

INFLUENCE OF BUDDHIST LOGIC ON ALAMKĀRA ŚĀSTRA¹

By

ANANTALAL THAKUR, Darbhanga

Kauṭilya describes logic as a lamp unto all the śāstras² and his claim is just. It is no wonder that the Alamkāraśāstra, which gradually became a veritable dialectic discipline, should have deep connections with it. But to a student of Alamkāra the predominance of the influence of the Buddhist logic on this śāstra in preference to the orthodox system of logic of the Akṣapāda school seems to be a puzzle. Almost all the rhetoricians were Brahmins and there is no reasonable ground to hold that they were catholic in their outlook at all. Yet when occasions arise, they unhesitatingly quote Kārikās from the classics of Buddhist philosophy in support of their contention and use definitions and terminology adopted by the Buddhist logicians.

We propose here to quote some important and concrete instances and offer an explanation.

Of all the Rhetoricians Bhāmaha seems to be the foremost to accept the viewpoints set-forth in the Buddhist logic in his *Kāvyaśāstra*. He “defines and illustrates the eleventh doṣa which arises from a faulty pratijñā, hetu or dṛṣṭānta, the treatment being based upon a discussion of such Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika (?) topics as the number and definitions of pramāṇas, definitions of pratijñā and its varieties, of hetu and its varieties, of dṛṣṭānta, etc. (*History of Sanskrit Poetics*—MM. Dr. P. V. Kane, 1951, p. 79). We should humbly point out that here Bhāmaha is indebted to the school of Dinnāga. And the fact has attracted the notice of modern scholars.

¹ Read in the All-India Oriental Conference, Delhi, 1957.

² प्रदीपः सर्वशास्त्राणां.....शस्त्रदान्वीक्षिकी मता ॥

Arthaśāstra. p. 28. Triv. Edn,

Daṇḍin's first example of *nyāyavirodha* refers to the Buddhist Philosophy and the way of the Tathāgata (*Jinayāna*) finds a mention in one of his illustrations.³

Commentators on Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* like Vādī Jaṅghāla and Ratnaśrī are found to quote and refer to the *Pramāṇavārttika* of Dharmakīrtti. Ratnaśrī was no doubt a Buddhist. But Vādī Jaṅghāla was to all intents and purposes a Brahmin.

Ānandavardhana in his *Dhvanyāloka* shows evidence of his close acquaintance with the works of Dharmakīrtti. His

मुख्यां वृत्तिं परित्यज्य गुणवृत्त्यार्थदर्शनम् ।
यदुद्दिश्य फलं तत्र शब्दो नैव स्वलङ्घतिः ॥

Dhvanyāloka, I. 17

reminds us of

यत्र रूढ्यासदर्थोऽपि जनैः शब्दो निवेशितः ।
स मुख्यस्तत्र तत्साम्याद् गौणोऽन्यत्र स्वलङ्घतिः ॥

Pramāṇavārttika II. 37

Ānandavardhana refers to the कृत्रिमसंबन्धवादिनः—Scholars who accept a conventional relation between words and their senses. Here the Buddhist thinkers must have been meant along with others and Abhinava the commentator refers to the *Pramāṇavārttika* III. 91 here. He quotes the *kārikā* in full in a separate context (p. 542, *Dhvanyālokalocana*, Chowkhamba)⁴. Abhinava in his *locana* refers to another verse of Dharmakīrtti⁵. Of the two verses attributed to Dharmakīrtti by Ānandavardhana himself, *viz.* लावण्यद्रविणव्ययो न गणितः and अनध्यवसितः.....the former is said to belong to the concluding portion of the *Nyāyaviniścayavṛtti*⁶.

Ānandavardhana employs the terms like नान्तरीयक which are familiar with the Buddhist logicians. He is reported to have written a commentary on the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* of Dharmakīrtti also.

³ सत्यमेवाह सुगतः संस्कारानविनश्वरान् ।

Kāvyādarśa III. 174 Vide also *Kāvya* III. 46.

⁴ शब्दाः संकेतितं प्रादुर्ग्यवहाराय स स्मृतः ।

तदा स्वलक्षणं नास्ति संकेतस्तेन तत्र न ॥ *Pramāṇavārttika*, III. 91

⁵ नोपादानं विरुद्धस्य तच्चैकमिति चेन्मतम् ।

तदज्ञानस्य विज्ञानं केनोपादानकारणम् ॥

Pramāṇavārttika, II. 263-4

⁶ cf. तथा चायं विनिश्चयवृत्त्यन्ते धर्मकीर्त्याचार्यस्य श्लोक इति प्रसिद्धिः । एतदर्थसंज्ञकश्चापरोऽपि हि स्फुट एव तस्य श्लोको विद्वद्भिः परिपठ्यते यथा—अनध्यवसितः....

