Bhartṛhari's Verses Cited in the *Ārya-Laṅkāva tāravṛtti* ('Phags pa Langkar gshegs pa'i 'grel pa)¹⁾

Toshiya UNEBE

1. The *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* (LAS) is one of the most important scriptures of Mahāyāna Buddhism. Two commentaries of this sūtra has come down to us in the form of Tibetan translation. Jñānaśribhadra (Ye shes dpal bzang po) who is thought to have flourished in the 11th century²⁾, wrote one of them: the *Ārya-Laṅkāvatāravṛtti* ('Phags pa Langkar gshegs pa'i 'grel pa), hereafter LAV. In his commentary he sets forth arguments against the views of various non-Buddhist schools and quotes many of their verses. Among them Nakamura [1955] has already identified some verses cited under the name of 'Bha-dra-ha-ri' or 'Bha-taha-ri' as those of the eminent grammarian Bhartṛhari (ca.450-510). Although more than forty years have passed since Nakamura's article first appeared, so far little attention has been given to the arguments of the LAV.

Jñānaśribhadra frequently refers to the positions of Bhartṛhari, the Grammarians (*Vaiyākaraṇa/Lung ston pa rnams*) or the *Śabdabrahmavādin* (*sGra tshangs par smra ba rnams*) in his LAV. As far as I have found, forty five verses are directly quoted from the *Vākyapadīya* (VP), the *magnum opus* of Bhartṛhari under these names³⁾. In this paper I will deal with some of them to illustrate how the Buddhist scholar Jñānaśribhadra understood Bhartṛhari's thought.

2. The LAS is well-known for its sharp criticism of our linguistic activity. Jñānaśribhadra often quotes Bhartṛhari's verses in his comments on such arguments. For example, the LAS (p. 86-87) says that *vāc* (word) and *vikalpa* (discriminating thought) are neither different nor notdifferent. The sūtra continues that they are not notdifferent, because if they are

not different, a word cannot reveal its object, which it does.

At first (LAV 140a1-2), Jñānaśribhadra explains that if a word and *vikalpa* are the same, they are not related as cause and effect. This Mādhyamikalike comment, however, does not seem to explain the sūtra passage sufficiently, because it says that a word reveal its object. Therefore he goes on to say that they appear as if they have a cause-effect relation, because *vikalpa* exists in the mind, while a word is created by the action of the tongue etc. and perceived by the sense of ear. In order to support this idea, the following verses of Bhartṛhari are quoted in LAV (140a2-5)⁴⁾.

A treatise on grammar reads as follows: Those who know words consider that there are two [kinds of] words in expressive words (*upādānaśabda/len pa sgra*): one is the cause of the words and the other is used in connection with its objects. (VP 1.44)

Just as the fire which is in the fire-stick acts as the cause for further lamp-lights, similarly the word which is in the mind (*buddhistha śabda/blo la gnas pa'i sgra*) is the cause of speech-sounds. (VP 1.46)

Conceived first in the mind and then applied to a certain object, [the words] is grasped through the speech-sounds which are produced by the speech organs. (VP 1.47)

That much is fitting to the essence of the words of the Omniscient...

According to the Grammarians, there are two kinds of words (*śabda*): *nitya* (permanent) and *kārya* (produced). The latter is the speech-sound which perishes in the moment it is uttered, but the former permanently exists in the mind. These verses of Bhartṛhari explain the relation of the two, namely, the former is the cause (*nimitta*) of the latter⁵⁾ and grasped through the latter. In the context of VP, these are introduced to explain the act of communication between speaker and hearer: a speaker conceives the word in his mind and he utters the speech-sounds. Then the sounds manifest the permanent expressive word which already exists in the mind of a hearer.

Judging from the quotation above, Jñānaśribhadra identifies *vikalpa* in the LAS as *buddhistha śabda* (word in the mind) in the VP. He interprets

the above sūtra passage: if a word and *vikalpa* are the same, the *vikalpa* as "word in the mind" can not be the cause of the speech-sounds, so that the word cannot communicate any object. But it is obviously false because it does communicate. Consequently, we can not say a word and *vikalpa* are the same, because the cause-effect relation is seen between the two.

After explaining this (LAV 140a6-140b1), he quotes the opening verse of the VP attributing it to the *Śabdabrahmavādin* in order to reject the philosophical thought of Bhartṛhari and says that there is no need to take such a view into consideration as our linguistic activity arises from *vikalpa* and articulation.

3. The relation between a word and *vikalpa* is discussed in another place of the LAS (p.154, ll.14-17). According to the sūtra, the word (*ruta*) is said to be 'the *vikalpa* connected with words and letters' and 'mutual conversation produced by the teeth, jaws, palate, tongue, lips, and the cavity of the mouth', and have 'the impression of *vikalpa* as its cause'. Here again, in order to support this passage, Jñānaśrībhadrā quotes another verses of Bhartṛhari along with a verse of the Buddhist logician Dharmakīrti (ca. 600-660) as follows (LAV 192a4-8):

As stated above (in the sūtra), pronunciation of phonemes is produced by the power of previous impressions among the ordinary people also. The Grammarians say as follows:

The first movement of speech organs. the upward sending of the breath and the striking of the places of articulation are not possible without the linguistic impression (*śabdabhāvanā/sgra yi goms pa*). (VP 1.114)

Discrimination of a word and its object is produced among the ordinary people also.

An object of a word (*śabdārtha/sgra don*) is based on the *vikalpa* produced by the beginningless impression, [and the object has] three natures: depending on existence, non-existence and the both of them. (PV 1.205)

Therefore those who are conversant with words state:

Words are produced by *vikalpas*, *vikalpas* are produced by words⁶¹.

