

Karl H. Potter (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies Volume IX: Buddhist Philosophy from 350 to 600 A.D.*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass (first Indian edition), 2003, 762 Pp., Rs. 1295. (Hardback).

Over thirty years have passed since this project to introduce the various philosophies of India was begun. The volume currently under review “covers the development of Buddhist philosophical notions from the time of Vasubandhu and Saṃghabhadra, i.e., from the mid-fourth to the end of the sixth centuries” (p. 19). This volume consists of two parts. Part One consists of an Introduction to certain topics based upon modern scholarship. Chapter One gives a historical overview of the Buddhist order from the fourth to the sixth centuries. Chapter Two summarizes the Abhidharma path to enlightenment, i.e., the process leading to *Nirvāna* in Abhidharma thought. Chapter Three addresses Dignāga’s views on perception, inference, and language. Section IV, “Bhavya on Inference,” of the same chapter, discusses mainly Bhavya’s idea of the two truths. Section V, “Mapping the Three Natures onto the Two Levels” deals with the methodological positions of the five philosophers, Buddhapālita, Bhavya, Kambala, Dharmapāla, and Dignāga. Part Two contains summaries of the works of the Abhidharma, Madhyamaka, and Yogācāra schools, etc. Due to limited space, I will not go into detail regarding the general contents of the various chapters. Instead, I would like to provide additional information and viewpoints found in Japanese scholarship.

Bhavya (c. 490-570) is one of the eight known commentators of Nāgārjuna’s *Madhyamakakārikā* and one of the most prominent figures in the Madhyamaka school. He is also known as the author of the *Prajñāpradīpamūlamadhyamakavṛtti* (hereinafter, *PP*), *Madhyamakahrdayakārikā* (*MHK*), and *Madhyamakahrdayavṛttitarkajvālā* (*TJ*), etc. His name is, however, a subject of debate due to the various forms found in different texts. The names “Bhāvaviveka,” “Bhāviveka,” “Bhagavatviveka,” and “Bhāvin” are assumed based upon Sanskrit, Chinese, and Tibetan materials. In Chinese materials, the names “Fen-pieh-ming,” “Ch’ing-p’ieh,” “Ming-pien,” “Yuch’ing-fen,” and “P’o-p’i-fei-chia” appear. In Tibetan materials “Legs ldan ’byed,” “Legs ldan,” “sKla ldan,” sNang bral,” “Bhavya,” etc., are used. Nowadays, the names Bhāvaviveka, Bhāviveka, or Bhavya are commonly used by scholars.

Yasunori Ejima, however, after examining the manuscripts of Candrakīrti’s *Prasannapadā* (*Pras.*) and the Tibetan and Chinese sources, suggests that the name of the author of the *MHK*, the *PP*, and the *Da-Cheng Zhang-Chen lun* (大乘掌珍論, *DCZC *Karataratna*), etc., should be Bhāviveka. His collected evidence may be summarized as follows:¹

- (1) The names “Bhāvaviveka” and “Bhāviveka” appear four times in the manuscripts of the *Pras.* The name “Bhavya” never appears in these manuscripts.
- (2) The transliteration “婆毘吠伽/迦” (◦b’uâ-◦b’ji-b’i wai°-◦ka = P’o-p’i-fei-

¹ Y. Ejima, “Bhāvaviveka/Bhavya/Bhāviveka,” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū*, vol. 38-2, 1990, pp. 846-838.

chia) and the Chinese translation “清弁” (Ch’ing-p’ieh) appear in the Chinese materials. The former “婆毘吠伽/迦” refers to Bhāviveka, not Bhāvaviveka or Bhavyaviveka. It is moreover, obvious that the name of the author of the *MHK*, the *TJ*, the *PP*, etc., was translated as “清弁” and was identified with Bhāviveka by Hsüan-tsang (c. 600-664). Further, there is no indication in Chinese materials of the names “Bhāvaviveka,” “Bhavya-viveka,” or “Bhavya” which are assumed based upon the Tibetan and Sanskrit materials for the author of the *MHK*, etc.

- (3) The name of the author of the *MHK* is “sNang bral” or “sKal ldan” in the Tibetan translation of the *Madhyamakālamkāraṭīkā*. The original Sanskrit word for the Tibetan “sNang bral” should be “Bhāviveka” or “Bhāvivikta.” On the other hand, the original Sanskrit word for the Tibetan “sKal ldan” can be assumed to be “Bhavya.” (*Mahāvvyutpatti*, no. 3495)

The name of the author of the *PP* is given as “Legs ldan byed” or “Legs ldan ’byed” in the Tibetan translation of the *PP* and the *Prajñā-pradīpamūlamadhyamakāṭīkā* (*PPT*), by Jñānagarbha and Klu’i rgyal matshan. However, “Legs ldan byed” is probably the Tibetan translator’s error. It should be corrected to “Legs ldan ’byed.” The original Sanskrit word for the latter would be “Bhavya-viveka” corroborating the part “viveka.”