Kāvyaṇuśāsanaviveka, p. 363

The *Kāvyañuśāsanaviveka* of Jaina Hemacandra also is found to quote **Pra.** var. II. 57.

The *Avaloka* of Dhanika on the *Daśarūpaka* of Dhananījaya uses terms like *Anvāpoha* (p. 251, Chowkhamba Edn., 1955), *Svasamvedana* (p. 210), *Vipratipatti* (p. 219), *nāntariyaka* (p. 220) and *avinābhava* (p. 244)—of which some are exclusively terms of Buddhist logic.

Mahima Bhaṭṭa, the author of the *Vyaktiviveka*, being himself a logician shows closer connection with Buddhist logic. He quotes several verses from the *Pramāṇavārttika* as authority :

P. 65 (Chowkhamba edn.)

तद्भावहेतुभावौ हि दृष्टान्ते तदवेदिनः ।
ख्याप्येते विदुषां वाच्यो हेतुरेव हि केवलः ॥

Pramāṇavārttika, III. 26.

P. 74

भ्रान्तिरपि[अर्थे]संबन्धतः प्रमा इति—
मणिप्रदीपप्रभयोर्मणिबुद्ध्याभिधावतोः ।
मिथ्याज्ञानाविशेषेऽपि विशेषोऽर्थक्रियां प्रति ॥

Pramāṇavārttika, II. 57.

P. 77

स्वज्ञानेनान्यधीहेतुः सिद्धेऽर्थे व्यञ्जको मतः ।
यथा दीपोऽन्यथा वापि को विशेषोऽस्य कारकात् ॥

Pramāṇavārttika, III. 262-3.

P. 407

नासिद्धे भावधर्मोऽस्ति व्यभिचार्युभयाश्रयः ।
धर्मो विरुद्धोऽभावस्य सा सत्ता साध्यते कथम् ॥

Pramāṇavārttika, III. 190.

Ruyyaka, the commentator, identifies a quotation in the *Vyaktiviveka* with a passage in the *Vādanyāya* of Dharmakīrti—

यदुक्तम्, तच्च न शब्दपुनरुक्तं पृथग्वाच्यम्, अर्थपुनरुक्तेन गतार्थत्वात् । न ह्यर्थभेदे शब्दसाम्येऽपि कश्चिद् दोषः । यथा

हसति हसति स्वामिन्युच्चैरुदत्यपि रोदिति ।
द्रविणकणिकाक्रीतं यन्त्रं प्रनृत्यति नृत्यति ॥

Vyaktiviveka, p. 288.

cf. The *Vādanyāya* JBORS, p. 111 where the verse is quoted in full—

हसति हसति स्वामिन्युच्चैरुदत्यपि रोदिति
कृतपरिकरं स्वेदोद्धारं पूर्वावति धावति ।
गुणसमुदितं दोषापेतं प्रणिन्दति निन्दति
धनलवपरिक्रीतं यन्त्रं प्रनृत्यति नृत्यति ॥

The definitions of inference and syllogistic reasoning in the *Vyaktiviveka* are evidently borrowed from the *Nyāyabindu* of Dharmakīrti :

Vyākṛti°, p. 78 त्रिरूपलिङ्गाद् यदनुमेये ज्ञानं तदनुमानम् ।

cf. *Nyāyabindu* II. 3.

Ibid, pp. 65 & 105 त्रिरूपलिङ्गाख्यानं परार्थानुमानम् ॥

cf. *Nyāyabindu* III. 1.

Another passage supporting the view of the Buddhist logicians that there are only two types of cognitive organ seems to have been quoted from some standard work⁷ of Buddhist logic.

The expression दुःखस्यानुभवविशेषात्मोपगम (*Vyakti*° p. 322) is traced to the *Saugataprakriyā* by Ruyyaka. Again terms current in the authoritative works on Buddhist logic like *Sarvopasaṃhāravvyāpti* (p. 376), *Vyāpakaviruddhopalabdhi* (p. 85), *Asaṃbhavo lakṣaṇadoṣaḥ* (p. 79), *anyathānupapatti*, (p. 112), etc. are often met with in the *Vyaktiviveka*.

