

TIBETAN CITATIONS OF BHARTRHARI'S VERSES AND THE PROBLEM OF HIS DATE.

by

Hajime NAKAMURA

University of Tokyo

About twenty years ago, the illustrious scholar to whom we are dedicating this commemoration volume pointed out the fact that some verses of a Vedāntin called Bhadrahari(?)¹ is mentioned in the Tibetan version of some philosophical works of later Mahāyāna Buddhism.¹ The author of the present article wants to elaborate on the problem, gathering Tibetan verses ascribed to him, and collating some of them with Sanskrit originals which have been identified by the author.

In the first place the following verse is cited in the Tibetan version of the *Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṅkāra-ṭīkā*,² a commentary by No-bo-ñid med-pa (=Asva-bhāva) upon the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra* :

— (fr. 1.) Bha dri ha ri(s) ji skad du /
nam mkhaḥ sa rluñ ñi ma dañ //
rgya mtsho gliñ dañ phyogs rnam ni /
nañ gi śes paḥi no bo yi //
cha las phyi rol lta bur ḥhug /

यथाह भद्रहरीः
द्यौः क्षमा ऽायु
सागराः संरितो दि
अन्तःकरणत्वस्य
भागा व हेरिव रि

ces bśad pa lta bu yin no // ḥdzin paḥi don las bzuñ baḥi don tha mi dad
mthoñ baḥo // shes bya ba ni gzuñ ba dañ ḥdzin paḥi rnam par śes pa kho
nar zad kyī rnam par śes pa la ma rtogs pa byis pas kun brtags pa mig la
sogs pa ḥdsin paḥi don ni yod pa ma yin no shes bya bar te / deḥi phyir
don du snañ ba thams cad sems kho na yin par ltaḥi / don sems las gshan
par ni mi blta ḥo // deḥi tshe ni ḥdiḥi gzuñ ba la rnam par gyeñ pa spañs
la ḥdzin paḥi rnam par rtog pa ḥbaḥ shig lus te/de ni bzod paḥi gnas skabs
yin no /

“As was declared by Bhadrahari . . .

‘Ether, earth, wind, the sun, the sea, continents and directions . . .
they exist like external things, having been manifested from the in-
nermost, proper portions of the interior intelligence (=adhyātma-
jñāna).’

¹ Prof. Susumu Yamaguchi, “日本佛教學協會年報” VIII, Kyoto 昭和11年 (1936), pp. 152-153.

² His comment upon *Dharmaparyeṣṭi* 5. *Bstan-hgyur* of the Peking edition, XLV, 90a, 8-b, 1.

Then follows Asvabhāva's annotation, in which he says, "So everything which has been manifested as an object is regarded as nothing but mind, and objects are not regarded as separate from mind." So we can assuredly conclude that Asvabhāva himself recognized in Bhadrachari's assertion something similar to the thought of Buddhist Idealism (*viññaptimātratā*).

The Sanskrit original of the above-cited Tibetan verse is the following one :

dyauḥ kṣamāvāyur ādityaḥ sāgarāḥ sarito diśaḥ /
antaḥkaraṇatattvasya bhāgā bahir avasthitāḥ //
—Vākyapadiya III, 7, 41 (p. 200)³

(cf. antaḥkaraṇadharmo vā bahir evaṁ prakāśate /—ibid., III, 6, 23. p. 170).

In the *Ārya-Laṅkāvatāra-ṛtti* by Jñānaśrībhadrā there are the following verses.

(fr. 2) de bas na Bha dra ha ris byed pa bstan pa las smras pa /
grub dañ ma grub ji sñed pa /
bsgrub paḥi phyir ni bstan par bya /
rten paḥi rim (23b) gyi rañ bsin phyir /
de ni byed par brjod pa ḥo //
ṣes pa ste / byed pa dpyad zin to //

Tr.— "Therefore it was told in a treatise written by Bhadrachari—

'In so far as a thing attained or a thing not yet attained should be denoted in order to be established,
On account of its essence being the order to be resorted to,
it is declared to be an action."

(=yāvat siddham asiddham vā sādhyatvenābhidhīyate /
āśritakramarūpatvāt kriyeti pratiyate //)⁴

(cf. kriyāyāḥ parīṣpattir yad vyāpārād anantaram /
vivakṣyate yadā tatra karaṇatvaṁ tadā smṛtam //—Vākyap. III, 7, b, 89. p. 237.)

(fr. 3)⁵ tshañs par smra ba po bha ta ha ri la sogṣ pa yañ smra ba /
thog ma med paḥi tshañs pa rtag /
yañ dag sgra ni yig ḥbru gañ /
gañ las don dños ḥbyuñ ba dañ /
ḥgro baḥi rab tu byed pa yañ //

³ *Vākyapadiya*, ed. by Paṇḍit Rāmachandra Śāstri Koṭibhāskara (Benares Sanskrit Series), Benares 1887 f., vol. 2, p. 200. According to the citation of the verse by Dr. Chakravarty *antaḥkaraṇadharmasya* instead of *antaḥkaraṇatattvasya* (Prabhatchandra Chakravarti: *The Linguistic Speculations of the Hindus*, University of Calcutta, 1933, p. 197). The reading of the Benares text corresponds with the Tibetan version.

