁
 2 °संकररहित°] K₁; °विरहित° M; °संविरहित° V; °संकरविरहित° M^{ka}A₁ 3 °स्वभावतया] MVA₁; °स्वभा+ K₁ 3 अपोहा°] K₁; अपोह° MVA₁ 3 °स्त्वभाव°] MVK₁; °स्तु भाव° A₁ 3 °रूपाविशेषा°] MA₁K₁; °रूपविशेषा° V 3 परस्परं] MVK₁; परं A₁ 4 भिद्यन्ते] A₁ K₁; भिद्यते MV 7 °धारत्वस्य] MVA₁; °धारस्य K₁ 8 °भेदप्रसङ्गः] M; °तद्भेदप्रसङ्गः V; °भभद्भेदप्रसङ्गः A₁; °भे+++ङ्गः K₁ 8 हीयेत] MA₁⁷K₁; हीयते V; हीयेते A₁^c 10 अथा°] MA₁K₁; आथा° V 10 °देनापोहभेद°] MVK₁; °देन तद्भेदापोहभेद° A₁ 10 °मवधार्य] MVK₁; °मवधाय A₁ 10 पराणुद्यते] MVK₁; परावाद्यते A₁

भवन्नप्यपोह्यभेदाद्भेदो न पर्यायत्वमपहन्ति । भाक्तो ह्यसौ न मुख्यः ।

न चापोह्यभेदाद्भेदो ऽप्यपोहस्यावकल्पते । यो हि संभाव्यमान-
संसर्गैराधारैरपि न भेत्तुं पार्यते, स दूरवर्तिभिरलब्धसंबन्धैरतिबा-
ह्यैरपोह्यैः कथं भिद्येत ।

5 अभ्युपगम्यापि वा ब्रूमः । यद्यपोह्यभेदादपोहभिन्नत्वम्, अ-
पोह्यैक्यात्तर्हि तदैक्येनापि भवितव्यम् । तथा हि गवाश्वयोरन्यापो-
हेन व्यवस्थाप्यमानयोरगावो ऽनश्वाश्च हस्त्यादयो ऽपोह्यास्तुल्या
भूयांसो भवन्ति । असाधारणस्त्वेको गौरश्च गवि वाश्वो ऽतिरि-

1 °प्यपोह्यभेदाद्भे°] *Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga* 132.10–11: अपोह्यभेदादिति
(sic) । केषाञ्चिद् अगोऽपोहो ऽर्थः केषाञ्चिद् अनश्वापोह इति ।

1 Cf. *Śloka-vārttika apoha* v. 47cd: स्वतस्तावदभेदः स्यात् परतस्त्वौपचारिकः ॥

2 Cf. *Śloka-vārttika apoha* vv. 48cd–49: न हि संबन्धिभेदेन भेदो वस्तुन्यपी-
ष्यते ॥ किमुतावस्त्वसंसृष्टमन्यतश्चानिवर्तितम् । अनवाप्तविशेषांशं यत्किमित्यनि-
रूपितम् ॥; *Śloka-vārttika apoha* v. 52: संसर्गिणो ऽपि चाधारा यं न भिन्दन्ति
रूपतः । अपोह्यैः स बहिःसंस्थैर्भिद्येतेत्यतिकल्पना ॥

5 Cf. *Śloka-vārttika apoha* v. 50: तस्माद्यथैव भेदे ऽपि पिण्डानां नैव भिद्यते ।
तथैवापोह्यभेदे ऽपि नानेको ऽयं भविष्यति ॥

