Erratum to: Journal of Indian Philosophy, Vol. 42, No. 2–3

Birgit Kellner · Sara McClintock

Published online: 22 April 2014
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2014

Erratum to: J Indian Philos
DOI 10.1007/s10781-013-9190-7,
DOI 10.1007/s10781-013-9200-9,
DOI 10.1007/s10781-013-9201-8

The Guest Editors Dr. Birgit Kellner and Dr. Sara McClintock of the Special Issue titled “*ākāra* in Buddhist Philosophical and Soteriological Analysis” would like to correct errors in the following articles.

In article [10.1007/s10781-013-9190-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-013-9190-7) by Birgit Kellner, under the section, “Context 1: *Ākāra* as Object-Form and the Denial of Perception as Activity” in paragraph 6 the noun phrase “*tad viṣayāntareṣūtpadyanānam*” is misspelt and the final sentence of the paragraph should read as “*tad viṣayāntareṣūtpadyamānam taṃ taṃ viṣayaṃ vijānātīty ucyate.*”

In paragraph 10 of the same section, the sentence “What, then, is its the object that caused resemblance?” should read as “What, then, is its resemblance?”

In the same article under the section “Appropriations of Abhidharmic Uses of *Ākāra* in Buddhist *Pramāṇavāda*” in paragraph 1 the phrase “it usage in Abhidharmic contexts” is misspelt and the correct sentence should read as “The examination of contexts for *ākāra* in AK(Bh) consequently calls the view into

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s10781-013-9190-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-013-9190-7),
[10.1007/s10781-013-9200-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-013-9200-9), [10.1007/s10781-013-9201-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-013-9201-8).

B. Kellner (✉)

Heidelberg Centre for Transcultural Studies, University of Heidelberg, Karl Jaspers Centre,
Vossstrasse 2, Building 4400, 69115 Heidelberg, Germany
e-mail: kellner@asia-europe.uni-heidelberg.de

S. McClintock

Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA
e-mail: simmcli@emory.edu

question that there is a general continuity between its usage as object-form in Buddhist *pramāṇa* discourse and its usage in Abhidharmic contexts.”

In the same section in paragraph 2 the phrase “Concepts like as the contact” is misspelt and the correct sentence should read as “Concepts such as the contact between sense-faculty and object which is a part of the Nyāya definition of perception are not suited to explain this state of affairs.”

In article [10.1007/s10781-013-9200-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-013-9200-9) by Shinya Moriyama in footnote 22 the name “Kaamlaśīla” is misspelt and the sentence should read as “The same text is also quoted in Kamalaśīla’s *Madhyamakāloka*.”

In article [10.1007/s10781-013-9201-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-013-9201-8) by Serena Saccone in footnote 26 line 3 the word “*mūrtānām*” has been misspelt and the beginning of the sentence should read as “Cf. TSP ad 1967: *niraṃśānām anekeṣām aṇūnām mūrtānām*”.

In the same article in footnote 70 line 3 the word “*tadekāṇiyamāj*” is misspelt and the correct sentence should read as “*tad ekāṇiyamāj jñānam uktaṃ sāmānyagoc-aram* || (PV 3.195–196)”.