

SAKALAJAGADVIDHĀTRANUMĀNAM (IV),

A Survey of Bhāsarvajña's Refutation against Prajñākaragupta's Criticism on the Theism of the Naiyāyikas

Toshihiko Kimura

Prajñākaragupta criticized extensively the theism of the Naiyāyikas in his *Prāmānavārttikabhāṣyam*. Especially he refuted the theism that the world had been created and governed by the God Śiva, reciting the renowned verse of the *Abhidharmakośakārikā* IV, 1a “*karmajaṃ lokavaicitryaṃ cetanā tatkr̥taṃ ca tat* / ” (The world has various forms caused by karmas. The latter is divided into the intent and its consequences i. e. speech and action).¹⁾

Prajñākaragupta thought that karma had the mentality (*cetana*) and the proofs of the government of the mental one (*buddhimatpārvakatvam*) were the tautology (*siddhasāadhanam*) for the Buddhists. On the contrary Bhāsarvajña advocates the Naiyāyika's assertion in his *Nyāyabhūṣaṇam*²⁾ saying that the psyche (*ātma*) only has the mentality, and there is not any proof (*pramāṇam*) for the mentality of karma. Karma cannot recognize any materials (*upādānam*), he says, as such it has no ability of the maker of the world. If karma can recognize all materials, such an ability of karma may be called the intelligence (*nirūpaṇam*). Prajñākaragupta acknowledged the mental karma to be the intelligence, and said :

cetanā karmarūpaiva pravṛtter yadi kāraṇam / nirūpaṇe'pi na param tannirūpaṇam iṣyate //³⁾ (If the cause of activity is the mentality having the character of karma, karma can be deemed as the intelligence, so that, we do not allow the other intelligence.)

But Bhāsarvajña points that Prajñākaragupta's assertion induces karma to be the God (*īśvaratvaprasaṅgaḥ*). According to him the God Śiva only has the intelligence to be aware of the character of materials and can compose the world with them, as if the potter has the intelligence to be aware of clay and can compose pots. But Prajñākaragupta did not allow the proof for the intelligence

of the God (*asiddho dṛṣṭāntaḥ*), for it contradicted the Naiyāyika's standpoint. The following verse was cited by Prajñākaragupta because it represented the theism of the Pāsupatas well.

*ajño jantur anīśo'yaṃ ātmanaḥ sukhaduḥkhaḥ | īśvaraṇaḥ gacchet svargaṃ vā
śvabhram eva ca* //4) (The being is not intelligent, who cannot control his own
misery and pleasure. He is caused to rove over the paradise or the hell according
to the God's order.)

Bhāsarvajña answers saying that the being is independent in such a limited sense as he can use a stick etc. (*daṇḍādīprerakāṭve*) You might think that the God is also dependent on the other supervisor, he says, but you are not reasonable because He is omniscient (*sarvajñaḥ*). The deference between the dependent being and the independent one occurs whether he knows all the materials or not. In the standpoint of the Naiyāyikas the proof of the Director (*prerakāḥ*) contains the proof of the Omniscient. The complex proof is called "*adhikaraṇasiddhāntaḥ*" in the Nyāyasūtram (Chowkhambā Skt. Ser.) I, 1, 30 5).

Prajñākaragupta said:

*adharmakaraṇe'pyeṣa vartayatyeva janmināḥ / ayuktaṃ kārayitvāsau kathaṃ yukte
pravartayet* //6) (This One causes beings to move on unrighteousness also. Why does
this One causes to move on trueness after causes to move on untrueness?)

Bhāsarvajña denies that the God causes beings to move on untrueness but acknowledges that the God causes to move on unrighteousness (*adharmāḥ*). He interprets such the God as the children at play (*bālakṛīḍavai*). He discriminates the term "*adharmāḥ* (unrighteousness)" and "*ayuktaṃ* (untrueness)" which Prajñākaragupta used synonymously, and answers that the God dare not cause beings to move on "*ayuktaṃ*" even though causes them to move on "*adharmāḥ*" also. All is under His delideration (*vicārtiam*), he says.

Then he cites the following verse of Prajñākaragupta:

śāstrāntarāṇi yad īśvaravikalpataḥ | satyasatyopadeśasya pramāṇaṃ dānataḥ kathaṃ ||
(If all the other scriptures are compiled by the God's intent, why is He the authority, who gives right and false texts?)

Bhāsarvajña does not think that all the scriptures (*śāstrāṇi*) are the revelation of the God Śiva, but he insists that those which the God composed are right,

therefore He is the authority (*pramāṇam*). The Vedas are the revelation of the God and seen by the Rishis in the standpoint of the Naiyāyikas. Speaking by the way, the author of the Pāśupatasūtram, Nakulīśa, is the incarnation of the God Śiva.⁷⁾

Bhāsarvajña stresses upon that the Maker of the world is one God. There are many human beings (*anīśvarāḥ*), but they seem to be innumerable babies (*stanandhayāḥ*) in comparison with an architect of a special palace. Moreover, if you deem of many gods making the earth etc., Bhāsarvajña says, the fault of contradiction to occur too many worlds lies with you. Think about the harmonious (*avirodham*) world. Thus Bhāsarvajña says to atheists in the sense of the theism of Leibniz. Then he cites the other criticism by Prajñākara Gupta.