6 Cf. *Śloka-vārttika apoha* v. 53cd: शेषं हस्त्याद्यपोह्यं तु द्वयोरपि न भिद्यते ॥

8 Cf. *Śloka-vārttika apoha* v. 53ab: अगव्यश्चातिरेकः स्यादनश्च गवाधिकः ।

1 भवन्नप्य°] K₁; तदाप्य° M; भवन्न° V; भदप्य° A₁ 1 °पोह्यभेदा°]
MK₁; °पोहिभेदा° V; °पौह्यभेदा° A₁ 1 °द्भेदो] MVK₁; °द्भेदे M^{ka}
A₁ 1 °मपहन्ति] MVK₁; °महपति A₁ 2 °दो ऽप्यपो°] MA₁K₁; °दो
ऽपो° V 3 °संसर्गैरा°] MVK₁; °संसर्गैरा° A₁ 4 °बाह्यैरपोह्यैः] MA₁
K₁; °बाह्यैः V 4 भिद्येत] MVA₁^{pe}K₁; भिद्येते A₁^o 5 अभ्युपगम्यापि]
MVK₁; अभ्युपगमस्यापि A₁ 5 वा] K₁; om. MVA₁ 5 यद्य°] MVK₁;
यद्यप्य° M^{ka}A₁ 5 °दपोह्यभि°] MVK₁; °दपोहनभि° A₁ 6 °ह्यैक्यात्तर्हि]
MVA₁; °ह्यैकात्तर्हि K₁ 6 तदैक्येनापि] MVA₁; तदैक्येनापि K₁ 6 तथा
हि] K₁; अतश्च MVA₁ 7 °रगावो] MVK₁; °रगोवो A₁ 8 भूयांसो] M
VK₁; भूयासो A₁ 8 भवन्ति] MVA₁; भवति K₁ 8 असाधार°] MVK₁;
आसाधार° A₁ 8 वाश्वो] K₁; चाश्वो MVA₁

च्यते । तत्रैकापोह्यभेदान्नवाश्वयोर्भेदो भवतु , भूयसामपोह्यानामभे-
दादभेदो वा भवतु—इति विचारणायाम् “विप्रतिषिद्धधर्मसमवाये
भूयसां स्यात्सधर्मत्वम्” इत्यभेद एव न्याय्यो भवेत् ।

अथासाधारण्यादश्चापोह एवागोऽपोह इष्यते , स तर्हि सिंहा-
दावप्यस्तीति सो ऽपीदानीं गौर्भवेत् ।

5

1 Cf. *Ślokovārttika apoha* v. 54ab: तत्रैकभेदाद्भेदो ऽस्तु बह्वभेदादभिन्नता ।

2 Cf. *Ślokovārttika apoha* v. 54cd: भूयसां स्यात्सधर्मत्वमित्यभेदः प्रसज्यते ॥

2 विप्रतिषिद्धधर्म°] *Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga* 132.12: विप्रतिषिद्धधर्मेति ।

2 विप्रतिषिद्धधर्मसमवाये भूयसां स्यात्सधर्मत्वम्] *Jaiminisūtra* 12.2.22

(Kevalānandasarasvatī's ed.): विप्रतिषिद्धधर्माणां समवाये भूयसां स्यात् सधर्म-
त्वम् ॥; *Śābarabhāṣya* ad 12.2.22, 2246.22–2247.3: विप्रतिषिद्धधर्माणामेतेषाम-
ग्नित्तुतश्चैकादशानां चाह्नां समवाय एतस्मिन् पञ्चदशरात्रे भूयसामेकादशानामह्नां
सधर्मत्वं स्यात्, तदीयो धर्मः कर्तव्यः । को हेतुः । भूयस्त्वमेव । बहुषु गुण-
संपन्नेषु महत्फलं भवति । एकस्मिन्नल्पं फलम् । एष हि लोके दृष्टान्तः । लोक
एकादशसु प्रदीपेषु तैलवर्तिसंपन्नेष्वेकस्मिन् गृहे महान् प्रकाशो भवति । विपर्यये
ऽल्पः ।; *Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga* 132.12–13: विप्रतिषिद्धधर्माणां विरुद्ध-
धर्माणां एकत्र समवायप्राप्तौ सत्याम् । बहूनां सधर्मत्वं । बहूनां ये धर्मास्ते ग्राह्या
इत्यर्थः ।

