SAKALAJAGADVIDHĀTRAṆUMĀNAM (I)

—The Proof of the God Śiva by Bhāsarvajña—

Toshihiko Kimura

In the Āgama chapter of his Nyāyabhūṣaṇa, Bhāsarvajña argues the highest God Śiva (*Īśvaraḥ*) devoted by Pāśupata Śaivas on a large scale¹⁾. Up to now the Nyāya theory of theism has been researched mainly by the Viennese school²⁾. Now we would report the argument of the highest God Śiva described in the Nyāyabhūṣaṇa, which has not been reported since the publication of it was realised.

Bhāsarvajña cites the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad III, 2a with good modifications as well as IV, 8; III, 3 and the Manu Smṛti XII, 122; 124 etc. as the Āgama proof of the dominion by the God Śiva³⁾. As the Anumāna proof, Bhāsarvajña shows thus:

*vivādadhyāsitaṃ upalabdhimatkāraṇaṃ abhāvabhāvitvad vastrādivat*⁴⁾

(Assertion) An object disputed is controled by an intelligent constructor.

(Reason) Because it came into existence after non-existence.

(Case) Such as cloth.

Bhāsarvajña had the opportunity to argue the theism of Nyāya on the description of the Ātma theory. That is:

*sa dvividhaḥ paraścaṇparaśca.....tatra paramātmā bhagavān maheśvaraḥ*⁵⁾

The commentators to the Nyāyasūtra discoursed the theism of Nyāya as explaining the Sūtra IV, 1, 21; but the authors who wrote the original texts of Nyāya argued the theism in connection to psyches (*atmānaḥ*), because psyche is one of the principles of Nyāya and the highest God is originally not so. This proof has the same construction as logicians of sixth A. D. tried. These of Uddyotakara are:

*pradhānaṇparamāṇukarmāṇi prakṛpavṛtter buddhimatkāraṇādhiṣṭhitāni pravartante cetanātvad vāsyādivat*⁶⁾

*buddhimatkaraṇādhiṣṭhitam mahabhātādi vyaktam sukhaduḥkḥhadinimittam bhavati rā-
padimattvat turyādivat*^[7]

*dharmādharmau buddhimatkaraṇādhiṣṭhitau puruṣasyopabhogaṃ kurutaḥ karaṇatvād
vāsyādivat*^[8]

In these proofs the subjects are materials or instrumental causes or effects of many sorts, and the predicates are “to be controled by an intelligent constructor.” The logicians of Nyāya compare these theses to materials or instrumental causes or effects dealt with by human beings.

So far as the human activity is concerned, the logical relation, that is, the subsumption (*vyāptiḥ*) between the mediate term and the prediacate is concluded.

Dharmakīrti criticized these proofs as tautological for Buddhists. Or, he says, if Nyāya philosophers suppose the subject to be in no relation to human activity, they could not find any real case. Even if they find it, it could not be fully allowed by Buddhist philosophers. That is:

*sthītva pravṛttisaṁsthānaviśeṣārthakriyādiṣu/ iṣṭasiddhir asiddhir va dr̥ṣṭānte saṁśayo
'tha vā*^[9] (Pramāṇavārttika, Pramāṇasiddhi chapter k. 10)

Dharmakīrti allowed the predicate “to be controled by an intelligent constructor” to significate “to be controled by a human constructor”, and Prajñākara-gupta cited the Abhidharmakośa Kārikā IV, 1a “*karmajaṃ lokavaicitryaṃ ce-
tanā tatkr̥tam ca tad*”^[10] for this explanation. These proofs are tautological for Buddhists. (*iṣṭasiddhiḥ*)

Bhaṣarvajña replies his critique saying that the constructor of the earth etc. is not concluded by Buddhists, so that, the proof of the God Śiva is useful^[11]. The earth and the others are, he says, obviously (*pratyaakṣeṇa gṛhitam*) controled by the constructor who has the eternal and excellent intelligence (*nityaiśva-
ryopetakartā*), but for the removal of stupid thoughts, he tried a contradictory proof (*bādhakapramāṇam*) against Buddhists, and stresses upon non-tautological proof. Bhaṣarvajña thinks Dharmakīrti to be too strict to find cases, and made a synical remark that all proofs could not obtain their cases if the predicate must be strictly interpreted.

He makes use of cloth as the case of the subsumption between the mediate

term and the predicate, and considered to be able to apply it to the earth etc., because the predicate “to be controled by an intelligent constructor” is common to cloth etc. and the earth etc. (*sādhyasāmānyasya niścitatvāt*)¹² “*sthitvāpravrṛtteḥ*” which is referred as the reason for the proof of the God Śiva by Dharmakīrti and Śāntarakṣita cannot be found in the Nyāya-vārttika. But, being noteworthy, Bhāsarvajña’s devicing reason “*abhūtavābhāvitvāt*” resembles “*sthitvāpravrṛtteḥ*”. If we compare that Prajñākara-gupta commented the reasons which Dharmakīrti cited as indicating effectness (*kāryātmānaḥ*)¹³, or the gerund “*sthitvā*” means “having stopped” (cf. *masaṃ sthitvā* = after a month), we could notice it to be common to Bhāsarvajña’s devicing term “*abhūtavābhāvitvāt*”. Jayasīma-sūri who commented upon the Nyāyasāra explanates it that it was not in existence in past time and now it occurs (*prag abhatva anutpadya paścād bhavatīti*). And he says, the earth etc. were not in existence in an annihilation (*pralayakāle*), but now it exists¹⁴. In the view point of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika metaphysics, after the pralayakāla (432000000 years) the highest God Śiva desires to rouse the good and bad energies (*dharmādharmau*) and connects psyches (*ātmanah*) to material causes (*aṇavaḥ*)¹⁵.

