

## Foreword

Dharmakīrti (550–650 CE?)<sup>1</sup> is arguably, of all Indian Buddhist thinkers, the one who has exerted the most decisive impact on Indian philosophy as a whole. Strangely enough, his contribution to the Buddhist intellectuals' heated polemics against both their coreligionists' personalism (*pudgalavāda*) and the non-Buddhists' (but also certain Buddhists') self (*ātman*) has never been made the object of the systematic study it deserves. The Buddhist doctors' polemic against the Vātsīputrīyas' and Sāṃmitīyas' *pudgala* is now fairly well documented: the arguments put forward in the VK, the KV, MSA(Bh), the TSi, the AKBh, the MHK, the MAV and the TS(P) have been studied or at least translated and/or summarized by La Vallée Poussin, Stcherbatsky, Schayer, Sastri, Iida, Oetke, Duerlinger, Huntington, Eltschinger and Kishi.<sup>2</sup> As for Dharmakīrti's polemic against the *pudgalavāda*, it has only recently received scholarly attention.<sup>3</sup> The situation is quite pitiable when it comes to the Buddhist intellectuals' polemics against the outsiders' *ātman*: whereas the arguments put forward by early Mādhyamikas (Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva) and Yogācāras (YBhū, Vasubandhu's KSP and AKBh) have already been investigated to a certain extent,<sup>4</sup> the same cannot be said of the controversy as it is reflected in the works of Dignāga, Dharmapāla, Dharmakīrti, Bhāviveka, Śāntaraksita/Kamalaśīla, Karṇakagomin and Śāṅkaranandana. Dignāga's *Nyāya-*, *Vaiśeṣika-* and *Sāṅkhya-parīkṣās* (which are likely to have contained arguments

---

<sup>1</sup> On the dates of Dharmakīrti, see Krasser 2011; for the state of the art before Krasser's new chronology, see, e.g., Eltschinger 2007: 25–28.

<sup>2</sup> See below, Chapter 1, §1.1.3.7.

<sup>3</sup> See Eltschinger/Ratié 2010, and below, Chapter 1, §1.2.

<sup>4</sup> On Nāgārjuna's MMK, see Vetter 1982; on Āryadeva's CŚ, Chapter 10, see Lang 1986: 95–103; on (the pseudo-)Āryadeva's ŚŚ, Chapter 2, see Tucci 1929: 19–37; on YBhū 129,6–137,8, see Shukla 1967; on Vasubandhu's arguments in the KSP, see Yoshimizu 1999; on Vasubandhu's arguments against Sāṅkhya and Vaiśeṣika in AKBh 9, see, e.g., Sanderson 1995, Duerlinger 2003a: 96–111 and 238–298, and Mejer 1999.

against these schools' views on the *ātman/puruṣa*) as well as Karṇakagomin's *Nairātmyasiddhi* are lost;<sup>5</sup> the Chinese of Dharmapāla's commentary on CŚ 10 is still awaiting a translator; Śāntarakṣita's and Kamalaśīla's extensive *Ātmaparīkṣā* in the TS(P) has hardly been studied in the West so far;<sup>6</sup> Śāṅkaranandana's *Dharmālaṅkāra*, the second Chapter of which is entitled "A Proof of Selflessness" (*Nairātmyasiddhi*), has only recently resurfaced in the Tibetan Autonomous Region and remains unedited.<sup>7</sup> And while Dharmakīrti's identification of the false view of a self or "personalistic" false view with ignorance/nescience has been made the object of several studies,<sup>8</sup> nothing similar can be said regarding his many arguments against the self. To be sure, Iwata, Tillemans and Watanabe have analyzed some occurrences of his critique of the Sāṅkhyas' teleological argument; Iwata and Ono have dedicated important studies to his critique of the Naiyāyikas' *vyatirekin* argument; Vetter's translation of PV 2.131cd–285 includes PV 2.220–256 as well as PV 2.267–269, where Dharmakīrti criticises the Naiyāyika soteriology and polemicizes against the Ātmavādins' view of recollection as providing a strong argument in favour of the self. However, Dharmakīrti's writings include many more arguments and critical allusions to the self. Maybe due to most specialists' understanding of Dharmakīrti as a disembodied and axiomatically neutral logician, this philosopher's overall attitude and arguments regarding the *pudgala* and the self have never been presented in a systematic, historically as well as religio-philosophically contextualized study. The present book aspires to fill this important need and is meant as a humble continuation of Oetke's *'Ich' und das Ich* (1988), to which many pages of this study are indebted.

<sup>5</sup> On Dignāga's *Parīkṣās*, see Hattori 1968: 9. Karṇakagomin refers his audience back to his own *Nairātmyasiddhi* in PVSṬ 32,21, 81,16, 82,8, 92,6, 95,26.

<sup>6</sup> For a systematic treatment of the *Ātmaparīkṣā* Chapter of the TS(P) in Japanese, see the references to Naito's numerous publications in Steinkellner/Much 1995: 61–62. For partial Western translations, see Schayer 1931–1932, Sferra 2004 and Kapstein 2009.

<sup>7</sup> The authors have undertaken a diplomatic and critical edition of Śāṅkaranandana's *Dharmālaṅkāra*, Chapter 2, and are planning to publish it, together with an English translation and study, in the not too distant future.

<sup>8</sup> See below, Introduction, §§0.1.1–2 and fn. 7, p. 4.