4 Cf. *Ślokovārttika apoha* vv. 55–57: गौश्च हस्त्याद्यपोहेन नाश्वरूपाद्विशिष्यते ।
करोति तदपोहं चेदैकरूप्यं विरुध्यते ॥ सर्वशब्देषु चैकैकमपोह्यमतिरिच्यते । त-
त्रासाधारणत्वेन तन्मात्रापोह्यता भवेत् ॥ ततो ऽश्चापोहरूपत्वात्सिंहादिः सर्व एव
ते । तन्निमित्तमगोऽपोहं बिभ्रदुच्येत गौरिति ॥

1 तत्रैका°] MA₁K₁; तत्रैहा° V 1 °द्रवाश्व°] MA₁K₁; °द्रव श्व° V 2
वा] MA₁K₁; om. V 2 भवतु—इति] MVA₁; भवतीति K₁ 2 विप्रतिषि-
द्धधर्म°] MA₁; विप्रतिषिद्धम्° K₁; विप्रतिषिद्धधर्मस्य V 3 °त्यभेद] MV
K₁; °त्यभेद A₁ 4 अथा°] MM^{ka}A₁K₁; अथ V 4 °साधारण्यादश्चापोह]
M; °साधारणाश्चापोह M^{ka}; °साधारणादश्चापोह्य V; °साधारण्याश्चापोह
A₁; °साधारण्यादश्चो पोह K₁ 4 एवागोऽपोह] K₁; एव गोऽपोह MA₁;
एव गोऽपोहेन व्यवस्थाप्य V 5 °दावप्यस्तीति] MVK₁; °दावस्तीति A₁
5 गौर्भवेत्] MVK₁; गौर्भवेत् अथासाधारण्याश्चापोह एव गोपोह इष्यते स तर्हि
सिंहादावप्यस्तीति सो पीदानीं गौर्भवेत् A₁

अथाश्चादिविशेषोन्मेषरहितमगोरूपं व्यवच्छेद्यमुच्यते, तत्प्र-
त्येकं ग्रहीतुमशक्यम्, आनन्त्यात्। वर्गीकरणकारणं च किञ्चि-
न्नास्त्येव। न हि सर्वेषामगवामश्चादीनामेकदेशत्वमेककालत्वं वा
समस्ति।

5 [3.4 न गोप्रतिषेधेन]

अथ गोप्रतिषेध एव वर्गीकरणे हेतुरिष्यते, हन्त तर्हि गौः पूर्वसिद्ध
एषितव्यः, यत्प्रतिषेधेनागावः प्रतीयेरन्। पूर्वसिद्धे च गवि लब्धे
किमगोभिः किं वा तदपोहेन प्रयोजनम्।

[3.4.1 न गोस्वलक्षणप्रतिषेधेन]

10 पूर्वसिद्धं गोस्वलक्षणमस्त्येवेति चेत्। न, तेन व्यवहाराभावात्।
गोसामान्ये तु पूर्वसिद्धे मुधापोहप्रयत्न इत्युक्तम्।

1 Cf. *Śloka-vārttika apoha* v. 58: सर्वापोहो यदीष्येत, स वक्तव्यः कथं पुनः।
यदि प्रत्येकरूपेण, नापोह्यानन्त्यतो भवेत्॥

1 °विशेषोन्मेषरहित°] Cf. *Nyāyamañjarī* 1 288.4-5: तदिहापि “यत्कृतकं
तदनुष्णम्” इति सामान्यतः परिच्छेदान्न तदानीमनलोन्मेष इति।

