

What affected the two truths theory of Jñānagarbha?: Study on the Satyadvayavibhaṅga (4)

AKAHANE Ritsu

1. Introduction

The two truths theory is the primary concept of the Mādhyamika school in Indian Buddhism, in particular, and the one that Jñānagarbha (ca. 700) insisted on in his text, *Satyadvayavibhaṅgavṛtti* (SDVV), has been studied by some researchers, including me. Some have argued that his theory is like Bhāviveka's (ca. 6c.) or Candrakīrti's (ca. 600–660), because of their similarities. However, it is natural that Jñānagarbha, who was active after these two Buddhists, knew their two truths theories and was influenced by them; for in Indian tradition, the important thoughts such as the two truths theory are always handed down from one generation to the next. Therefore, if we want to know his theory more clearly, we must try to find some text or passage which played an important role when Jñānagarbha completed his theory. So in this short paper I would like to pick up one passage of the sūtra, *Ārya-Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra* (ANS), because it is quoted as evidence of the two truths theory in SDVV and other Buddhists' texts with comments on it. We can expect to get an important clue about the issue at hand by comparing their understandings of it.

2. Influences from and on SDVV

First I would like to show the passage concerned as [A], which is quoted in SDVV.

[A] de la kun rdzob kyi bden pa gang zhe na / ji snyed 'jig rten gyi tha snyad gdogs pa dang / yi ge dang skad dang brda bstan pa dag go // don dam pa'i bden pa ni gang la sems rgyu ba yang med na / yi ge rnams lta smos kyang ci dgos zhes gsungs so // (SDVV: p.158 ll.25-29)

Moreover, the following are Jñānagarbha's comments on [A].

[SDVV-Acom] (a) 'jig rten gyi tha snyad gdags pa ni 'jig rten gyi 'jug pa ste / shes pa dang shes bya'i mtshan nyid yin gyi / rjod par byed pa'i mtshan nyid ni ma yin te / de ni 'og mas brjod pa'i phyir ro // (b) ji snyed ces bya ba'i tshig ni mtha' dag ces bya ba'i don to // (c) des na rnam par

(86) What affected the two truths theory of Jñānagarbha? (R.AKAHANE)

rtog pa med pa'i mngon sum gyi shes pas yongs su bcad pa'i ngo bo'i dngos po gzugs la sogs pa dang bde ba la sogs par rig par grub pa rnam ni kun rdzob kyi bden pa kho na yin no // (d) de ni 'og tu yang sbyar bar bya'o // (e) de'i phyir mdo las 'byung ba dang / yi ge dang skad dang brda bstan pa gshan dag kyang gzung ngo //¹⁾ (SDVV: p.158 l.29 - p.159 l.4)

We can also find [A] quoted in *Madhyamakālmkāravṛtti* (MAV), written by Śāntarakṣita, who wrote the commentary to SDVV and is often thought to have been a disciple of Jñānagarbha. Śāntarakṣita's comments on [A] are also the very similar to [SDVV-Acom]²⁾. Therefore it appears that Jñānagarbha influenced Śāntarakṣita's interpretation of [A]³⁾. On the other hand, according to my recent study⁴⁾, some parts of [SDVV-Acom] (namely, (b), (d), and (e)) are based on contents written in *Ārya-Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra-ṭīkā* (ANST)⁵⁾.

3. The Relationship Between Jñānagarbha and Candrakīrti

Did any other texts directly influence the remains, (a) and (c)? I think that Jñānagarbha kept a certain text in mind, at least when he wrote (a)⁶⁾. What text was it? It was *Śūnyatāsaptati-vṛtti* (ŚSV), written by Candrakīrti.

In [A] the relative truth (*samvṛtisatya*) is defined to have two characteristics, namely “all worldly convention” and “all that is expressed by syllables, words, and designations.” In summary, in (a) Jñānagarbha explains these two characteristics as follows;

The former of the two is “the ordinary people's activity” and “all activities that are cognitive in nature,” but not “all activities that are verbal in nature,” because it (= all activities that are verbal in nature) is the character of the latter (= all that are expressed by syllables, words, and designations).

Here, why did he say that the former is not “all activities that are verbal in nature”? That is probably because some person at that time insisted that the former is “all activities that are verbal in nature” and he wanted to correct that person's misunderstanding. The next question, then, is who was that person? Maybe it was Candrakīrti. We can find the following description in his text, ŚSV.