- (4) Atīśa (Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna, c. 982-1054) calls the author of the *MHK* and the *PP* “Bhavya” or “Bhavya sNang bral” (Bhavya-Bhāviveka) in his *Bodhipathapradīpapañjikā*. Besides his own treatise, Atīśa translated the *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* (*MRP*), the *MHK*, the *TJ*, *Nikāyabhedavibhaṅgavyākhyāna* (*NBVV*), and *Madhyamakārthasamgraha* (*MAS*) into Tibetan from Sanskrit with the Tibetan translator Tshul khirms rgyal ba. He calls the author of the *MRP*, the *MHK*, the *TJ*, and the *NBVV* “Bhavya,” and Tshul khirms rgyal ba calls him “Legs ldan ’byed” (Bhavya-viveka) in the *MAS*.
- (5) The Tibetan Buddhist scholar lCang skya Rol pa’i rdo rje (c. 1717-1786) states that the author of the *MRP* is not Bhāviveka who composed the *MHK* but is “junior Bavya” (Legs ldan chung ba) or “later Bhavya” (Legs ldan phi ma).
- (6) The *TJ* is recorded as a treatise in the process of translation in the *Dkar chag Ldan dkar ma*, completed in 842 A.D. The surviving *TJ* was translated and finalized by Atīśa and Tshul khirms rgyal ba in the eleventh centuries.

In this review, assuming the correctness of Ejima’s investigation, I adopt the name “Bhāviveka.”

Next is the issue of which texts can be attributed to him. According to Tibetan tradition,² the following works are ascribed to Bhāviveka. (1)

² Lama Chimpa, Alaka Chattopadhyaya (tr.), Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya (ed.), *Tāranātha’s History of Buddhism in India*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970, p. 401.

Pradīpodyotanāmaṭikā, (*PNT*), (2) *Pañcakramapañjikā* (*PKP*), (3) the *PP*, (4) the *MRP*, (5) the *MAS*, (6) the *NBVV*, (7) the *MHK*, and (8) the *TJ*. Besides the above treatises, the *DCZC* is ascribed to Bhāviveka in the Chinese Tripiṭaka.

P.L. Vaidya ascribes the *Madhyamakapratītyasamutpāda* to Bhāviveka.³ In the Tibetan Tripiṭaka, however, it is attributed to Kṛṣṇa. For this reason, nowadays this treatise is not ascribed to Bhāviveka. (1) The *PNT* and (2) the *PKP* are not attributed to Bhāviveka in the Tibetan Tripiṭaka too. Therefore, modern scholars do not at present consider them to be Bhāviveka's works. Stanislaw Schayer and Susumu Yamaguchi do not ascribe (4) the *MRP* to Bhāviveka.⁴ D. Seyfort Ruegg and Y. Ejima ascribe (4) the *MRP* to the later Bhavya who is different from Bhāviveka.⁵ Christian Lindtner attributes this treatise to Bhāviveka⁶ (In this volume (pp. 443-457), Ch. Lindtner's ascription is adopted.). Ejima does not ascribe (5) the *MAS* to Bhāviveka.⁷ Lindtner and Ruegg on the other hand, attribute (5) the *MAS* to Bhāviveka⁸ (In this volume (pp. 442-443), the *MAS* is ascribed to Bhāviveka). Yamaguchi and Ejima doubt whether (6) the *NBVV* was composed by Bhāviveka.⁹ Thus, the attribution of works to Bhāviveka has been frequently debated, and we are still faced with the question whether or not one and the same Bhāviveka was the author not only of the *MHK*, the *TJ*, and the *PP*, but also of the *MRP* and the *MAS*.

In section IV of Chapter of Two, "Bhavya on Inference" (pp. 53-58), Yuichi Kajiyama's statement regarding the characteristics of Bhāviveka's syllogism is quoted. His statement is as follows:¹⁰

"We can summarize the ... characteristics of Bhāvaviveka's syllogism (under) the following four items:

- (1) A peculiar qualification "from the transcendental point of view (*paramārthatas*)" is added in every conclusion (*pakṣa*).
- (2) He negates the *prasaṅga-vākya*, which is the unique method of the Prāsaṅgikas.
- (3) (The) reason (in) his syllogism lacks "non-existence of (the) reason in

³ P.L. Vaidya, *Études sur Āryadeva et son Catuṣṣataka*, Paris, 1923, pp. 51-52.