2 Cf. *Śloka-vārttika apoha* v. 61: समुदायात्मना नापि भवेदेषामपोह्यता। समु-
दायो हि नैकेन विना धर्मेण जायते॥

3 Cf. *Śloka-vārttika apoha* v. 62ab: नाप्येकदेशता तेषामस्ति नाप्येककालता।

6 Cf. *Śloka-vārttika apoha* v. 84cd: सिद्धश्चेद् गौर्, अपोह्यार्थं वृथापोहप्रकल्प-
ना॥

10 Cf. *Śloka-vārttika apoha* v. 83: सिद्धश्चागौरपोह्येत, गोनिषेधात्मकञ्च सः।
तत्र गौरेव वक्तव्यो नञ्चा यः प्रतिषिध्यते॥

1 °षोन्मेष°] K₁; °षोद्धोष° M; °षोद्धोष° VA₁ 1 °मगोरूपं] MA₁K₁;
°मागोरूप्यं V 2 तत्प्रत्येकं] MVK₁; तत्प्रत्येकं A₁ 3 °षामगवामश्चा°]
MVA₁; °षां गवाश्चा° K₁ 3 °देशत्वमेक°] MVK₁; °देशत्वं सकल°
M^{ka}A₁ 6 एव] MVA₁; एवम° K₁ 6 वर्गीकरणे] K₁; वर्गीकरण° MV;
वशीकरण° A₁ 8 किम°] MVK₁; किकिम° A₁ 8 किं वा] MK₁; किं V;
किं चा° A₁ 10 °मस्त्येवेति] MVK₁; °मस्त्येवेति A₁ 10 °राभावात्]
MVK₁; °रात् M^{ka}A₁ 11 गोसामान्ये] MVA₁; गोसामान्ये K₁ 11 मुधा°]
MVK₁; सोधा° A₁

[3.4.2 न गोसामान्यप्रतिषेधेन]

अथ गोसामान्यमगोप्रतिषेधेन सिध्यति, तदा दुस्तरमितरेतराश्रयम्— अगोनिषेधेन गोसिद्धिः, गोसिद्ध्या चागोनिषेधसिद्धिरिति।

[3.5 उपसंहारः]

तस्मादपोह्यस्यैव निरूपयितुमशक्यत्वान्न तद्भेदादपोहभेदः सिध्यति। 5

[4 अपोहनप्रकारः]

अपि चाश्वादयः सामान्यरूपेणापोह्येन विशेषात्मना वा। न विशेषात्मना, तदनन्तत्वादशब्दवाच्यत्वाच्च। सामान्यात्मना तु तेषामप्यपोहरूपत्वादभावत्वम्। कथं वाभावस्यैवाभावः क्रियेत। करणे वा प्रतिषेधद्वययोगाद्धिधिरेवावतिष्ठत इति विधिरूपः शब्दार्थः स्यात्। 10

2 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 84ab: स चेदगोनिवृत्त्यात्मा, भवेदन्योन्यसंश्रयः।

5 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 84cd: गव्यसिद्धे त्वगौर्नास्ति, तदभावे च गौः कुतः॥

7 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 58cd: यदि प्रत्येकरूपेण, नापोह्यानन्त्यतो भवेत्॥

7 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* vv. 63cd-64: यदि सामान्यरूपेण ते ऽपोह्यन्ते, न वस्तुता॥ कथं वावस्त्वपोह्येत, नाभावो भावमृच्छति। अपोह्यमाने चाभावे भाव एवावशिष्यते॥

2 अथ गो°] MVA₁; अगो° K₁ 2 °मगोप्रति°] MVK₁; °मपोह° M^{ko}; °मपोप्रति° A₁^{co}; °मपोहप्रति° A₁^{po} 2 तदा ... सिध्यति] MV; त ... सिद्धति A₁; om. K₁ 5 °पोह्यस्यैव] M; °पोहस्यैव V; °पोह्यस्य A₁ 7 °रूपेणा°] K₁; °रूपेण वा° MVA₁ 7 °पोह्येन विशेषा°] VK₁; °पोह्येन तद्विशेषा° M; °पोह्येनद्विशेषा° A₁ 8 तदनन्त°] MA₁; तदनङ्ग° V; तदनन्तर° K₁ 8 °दशब्द°] MVK₁; °दश- A₁ 8 °वाच्यत्वाच्च] MVK₁; °वाच्यत्वात् A₁ 9 तेषामप्यपोह° ... शब्दार्थः स्यात्] MVK₁; तेषामप्य A₁(eyeskip) 9 °दभावत्वम्] VK₁; °दभावरूपत्वम् M 9 कथं वा°] K₁; कथं चा° MV 9 क्रियेत] MK₁; क्रियते V 10 °धिरेवाव°] K₁; °धिरव° MV