*saṃsthānasaṅgamād bhāvāḥ kartreti sidhyatu | ahetugunayuktasya kuta eva tu siddhatā ||*⁸⁾ (You will prove that the existences have been made by a maker on the ground of uniting with various shapes, but why can that which contains the causeless characters be proved?)

*svābhāvikatve tat tasya jagat svābhāvikam bhavet | tasyaivaikasya tad idaṃ vyaktam īśvaraceṣṭitam ||*⁹⁾ (If that One is spontaneous, the world would be also spontaneous. If it is monotonous, it had been evidently composed by the God.)

The term “*ahetugunayuktatvam*” and “*svābhāvikatvam*” are synonymous. The God does not have His own cause for the Pāśupatas. Saying in other words, He is spontaneous and out of order, so that, we cannot infer Him by experiential logics. And, if He is the Maker of the world, the world would be out of order. Or it would be monotonous if the God is monotonous. Thus considered Prajñākara Gupta, but Bhāsarvajña answers that, even if he does not approve the Maker of the earth etc., he cannot deem that the existences have causeless characters. For, the world has various forms according to karmas for the Buddhists. If the God is the Maker of the earth etc., the proof of the Maker (*buddhimatkāraṇam*) contains simultaneously the proof of the eternity of the Maker of the earth etc. as well as His omniscency⁵⁾

Prajñākara Gupta ridiculed the Pāśupatas saying that human beings could become the God (*īśvaratvam api prāptam*) by ascension which was preached in their scriptures, as such there must be not eternal God (*nityeśvaraḥ*). Bhāsarvajña

says against this, the Pāśupata āgama is not the authority (*pramāṇam*) for the Buddhists as if the āgama of the Buddha is not the authority for the Pāśupatas.

- 1) *Pramāṇavārttikabhāṣyam* (Tib. Skt. Work Ser. 1) edited by R. Sāṅkṛityāyana, Panta 1953 36, 1 But Prajñākaragupta's citing passage is ".....*cetanā mānaṣaṃ ca tat /*", and Bhāsarvajña's one is ".....*cetanā mānaṣaṃ karma /*". The above cited verse on my paper conforms itself to the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam* (TSWS. 8) ed. by P. Pradhan, Patna 1967 p. 192.
- 2) *Nyāyabhūṣaṇam* (Śaḍḍarśanaṣaṅgrahāṇikā 1) ed. by S. Yogīndrānanda, Varanasi 1968 p. 472.
- 3) Prajñākaragupta, op. cit. 36, 10 (verse no. 251), cited in the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇam* 472, 19-20,
- 4) This verse has been originally cited from the *Mahābhāratam* (published from the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona 1971) III, 31, 27. In the Nyāya school Uddyotakara in his *Nyāyavārttikam* and Jayanta in his *Nyāyamañjarī* cited this verse as the representation of their theism. In the Sāṅkhya school Gauḍapāda in his *Bhāṣyam ad Sāṅkhyakārikā* and Māṭhara in his *Vṛttiḥ ad hoc* cited the verse as denoting the opponent thesis (*īśvaravādaḥ*). Besides, Kamalaśīla in his *Tattvasaṅgrahapañjikā*, Prajñākaramati in his *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā*, Guṇaratna in his *Tarkarahasyadīpikā*, and Malliṣeṇa in his *Syādvādamāñjarī* cited this verse to show the Naiyāyika theism.
- Originally in the *Mahābhāratam*, the verse has been sung by Draupadī who has lamented the misery of her husbands Yudhiṣṭhira and so on. The God and gods has been grudged by her. She has asked them, why cannot they help the Pāṇḍavas in spite of their miraculous power? The present verse has been sung to laud His formidable power by Draupadī.
- 5) See also the *Pramāṇavārttikavṛttiḥ* of Manorathanandin (Bauddha Bharati Ser. 3) 10, 18-11, 2, where the proof of the Maker is explained as including the proof of the omniscience according to the principle of *adhikarāṇasiddhānta*.
- 6) Prajñākaragupta, op. cit. 36, 27 (verse no. 256), cited in the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇam* 474, 3-4.
- 7) See the introduction of the *Pāśupatasūtram* edited by R. A. Śāstri (Trivandrum 1940).
- 8) Prajñākaragupta, op. cit. 40, 23 (verse no. 300), cited in the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇam* 476, 23-24. The cited word "*karteti*" must be amended as "*kartreti*" according to the *Bhāṣyam* and the Tibetan version (Derge ed. Tōhoku Univ. Catalogue no. 4221 35 a, 7-35 b, 1), but "*sidhyati*" which is the reading of the *Bhāṣyam* is wrong in comparison with the cited passage and the Tibetan version.
- 9) Prajñākaragupta, op. cit. 40, 13-14 (verse no. 296 b, a), cited in the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇam* 477, 1-2. The cited word "*tattvasya*" must be amended as "*tat tasya*" according to the *Bhāṣyam* and the Tibetan version (ibid. 35a, 4).

(Assoc. Prof., Tōkai Women's College)