⁴ S. Schayer, "Notes and Question Buddhism," *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* vol. 11, 1935, pp. 206-211; S. Yamaguchi, *Bukkyo niokeru Mu to U tonno Tairon* (Dialogue concerning existence and non-existence in Buddhism), Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin, 1941, pp. 54-57.

⁵ Y. Ejima, *ibid.*, pp. 846-838.

⁶ Ch. Lindtner, "Adversaria Buddhica," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* vol. 26, 1982, pp. 172-184.

⁷ Y. Ejima, *Chūkan Shisō no Tenkai: Bhāvaviveka Kenkyū* (Development of Mādhyamika Philosophy in India: Studies on Bhāvaviveka), Tokyo: Shunjusha, 1980, pp. 18-33.

⁸ Ch. Lindtner, "Atīśa's Introduction to the Two Truths," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* vol. 9, 1981, p. 200, n. 14.; D.S. Ruegg, *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India, A History of Indian Literature*, Jan Gonda (ed.), Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1981, p. 64, n. 202.

⁹ S. Yamaguchi, *ibid.*, pp. 53-54.; Y. Ejima, *ibid.*, p. 10.

¹⁰ This statement is originally included in Y. Kajiyama, "Bhāvaviveka and the Prāsaṅgika School," in S. Mookerjee (ed.), *Nava-Nalanda-Mahavihara Research Publication* vol. I, Patna, 1957, pp. 56-57.

the counter example” or “negative concomitance” (*vipakṣe nāstitā*), one of (the) three conditions of (the) reason.

- (4) The conclusion of every syllogism is a negative proposition and yet the negation is qualified as an absolute negation (*prasajya-pratiṣedha*) and is not a relative negation (*paryudāsapraṣedha*).”

There is no disagreement on this point that Bhāviveka’s independent inferences (*svatantrānumāna*) includes three unusual modifications: adding the word “*paramārthatas*” to the proposition in a proof formula, the specification that the negation in his proof formulae should be taken as “*prasajyapraṣedha*,” and the condition that no dissimilar instance is to be given (i.e., items (1), (3), and (4) in Kajiyama’s summary quoted above). As Ejima states, however, item (2), “[Bhāviveka] negates the *prasaṅga-vākya*, which is the unique method of the Prāsaṅgikas” should not be regarded as one of the characteristics of Bhāviveka’s syllogism.¹¹ Kajiyama states: “Bhāviveka starts with criticizing (the) argument of Buddhapālita, the founder of the Prāsaṅgika school, for containing fallacies, and tries to constitute his own logic with unblamable validity even for the purpose of negating other’s argument.”¹² It is true that Bhāviveka strongly criticized Buddhapālita (c. 470-540). He maintains that Buddhapālita’s statement is deficient, because neither a reason (*hetu*) nor an example (*drṣṭānta*) had been stated,¹³ and thus the *prasaṅgānumāna* was not enough to demonstrate the philosophy of “emptiness” (*śūnyatā*).¹⁴ For Bhāviveka, however, the intention to try to establish his own logical methodology was not to criticize Buddhapālita, but to clarify the philosophy of “emptiness.” Bhāviveka was a follower of Nāgārjuna and a Mādhyamika philosopher so that for him the most important issue should be how adequately and positively to demonstrate the philosophy of emptiness.

Logic itself belongs to verbal usage and is not absolute reality so logic, as Kajiyama states, “confesses its nonsense under the light of the absolute reality” (p. 56). Without verbal usage, however, it is not possible to demonstrate the philosophy of “emptiness.” Accordingly, Bhāviveka added a restriction “*paramārthatas*” to the proposition in a proof formula arguing “*śūnyatā*,” in order to caution the reader about this contradiction. For Bhāviveka, the restriction “*paramārthatas*” is the function which leads to “absolute reality” from the “conventional world,” and only on reaching the absolute truth, i.e., *Nirvāna*, should logic be abandoned.