[5 अपोहो ऽपोह्याद्विलक्षणो ऽविलक्षणो वा]

अपोह्यात्मनश्च तुरगादेर्यो ऽपोहः, स तस्माद्विलक्षणो ऽन्यथा वा ।
वैलक्षण्ये तस्य भावात्मता भवेत् । अवैलक्षण्ये तु यादृश एवागौ-
स्तादृश एव तदपोह इति गौरप्यगौः स्यात् ।

5

[6 व्यवहारविप्रलोपप्रसङ्गः]

किञ्चापोहशब्दार्थपक्षे नीलोत्पलमित्यादौ विशेषणविशेष्यभावसामा-
नाधिकरण्यादिव्यवहारा विप्रलुप्येरन् । न ह्येकस्मिन्नर्थे द्वयोरपोह-
योर्वृत्तिरुपपद्यते । न तथैकः कश्चिदर्थो ऽस्ति यत्र तयोर्वृत्तिः, स्वल-
क्षणस्याशब्दार्थत्वादन्यस्य चासंभवात् । न च वृत्तिरपि काचिदस्ति ।

2 Cf. *Ślokaṅkārttika apoha* v. 97: अभावस्य च यो ऽभावः स चेत्तस्माद्विलक्षणः ।
भाव एव भवेन्, नो चेद् गौरगौस्ते प्रसज्यते ॥

2 तस्माद्विलक्षणो] *Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga* 132.14: तस्माद्विलक्षणस्तु-
रा (र)गादेरपोहरूपाद् विलक्षणः ।

6 Cf. *Ślokaṅkārttika apoha* vv. 115–116c: अपोहमात्रवाच्यत्वं यदि त्वभ्युपग-
म्यते । नीलोत्पलादिशब्देषु शबलार्थाभिधायिषु ॥ विशेषणविशेष्यत्वसामानाधिक-
रण्ययोः । न सिद्धिर्

7 Cf. *Ślokaṅkārttika apoha* v. 118ab: सामानाधिकरण्यं च न भिन्नत्वादपोहयोः ।

9 Cf. *Ślokaṅkārttika apoha* v. 119: न चासाधारणं वस्तु गम्यते, ऽन्यच्च नास्ति
ते । अगम्यमानमैकार्थ्यं शब्दयोः ज्ञोपयुज्यते ॥

9 न च वृत्तिरपि काचिदस्ति] *Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga* 132.14–15: न च
वृत्तिरपि काचिदस्त्यभावरूपत्वात् ।

2 अपोह्यात्म°] VK₁; अपोहात्म° MA₁ 2 तुरगादेर्यो] MVK₁; तुरगादेर्दो
A₁ 3 भवेत्] VA₁K₁; भक्ते M 4 एवागौस्ता°] A₁K₁; एवापोह्यः ता°
MV 6 नीलोत्पल°] K₁; नीलमुत्पल° MVA₁ 7 विप्रलुप्येरन्] em.; वि-
लुप्येरन् MV; विलुप्येरन् A₁; विप्रलुप्येरन् K₁ 8 न तथैकः] K₁; न चैकः
MV; तन चैकः M^{ka}A₁ 8 यत्र] MVK₁; यत् A₁

[7 सज्ज्ञेयादिशब्दाः]