One Kārikā from Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika* is found quoted in the *Śrīngāraprakāśa* of Bhoja.⁸

Mammatā's definition of inference definitely smacks of Buddhist influence :

p. 696 अनुमानं तदुक्तं यत् साध्यसाधनयोर्वचः ।

पक्षधर्मान्वयव्यतिरेकित्वेन त्रिरूपो हेतुः साधनम् ॥

Kāvya Pra. BORI, 1950

The *Alaṃkārasarvasva* (pp. 12-13) of Ruyyaka while refuting Mahimabhaṭṭa's inclusion of suggestive sense in inference refers to the Buddhist view of invariable concomitance arising out of *tādātmya* (identity) and *tadutpatti* (causation). Jayaratha commenting on the same makes the point clearer.⁹

The *Tarala* by Mallinātha on the *Ekāvali* of Vidyādhara also criticises Mahimabhaṭṭa on the same point and a discussion on the same theory of causation follows in it¹⁰.

The *Sāhityadarpaṇa* of Viśvanātha is no exception to it. It defines *Savikalpakajñāna* just in accordance with the Buddhist logicians.

अभिलापसंसर्गयोग्यत्वविरहान्न च ।

सविकल्पकसंवेद्यः

Sāhityadarpaṇa, III.57

cf. अभिलापसंसर्गयोग्यप्रतिभासा प्रतीतिः कल्पना । तथा रहितं ज्ञानं प्रत्यक्षम् *Nyāyabindu* I.5, 6.

Again Viśvanātha is found to quote Pra. Vār. III. 262-3 स्वज्ञानेनान्यथी हेतुः etc. (S. D. Cal. p. 72) and to use the term *apoha* (p. 710).

⁷ न चान्यदर्शनेऽन्यकल्पना युक्ता, अतिप्रसङ्गात् ! तस्य नान्तरीयकतायां स्यात् । न हि यथाविधसिद्धः तथाविधं विधानं सूत्रयति सामान्येन च संबन्धिना अर्थप्रतिपत्तिरनुमानमिति द्वे एव प्रमाणे, *Vyakti*°, p. 79.

⁸ अविभागोऽपि बुद्ध्यात्मा *Pramāṇavārttika*, II. 345.

⁹ *Alaṃkrasarvasva*—pp. 12-13.

¹⁰ *Ekāvalītarala*, pp. 32-35

These internal evidences render it obvious that the relation between the two systems is more than casual. It was thought, though without sufficient ground, that the Buddhist philosophers like Dharmakīrti and others made important contributions to Indian Rhetorics. There are references to Śaundhodani—a rhetorician and Rāhula—a dramaturgist. Bhāmaha also has been called a Buddhist. But Mm. Dr. P. V. Kane could not accept the suggestion of Dharmakīrti being a rhetorician for want of sufficient proof¹¹. The contributions of Śaundhodani and Rāhula do not seem to be great and grave doubt is entertained regarding Bhāmaha's religious faith. Hence we are inclined to hold that the influence was indirect rather than direct though it was strong.

It has been shown elsewhere that the school of Dinnāga is responsible to bring about drastic changes in all the speculative systems of India¹². It may also be said that the Buddhist Philosophers replaced blind faith by pure reason in Indian thought. The orthodox philosophers coming after Dinnāga and Dharmakīrti had to refashion their outlook and important additions and alterations were made in every system. The *Alamkāraśāstra* also cannot be an exception. It has many things in common with the Buddhist philosophers—the relation between the words and their import being one such important topic. We find Buddhist thinkers making important contributions on this item. Thus independent works on this topic like the *Śabdārthacintāvivṛti* of Ratnaśrījñāna of Ceylon are heard of¹³. The Buddhist definitions in almost all the cases were precise and their terminology very rich and all-embracing. Moreover Kashmir was the land where *Alamkāraśāstra* thrived more than anywhere else. It was Kashmir where Buddhist Logic and Philosophy also flourished a bit earlier and formed an important item in the curriculum. Hence it is but natural that the rhetoricians should take recourse to the Buddhist means and methods of thought and quote from Buddhist works whenever they were found useful. It may be added in this context that Brahmanical logic for a time was overshadowed by its Buddhist counterpart to be revived subsequently by scholars like Vācaspati Miśra and others. But the Buddhistic elements made a permanent impression on the *Alamkāraśāstra* in its hey days and continued to exert the same influence unabatingly even long after the decline of Buddhism in India.¹⁴

¹¹ *History. Sans. Poetics*

¹² Introduction to the *Ratnakīrtinibandhāvalī*—KPJ Institute, '57.

¹³ *Kāvyalākṣaṇa* of Daṇḍin, Mithila Institute, 1957, p. 143.

¹⁴ I am glad to note that Professor Sivaprasad Bhattacharya has written an illuminating article on the same subject—*Neo-Buddhist Nucleus in Alamkāraśāstra*, JASB, Vol. XXII, 1956 which came to my notice when the above note was prepared. It is hoped that this note will be accepted as a supplement to Prof. Bhattacharya's learned paper.