⁴ *Vākyapadiya* III, 8 (kriyāsamuddeśa), 1. p. 298 (Benares Sanskrit Series). However, the verse cited by Dr. Chakravarti reads *vyāpadiyate* instead of *pratiyate*. (P. Chakravarti: *op. cit.* p. 237)

⁵ All citations henceforth are taken from the Peking edition.

- (fr. 4) gañ yons rtogs pa thams cad la /
 (127a) snañ bar yañ ni mi gnas te /
 rtog pa luñ dañ rjes dpag pas /
 rnam pa du mar kun brtags pañ //
- (fr. 5) hdaś kyañ hdu hdi byed pa dañ /
 dños dañ dños med rim mi rim /
 bden dañ brdzun par sna tshogs bdag /
 dben pa las ni rab tu snañ //
- (fr. 6) hbyuñ po rnam kyis nañ rgyu ba /
 hgran dañ rim duññ snañ ba ste /
 thar pa rab tu grol ba de /
 grol hdod rnam kyis bstan par byed //
- (fr. 7) de yi tshor ba gcig po yañ /
 rnam pa mañ por rab tu hbyed /
 hjig pa hbyuñ bañ me mdag dañ /
 chu yi phuñ por chu bshin du //
- (fr. 8) de phyir da rod rigs gnas pa /
 gsal bañ groñ rnam hbyur ba ni /
 sprin rnam char dañ ldan pa rnam /
 rluñ las hbyuñ ba bshin duñ //
- (fr. 9) gsum gyi gzugs su de snañ ba /
 mur smra tha dad rnam la ni /
 mchog gi yons su hgyur ba ste /
 lta ba tha dad kyis ni bcñs //
- (fr. 10) shi shin rigs bdag tshañ pa ste /
 de las byuñ bañ ma rig pa /
 des ni srin po bshin du med /
 gañ smra mi nus rnam dag go //
- (fr. 11) ji ltar nam mkhañ rnam dag par /
 rab rib hkhrol pañ skyes bu yis /
 ri mo rnam pa sna tshogs kyis /
 kun tu gañ bar sems pa pa //
- de ltar tshañ pa bdud rtsi hdi /
 hgyur ba med pa ma rig pas /
 rñog pa lta bur byas pas na /
 tha dad gzugs su snañ ba ste //
- (fr. 12) lha sa rluñ dañ nam mkhañ dañ /
 ri dañ chu dañ phyogs rnam kyañ /
 nañ du byed pañ yañ dag gi /
 cha rnam phyi rol bshin du gnas //
- (fr. 13) tshul ni gcig ñid gañ yin las /
 tha dad mthu ni rnam gnas pas /
 mthu las tha dad ma yin yañ /
 tha dad bshin du hbyuñ bañ //
- (fr. 14) tshañ sgrañ hdi ni sprul pa ste /
 sgra yi mthu las gnas pas na /
 sgra tsam las ni byuñ ba yañ /

de dag ñid du sha bar hgyur //

(fr. 15) rab tu byed pa gcig hbyed la /

mañ por rab tu phye ba pa /

de ni (127b) luñ ston rtogs pa las /

tshañs pa mchog ni chud par hgyur //

shes rgya cher ro //

Tr. . . . Bhatahari and others, who are *brahmacāra*s, also say :

(fr. 3) 'The beginningless, eternal Brahman, whose essence is Word and Syllable (*akṣara*, undestructable) . . . , from That, things have evolved, and the function of the world also has appeared.'

(=anādinidhanam brahma śabdatattvaṃ yad akṣaram/

vivartate' rthabhāvena prakriyā jagato yataḥ//—Vākyap. I, 1)

(fr. 4) 'Whatever has appeared by dint of imaginary assumption (*parikalpa*) does not abide.

Imaginary assumptions appear in various forms by dint of ratiocination (*tarka*, *vitarka*), scriptural dogma (*āgama*) and reasoning (*anumāna*).'

(cf. Vākyap. II, v, 143, p. 140; III, 4, 1-2, p. 139; III, 14, v. 199. p. 550) {x

(fr. 5) 'Separation and connection (*samsarga*), being (*bhāva*) and non-being (*abhāva*), order (temporal sequence) and non-order (simultaneity), truth and falsehood, various things are manifested from Ātman, the Truth.

(cf. *avirodhī virodhī vā sann asan vāpi tattvataḥ /*

kramavān akramo vāpi nābhāva upapadyate //—Vākyap. III, 3, 66, p. 130) (cf. II, 317. p. 214.) No reason to read 3.2.12.13 }
3.2.16.13

(fr. 6) '(It is) the internal cause of beings (*bhūta*), which put forth effort and appear in time (temporal sequence). Deliverance is to be saved and relieved. This is taught by those who wish for deliverance.'

(fr. 7) 'The sensation (*vedanā*) of it is divided in a uniform and multiform way.

It is like water in contrast with the multitude of waters and like flames which flare and vanish.' (cf. Vākyap. II, 252; 480) x

(fr. 8) 'Therefore a man who now belongs to a superior clan becomes (a member) of a distinctive family (*kula*) as when many clouds bearing water are born of winds.'

(fr. 9) 'It appears in three forms.