अपि च सज्ज्ञेयादिशब्दानामपोह्यनिरूपणासंभवान्नापोहवाचित्वम् ।
न ह्यसदज्ञेयं वा किञ्चिदवगतं यद्ववच्छिद्येत । ज्ञातं चेत्सदेव तज्ज्ञेयं
चेति । अतः कथं सच्छब्देन सदेव ज्ञेयशब्देन च ज्ञेयमेवापोह्येत ।
अज्ञातं तु नतरामपोह्यम् । कल्पितं तु तद्वक्तुमशक्यम्, कल्पनयैव 5
सत्त्वाज्ज्ञेयत्वाच्च ।

[8 अपोहशब्दस्य वाच्यम्]

अपोहशब्दस्य च किं वाच्यमिति चिन्त्यम् । अनपोहो न भव-
तीत्यपोहः । कश्चायमनपोहः । कथं वासौ न भवति । अभवन्वा
किमवशिष्यत इति सर्वमवाचकम् । 10

2 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* vv. 98–99: यद्यप्यन्येषु शब्देषु वस्तुनः स्यादपोह्यता ।
सच्छब्दस्य त्वभावाख्यान्नापोह्यं भिन्नमिष्यते ॥ तत्रासतो ऽपि भावत्वमिति क्लेशो
महान् भवेत् । तदसिद्धौ न सत्तास्ति न चासत्ता प्रसिध्यति ॥; *Ślokavārttika*
apoha v. 144cd: प्रमेयज्ञेयशब्दादेरपोह्यं कुत एव तु ॥

5 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 100: न चापि वासनाभेदाद् भेदः सदूपतापि वा ।
अपोहानां प्रकल्प्येत, न ह्यवस्तुनि वासना ॥

5 कल्पनयैव] *Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga* 132.15: कल्पनयैव कल्पितेनैव रू-
पेण ।

8 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 144ab: अनन्यापोहशब्दादौ वाच्यं न च निरूप्यते ।

2 अपि च सज्ज्ञे°] A₁K₁; सज्ज्ञे° M; असद्वज्ञे° M^{sa}; असदज्ञे° V 2 °म-
पोह्यनि°] MA₁K₁; °मपोहनि° V 3 °वच्छिद्येत] MA₁K₁; °वच्छिद्यते
V 3 चेत्सदेव] MV; देत्सदेव A₁; चेत्सदैव K₁ 4 चेति । अतः कथं स-
च्छ°] MVK₁; चेति । अतः कथं ज्ञेयं चेच्छ° M^{ka}; चेच्छ° A₁ 4 °पोह्येत]
A₁K₁; °पोह्यते MV 5 नतरा°] em.(Isaacson); न नितरा° M; नितरा°
V; नेतरा° A₁; न सुतरा° K₁ 5 °मपोह्यम्] MA₁K₁; °मनपोह्यम् V
5 कल्पनयैव] MVK₁; कल्पनयेव A₁ 8 च किं] VA₁; किं M; स किं K₁
8 न] MVA₁; om. K₁ 9 वासौ] MVK₁; वासो A₁

[9 अन्यशब्दस्य वाच्यम्]

प्रतिषेधवाचिनां च नञादिशब्दानां का वार्ता। अन न भवतीति नेति को ऽर्थः। उपसर्गनिपातानां च कथमपोहविषयत्वम्। आख्यातशब्दानां च पचत्यादीनामपोहो दुरुपपादः।

5 नाम्नामेव जातिशब्दानामपोहविषयत्वमिष्यते, येषां भवन्तो जातिवाचित्वं तद्वद्वाचित्वं वा प्रतिपद्यन्त इति चेत्। ततो ऽन्येषां तर्हि का वार्ता। बाह्यार्थवाचित्वे जातिशब्देषु को द्वेषः। निरालम्बनत्वे ज्ञानांशालम्बनत्वे वा जातिशब्दानामपि तदेवास्तु, किमपोहवाद-

