Quotations in the Mīmāṃsā Chapter of Bhavya’s Madhyamaka-hṛdaya-kārikā

Shinjō Kawasaki

For a study of the theories and practices of the Brahmanical schools in India around the fifth century, the Madhyamaka-hṛdaya-kārikā (hereinafter referred to as MHK) of Bhavya or Bhāvaviveka (490–570 ca.) and his auto-commentary Tarkajvala (TJ) provide much valuable information. In the following, the Mīmāṃsaka ideas quoted in the Pūrva-pakṣa (Opponent’s View) of Chapter IX: Mīmāṃsā-tattvanirṇaya-avatāra of this work will be discussed on the basis of the Sanskrit text in collation with the Tibetan translation

There are 17 verses as a whole in this Pūrva-pakṣa quoted as the assertion of the Mīmāṃsakas of Bhavya’s time. What is discussed in those verses can be summarized in the following seven points:

a) The Mīmāṃsakas put the primary importance on the sacrificial rites. The state of deliverance (apavarga) is attainable only by the ritualistic practices prescribed in the Śāstras, such as the oblations of corn, cattle, or clarified butter and the sexual union at the site of sacrifice (śāstra-ukta-vṛihi-pāśv-ājya-patnīsambandha-karmaṇaḥ). They think little of the meditation and accumula-

1) This study is based on the Sanskrit text of the Madhyamaka-hṛdaya-kārikā offered by Prof. V. V. Gokhale of Poona. It is a copy, made by his own handwriting, from what Rev. Sāṃkṛtyāyana copied at Sha-lu monastery in Tibet. The present writer remains thankful to Prof. Gokhale’s kind guidance and his generous permission for the use and publication of this material.

2) A full translation of 17 verses, together with the Sanskrit text and the Tibetan text, appears in an article by the present writer: “The Mīmāṃsā Thought as Is known to Bhavya (in Japanese)”, in Indo Shisō to Bukkyō (a collection of the articles dedicated to Dr. Hajime Nakamura at the sixtieth anniversary of his birthday), (Tokyo, November 1973), pp. 71–86.
tion of knowledge which is the right means to get deliverance (apavarga-san-
mārga-dhyāna-jñāna-apavādinaḥ). (Verses Nos. 1 and 2).

b) These rites are prescribed by the Śāstras on the authority of the Vedas. What is here in the Vedas is in others and what is not here is not anywhere else (yad ihāsti tad anyatra yan nēhāsti na tat kvacit). (Verse No. 12. As to this idiomatic phrase, see the opening verses in the Mahābhārata.) The Vedas are the exclusive authority for their deeds.

c) The Vedas are the revealed literature, the author of which is not in our memory (kartur asmaranāt). After they are revealed to the ancient Rṣis, they have been transmitted to this day without interruption (sampradāya-anupacchedāt). (Verse No. 4). As they are not the products of the human being who is inevitably spoiled by three defect of desire and so on (a-puruṣa-kartṛtvāt), the Vedas are free from error and eternally valid as the right source of knowledge (pramāṇam iti gṛhyate). (Verse No. 3).

d) Since the Vedas consist of word (śabda), the eternal validity of the Vedas as the right source of knowledge is based on eternality of the word (nityaḥ śabdaḥ). Word is eternal, manifested by sound (dhvani-vyaṅgyaḥ) and stands in eternal relation with the meaning (sambandho 'rthena nityataḥ). (Verse No. 6).

e) What is the Vedas as a means of cognition? Direct perception (pratyakṣa) gives knowledge of the particular (svalakṣaṇa) and inference (anumāṇa) gives knowledge of the universal (sāmānya-lakṣaṇa). Verbal cognition (śābda) of the Vedas, on the other hand, gives knowledge of both: knowledge of the particular such as Apavarga and that of the universal such as Svarga. (Verse No. 8). Those matters like Svarga and Apūrva are beyond human perception (atyanta-akṣa-parokṣa); neither are they known by means of inference since their relation with the signs is not perceived (adrśta-liṅga-sambandha). (Verse No. 5). Those are known only by the third means of cognition, Āgama or the verbal cognition. (Verse No. 9).

f) The validity of the Āgama as an independent means of knowledge is never damaged by the strictest scrutiny of reasoning (hetu-vāda). (Verses Nos. 13 and 14).
g) There is no human being capable of getting a direct cognition of such a super-sensory matter as Apūrva. There is no omniscient being (sarva-jñā). (Verse No. 15). Being human, neither the Buddha nor the Jain Kevalin is free from error. They cannot claim themselves to be right in so far as they contradict the Vedas. (Verses Nos. 16 and 17).