To (those thinkers who adhere to) various extremes, it (=one of these) becomes the supreme one. They are bound by various heretical opinions (*drṣṭi*).'

(fr. 10) 'Brahman is Ātman, which is to be known by tranquility, and from

which ignorance (*avidyā*) appears.

By means of it (it) does not exist like *rākṣasas* (demons), which are of such a nature as can not be explained.'

(fr. 11) The Sanskrit verse corresponding to this verse and parallel verses are found in several works. We shall discuss it later.

(fr. 12) 'Gods (*deva*), earth, the wind, the ether, mountains, water and directions are what the internal essential portion has manifested as if they were things external.' (cf. fr. 1.)

(fr. 13) 'Whereas there exist various potentialities (*śakti*) different from the entity of one form, yet that is not different from potentialities.

They appear as if they were different.'

(=) *ekam eva yad āmnātam bhinnam śaktivyapāśrayāt /
apṛthakte 'pi śaktibhyaḥ pṛthaktvene va vartate //*—Vākyap. I, 2.)

(cf. Vākyap. II, v. 22, p. 78; v. 25, p. 79; v. 476, p. 279; III, 1, v. 20. p. 23; III, 14, v. 567. p. 714.) 570 in AL

(fr. 14) 'This is the transformation (emanation) of *śabdabrahman*.

Abiding by the potentialities of Words, they become tranquil in themselves, although they have arisen from Words alone.'

(=) *śabdasya pariṇāmo 'yam ity āmnāyavido viduḥ /
chandobhya eva prathamam etad viśvam vyavartata' //*—Vākyap. I, 121)

(cf. Vākyap. II, 31. p. 82)

(fr. 15) 'As the one entity is divided into many by means of various creative processes, the highest *brahman* will be attained by resorting to (the science of) grammar.'

(=) *Yad ekaṃ prakriyābhedaḥ bahudhā pravibhajyate /
tad vyākaraṇam āgamyā param brahmādhigamyate //*—Vākyap. I, 22.)

So the problem has been discussed in detail."

(fr. 16) (42. 138a⁸) de bñin du nam mkhañi yañ nam mkhañi kho na ste /
bro ba la sogs pa du ma dañ sbyor bas yul tha dad par brtags pa ste / mañ
poñi gnas na nam mkhañi kho nañ shes bha dra ha ris smras pa ño //

"Likewise there exists ether alone for ether. The object (place) is regarded as differing with adjuncts and with desires of various kinds.

Although there exist many things in ether, there is ether alone in reality'

⁸ The negative character of the absolute was stressed by Yājñavalkya, the Upanishadic thinker; and later in the Kāṭhapa-Up. (II, 6, 9; 12).

⁷ It seems that the Tibetan translator took *vyavartata* in the original for *nyavartata*.

... So spoke Bhadrahari."

(=saṃyogidharmabhedena deśe ca parikalpate /
teṣu deśeṣu sāmānyam ākāśyāpi vidyate //— Vākya. III, 15. p. 20)

(42. 138b—139a) mtshan ñid kyi tshig ces bya ba ni smra ba rnams kyi
rjod pañi don du hbyed pas na rtsod pa yañ mañ ste / yi ge ma gtogs tshig
gshan ni // yod pa ma yin brjod pa ni / yi ge tshig ni ma gtogs par (139a)
cuñ zad kyañ ni yod pa min shes dpyod pa can gyi rjes su mthun par bya
ste / Bhadra haris bśad pa /

(fr. 17) smras pañi sgra kyañ hdus pa ni /
rigs ni hjug par hgyur ba ste /
gcig bu yan lag med pañi sgra /
blo yis rigs su bsdu ba ho //

(fr. 18) thog mañi tshig ni so sor kun /
bltos dañ bcas te de ltar yañ /
brjod pañi phyir ni tha dad blo /
tshul smra rnams kyi rnam pa mañ //

shes te /

"Bhadrahari says :

(fr. 17) 'Spoken Words, having been gathered, are classified into classes
(*jāti*).

A single, undifferentiated word is put in a class by the mind (of hearers).'

(=svā jātiḥ prathamam śabdaiḥ sarvair evābhidhiyate /
tato 'rthajātirūpeṣu tadadhyāropakalpanā //— Vākya. III, 6.)

(fr. 18) 'The first syllables (*akṣara*) have each of them something to be
seen (visible aspect) and express (meaning) in such a way, that the capability
(of hearers to interpret them) is multiple.

There are many kinds of those expressing ways.'

(=ekasminn api drśye 'rthe darśanam bhidyate prthak /
kālantareṇa vaiko 'pi taṃ paśyaty anyathā punaḥ //
ekasyāpi ca śabdasya nimittair avyavasthitaiḥ /
ekena bahubhiś cārtho bahudhā parikalpyate //— Vākya. II, 138;
139, pp. 138-139.)