[ŚSV] 'jig rten gyi tha snyad du gsungs pa yang gzhan gyi khong du chud par 'dod pa'i dngos po kun nas rtogs pa'i dngos po sna tshogs pa gzhan gyi rgyud la rtog pa 'jug par byed pa la tha snyad ces brjod do // 'jig rten pa'i tha snyad ni 'jig rten tha snyad de ji ltar 'jig rten pa rtogs par 'dod pa'i don phan tshun du rtogs par byed pa'am / shes par 'dod pa'i don khong du chud pa'o // de bzhin

du don de la brjod bya rjod byed kyi 'brel pa dang / shes bya shes byed du rnam par 'jog par byed cing / dus gzhan du yang tha snyad kyi gdams pa mi 'chad pa'i don du de la 'di ltar rjod byed dang brjod bya dang / shes pa dang shes bya'i mtshan nyid can gyi don phyin ci log tsam gyis nye bar bskyed pa'i bdag nyid kyi dngos po la tha snyad ces brjod kyi / byed pa po'i tshogs pa gcig dang 'brel pa ni ma yin no // de nyid kyang 'jig rten pa bden par 'dod pa'i phyir 'jig rten pa'i tha snyad kyi bden pa zhes bya ste gcig go // (ŚSV: D. 268b7-269a3)

After the part about relative truth in [A] is quoted in ŚSV, this [ŚSV] appears as the comments on it. In summary, especially in the underlined part, Candrakīrti said the following:

“All worldly convention” is the thing that makes a person understand such a meaning as is intended [by other ordinary people], or the thing that tell a person what he wants to know. [All worldly convention] has [two] characters, “all activities that are cognitive in nature” and “all activities that are verbal in nature”.

“All activities that are cognitive in nature,” which Candrakīrti shows here, is the identical character which Jñānagarbha shows in (a). And “all activities that are verbal in nature” is also thought to be a character of “all worldly convention” here, which is denied in (a) by Jñānagarbha. Namely, in (a) Jñānagarbha implicitly corrects this misunderstanding of Candrakīrti’s about “all worldly convention,” that is, one of characters of the relative truth shown in [A]. If this is true, (a) may be read as following;

(I think that) “All worldly convention” is ordinary people’s actions, and (Candrakīrti insisted in ŚSV that it is “all activities that are cognitive in nature” and “all activities that are verbal in nature”. I admit the one of the two, namely) “all activities that are cognitive in nature”, but (I do) not (admit the other, namely) “all activities that are verbal in nature”...

Here it is clear that Jñānagarbha thought that “all worldly convention” is only “all activities that are cognitive in nature” but Candrakīrti thought that it is both “all activities that are cognitive in nature” and “all activities that are verbal in nature.” Now I think that this difference between these two people’s texts results from the confusion about ANS’s original text, but I will try to examine this question in another paper because of limited space⁷⁾.

4. Conclusion

Considering the comments about [A] quoted in ANST, SDVV, MAV, and ŚSV, we can understand that Jñānagarbha’s interpretation of [A] strongly influences Śāntarakṣita’s one, on the other hand, is mostly under the influence of ANST’s. It is especially remarkable that

(88) What affected the two truths theory of Jñānagarbha? (R.AKAHANE)

in (a) Jñānagarbha corrects Candrakīrti's idea that "all worldly convention," which is defined as one of characters of the relative truth, is "all activities that are verbal in nature."

ABBREVIATION: ANS: *Ārya-Akṣayamatinirdeśasūtra*, ed. Braarvig (1993); ANST: *Ārya-Akṣayamatinirdeśasūtraṅkā* by Vasubandhu, ed. Braarvig (1993); D.: sDe dge edition.; MAV: *Madhyamakālaṅkāravṛtti* by Śāntarakṣita, ed. tib. Ichigo (1985), 2-336.; SDVP: *Satyadvayavibhaṅgapañjikā* by Śāntarakṣita.; SDVV: *Satyadvayavibhaṅgavṛtti* by Jñānagarbha, ed. tib. Eckel (1987). ŚSV: *Śūnyatāsaptatīvṛtti* by Candrakīrti.; Akahane (2006) 'On the Interpretations of the Ārya Akṣayamatinirdeśasūtra' *Humaniora Kiotoenia – On the Centenary of Kyoto Humanities* -, pp. 215-227; Braarvig (1993), *Akṣayamatinirdeśasūtra* volume I, Solum Forlag, Oslo.; Eckel (1987) *Jñānagarbha on the Two Truths*, State University of New York Press, New York.; Ichigo (1985) *Madhyamakālaṅkāra*, Bun'eidō, Kyōto; Matsumoto (1978) 'Jñānagarbha no Nitaisetsu', *Bukkyōgaku* 5, 109-37.