**Parallels in other works**

Almost all the points of discussion in what Bhavya quotes as the assertion of the Mīmāṃsakas are reiterated, in a similar form and manner, in Śāntarakṣita’s Tattvasaṃgraha (8th century) as the points of controversy between the Buddhist logicians and Kumārila of the Mīmāṃsā School. None of the 17 verses in MHK, however, can be actually found either in the Tattvasaṃgraha or Kumārila’s Ślokavārtika.

In Śabarāsvain’s Bhāṣya on the Mīmāṃsā-sūtra, “śabda-nityatva (ad MS. I, 6, 6–23)”, “vākya-artha-prāmāṇya (ad MS. I, 7, 24–26)”, and “veda-apauruṣeyatva (ad MS. I, 8, 27–32)” are discussed, but few of its words or of its contexts are shared by Bhavya’s 17 verses.

The Tibetan text3) of MHK has one extra verse which is not found in the

3) When compared with the various Tibetan editions of MHK (sDe dge bṣtan ḥgyur Dsa 31a–32a, hereinafter referred to as D31a; sNar Thaṅ bṣtan ḥgyur Dsa 31a–32a; Peking bṣtan ḥgyur Dsa 34a–35a), the Sanskrit text of these 17 verses differs in the following points:

i) The Tibetan verses not found in the Sanskrit text

As mentioned here, the Tibetan text of MHK has one extra verse which cannot be found in the Sanskrit text. What is more, Chapter IX of the Sanskrit text of MHK brought by Rev. Sāmkṛtyāyana counts 148 verses as a whole, whereas the Tibetan text has more than 160 (?) verses for this chapter, and there are some parts in the Tibetan text where the usual set-form of a verse with four padas is not strictly observed. (e. g. D305a1–5). All those verses augmented in the Tibetan text of MHK are explained in TJ as quotations from some other works.

ii) The Sanskrit verses not found in the Tibetan text

Verses Nos. 2 and 5 of the Sanskrit text are not found in the Tibetan text of MHK. In TJ, however, both of these two verses are translated, not in a verse style, but in prose, and some of their words as parokṣa, adṛṣṭa-liṅga-sambandha,
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Sanskrit text: “mñoṇ sum rjes su dpag pa dañ, sgra las byuñ dañ ñer ġjal bcas, don gyis go dañ dnos med pañi, gtan tshigs bsgrub bya sgrub par byed”.
This verse in Tibetan is identical with what the *Yuktidipika* quotes as the opinion of “other people who speak of the six kinds of *pramāṇa*”: “tatha śaḍ ity anye: pratyakṣam anumāṇaṁ ca śabdaṁ cūpamayā saha/ arthāpattir abhāvaś ca hetavaḥ sādhyā-sādhakaḥ”4). From the *Yuktidipika*, however, we cannot tell whose opinion it is.

As it has been pointed out by Prof. Hajime Nakamura5), Verse No. 14 of *MHK*: “pāda-sparśad iva (an)dh(ānām) viśame pathi dhāvatām, anumāṇa-pradhānānām pātaḥ teṣāṁ na durlabhaḥ” agrees with a few slight variations with Bhartrhari’s *Vākyapadīya* I, 42: “hasta-sparśad ivāndhena viśame pathi dhāvatā, anumāṇa-pradhānena vinipāto na durlabhaḥ”.