(cf. Vākya. II, v. 33. p. 82)

Bhavya, the Mādhyamika philosopher, commenting upon Nāgārjuna's
Madhyamaka-śāstra IX, 3 cites the following verse :⁸

⁸ This verse is not found in the corresponding passage in the Chinese translation by Prabhā-
mitra of Bhāvaviveka's *Prajñāpradīpa* (般若燈論釋, 何本龍樹菩薩, 釋論分別明菩薩, 唐波羅頗蜜多
羅譯, Taisho Tripiṭaka, vol. XXX, p. 82 c). According to Prof. Nozawa it is likely that this verse
was omitted by the translator.

shes bya ba lta bur hgyur ro she na / de ni rigs pa ma yin te /

The Sanskrit original of the cited verse seems to have been the following :

“Just as a (blind) man who is running quickly on a dangerous pass (in the mountains) may fall down if he fails to cling by hand, so it is not impossible for a man who chiefly relies upon his own reasoning (lit. inference) to fall down (into a hell).”

Among the above-mentioned verses, fr. (1) and fr. (12) are nearly identical to each other. It is likely that the same original verse was cited in a slightly different way, as was mentioned, by the two scholars Asvabhāva and Jñānaśrī-bhadra, who lived in different periods. It is note-worthy that we can find the apparent Sanskrit originals of some of the fragments in the *Vākyapadīya* of Bhartṛhari. As for some other fragments, also we find in this work verses of similar purport, as has been pointed out by the writer. Present

⁹ Ad v. 144, p. 72 (ed. by Embar Krishnamacharya, Baroda 1926, GOS, 30).

(paramata) in the verses beginning with v. 144. As an instance of the latter, he writes as follows :

yathoktam . . .

yathā viśuddham ākāśam timiropapluto janah /
samkirnam iva mātṛābhiś citrābhir abhimanyate //
tathedam amṛtam brahma nirvikāram avidyayā /
kaluṣatvam ivāpannam bhedarūpaṁ vivartatah //

ji skad du /

ji ltar nam mkhaḥ dag pa la /
rab rib kyis bslad skye bo yin /
rab rib sna tshogs dag dañ ni /
ldan pa bshin du mñon par rlom //
de ltar bdud rtsi ḡgyur med paḥi /
tshañs pa hdi ni ma rig pas /
rñog pa bshin du ḡgyur ba ste /
tha dad ño bor rnam par ḡgyur //

shes bśad pa lta buḡo /¹⁰

(In the Sanskrit original of the foregoing Tibetan version, the final word seems to have been *vivartataḥ* instead of *vivartatah*.)

Ganganatha Jha's translation : . . .

"This has been thus declared : . . .

'Even though Ākāśa (Space) is pure, yet obsessed by darkness, people come to regard it as limited and made up of diversified parts ; in the same manner, though Brahman is immortal and unmodifiable, yet It appears to be sullied by Nescience and hence diversely modified'.¹¹

The foregoing verses, moreover, nearly completely correspond to two verses of the *Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad-bhāṣya*¹² by Sureśvara, a disciple of Śaṅkara. (In the latter, *amalam* occurs instead of *amṛtam*, *prakāśate* instead of *vivartatah*, *upalakṣayet* instead of *abhimanyāte* ; otherwise the passages completely the same.) These two verses are also cited by Prabhācandra, the Jain scholar, in a passage of the *Prameyakamala-mārtaṇḍa* where he criticized¹³ the doctrine of the *śabdabrahmavādins*. (In this text, *amalam* occurs instead of *amṛtam*, *bhedarūpaṁ prapaśyati* instead of *bhedarūpaṁ vivartatah*). Once again, the same verse is cited by Abhayadeva, the Jain scholar, in his work *Tattvabodhavidhāyini* (p. 388), as a doctrine of the *śabdabrahmavādins*. (*amalam* instead of *amṛtam*, *vivar-*

¹⁰ The Der-ge edition, Bstan-ḡgyur, vol. 293, 187 b.

¹¹ *The Tattvasaṅgraha of Śāntarakṣita with the Commentary of Kamalaśīla*, tr. into English by Ganganatha Jha, vol. I, Baroda 1937, p. 126.

¹² Ad III, 5, 43 ; 44. p. 1246, AnSS.

¹³ p. 12 b, NSP.

tate instead of *vivartataḥ*.)¹⁴ Most strikingly, in the commentary (*vṛtti*) by Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha upon the *Mṛgendrāgama*, a very important, fundamental scripture of the Śaivas, those verses are ascribed to Bhartṛhari, who is characterized as a *vivartavādin*, as follows :¹⁵

tathā cāha tatrabhavān Bhartṛhariḥ . . .

yathā viśuddham ākāśam timiropapluto janah /
saṃkīrṇam iva mātṛābhiś citrābhir abhimanyate //
tathedaṃ amṛtaṃ brahma nirvikāram avidyayā /
kaluṣatvam ivāpannam bhedarūpe pravartate //

evaṃ cābhinnam evedaṃ paraṃ brahma paramātmalakṣaṇam, manasāṃ
hi saṃsāradharmaiḥ sukhaduḥkhādibhir yogaḥ / paramātmā tu sūrya ivāṃ-
bhaḥpratibimbabhedaḥ upādhibhir abhinno'pi bhinna iva pratibhāti /

The Sanskrit text by Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha seems to be the least affected form of the original verse.¹⁶ These verses seem to be of the same purport as the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* III, 8.

yathā bhavati bālānāṃ gaganam malinam malaiḥ /
tathā bhavaty abuddhānāṃ ātmāpi malino malaiḥ //