Dharmakīrti do not approve the above mentioned metaphysics, therefore he thinks that the cases in relation to human activities cannot prove “to be controled by the God Śiva”, or any case cannot prove it (*asiddhir vā dṛṣṭante*). Or any reason which the Naiyāyikas show cannot but prove “to be controled by a human constructor (*puruṣādhiṣṭhītaḥ*)”. So that, Dharmakīrti says that the reasons cannot prove any conclusion (*saṃśayo’ tha vā*). Against his critique Bhāsarvajña defended his proof explanating that he didn’t use the term “*īśvarapūrvakam*” but use “*buddhimatpūrvakam*”. Because “*buddhimatpūrvakam*” has the common conception to “*puruṣapūrvakam*” and “*īśvarapūrvakam*”. He, on the same time, defended also the past proofs from Dharmakīrti’s critique.

(to be continued)

1) Bhāsarvajña is said to compose the Pāśupata treatise Gaṇakarikā according to the colophon of it, but we have doubt about it because of the grammatical or phonetical misusage (*trīṇi vṛttayaḥ, smaśanam*). We may suppose that Bhāsarvajña wrote the commentary Ratnaṭīkā because of the mode of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika

(*vaiśeṣikadr̥ṣṭya dravyavat, pramāṇabhāsaṃ jñānam mithyājñānam uktam*). Then the colophon will be amended thus : “*ācāryabhāsarvajñaviracita gaṇakārikāyāṃ ratnaṭika parisamaptā*”

- 2) It was very encouraging for me that Prof. Dr. Ernst Steinkellner kindly prepared and sent me the micro-film of his dissertation Augenblicklichkeitsbeweis und Gottesbeweis bei Śaṅkarasvāmin (Wien 1963) and Dr. G. Chemparathy's dissertation Aufkommen und Entwicklung der Lehre von einem höchsten Wesen in Nyāya und Vaiśeṣika (Wien 1963) about ten years ago. Prof. Dr. G. Oberhammer's monograph Der Svābhāvika-Sambandha, ein geschichtlicher Beitrag zur Nyāya-Logik (WZKSO. Bd. 8 Wien 1964) is also very helpful for me.
- 3) Nyāyabhūṣaṇam (Ṣaḍḍaraśanagranthamālā I) ed. by Yogīndrānanda (Varanasi 1968) p. 460. The cited passage of the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad III, 2a is “*eko rudro na dvitīyo yaḥ sūrya iva imāṃllokān īśata īśanibhiḥ*” in place of “*eko hi rudro na dvitīyāya tasthur ya imāṃllokān īśata īśanibhiḥ*” (Ānandaśrama Skt. Ser.) Compare the Pañcārthabhāṣya on the Pāśupatasūtra II, 23; where Kaundinya mentions that Rudra Śiva control beings to various lives (*sthānāni*).
- 4) Nyāyabhūṣaṇa p. 447.
- 5) *ibid.*
- 6) Nyāyavārttika (Kashi S. S.) p. 457.
- 7) *op. cit.* p. 459.
- 8) *ibid.*
- 9) Cited in the Nyāyabhūṣaṇa p. 471.
- 10) Pramāṇavārttika-Bhāṣya (Tib. Skt. Work Ser.) p. 36, citing “*mānaṣam*” in place of “*tatkṛtam*”. (Abhidharmakośa-Bhāṣya, Tib. Skt. Work Ser., p. 192)
- 11) Nyāyabhūṣaṇa p. 472.
- 12) *op. cit.* p. 478.
- 13) Pramāṇavārttika-Bhāṣya p. 35.
- 14) Nyāyatātparyadīpikā (Bib. Ind.) p. 256-257.
On this occasion we call your attention to the excellent scholar Dr. G. Jha's English version (GOS.) of the Tattvasaṅgraha Kārikā 50 “.....*sthitoṣṭhāpravṛttes*.....” translating “because they operate i n t e r m i t t e n t l y” (p. 71).
- 15) Cf. Manu-smṛti (Bib. Ind.) II, 64-72; Kiraṇāvalī (GOS.) et Nyāyakandalī (Benares ŚS) ad Praśastapādabhāṣya, Sṛṣṭisaṃhāravidhi.

Note: we have reported the synopsis of the Pramāṇasiddhi-chapter of the Pramāṇavārttika on Vol. XX, Pt. 1 of this journal in Japanese. Our detailed research will be published in Japanese with English synopsis.