In section V, “Mapping Three Natures onto Two Levels” (especially pp. 58-62), Bhāviveka’s theory of two levels is discussed based mainly upon the *MAS*. As is mentioned above, however, the question remains whether or not the *MAS* was composed by Bhāviveka, the author of the *MHK*, the *TJ*, the *PP*, etc. As to

11 Y. Ejima, *ibid.*, p. 38, n. 13.

12 Y. Kajiyama, *ibid.*, p. 304.

13 See the *PP* D49a5 to 50a1.

14 See Louis de la Vallée Poussin, *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā, Commentaire de Candrakīrti*, Bibliotheca Buddhica IV, St. Péterbourg: Académie Impériale des Sciences, 1913, pp. 14-15.

this, Ejima points out that the usage of the two terms, i.e., “*aparyāya-paramārtha*” and “*paryāya-paramārtha*” in the *MAS* is not found in the works ascribed to Bhāviveka, such as the *PP*, the *MHK*, and the *TJ*, and that the theory of two levels in the *MAS* seems to be influenced by the thought of Jñānagarbha (eighth century). As for the *MAS*, Ruegg also states that “it can be observed that starting with its introductory verse of salutation this text is quite related to the *Satyadvayavibhāṅga* by Jñānagarbha (eighth century), the master mentioned above who belonged to a lineage in which he linked Bhāviveka and Śrīgupta with Śāntarakṣita” and that “The *Madhyamakārthasaṃgraha* mentions the division between true *saṃvṛti* ... and false *saṃvṛti* ..., a distinction seemingly implied in the *Tarkajvālā* (iii. 7, which however mentions only the *tathya-saṃvṛti*) and explicitly mentioned by Jñānagarbha.”¹⁵

If the *MAS* is not a work composed by Bhāviveka, then the theory of two levels discussed in this volume needs to be reconsidered, and an understanding that ‘the faultless phenomenal knowledge is nothing but the convertible absolute knowledge, so Bhāviveka apparently champions a tripartite model which at least formally resembles the very account he is apparently criticizing’ (p. 61) may not be acceptable. As far as authorship of a text (or texts) is uncertain, the text should be dealt with more carefully. At the very least, this volume should have included the arguments to support Ch. Lindtner’s contention, for many scholars have questioned his ascription of the *MAS* and the *MRP* to Bhāviveka.

In Part Two, a wide selection of the works ascribed to important Buddhist philosophers, such as Buddhaghosa, Buddhadatta, Śamathadeva, Buddhapālita, Dignāga, Kambala, Guṇamati, Bhavya/Bhāviveka, Śaṅkarasvāmin, Dharmapāla, Sthiramati, Vimalamitra, etc., are included. Examples of the texts covered in detail include, the *Visuddhimagga* (pp. 111-173), the *Kathāvattu-Atthakathā* (pp. 195-212), the *Abhidhammāvātāra* (pp. 217-254), the *Madhyamakāsūtra-Vṛtti* (pp. 286-305), the *Ālambanaparīkṣā* (pp. 314-318), the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* (pp. 328-362), the *Ālokaṃālā* (pp. 372-377), the *Madhyamakahrdayakārikā/Tarkajvālā* (pp. 397-422), the *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* (pp. 443-457), the *Nyāyapraveśa* (pp. 463-470), the *Catuḥśataka-Vṛtti* (pp. 474-479), the *Śataśāstra-Vṛtti* (pp. 479-486), the *Abhidharmakośa-Tattvārthaṭīkā* (pp. 491-495), the *Abhidharmasamuccaya-Bhāṣya* (pp. 495-510), and the *Abhidharmadīpa/Vibhāṣāprabhāvṛtti* (pp. 532-558). The summaries are substantial, often including information on the author, and detailed chapter by chapter analysis. Most of the important texts are summarized by various well-known and respected scholars.

The texts ascribed to Bhāviveka have been studied by many scholars in both West and East and a great deal of effort has been expended on their philosophical theories. It should be pointed out, however, that the arguments in this volume are based only upon the works written in Western languages. Buddhist scholarship would benefit greatly if Western Buddhologists had a working knowledge of

¹⁵ D.S. Ruegg, “On the Authorship of some Works ascribed to Bhāviveka/Bhavya,” in D.S. Ruegg and L. Schmithausen (eds.), *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1990, p. 67.

BOOK REVIEW

Japanese and increased access to the wealth of information contained in Japanese scholarship. In addition, Japanese scholars should write more in English or in other Western languages, in order to broaden their audience.

I would also like to note that there are some errors and omissions in the endnotes and index. For instance, my name is consistently misspelled as "Shikafumi Watanabe." The first appearance is in one of the summaries, on page 409, and the mistake is repeated in the endnotes and Index. However, despite these criticisms, there is no doubt that this volume, as well as other volumes in the series, must be acknowledged as a useful reference work.

Kyoto Women's University
Kyoto

Chikafumi WATANABE