“As the sky appears to be soiled with dirt to the ignorant, so appears Ātman, too, with impurities, to those who are not enlightened”.¹⁷

The same view was shared by Śaṅkara also.¹⁸

What is most striking from the viewpoint of the history of ideas is that verses very similar to the foregoing are given by Dignāga, the Buddhist philosopher, in vv. 31.—32 of his *Trikālaparikṣā* as follows :¹⁹

ji ltaṃ nam mkhaḥ rnam dag la /
rab rib kyis ni bslad paḥi mi /
skra śad kyis ni kun gaṇ ltaṃ /
sna tshogs su ni mñon par rtogs // 31
de ltaṃ ḥdir yaṇ rnam śes ni /

¹⁴ The text is not now available to the author, who has read it in E. Frauwallner's “Dignāga und anderes” (*Festschrift Winternitz*, S. 237).

¹⁵ Hārāṇacandra Śāstri : Śabdabrahmavādaḥ. (*G. Jhā Commemoration Volume*, p. 93.)

¹⁶ As for understanding the meaning of the verse, Ānandajñāna's ṭīkā upon the *Bṛhad. Up. Vārttika* is highly valuable.

¹⁷ *The Āgamaśāstra of Gauḍapāda*, edited, translated and annotated by Vidhushekhara Bhattacharyya, University of Calcutta, 1943, p. 53.

¹⁸ Ś. ad *Bṛhad. Up.* p. 152, l. 24 . . .

na hi bālāis talamalinatādibhir vyomni vikalpyamāne talamalinatādiviśiṣṭam eva paramārthaḥ
vyoma bhavati (Ś. ad BS. I, 2, 8. vol. I, p. 184, ll. 5-7). vyomnīva talamalādi parikalpitaṃ (Ś. ad BS. I, 3, 19. vol. I, p. 279, l. 7.).

ākāśe bālāis talamalinatādy adhyasyanti (Ś. ad BS. I, 1, 1, vol. I, p. 11. AnSS). Upadeśasāhasri, II, 18, 22.

¹⁹ The author has cited the verse from the above-mentioned Frauwallner's work. ॐ

nam par mi hgyur ma rig pas /
chu rñog bshin du shugs pa ni /
tha dad gzugs su rnam par hjug // 32

[Some noteworthy differences; *skra tad kyis* (keṣaṇḍukaiḥ) instead of *mātrābhiḥ*; *hdir yan rnam ses ni* (atrāpi vijñānam eva) instead of *idam amṛtam* (amalaṁ) *brahma*.]

Those verses cited in Tibetan versions should be considered as having probably been ascribed to Bhartṛhari. Reasons: (1) Tibetan versions mention the name of the author of the verses as *Bhadrahari*, *Bhadrihari*, *Bhatahari*, *Bharitehari* or *Bhāndrihari*. These names give ample testimony to the supposition that the original Sanskrit name of the author of those verses was a little difficult to transcribe with Tibetan characters, and so the name must have been *Bhartṛhari* which could easily be corrupted into any one of them. b

(2) We can find in the *Vākyapadīya* by Bhartṛhari the Sanskrit original texts of at least 10 of these verses. As for some of the other verses we find similar verses in the same work.

(3) Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha ascribed (fr. 11) to Bhartṛhari. Although some of the above-mentioned verses can not be traced in the *Vākyapadīya*, the *Bhartṛhariśataka* or in collections of lyrical songs ascribed to him, it is possible that he might have composed²⁰ other works which are not extant now or that some of the verses might have been ascribed to him in later days.²¹

There are on the other hand some difficulties in identifying Bhadrahari etc. with Bhartṛhari. However these difficulties will be easily solved by the following considerations:

(1) It is a well-known fact that Bhartṛhari adopted the standpoint of emanation-theory (*pariṇāmavāda*), whereas the standpoint made clear in (fr. 11) is, as Nārāyaṇa-kaṇṭha asserts, manifestation-theory (*vivartavāda*). These two standpoints were strictly distinguished from each other by later Vedāntins.²² It seems that the author of (fr. 11) would be different from Bhartṛhari, the author of the *Vākyapadīya*. However, in the days when these verses were composed these two philosophical standpoints were not strictly distinguished from each other. Bhartṛhari himself used the two terms (*pariṇāma* and *vivarta*) as nearly the same meaning,²³ just as the *Brahma-sūtras* used many similes which

²⁰ *The Epigrams Attributed to Bhartṛhari*, ed. by D. D. Kosambi (Singhi Jain Series, vol. No. 23). Bombay 1948. This work contains not only the famous three *śatakas*, but also the *Viṣaṇṭha*, *Vijñānaśataka* and many other poems ascribed to him.

²¹ Professor Louis Renou told the author that, according to the information by the late S. Dasgupta the editions of the *Vākyapadīya* published hitherto do not contain all the verses of the work, and so it might be possible that those verses not identified by the author are found in unpublished MSS.

²² Paul Deussen: *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie* I, 1, 4 Aufl., Leipzig 1920, S. 63 f.

²³ The author discussed the problem in a Japanese work of his (哲學的思索の印度的展開, p. 239f). Cf. Paul Hacker: *Vivarta*, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1953 Nr. 5.

could be interpreted in different ways.

