

Introduction

Bhaṭṭa Jayanta's *Nyāyamañjarī* (henceforth NM) is a rich compendium of ontological, epistemological and linguistic issues. Due to its clear prose and thorough exposition, it is an invaluable tool to reconstruct the history of ideas of Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā, Vyākaraṇa and other traditions, and as such it has become one of the most quoted and studied Sanskrit philosophical works.

Why a new edition of the *Nyāyamañjarī* (NM)?

The NM has been edited and studied in multiple forms. Most importantly, the two editions based on manuscript sources are those by Gangadhara Shastri Tailanga and K.S. Varadacharya. These pioneering works are both extremely valuable and deserve utmost respect, since they paved the way for most later researches on the NM, including the present one. Yet, these two editors obviously worked with a restricted number of manuscripts and could not avail themselves of the present technology. Moreover, neither of them appears to have followed a consistent editorial method, so there is still room for improvement on their work.

Gangadhara mostly based his edition on a single manuscript, with the sporadic assistance of a second one. Varadacharya improved Gangadhara's edition by means of some additional manuscripts and was capable of reconstructing a much more complete text. In both editions, however, the manuscripts are barely mentioned and not described in any detail. Also, neither editor clarified the criteria used in the editorial choices.

The impact of Nagin J. Shah's writings on the present edition

should be mentioned. He edited the only extant commentary of the NM, the *Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga*, with remarkable accuracy, lucidity, and historical perspective. Furthermore, he contributed important studies on the NM itself, besides editing and translating the NM into Gujarati.

In the last decade, Kei Kataoka has edited thematic passages of the NM on the basis of previously unedited manuscripts, thus improving the quality of the text and in the process shedding further light on the NM manuscripts and editions. His editorial work, however, has so far not covered any part of the sixth *āhnika* of the NM, which is the target of the present book.

In general, there is no NM edition based on a genealogical study of the sources and with a focus on the history of the transmission. Notwithstanding the intellectual debt to all the scholars who have previously worked on the NM, the intention is to contribute here in the following areas:

- identification, location and detailed description of all the witnesses;
- collation of all the relevant witnesses, including some previously never used ones;
- study of the genealogy of the sources, culminating in a *stemma codicum*;
- elimination of apographs (*codices descriptii*);
- elaboration of a pragmatic editorial strategy;
- documentation of all the substantive variants;
- improvement of the text on the basis of the *stemma codicum* and, when needed, of internal criteria;
- study of the indirect transmission (secondary testimonia).

Reasons for the choice of NM 6

The sixth *āhnika* of the NM (NM 6) is structured in three conceptually independent sections, dealing, respectively, with the object of words (*padārtha*), the object of sentences (*vākyārtha*), and the object of the Veda (*vedārtha*).

The first of these three sections was the topic of my *Laurea* (MA)

thesis at the University of Rome “Sapienza” (Graheli, 2003). At that time my research was limited to the printed editions, in which I found some passages that were difficult to interpret on the basis of the printed texts alone. At that time I began to sketch a survey of the known manuscripts of the NM and to gradually realize the importance of building an accurate inventory and description of both the printed and manuscript sources. Once accomplished a fairly exhaustive version of this survey (see Graheli, 2012a), it dawned to me that some crucial yet mutilated manuscripts covered NM 6 but lacked other chapters of the NM; for this reason, in order to develop a stemmatic method to edit the NM, the obvious choice was to focus on this very section of Jayanta’s work.

In short, the first section of NM 6 is for the present purposes the ideal choice because conceptually self-contained, extensive enough to provide statistically meaningful hypotheses on the genealogy of the manuscripts, and documented in all the key witnesses of the transmission.

The structure of this book

This book is divided into two major parts: the study of the history of the transmission and the critical edition of the *padārtha* section of NM 6.

The first part includes all the propaedeutic steps in view of the critical edition. Briefly said, it consists of the *recensio* of the NM sources, including their inventory, description, collation of their variants, and study of their genealogy. The sequence of the chapters largely conforms to the method and the heuristic process followed in the course of the research. This part begins with a general presentation of the NM and its author, about whom there is, in comparison to many other Indian works and authors, a more extensive amount of historical and chronological information. There is here a deliberate choice to pay full attention to the printed sources as well, to facilitate an evaluation of their respective merits and to further clarify the needs of better editions. Hence, the survey of the editions precedes that of the manuscripts. This part continues with a detailed study of the genealogy of the editions only after the description of the manuscripts, be-

cause the assessment of the relation among the editions is better understood in the context of the number and quality of the manuscripts on which the editions are based. The genealogy of the manuscripts is then studied on the ground of the collation of NM 6, resulting in the *stemma codicum* on which the choice of the variant readings has been largely based during the editing process.

The second part of this book contains the edition of the first third of NM 6, which concerns a presentation and rebuttal of the *sphoṭa* theory of word-meaning. The decision to publish this part separately from the two other sections of NM 6 is eminently pragmatic, since it is extensive enough to allow for statistically meaningful considerations, but also short enough to be single-handedly manageable in the present publication. The publication of the complete NM 6 would have been difficult to manage in a single book; thus the decision to divide it into three segments according to its natural division in the three sections of *padārtha*, *vākyārtha* and *vedārtha*. One of the main goals of this research was to devise a method to edit NM passages that could be feasible for individual enterprises, without the demand of formidable resources in terms of time, man-power, and funds.

The plan is to complete the edition of NM 6 in two more volumes, on the strength of the method and the editorial principles established in the present publication.

The choice of Devanāgarī

The present edition is typeset in Devanāgarī characters. There are two reasons behind this choice: the first is pragmatic, related to aspects of dissemination, and the second heuristic, related to a personal approach to stemmatics and critical editing.

The advantage of Devanāgarī characters is that it makes the book widely accessible to Indian scholarship. In fact, while most seasoned Sanskritists in the West are accustomed to read Sanskrit in either Devanāgarī or Roman transcription, Indian scholars who are comfortable with romanized Sanskrit are comparatively rare.

Furthermore, the study of the history of the transmission and of the genealogy of the sources is a central aspect of the present research. During the editorial processes I found that studying the NM

in Roman characters was a step away from the linguistic universe of Jayanta, Cakradhara, the scribes, and the Indian editors: even if some of these personalities wrote in other Indic scripts, all of them reasoned in terms of *akṣara*-s, or *abugida* scripts, rather than Roman letters. Though Devanāgarī is in a sense also an arbitrary choice, I found that this script was more conducive to my inferences about the genealogy of errors, and thus heuristically productive in terms of stemmatic hypotheses, because its visual representation helped my judgement on the weight of variants, on specific typologies of errors such as dittography and haplography, on the likelihood for errors to be genetically or polygenetically derived, etc.

The Romanization of Sanskrit offers the advantage of facilitating a more detailed analysis of the text, due to the graphical division of vowels and consonants and to a more frequent separation of words. Moreover, machine-readable texts are certainly more useful in Roman Unicode characters, rather than in Devanāgarī ones. For such purposes the interested reader can profit from the full documentation, in Roman characters, of the collated variants on which this edition is based and that has been made available online, presently at <http://homepage.univie.ac.at/alessandro.graheli>.

