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1. Introduction

In this paper, I consider the first chapter of Dharmakīrti’s (600–660)\(^1\) main work, the *Pramāṇavārttika* (PV), and his autocommentary, the *Pramāṇavārttikasvavṛtti* (PVSV), focusing in particular on those sections discussing the *apoha* theory.

The *apoha* theory was first proposed by Dignāga (480–540), the founder of Buddhist logic. It is the linguistic theory concerning the objects of words. However, Dharmakīrti who followed upon Dignāga’s footsteps seldom uses the word *apoha*.\(^2\) It is believed that when he discusses the *apoha* theory, he uses terms like *bheda* and *vyāvṛtti* instead of *apoha*.

Fukuda 2011, one of the previous studies of *apoha* theory, has already examined passages in the first chapter of PV and PVSV where *apoha* or *anyāpoha* is used and shown that Dharmakīrti mostly uses these words when referring to and interpreting Dignāga’s thought. That paper also classified Dharmakīrti’s contents of *apoha* into ‘exclusion of superimposition (*samāropavyavaccheda*)’, ‘distinctions from others in real things’, and ‘restriction of objects’. However, that paper did not provide a detailed investigation of the words that Dharmakīrti uses in the place of *apoha*. The synonyms of *apoha* has not been studied in detail so far and much more research is needed concerning the relationship between Dharmakīrti’s *apoha* and internal form (*ākāra, pratibhāsa*).\(^3\)

In this paper I select the words which Dharmakīrti uses as *apoha* and examine the examples where those words are used paying attention to connection with ‘internal form’. By means of this I clarify the relationship between Dharmakīrti’s *apoha* and internal form, and comprehend Dharmakīrti’s own *apoha* theory in more detail.

2. The relationship between *apoha* used by Dharmakīrti and internal form

Several previous papers including Fukuda 2011 have already examined examples of
Dharmakīrti uses of the word *apoha*. In this section I will first review the conclusions of the previous papers and consider the relationship between *apoha* used by Dharmakīrti and internal form.

One of the major issues taken up in previous studies about Dhamakīrti’s *apoha*, concerned whether Dhamakīrti’s *apoha* is internal form or not. With regard to this problem, Dhamakīrti actually does not recognize that *apoha* is internal form. However, as Fukuda 2011 has concluded, if Dhamakīrti uses the word *apoha* in PVSV when explaining and re-interpreting Dignāga’s thought, there is no way we can decide whether or not Dhamakīrti’s *apoha* is internal form by examining Dhamakīrti’s example of *apoha*. In fact, it is difficult to determine whether Dhamakīrti’s example of *apoha* in PVSV includes not only of Dignāga ideas but also those of Dhamakīrti, but it is possible to determine whether Dhamakīrti’s synonym of *apoha* is concerned with internal form. I will investigate this in next section, but in this section I will focus on whether Dignāga’s ideas are included where the word *apoha* is used and internal form is mentioned in Dhamakīrti’s texts excluding PVSV.

In Dhamakīrti’s texts other than the PVSV and in the commentaries by other commentators, Dharmakīrti regards *apoha* as being closely related to internal form in PV 3. In his *Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā* (PVṬ) (660–720), a commentary on Dhamakīrti’s autocommentary, Śākyabuddhi interprets *apoha* as internal form.

In other words, the relationship between Dharmakīrti’s *apoha* in PVSV and internal form is decided depending on whether to separate the contents of PV 3 from that of PVSV and on whether to understand Dharmakīrti through Śākyabuddhi’s commentary. But on this point, it is also necessary to examine whether the example of *apoha* found in PV 3 reflects Dharmakīrti’s own thought and whether passage in the PVSV on which Śākyabuddhi commented in the PVṬ and where Śākyabuddhi regards *apoha* as internal form, reflects Dharmakīrti’s own thought. Concerning the latter point, if Śākyabuddhi is commenting on Dignāga’s thought that Dharmakīrti is simply explaining, there seems to be little connection between Śākyabuddhi’s commentary and Dharmakīrti’s thought.

Firstly, about the former example from PV 3, in this example Dharmakīrti is obviously following Dignāga’s thought because Dharmakīrti quotes Dignāga’s *Pramāṇasamuccaya* (PS). It is unclear whether Dharmakīrti himself includes this quotation in his own thought, but it is certain that Dharmakīrti thinks ‘Dignāga’s *apoha* is closely connected with internal form’.
Secondly, is Dignāga' thoughts concerned related to the words in the PVSV on which is Śākyabuddhi commented on in the PVṬ (the passage where Śākyabuddhi regards *apoha* as internal form)? This section of PVṬ⁹ is a comment on PV 1.169 and PVSV to it,¹⁰ and here Dharmakīrti uses word *anyāpoha*. But in this section Dharmakīrti indicates that *anyāpoha* has no nature (*svabhāva*), so it is not sure that Dharmakīrti refers to Dignāga's thought here. And Śākyabuddhi quotes PV 1.40cd in this section of PVṬ,¹¹ but this verse is one of verses that indicates the structure of Dharmakīrti's *apoha* theory. Therefore, it is thought that the passage on which Śākyabuddhi comments is not interpretation of Dignāga's *apoha* theory but Dharmakīrti's *apoha* theory.