(2) Hitherto it has been generally supposed that Bhartṛhari died forty years before I-tsing sojourned in India, following the information given by I-tsing himself.²⁴ Accordingly Bhartṛhari was regarded by J. Takakusu to have died in 651—652 A. D. If we examine this passage more closely, however, it becomes clear that in I-tsing's information there is something amiss. I-tsing said that Bhartṛhari "was a contemporary of Dharmapāla",²⁵ and yet also that Dharmapāla composed a commentary upon Bhartṛhari's verses"²⁶ These two are not consistent with each other.) Let us discuss this problem.

Dr. Hakuji Ui²⁷ took the passage as meaning that Bhartṛhari died forty years before the beginning of I-tsing's stay in the Nālandā monastery. According to his calculation Bhartṛhari died c. 630 A. D. In the above-cited passage, however, he is said to have been a contemporary of Dharmapāla who commented upon the Prakīrṇaka of Bhartṛhari. The date of Dharmapāla is well-known; he lived 530—561 A. D. Now, Bhartṛhari must have been somewhat Dharmapāla's senior. Suppose that the former was older than the latter by, say, ten years; then Bhartṛhari should have lived c. 520—630. If we adopt Takakusu's view, he must be supposed to have lived c. 520—652. Needless to say, this supposition is absurd. We are brought to the conclusion that either (1) the information that "Bhartṛhari died forty years before I-tsing" is wrong or (2) the information that Dharmapāla commented upon Bhartṛhari's work is wrong. We shall take up this problem in another light. Mr. H. R. Rangaswamy Iyengar²⁸ made clear the fact that Bhartṛhari lived in an age not so remote from that of Vasubandhu. He asserts as follows:

"In the second Kāṇḍa of the *Vākyapadiya*, while describing how the science of grammar, which had been almost extinct, was restored and propagated by the great grammarians, Chandra and Vasurāta, Puṇyarāja, the commentator of the *Vākyapadiya*, mentions several times Vasurāta as the teacher of Bhartṛhari.²⁹ In the Kārikā 490 of the *Vākyapadiya*³⁰ Bhartṛhari himself seems to refer to his teacher Vasurāta by 'Guruṇā' as is evident from the words of

²⁴ "It is forty years since his death (A. D. 651-652)." (J. Takakusu: *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago*. Oxford 1896. p. 180)

²⁵ J. Takakusu: *op. cit.*, p. 179.

²⁶ 南海寄歸內法傳 第四卷, Taishō, vol. LIV, p. 229.

²⁷ 印度哲學研究 vol. V, p. 130.

²⁸ H. R. Rangaswamy Iyengar: "Bhartṛhari and Dignāga" (*Śrī Ātmānanda Prakāśa*, published by "Jain Atmananda Sabha", Bhavnagar, 1952, p. 27 f. The author obtained a copy by courtesy of Mr. Muni Jambuvijay).

²⁹ na tenāsmadguroḥ tatrābhavato Vasurātād anyah kaścid imaṃ bhāṣyārṇavam avagāhitum alam ity uktam bhavati (Puṇyarāja ad II, 486). kenacīc ca brahmarakṣasānīya Candrācūrya-Vasurātaturuprabhṛtīm datta iti / te [taiḥ?] khalu yathāvat vyākaraṇasya svarūpaṃ tata upalabhya satatam ca śiṣyāṇaṃ vyākhyāya bahusākhitaṃ nito vistaram prāpita ity anuśrūyate (ad II, 489).

³⁰ Cf. II, 490b: . . . praṇīto guruṇāsmākam ayam āgamasamgrahaḥ.

Puṇyarāja prefaced to the verse.³¹ Again a Jain writer, Siṃhasūrigaṇi, who may be assigned to the beginning of the sixth century A. D., in his unpublished work, *Nayacakṛāṇikā*, a commentary on the *Nayacakra* of Mallavādin the senior,³² which is not now extant, mentions, twice in his work, Vasurāta the Upādhyāya of Bhartṛhari.³³ This confirms the statement of Puṇyarāja and establishes that Vasurāta was a great grammarian of the day under whom Bhartṛhari studied and that Bhartṛhari often held views quite different from those of his master.

According to Paramārtha, Vasurāta was a Brahmin and brother-in-law of Balāditya, a pupil of Vasubandhu.³⁴ He was well-versed in grammar. He defeated Vasubandhu, through the intervention of Chandra, another great grammarian. This means that Vasurāta, Chandra, and Vasubandhu should be regarded as contemporaries and Bhartṛhari, the pupil of Vasurāta, assigned to the fifth century A. D."