It includes three chapters: 1. Dharmakīrti's polemics against his coreligionists' *pudgalavāda*; 2. Dharmakīrti's critique of the non-Buddhists' arguments in favour of a self or in disfavour of the Buddhists' (then mainly Vasubandhu's) accounts of selflessness; 3. Dharmakīrti's arguments (mainly) against the Nyāya's crypto-Buddhist but *ātman*-centered soteriology. About one half of the arguments composing Chapter 2 recur in several works of Dharmakīrti (PVSV, PVin 2 and 3, NB) and have already received sustained scholarly attention: in this case, we have tried our best to present the doctrinal background of these arguments and to sum up Dharmakīrti's critique as expounded in the available secondary literature. Although Vetter's notes on PV 2.220–256 already contain many insightful remarks, we thought it might be worth providing these stanzas with an English translation, a doctrinal introduction, a running commentary and numerous footnotes taking into consideration Devendrabuddhi's and Śākyabuddhi's commentaries as well as the religio-philosophical ideas of his Brahmanical opponents. As for Dharmakīrti's critique of Buddhist personalism, we have allowed ourselves to reproduce, with a new introduction and a few adaptations, a previously published joint contribution of ours.<sup>9</sup> These three chapters are preceded by an introduction attempting to capture Dharmakīrti's general attitude regarding the self, to provide his critique of the self with a religio-philosophical meaning, and to deal with all those remarks by Dharmakīrti – critical or not – that found no place in either of the three parts.

An additional remark is called for concerning Chapter 1. Before dealing with Pudgalavāda Buddhism and Dharmakīrti's critique of his coreligionists' "person," we have devoted considerable attention to the *tathāgatagarbha* or *buddha*-nature strand of Indian Mahāyāna. And this we have done in spite of the fact that the (at least *prima facie*) substantialist leaning of this tradition has never been made the explicit target of "mainstream" philosophers, and even less so by Dharmakīrti. This addition has no other justification than our wish to call attention to the fact – or let us say the strong hypothesis – that Dharmakīrti, like Vasubandhu before him, elaborated his ideas on self and selflessness in an environment in which Buddhist attempts to relativize selflessness

---

<sup>9</sup> See Eltschinger/Ratié 2010.

and resort to an enduring personality principle are likely to have been in far greater number than is generally recognized.

Neither of us knows enough Chinese to investigate the important materials supplied by the the ŚŚ, VK, the Mahāyānist MPSū, the TSi, the TDK, the SNŚ and the DPŚ. We have relied on English and French translations in La Vallée Poussin 1925, Tucci 1929, Venkataramanan 1953, Yamamoto 1973, Sastri 1978, Liu 1982 Fujii 1991 and 1993, Priestley 1999, Walser 2005, Miyamoto 2007, Lusthaus 2009, contenting ourselves with providing references to the Taisho edition and quoting the Sanskrit text of the TSi as reconstructed by Sastri (1975).

Needless to say, writing a book *à quatre mains* is a major challenge. Two authors who pursue different scientific interests and have different scholarly backgrounds might translate and interpret somewhat differently the same source materials, and this is bound to happen when two alleged specialists of distinct (albeit related) fields – i.e., on the one hand, Dharmakīrti and Buddhist studies, and on the other hand, Śaiva nondualism and Brahmanical conceptions of the self – come to work together. Moreover, we have different styles and writing habits (although both of us obviously have a certain leaning toward endless footnotes!). But in spite (or maybe because) of our different backgrounds and perspectives (and also in spite of the tendency to work in solitude that usually affects both of us), we took immense pleasure in working together and intend to pursue this collaboration in the future.

Vincent Eltschinger has supplied the first draft translation of almost all the Dharmakīrti materials mentioned in this book and is responsible for all translations from the Tibetan. For her part, Isabelle Ratié has provided the first draft translation of nearly all the non-Buddhist materials mentioned in the footnotes, introductory sections and running commentaries. Not only have we shared the task of interpreting the gathered materials; we have also discussed together all the aspects of this work (including all translations and interpretations, as well as the overall structure to be given to this study), so that we assume equal responsibility for the entire book.

It is our pleasant duty to thank Shoryu Katsura and Toshikazu Watanabe for putting at our disposal their provisional reconstruction of Dignāga's PS 3 as well as their edition of the PST thereon; Kyo Kano, for sending us an article on Dharmakīrti's critique of the self that was

still unpublished at that time; Robert Kritzer, for sending us unpublished teaching materials; Helmut Krasser, for the many materials he has made available to us and for his help in technical matters; Johannes Bronkhorst, who provided insightful remarks on several of the materials alluded to here; Tina Draszcyk, Berthe Jansen and Birgit Kellner, for their help in interpreting two difficult passages; Masamichi Sakai and Jonathan Silk, for providing many quotations with their exact references in the Taisho *Tripitaka*; the editors of the *Indogaku Chibettogaku Kenkyu*, for allowing us to reproduce significant parts of a previous publication. Michael Ravenscroft deserves heartfelt thanks for carefully reading the manuscript and improving our English; and our debt to him and Pamela Ravenscroft goes far beyond what language and science will ever be able to reach. Last but not least, the authors wish to express their deepest gratitude to those who took the trouble to read and thus significantly improve (parts of) an earlier draft of our manuscript: Hugo David, Harunaga Isaacson, Ernst Steinkellner, John Taber, Toshikazu Watanabe.

Vienna – Leipzig – Leiden  
September 2010 – March 2012