The *Vākyapadīya* (I, 30-42) where this verse is found is noteworthy as it is here that Bhartrhari sets forth against the so-called logicians (hetu-vādin= tārkika) who put the primary importance on reasoning, his traditionalist standpoint asserting the exclusive authority of the Vedas as the source of knowledge. This part of the *Vākyapadīya* shares in common many words and phrases with the Mīmāṁsā Chapter of *MHK*, but except Verse No. 14 no other verse in the 17 verses in *MHK* agrees with the *Vākyapadīya*.

svarga, apūrva and so on are elucidated by paraphrases. It is very probable, therefore, that these two verses not found in the Tibetan translation of *MHK* are in the original *MHK*.

From the above-mentioned facts i) and ii), we can assume that originally there was the Tibetan translation of *TJ* only and not of *MHK*, and that Tibetans of some later period extracted only verses from the Tibetan *TJ* and made an independent text of *MHK* out of it. For this reason, the verses quoted in *TJ* are mixed in the Tibetan *MHK* only because they are in verse style and the original verses in the Sanskrit *MHK* are not collected in the Tibetan *MHK* as they are in prose in *TJ*.

4) See R. C. Pandeya ed: *Yuktidipika* (New Delhi, 1967), p. 31. The presence of this verse in the *Yuktidipika* was informed by Dr. Naomichi Nakada.
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Quotations in the Tarkajvalā

In TJ, Bhavya’s auto-commentary to his MHK, there are many quotations from Brahmanical works, which suggest Bhavya’s good stock of knowledge about the Brahmanical doctrines and ritualistic practices. To mention some, of which the sources can be identified:

i) In reference to the 48 samskāras to be an authentic Brāhmaṇa,

\begin{align*}
\text{Oṃ khyab ḥjug mñaḥ yin no} & \quad \text{viṣṇur yoniḥ kalpayatu} \\
\text{tva stas gzugs sbyaṅs so} & \quad \text{tvaṣṭā rūpāṇī piṃśatu} \\
\text{tshaṅs pas sa gcod par byed do} & \quad \text{ā sīṃcatu prajaśatīr} \\
\text{skyed dguḥi bdag pos ni mñaḥ} & \quad \text{dhātā garbham dadhātu te} \\
\text{speṅs par byed do} & \quad (R.V. X, 184)
\end{align*}

ii) As an evidence of human sacrifice,

\begin{align*}
\text{bram ze la ni bram ze bsad} & \quad \text{brahmaṇe brāhmaṇam ālabhate} \\
\text{rgyal rigs kyi la rgyal rigs bsad} & \quad \text{kṣatraya rājanyam} \\
\text{ma ru dag la rje riggs te} & \quad \text{marudbhyo vaiśyam} \\
\text{dkaḥ thub dag la dmaṅs riggs so} & \quad \text{tapase śūdram} \\
\text{(D272a)} & \quad (Tait. Br. III, 4, 1)
\end{align*}

iii) The sexual union (patni-sambandha) as a means of deliverance,

\begin{align*}
\text{gau ta ma bud med me niid yin} & \quad \text{yosā vāva, gautama, agniḥ,} \\
\text{de yi ņe bar gnas thub khaṇ yin} & \quad \text{tasyā upastha eva samit,} \\
\text{der skyes sbu ni du ba yin} & \quad \text{yad upamantrayate sa dhūmaḥ,} \\
\text{dehi nañ shugs pa sol baḥo} & \quad \text{yonir arciḥ, yad antaḥ karoti} \\
\text{dehi khu ba me stag yin} & \quad \text{te aṅgārāḥ, abhinandā visphulingāḥ} \\
\text{(D272a)} & \quad (Chānd. Up. V, 8, 1) \\
\text{ (=Śat. Br. 14, 9, 1 ; Brh. Up. VI, 2)}
\end{align*}

iv) Taking of the Soma drink in a ritual,

\begin{align*}
\text{zla ba ḥthuṅs so} & \quad \text{apāma somam} \\
\text{ḥchi ba med par gyur to (D267a)} & \quad \text{amṛtā abhūma (RV. VIII, 48).}
\end{align*}

v) To be recited at the time of Agnihotra,

\begin{align*}
\text{me khyod kyi žas ni bdun no} & \quad \text{sapta te agne samidhaḥ} \\
\text{ice ni bdun no, dañ sroñ ni} & \quad \text{sapta jīhvāḥ sapta ṛṣayaḥ}
\end{align*}
Quotations in the Mīmāṃsā Chapter (S. Kawasaki) (6)