Therefore, in Dharmakīrti's texts excluding PV 1 and PVSV, the relationship between Dharmakīrti's *apoha* and internal form is interpreted through the thought of Dignāga and Śākyabuddhi. It seemed that Dharmakīrti thinks that Dignāga's *apoha* is closely connected with internal form, and Śākyabuddhi thinks that Dharmakīrti's *apoha* is internal form.

### 3. The relationship between Dharmakīrti's synonym of *apoha* and internal form

In this section I will consider examples where Dharmakīrti uses synonyms of the word *apoha* in PV 1 and PVSV, and examine the relationship between those synonyms and internal form.

Dharmakīrti sometimes uses synonym of *apoha* where *apoha* is used,¹² but he seems to use words such as *vyavaccheda*, *vyāvṛtti*, and *bheda* as synonyms of *apoha*. In order to confirm this, it is necessary to investigate the contexts in which those words are used. If it is possible to show the connection between what must be the synonym of *apoha* and internal form, the relationship between Dharmakīrti's *apoha* and internal form will be clarified.

Although *apoha* is used infrequently, there are many examples in which words like *vyavaccheda* and *vyāvṛtti* are used.¹³ But there is no need to investigate all of them, and it is enough to consider the section in which internal form is referred to. Perhaps the best example is the following.

PVSV 42, 20–26: *tad arthakriyākāritayā pratibhāsanāt tadakāribhyo bhinnam iva, na ca tat tattvam pariksānāntvād iti pratipādayiṣyāmaḥ. te ’rthā buddhiniveśinas tena samānā iti grhyante, kutaścid vyāvṛttyā pratibhāsanāti, na svalakṣaṇam, tatrāpratibhāsanāti. ta eva ca kutaścid vyāvṛttāḥ punar anyato’pi vyāvṛttimanto ’bhinnāś ca pratibhāntūti.*

Because that [appearance in conceptual awareness] appears as what has effect, [they] seems to be
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distinguished from what doesn’t have effect, but that [appearance in conceptual awareness] is not real because not contributing to investigating [as what has effect]. we will explain about this. Those objects which get into [conceptual] awareness are apprehended as similar by this (=universal whose characteristic is distinction from others) because they appear by means of distinction (vyāvṛtti) from certain things. [Objects which get into conceptual awareness] are not particular because [particular] doesn’t appear in that [conceptual awareness]. And these [objects in conceptual awareness] are distinguished (vyāvṛtta) from certain things and also have distinction (vyavṛttimat) from others and appear [as one thing] undivided (abhinna).14)

This example treats the way in which the universal (sāmānya) and co-reference (sāmānādhikaranya) are establish.15) This problem is already examined in many previous studies, and since it is not related to the main point of this paper, I will refrain from discussing it in detail. My point is that this is one of many examples where vyāvṛtti and pratibhāsa are most often used in same context in apoha section of PV 1. And according to its context it is possible to say that vyāvṛtti is synonym of apoha.

Confirming the position of these two words, distinction (vyāvṛtti) is the basis which makes linguistic practices such as universal and co-reference establish through the object which appears in conceptual awareness, and distinction itself is not appearance in conceptual awareness.16)

4. Conclusion

I have considered Dharmakīrti’s synonym of anyāpoha referring to its connection with internal form. In Dharmakīrti’s texts excluding PV 1 and PVSV, there is the relationship between Dharmakīrti’s apoha and internal form through the thought of Dignāga and Śākyabuddhi, but it seems that Dharmakīrti understood that Dignāga’s apoha is closely connected with internal form, and that Śākyabuddhi understood Dharmakīrti’s apoha to be internal form.

And through an examination of the way in which Dharmakīrti uses vyāvṛtti as synonym of anyāpoha in PVSV, distinction (vyāvṛtti) is the basis which enables linguistic practices such as universal (sāmānya) and co-reference (sāmānādhikaranya) to establish through the object appearing in conceptual awareness (vikalpabuddhi), and distinction itself is not thought as appearance in conceptual awareness.

In all of the examples examined in this paper, Dharmakīrti does not consider that apoha is internal form, and he uses these two words by distinguishing between them. However,
in order to conclude that ‘Dharmakīrti’s apoha is not internal form’ I have to classify and consider other examples because there are other ways Dharmakīrti grasps apoha. This however must be left for another occasion.