2 Cf. *Ślokovārttika apoha* v. 142cd: नञश्चापि नञा युक्तादपोहः कीदृशो भवेत् ॥

3 Cf. *Ślokovārttika apoha* v. 143ab: चादीनामपि नञ्योगो नैवास्तीत्यनपोहनम्।

3 उपसर्गनिपातानां] *Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga* 132.15–16: उपसर्गनिपातानामिति। प्रादिचादीनामपोहस्यादर्शनादस्वतन्त्रप्रयोगत्वात् तेषाम्। तथा चाह भट्टः “चादीनामपि नञ्योगो नैवास्तीत्यनपोहनम्” इति

4 Cf. *Ślokovārttika apoha* v. 139: आख्यातेषु च नान्यस्य निवृत्तिः संप्रतीयते। न पर्युदासरूपं हि निषेध्यं तत्र विद्यते ॥

4 आख्यातशब्दानां च] *Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga* 132.17–18: आख्यातशब्दानां चेति। पचत्यादौ हि नञ्योगे पाकाभावप्रतीतिर्नपाठादेवेति। तथा चाह — आख्यातेषु च नान्यस्य निवृत्तिः संप्रतीयते। न पर्युदासरूपं हि निषेध्यं तत्र विद्यते ॥ न नेति ह्युच्यमाने ऽपि निषेधस्य निषेधनम्। पचतीत्यनिषिद्धं तु स्वरूपेणावतिष्ठते ॥ इति।

7 Cf. *Ślokovārttika apoha* vv. 37–38: तस्यां चाश्चादिबुद्धीनामात्मांशग्रहणं भवेत्। तत्रान्यापोहवाच्यत्वं मुषेवाभ्युपगम्यते ॥ सामान्यं वस्तुरूपं हि बुद्ध्याकारो भविष्यति। शब्दार्थो ऽर्थानपेक्षो हि वृथापोहः प्रकल्पितः ॥

2 प्रतिषेध°] MVK₁; प्रतिप्रिय° A₁ 2 नञादिशब्दानां] V; नञादिपदानां M; ननादिशब्दानां A₁; नञातिशब्दानां K₁ 2 का वार्ता] MVK₁; क्वा A₁ 2 अन] A₁K₁; अत्र MV 4 पचत्यादी°] VA₁K₁; पचतीत्यादी° M 6 तद्वद्वाचित्वं] MVK₁; तद्वद्वाच्यत्वं M^{ka}A₁ 7 निरालम्बनत्वे] MVK₁; निरालम्बनत्व A₁ 8 °शालम्बन°] VK₁; °शावलम्बन° MA₁

प्रमादेन ।

[10 प्रतिभामात्रम्]

यथैव प्रतिभामात्रं वाक्यार्थ इति कल्पितम् ।
पदार्थो ऽपि तथैवास्तु किमपोहग्रहेण वः ॥

[11 उपसंहारः]

इत्यादि दूषणौदार्यमपोहे बहु दर्शितम् ।
अतः शब्दार्थतामस्य वदेयुः सौगताः कथम् ॥

5

1 °प्रमादेन] Cf. *Nyāyamañjarī* II 405.6–7: अलं सत्कार्यवादप्रमादेन ।

3 Cf. *Ślokavārttika apoha* v. 40: असत्यपि च बाह्ये ऽर्थे वाक्यार्थः प्रतिभा यथा । पदार्थो ऽपि तथैव स्यात्किमपोहः प्रकल्प्यते ॥

1 °प्रमादेन] MVA₁; °प्रवादेन K₁ 3 इति कल्पितम्] A₁K₁; इति कल्पितः M; उपकल्पितः V 4 किमपोह°] M^{ka}A₁K₁; किमपोहा° MV 6 °षणौ-दार्यम°] MVK₁; °षणौ--म° A₁ 6 बहु] MVK₁; बहुव A₁ 7 वदेयुः] MVK₁; वदेयुः A₁ 7 कथम्] MVA₁; om. K₁(unmetrical)