bdun no, khyim ni bdun no, sapta dhāma priyāṇi, sapta
fiṅ shag bdun du lan bdun du hotrāḥ saptadhā tvā yajanti
khyod mchod do, skye gnas bdun sapta yonir āpṛṇasva ghrtena
du khyod mar gyis tshim par byaḥo svāhā (Vāj. S. XVII, 79)
svā hā (D274a)

vi) As a praise of Agni,
rvā ni bshiho, ḫdiḥi ḍkaṇ pa ni catvāri śṛṅgā trayo asya pādā
gsum mo, mgo ni gñis so, lag pa dve śīrṣe sapta hastāso asya
ni bdun no de ḫdir gsum nas tridhā baddho vṛṣabho roravīti
bcīṅs la khyu mchog ḫdi na ḫa ro ḫdon to......lha
chen po......ḥjig rten ḫdiḥi (=Gopātha-Br. I, 2, 16)
ḥchi bar ḫgyur ro (D273a–274a)

Of course it is very probable that Bhavya derived a knowledge of those passages in his TJ, not directly from the sources mentioned above, but on a verbal transmission or through quotations in some other works. Passages v) and vi) are noteworthy since Bhavya gives an elaborate interpretation on them in TJ. On the well-known enigmatic phrases in Passage vi), Yāska (Nirukta XIII, 7), Patañjali (Mahābhāṣya, Kielhorn ed. Vol. 1. p. 3), Śabaravāmin (Bhāṣya ad MS. I, 2, 46), and Kumārila (Tantravārtika ad MS. I, 2, 46) also give their respective interpretations. A comparative examination of those diverse interpretations with Bhavya’s interpretation in TJ will tell us what Brahmanical background Bhavya had and from what Brahmanical tradition he got his knowledge of the Mīmāṃsakas.

At the very beginning of the Mahābhāṣya, Patañjali gives his interpretation of this passage in RV: “The great divinity entered into the mortals (maho devo martyām ā viveśa)” to mean “The word (śabda) as the ultimate comes into the mortals”. It is in this passage that he finds the metaphysical authority on which to found his science of grammar6). Sāyaṇa gives his interpretation

6) “mahān devaḥ śabdaḥ, martyā maraṇa-dharmāṇo manusyaḥ, tāṇ āviveśa, ma-
in two different ways; in one of them, he takes “maho devaḥ” to mean “the Sun (सूर्य)” (सूर्य). All other interpreters are in accord in taking “maho devaḥ” to mean “sacrificial rite (यज्ञ)” (यज्ञ), but they differ each other in interpreting what “four horns (कत्वारी स्रंगच्)” (कत्वारी स्रंगच्), “three feet (त्रयो आय पादाः)” (त्रयो आय च पादाः), “two heads (द्वे सिर्शे)” (द्वे सिर्शे), “seven hands (सप्तो हस्तास्या)” (सप्तो हस्तास्या), “bound in threefold (त्रिधात्रं ढेक्किन्)” (त्रिधात्रं ढेक्किन्), “a bull (र्शभाः)” (र्शभाः), and “roars (रौरविति)” (रौरविति) actually mean. To show Bhavya’s interpretation and its relation with others’ interpretations (identity mentioned in parentheses), it is as follows:

The four horns stand for the four Vedas (=Yāska & Sāyaṇa); the three feet stand for the three Savanas (=Sabara, Yāska, & Sāyaṇa); the two heads stand for the sacrificer and his wife (=Sabara); the seven hands stand for the seven metres (=Sabara, Yāska, & Sāyaṇa); bound threefold means the three parts of body, that is, heart, neck and head; the bull stands for the syllable Om7); roars means to make a sound. (D273b)......Great means that Viṣṇu, Śiva and Brahmā, who are great themselves, are surpassed by its greatness; the great divinity means the sovereign lord; entered the mortals means that it reached, starting from the world of Brahmā and so on, the end of existence, that is, it covers all and stays in all. (D274a)

The latter half of Bhavya’s interpretation does not agree with any other interpretations. Is it Bhavya’s own invention? (Cf. Kumārila, although knowing Śabarasaṃśāmin’s interpretation, interprets this passage to mean yāga-stuti.) Or, does Bhavya owe his interpretation to some unknown predecessor? So far, the present writer has no means to answer the question8).