Another piece of evidence of much more importance was discovered by him. In the fifth chapter of Dignāga's *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*, which is devoted to the exposition of the *Apoha* theory, the following two Kārikās are found :

thigs pa dañ ni tshogs pa yi /
chu sogs rnams la rjod byed ni /
graṅs dañ tshad dañ dbyibs rnams la /
ltoṣ pa med par ḥjug par byed //
dbyibs dañ kha dog yañ lag rnams /
khyad par can la gañ ḥjug pa /
de yi yan lag la sgra ni /
rab tu ḥjug la dun asma yi //

[The above-mentioned Tibetan verses have been cited from Mr. Iyengar's article. According to the Sde-dge edition of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons kept by Tōhoku University, Sendai, the sentences run as follows :

la lar dños su rjod par byed de dper na /
graṅs dañ mtshan ṅid dañ ni dbyibs /
ltoṣ pa med par rab tu ḥjug /
chu la sogs paḥi thigs pa dañ /
ḥdus pa la yañ rjod par byed //

³¹ Cf. *ibid.* : atha kadācit yogato vicārya tatra bhagavatā Vasurātaguruṇā mamāyam āgamaḥ saṃjñāya vātsalyāt praṇīta itī svaracitasya granthasya gurupūrvakam abhidhātum āha.

³² This *Mallavādin* should be distinguished from another Jain writer of the same name who is the author of *Nyāyabinduṭīppaṇī*.

³³ Cf. *Nayacakṛāṇikā*, folio 272 a : . . . so 'bhijalpo 'bhidheyārthaparigrāhī bāhyāc chabdhād anyā itī Bhartṛharyādīmatam / Vasurātasya Bhartṛharyupādhyāyasya matam tu . . . Cf. *ibid.*, folio 277 a : . . . evaṃ tāvat Bhartṛharyādīdarśanam uktam / Vasurātaḥ Bhartṛharer upādhyāyah

³⁴ Cf. "A study of Paramārtha's life of Vasubandhu and the Date of Vasubandhu" by J. Takakusu *JRAS*, 1905, pp. 33 ff.

la lar yan lag hbaḥ shig la hjug pa ma yin te / dper na /

dbyibs daṅ kha dog cha śas kyis /
khyad par byas nas hjug pa yin /
sgra yis de yi cha śas la /
rab tu hjug pa dmigs ma yin //

A restoration into Sanskrit of these verses might easily correspond to the following verses in the *Vākyapadīya* :

bindau ca samudāye ca vācakaḥ salilādiṣu /
saṃkhyāpramāṇasaṃsthānanirapekṣaḥ pravartate // (Vākyap. II, 160.)³⁵
saṃsthānavarnāvayavair viśiṣṭe yaḥ prayujyate /
śabdo na tasyāvayave pravṛttir upalabhyate // (Vākyap. II, 157.)

☞ This means that either Dignāga took the Kārikās from Bhartṛhari's work or both Dignāga and Bhartṛhari took them from quite a different work. But there is no evidence to support the latter alternative. (We learn from Jinendrabuddhi, author of *Viśālāmalaṭikā* on the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya-vṛtti* of Dignāga, that Dignāga, is here referring to the views of Bhartṛhari.³⁶) This evidently supports the former alternative that Dignāga is quoting from Bhartṛhari.

The foregoing are the pieces of evidence set forth by Mr. H. R. Rangaswamy Iyengar. But whereas he has pointed out just one Tibetan citation of a verse by Bhartṛhari, we have in addition pointed out many citations of his verses. Taking all these pieces of evidence into consideration, we have to conclude that Bhartṛhari must have lived prior to, or at latest contemporary with, Dignāga, Asvabhāva (No-bo-ñid med-pa), Bhavya (Bhāvaviveka) and Dharmapāla.

There has been much dispute about the date of Dignāga.³⁷ Randle once said that "all that can be said with certainty is that he lived somewhere between 350 A. D. and 500 A. D."³⁸ According to most scholars he lived about 500 A. D.³⁹ Dr. H. Ui fixed his date as c. 400—480, on the ground that he

³⁵ The first and the second halves are given in reverse order in the edition of the Benares Sanskrit Series. (p. 185)

³⁶ Cf. *Viśālāmalaṭikā* : Mdo. re, folio 331 b. l. 6 ff. : kha cig tu gtso bor cha tshas rnam la hjug te / bha rite haris yis smras pa / cha sogs rnam la zes paḥi sogs paḥi sgras. sa la yoḥs su gzuñ ño / (=kva cit tu mukhyā avayaveṣu vṛttiḥ / yathoktaṃ Bhartṛhariṇā salilādiṣv iti / ādiśabdena prthivyādinām parigrahaḥ /)

³⁷ According to Tāranātha, Dignāga was a pupil of Vasubandhu (*Tāranātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien*, übersetzt von Anton Schiefner, St. Petersburg 1869, S. 131).

³⁸ H. N. Randle : *Fragments from Dignāga*. London 1926, p. 3. In another work he says : "Dignāga's date shares the uncertainty attaching to that of his master Vasubandhu. He may fall anywhere between 400 and 500 A. D." (Randle : *Indian Logic in the Early Schools*. Oxford University press, 1930 p. 27).

³⁹ Moritz Winternitz : *Geschichte der indischen Literatur*, Bd. III. Leipzig 1920. S. 467. Louis Renou et Jean Filliozt : *L'Inde Classique*, tome II. Paris 1953, p. 380.

At the end of this article the author should not fail to mention the names of the scholars who kindly helped him in carrying on this study. Prof. Yamaguchi introduced him to Dr. Kenshō Hasuba and Dr. Kyōgo Sasaki, who went over Ōno-bo-ñid med-pa's works in order to discover the suspected citations of Bhartṛhari's verses. Prof. Jōshō Nozawa kindly informed him of Bhavya's citation of a verse of Bhartṛhari. Dr. Bunkyō Aoki and Prof. Shinya Kasugai did not spare efforts to give the author valuable suggestions. Here the author wants to express his sincere gratitude to these scholars, without whose kind help this article could not have been brought to its present state of completion. P. S.