In VP 1.114, Bhartṛhari calls our innate language-ability '*śabdabhāvanā*', and states that we cannot even utter a sound without it. Dha-

rmakīrti's verse adds that the impression produces the *vikalpa* which then becomes the basis of an object of a word. Finally, a half-śloka is introduced which asserts mutual cause-effect relation between the word and *vikalpa*.

Dharmakīrti's verse above refers to the relation between the *vikalpa* and the object of word. To clarify the relationship, Jñānaśrībhadra next states (LAV 192a8-192b1) :

Accordingly, they (words) never touch external objects. It is said that the *vikalpa* in our mind enables us to apprehend something expressed (*vācya/brjod par bya ba*) as that which appears as an object.

Conceived in the mind at first and then applied to a certain object, [the word] is grasped through the speech-sounds which are produced by the speech organs. This verse (VP 1.47) is also cited in the passage which we have seen in the preceding section. Although the verse is intended to explain the act of communication in the context of VP, here the verse is quoted to show that any object of words grasped through the speech-sounds is mentally constructed by the *vikalpa* whether it really exists or not.

As is well-known, the LAS itself holds a similar view called *svacitta-dr̥ṣya*: 'own mind as what is to be seen'. According to this view, whatever we see as an external object is just manifested by our mind like a mirage or dream. And this manifestation is closely connected to our *vikalpa* and linguistic activity. Jñānaśrībhadra sees the same kind of thought in the verse of Bhartṛhari.

4. To discuss how Jñānaśrībhadra understood Bhartṛhari's thought as a whole is beyond the scope of this brief paper. What we have seen is no more than a first step understanding it. But we tentatively conclude that he has a favorable opinion of Bhartṛhari as far as linguistic thought is concerned and utilizes his verses to explain LAS.⁷⁾

[TEXT] LAV: *Hphags-pa Laṅkar gśegs-paḥi hgral-pa*, included in the Peking edn, vol. 107 (No. 5519). LAS: *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, ed. by B. Nanjio, 1923. PV: *The Pramāṇavārttikam of Dharmakīrti*, serie Orientale Rome XXIII, ed. by R. Gnoli 1960. VP 1: *Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari* 1, Deccan College BC & SJ Series 32, ed. by K. A.S. Iyer, 1966. [OTHERS] Hadano, H. 1975: A Note on

the *Ārya-Laṅkāvatāra-vṛtti* by Jñānaśrībhadrā, *Acta Asiatica* 29, pp.1-20. Hadano, H. et al. (eds.) 1993: *Ārya-Laṅkāvatāra-vṛtti*, Publication of the Institute of Tibetan Buddhist Textual Studies 4. Houben, J. E.M. 1995: *The Saṃbandha-Samuddeśa*, Gonda Indological Studies 2. Iyer, K.A. S. 1969: *Bhartṛhari*, Deccan College BC & SJ Series 68. Lindtner, C. 1993: Linking up Bhartṛhari and the Bauddhas, *Asiatische Studien* 47, pp.195-213. Nakamura, H. 1955: Tibetan Citations of Bhartṛhari's Verses and the Problem of His Date, *Studies in Indology and Buddhology presented in Honour of Prof. S. Yamaguchi*, pp.122-136.

- 1) This is an English version of the first half of the paper read at the 48th annual conference. The complete version (in Japanese) will appear in *Bukkyo-Bunka* 8. 2) [Hadano 1975: 10].
- 3) Here is the list of verses I have identified so far: VP 1.1 (74a2), (126b8), (140a7), Verse *ka* in the *Vṛtti* ad VP 1.1 (126b8), *kha*(127a1), *ga*(127a2), *gha*(127a2), (276a6), *ca*(127a3), (242b5), (276a7), *cha*(127a4), (276a8), *ja*(127a4), (276a8), *ṇa*(127a5), (276b1), *ṭa*(127a6), (276b2), *ṭha*(74a3), (127a8), VP 1.2 (127a7), VP 1.22(127a8), VP 1.44(140a3), VP 1.46(140a3), VP 1.47(140a4), (192a8), VP 1.72(74a6), (138b8), VP 1.114(192a5), VP 2.1(74a4), (139a1), VP 2.2(74a5), (139a2), VP 2.330(98a4), (196b1), VP 2.422(142a4), (194b8), VP 3.1.1(74a7), (138b3), VP 3.1.34(209a1), (242b6), VP 3.3.55(196a8), VP 3.7.41(127a6), VP 3.8.1(23a8). *Leaf & line numbers of LAV are in the brackets. Nakamura [1955: 123-7] and Lindtner [1993: 212-3] have already referred to some of them.
- 4) Although the Tibetan version of the VP verses are considerably different from the extant Skt verses, the differences are probably caused by simple translation errors in many cases. In this paper, my translation of the verses is based on the Skt text for the sake of convenience. As space is limited, discussion about the text is omitted.
- 5) This interpretation is based on Bhartṛhari's *Vṛtti* and suitable for the context of the LAV. Cf. [Iyer 1969: 152-153]. He suggests that in the context of VP it may also be understood that the latter is the cause of the former.
- 6) This may correspond to '*vikalpayonayaḥ śabdā vikalpāḥ śabdayonayaḥ*'. See [Houben 1995: 393, fn. 834] for this oft-cited (Dignāga's?) verse.
- 7) On the contrary, he criticizes the Vedantic philosophical thought of Bhartṛhari. For his criticism, see my forthcoming article mentioned in note 1).

<Key Words> Jñānaśrībhadrā, Bhartṛhari, vikalpa

(Research Fellow, Otani University)