Around the time of Bhavya, among the scholars of Brahmanism, including those who are later known as the Vaiyākarana, careful discussions were held about the sacrificial rites prescribed in the Vedas and their relation to language.

8) It would be noteworthy how Bhartṛhari interprets this Vedic passage. The two recent publications of the text of the Mahābhāṣya-dīpīka (Abhyankar-Limaye ed.; Svāmināthan ed.) both lack the opening several leaves in which it is assumed that Bhartṛhari’s commentary on this passage might be contained. See “प्रहुर महांतम र्शभाः” in the Vākyapadīya I, 122.
Quotations in the Mīmāṃsā Chapter (S. Kawasaki)  (8)

Bhavya, a Buddhist scholar, had a good knowledge about those points of controversy. As a presupposition, there is a probability of Bhavya’s getting his knowledge on the Mīmāṃsakas through some grammarian’s works.9) The Mīmāṃsā Chapter of MHK offers one of the rare examples to show how far a Buddhist scholar of the fifth-sixth centuries understood the Brahmanical doctrines.

9) As to the relation of Bhartrhari and the Mīmāṃsakas, the following points should be taken into consideration.

In the Śabarabhasya ad MS I, 1, 5, a Sphoṭa-vādin is quoted as an opponent’s view. In a later period, Kumārila attacked Bhartrhari’s theory of sphoṭa, whereas Maṇḍanamiśra spoke in defense of Bhartrhari. Bhartrhari himself, in his turn, criticized a certain unnamed Mīmāṃsaka on his interpretation on of the sentence (vākya). cf. Vākyapadīta II, 41; 42. So, it is obvious that on some points Bhartrhari stood in opposition to the Mīmāṃsakas. Compare a Mīmāṃsaka’s view quoted in MHK IX, Verse 6: “nityaḥ śabdo dhvani-vyaṅgyah” with Bhartrhari’s interpretation of śabda in his Mahābhasya-dīpikā (Abhyankar-Limaye ed., Poona, 1967): “etac cărtha-svarūpaṃ sphoṭo ’yam eva śabdātmā nityaḥ, ye tu krāma- janmāno ’yugapat-kālā vyaktayo dhvany-ātmānas te (p. 4)” and “dvau śabdātmānau nityaḥ kāryaś cēti, kaiścin nityam iti dṛṣṭaḥ kaiścid anitya iti, athavā jātir vyaktiś cēti, atha vā sphoṭo dhvaniś ca (p. 13)”. See also K. A. S. Iyer: Bhartrhari (Poona, 1969, p. 159f).

Verse 7 of MHK gives four reasons in proof of śabda-nityatva: “i) adviḥpravrṛttter, ii) abhyāsāt, iii) pratyabhijñānatas, iv) tathā śabdāvac chrāvaṇatvād…” These four to prove the eternity of sound are not found in the Vākyapadīya, so far. cf. “pratyabhijñāna” in Śabarabhasya ad MS I, 1. 19.

At the same time, Bhartrhari agreed with the Mīmāṃsakas when he placed emphasis on Patañjali’s traditionalist standpoint as to the contribution of science of grammar to the establishment of the Vedic authority: “rakṣārthaṃ Vedānāṃ adhyeyam vyākaraṇam (Mahābhāṣya vol. I, p. 1)”.

P. S.: Prof. V. V. Gokhale gives the following remarks on the author’s Note (3). “This presupposition seems too radical. We know that a Skt.-MHK-text exists separately, although the version used by the Tib. translator might have been different from our present one. Besides Bhavya often incorporates quotations in his own text of MHK while relegating many others to the TJ. Again the Tib. translator may have found it difficult to translate some Skt. verses in Tib. metrical form. These being in prose form may have been dropped from Tib.-MHK by some later reviser”.
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