Referring to the Vijñānavāda, Bhartṛhari says :

'kecid vyāvṛttirūpam tu dravyatvena pracakṣate/(Vākyap. 3, 1, 19. p. 22.)

⊙ This must refer to later Buddhist Idealists, not to such earlier ones as Asaṅga and Vasubandhu. If so, the date of Bhartṛhari should not be fixed in a period much earlier than was set forth above.

The Sanskrit original of the above-mentioned fragment No. 5 is found in the commentary by Vṛṣabhadeva upon the Vākyapadīya. As the text is not now available to the writer, he wants to cite Dr. Hacker's explanation : " In einer Reihe von 12 Strophen, die der Kommentar zitiert, befindet sich die folgende (p. 7,1—2):

Vyatīto bheda-saṁsargau bhāvābhāvau kramākramau

Satyānte ca viśvātmā pravivekāt prakāśate,"

(Paul Hacker : *Vivarta. Studien zur Geschichte der illusionistischen Kosmologie und Erkenntnistheorie der Inder*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1953. Nr. 5. S. 205.) Dr. Hacker takes this anonymous verse for a later development. Taking the above-cited Tibetan version into consideration, however, the present writer thinks that this verse also should be ascribed to Bhartṛhari. He expresses his sincere gratitude to Dr. Hacker who kindly sent him copies of his valuable works.

must have lived a little earlier than Guṇamati (德慧).⁴⁰ The latter must have lived prior to Paramārtha's arrival in Kuang-tung in China in 546 A. D. and earlier than Sthiramati.⁴¹ Sthiramati must have lived in the sixth century⁴² or according to Dr. Ui, c. 470—550.⁴³ Winternitz assigns him to the fifth century.⁴⁴ Recently Professor Hikata has surmised that the date of Dignāga is about 440—520.⁴⁵

It is generally admitted that Asvabhāva lived earlier than Dharmapāla and later than Dignāga. He lived, according to Dr. Ui, c. 450—530 A. D.,⁴⁶ and, according to Prof. Hikata, c. 470—550 A. D.⁴⁷

Bhavya was almost contemporary with Buddhapālita (c. 400—450?).⁴⁸ He is regarded to have lived and worked at the beginning of the fifth century A. D.⁴⁹ According to Dr. Ui, he lived c. 490—570.⁵⁰ In any case he was an elder contemporary of Dharmapāla. The date of Dharmapāla (護法) has precisely been fixed. He lived 530—561 A. D.⁵¹

So we can assuredly say that Bhartṛhari must not have lived later than these Buddhist scholars. It has become clear that the statement of I-tsing that Bhartṛhari died some forty years before the date of his record is incorrect.

It is, however, doubtless the case that Bhartṛhari lived after Vasubandhu, as is clear from the above-cited materials. Vasubandhu is generally regarded to have lived in the fourth century,⁵² or in the latter half of the fourth century.⁵³ According to Dr. Ui, Vasubandhu lived c. 320—400.⁵⁴ According to Prof. Hikata, he lived c. 400—480.⁵⁵ Frauwallner asserted the existence of two Vasubandhus, ascribing the elder to 320—380 A. D. and the younger to 400—480 A. D.⁵⁶ Such has been the extent of the debate about his date.

So, taking these facts into account, we are brought to the conclusion that Bhartṛhari, the author of the *Vākyapadiya*, must have lived c. 450—500 A. D.

⁴⁰ “印度哲學研究”, vol. V, pp. 142–145.

⁴¹ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 136.

⁴² Filliozat: *op. cit.*, p. 380.

⁴³ H. Ui: *op. cit.*, p. 136.

⁴⁴ M. Winternitz: *History of Indian Literature*, vol. II. University of Calcutta, 1933. pp. 362–363.

⁴⁵ 千渴龍祥: 世親年代再考 (『印度學佛教學論集——宮本正尊教授還曆記念論文集——』三省堂, 昭和二十九年, p. 321).

⁴⁶ H. Ui: *op. cit.*, p. 147.

⁴⁷ R. Hikata: *op. cit.*, p. 321.

⁴⁸ J. Filliozat: *op. cit.*, p. 379.

⁴⁹ M. Winternitz: *History, etc.* II, p. 362.

⁵⁰ H. Ui: *op. cit.*, pp. 148–149.

⁵¹ H. Ui: *op. cit.*, pp. 128–132; R. Hikata: *op. cit.*, p. 321.

⁵² M. Winternitz: *History, etc.* II, p. 355 f.

⁵³ J. Filliozat: *op. cit.*, II, p. 380.

⁵⁴ H. Ui: “*op. cit.*”, vol. I, pp. 413–414.

⁵⁵ R. Hikata: *op. cit.* pp. 315 f.

⁵⁶ E. Frauwallner: *On the Date of the Buddhist Master of the Law Vasubandhu*. Roma 1951. All different views about Vasubandhu's date have been mentioned in this work.