1) I have divided this [SDVV-Acom] into five parts ((a) – (e)) in order to make its contents more understandable.

2) Comments concerned of MAV is following: (a) sems can dang snod kyi bdag nyid kyi 'jig rten myong bar bya ba dang myong ba'i ngo bo'i tshul 'dir 'jig rten gyi tha snyad du dgongs pa ste / byed pa'i sgrub pa yongs su bzung ba'i phyir ro / brjod pa'i ngo bo ni ma yin te / de ni yi ge la sogs pas brjod pa'i phyir ro // (b) ji snyad pa zhes bya ba ni ma lus pa'i don yin par bstan te / (c) de'i phyir rnam par mi rtog pa'i shes pas rtogs pa'i bdag nyid gzugs la sogs pa dang / bde ba la sogs pa ni kun rdzob kyi bden pa nyid las mi 'da' 'o // (d) de'i rjes su 'brel pa'i phyir yi ge la sogs pa yang sbyar ro // (e) de'i phyir lung las byung ba dang 'jig rten pa yang bsdu ste / de ni yid kyi dang ngag gi'o / dper na yid kyis brgya byin la chos mngon par bshad pa dang / yid kyis tshigs su bcaid pa'i lan btab par de dang de dag nas 'byung ba lta bu'o // (MAV: p.205 ll.1-11)
*these (a) – (e) accord with the ones of [SDVV-Acom]

3) See, Matsumoto (1978), Ichigo (1985), and Akahanane (2006).

4) See, Akahane (2006).

5) I have already referred to its problem in my latest paper. See, Akahane (2006). But after publishing it, I found that there are some disputable points in it. Therefore I will present another article where some problems are corrected.

de la kun rdzob kyi bden pa bshad par bzhed nas / 'jig rten gyi tha snyad dang yi ge dang sgra dang brdas bstan pa ji snyed pa zhes gzungs te / (d) ji snyed ba zhes bya ba'i sgra thams cad dang sbyar te / 'jig rten gyi tha snyad ji snyed pa dang / yi ges bstan pa ji snyed pa dang / sgras bstan pa ji snyed pa dang / brdas bstan pa ji snyed pa zhes bya bar sbyar ro // (b) ji snyed kyi sgra ni ji tsam yod pa'i don drangs te / 'jig rten gyi tha snyad ji tsam yod pa zhes bya ba'i tha tshig go // de la 'jig rten gyi tha snyad ni bstan pa'o // lhag ma rnams ni bshad pa ste / yi ge ni a dang ka la sogs pa gsung rab kyi lung dang 'brel pa rnams so // sgra ni gsung rab kyi lung dang 'brel pa 'du byed mi rtag ces bya ba la sogs pa'i tshig gi rkang pa rnams so // brda ni don ston par nus shing khong du chud par nus pa'i tshig gi rkang pa rnams so // (e) ji snyed ces bya ba'i

What affected the two truths theory of Jñānagarbha? (R.AKAHANE)

(89)

tshig ni (original: gi) lung 'ba' zhig gis ma yin gyi / 'jig rten gyi yi ge dang sgra la sogs pa ci
tsam yod pa rnams kyang sdud de / de yang yid kyi dang ngag gi sgo nas ston pa rnam pa gnyis
so // de la yid kyis ston pa ni ji ltar brgya byin la yid kyis chos mngon par bshad pa dang / de dag
gis kyang rang gi the tshom yid la brtags pa dang / lan kyang yid kyis tshigs su bead pas glan no
// mdo de dang de dag las 'byung ba lta bu'o // dga gis bstan pa ni tshig gi rig byed rnam pa sna
tshogs nyan pa'i gang zag rnams kyi rna bar song ba rnams so // de dag gis ni mdor na 'di skad
du / gdul bar bya ba'i sems can rnams kyi dbang du ji tsam du tha snyad brjod pa thams cad kun
rdzob kyi bden pa yin no zhes bstan te / (ANST: p.269 l.45–p.270 l.18)

6) We can also find the related sentence about (c) in ŚSV, but not directly.

7) It is remarkable that this Candrakīrti's interpretation is like Yogācāra's.

<Key words> Jñānagarbha, Ārya-Akṣayamatirdeśasūtra, Candrakīrti, Śūnyatāsaptatīrtti

(Part-time Lecturer, Osaka Gakuin University)

新刊紹介

天台宗典編纂所

『天台電子佛典CD3』

定価 2,857 円

天台宗典編纂所・2007年1月