Notes

1) In this paper I depend on Frauwallner 1961 about dates of Buddhists.
2) See Ono, Oda, and Takashima 2020.
3) See Kataoka 2010, 2012, and Fukuda 2011.
4) See Fukuda 2011, 70.
5) PV 3.163cd–165: bāhyaśaktivyavacchedaniṣṭhābhāve ’pi tacchrutiḥ // vikalpapratinimitubhiṣu tanniṣṭhavā uktanāyāpohakre chrutiḥ // vyatirekāva yaj jñāne bhāty arthapratinimitubhiṣu / śabdād tad api nārīḥāmā bhrāntiḥ sā vāsanodbhavā //
6) As is well known, Śākyabuddhi classifies apoha theory into three classes, and one of them is ‘appearance in conceptual awareness’ (vikalpyabhātiprathāsya). See Ishida 2005 about Śākyabuddhi’s three classes of apoha theory.
7) For example, in Fukuda 2011 contents of PV 3 and PVT are separated from that of PVSV, but in Kataoka 2012 this separation is not admitted. See Kataoka 2012, 117–119 about this discussion.
8) In PV 3.164, PS 5.11d (tenāyāpohakre chrutiḥ) is quoted.
9) See PVT 200b3–6: ’dir ni gzhan sel ba ni rnam pa gsum yin te / re zhih gcig ni ’di las gzhan dang gzhan sel bar byed pa’i phyir rang gi mtshan nyid bzlog pa kho na yin no // gang gi dbang du mdzad nas / mthun dngos gzhan gyi dngos dag la // Idog pa la ni brten pa can // zhes bya’ ba gsungs so ’//’di yang sgra dang rtags la brten pa’i tha snyad kyi rten nyid du rnam par gzhag pa yin gyi sgras brjod par bya ba nyid du ni ma yin no // gnyis pa ni gzhan gcod pa’i phyir gzhan rnam par gcod pa tsam yin zhing // gang sngo gyi slob dpon dag gis thams cad la khyad par med pa rnam par gzhag pa yin te / thams cad la dqag pa tsam la khyad par med pa’i phyir ro // gsum pa ni ’dis gzhan sel bar byed pa’i phyir rnam par rtog pa’i blo la snang ba’i phyir te / gang bstsan becos mdzad pas sgrai brjod par bya ba nyid du bzhed pa zhes bya ba’ ’di yin no //. Ishida (2005, 87) restores Sanskrit text of this section.
10) See PV 1.169 and PVSV 85,22–23: nivṛtter niḥsvabhāvatvān na sthānāsthitakalpanā / 169ab / na hy anyāpho nāma kincit. tasya ca svabhāvususagānyāḥ svabhāvasthitipracyutkalpanā na kalpante. upaplavaś ca sāmānyadhīyas tenāpy adūṣanā // 169cd //
11) See Ishida 2005, 87.
12) For example in PV 1.46 and PVSV to it Dharmakīrti uses vyavaccheda as synonym of apoha after using apoha, and similarly in PV 1.169 and PVSV to it he uses nivṛtta as apoha after using apoha.
13) See Ono, Oda, and Takashima 2020.
14) Cf. Eltschinger et al. 2018, 89–90.
15) In Hatano 2017, I investigated Dharmakīrti’s thought of sāmānya and sāmānādhikarana. Dharmakīrti indicates same contents in other example PVSV 34,23–35,5: katham idānīm ekasya vyāsvṛtasyānyānanugamād anyavyāsvṛttiḥ sāmānyaṃ. tadbuddhau tathā pratibhāsanāt. na vai kincit sāmānyaṃ nāmāya. śabdāsrayā buddhir anādīvāsamānmrothāyād asamsṛṣṭān api dharmān samsṛṣṭantī jāyate. tasyāḥ pratibhāsavasena sāmānyaṃ sāmānādhikaranaṃ ca vyavasthāpyate, asadartho ’pi. arthānāṃ samsargabhēdābhāvāt. tasya sarvasya tatkāryakāranatayān bhāvyo bhidyamāṇā arthāh samāśrayo dvaniṣ cānistaparitāpya pravartayaśḥ anyāphaviṣaya uktāḥ. In this example Dharmakīrti uses word apoha at the end of sentence, so it is thought that he doesn’t interpret Dignāga’s thought here,
and after indicating his own view about establishment of universal and co-reference, he refers to Dignāga’s view.

Abbreviations

PS(V) 5 Pramāṇasamuccaya(vṛtti). Dignāga. See Pind 2015.
PV 1 Pramāṇavārttika, chapter 1. Dhammakīrti. See PVSV.
PV 3 Pramāṇavārttika, chapter 3. Dhammakīrti. See Tosaki 1979; 1985.
PVSV Pramāṇavārttikasvavṛtti. Dhammakīrti. In The Pramāṇavārttikam of Dhammakīrti: The First Chapter with the Autocommentary. Ed. Raniero Gnoli. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1960.
PVṬ Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā (thad ma rnam ’grel gyi ’grel bshad). Śākyabuddhi. Derge ed., Tohoku no. 4220. Tshad ma, je 1b1–328a7, nye 1b1–282a7. Peking ed., Otani no. 5718. Tshad ma, je 1a1–402a8 nye 1a1–348a8.
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