



The Intellectual as Interpreted in the Indian Buddhist Logical Literature

Dr. Manotosh Mandal
Department of Indo- Tibetan Studies
Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan West Bengal

At the outset term ‘intellectual’ (in Sanskrit *dhi*, *medha*, *dhiman*) may require clarification. It is not intelligentsia (*shista*) as a class. Lexically the word ‘intellect’ is derived from the Latin word ‘intellectus’ suggesting ‘the faculty of knowing and reasoning; understanding; Parson’ etc. Intellectual is substantive and attributive as well. Here the attributive use may be applicable. The Intellectual therefore refers to a class of the humans possessing a good understanding. Good understanding requires none biased pure and clam intellect with the least inclination to a particular concept. Unfortunately cleanliness of an intellectual becomes perverted by the socio ecological contamination. During the Brahminic high brownness intellectualism *shaistamatam* became the doctrine that the knowledge in wholly or mainly derived from pure-reasoning. A pity is that in the pre Buddhist India the intellectualism developed with the determinate adherence to the concept of Brahmanhood. Buddhism therefore is a counter concept. In that respect Buddhism in its early stage became social model with an emphasis on the observance at personal good conduct as an ethical order.

The Intellectual and the intelligentsia hold no similar connotation. The latter is ‘a part at the notion that aspires to independent thinking’. In the case of the Indian thinkers the national intelligentsia literally could not grow as that had been in a Europe since the 16th century down wards. In Europe, the independent thinkers endeavored to develop for innovating a new thought for social experiments along with the intellectual. The Indian scenario might claim a new era of independent reasoning by the 6th century B. C. Two parallel cultural columns, like the Brahmana and the Shramana had been challenging one another.

No reasoning grows without its logical background. The logical background of the Brahmins was sponsored by the Upanishadic dialectics of ‘being’ in opposition to ‘no being’ or ‘non – being’. A Buddhist Shramana however added being, ‘no-being’ and both “being and non-being”. The third dimensional approach to the understanding of the Vedic knowledge by reasoning claimed a new chapter in Indian intellectualism. The *Jaina Shramana* however left a wider scope by entertaining manifold probable to ensure the correctness. Evidently the logical paradigm of the reality becomes challengeable among the intellectuals. The ‘social order’, which was divided in four major castes or groups depending on

professional collective labour was challenged by the *Shramans* strongly. In other word the *varnashram* a dharma four colors and states in respect to the individual advocated by the *Vedists Brahamanas*, claimed superior others themselves, fell flat when the *Shramana* advocates like that Maha vira the Jina and Gautama the Buddha. In other words, the approach to the methodology of pure reasoning bifurcated. The *Brahmanik* (Gotamiya) logic claimed the social order as an existent reality whereas the Buddhist demanded negated that Brahminhood is achieved by pure conduct and good reasoning. Here good reasoning means unbiased for the attainment of merits with no determination of the birthright.

In ancient India there are five major sciences in academic curriculum and logic is one of them. Prince Siddhartha acquainted these major sciences and as well as logic. It may be pointed out that Gautama the Buddha's teaching, which is them now in the *Tripitaka* literature were mainly aimed as how people came out of their sufferings that is the fundamental view point, and hence as his Pali discourses prove. Gautama the Buddha seems to avoid speculative ontological view point as well as spirituality. In fact he had no intention to establish a new kind of conventional thought, then current in the society. No doubt he was a great master and accordingly his goal was quite different from highly development of logical thoughts. Even he did not preach in discussing logical principles and there is hardly any book in Pali *Tripitaka* which may be taken as a logical treatise, in the true sense of the term. But the way of his teaching manly based on the logical conscience. In the *Mahāvagga* and may be in some other texts the seed of the logical treatment may be found as exception. But those cannot be claimed as complete logical text or systematic logical teaching. Actually his teaching enlighten on the basics of *prajna* and *upay* i.e wisdom and method.

Intellectual statuses:

Gautama the Buddha distributed the humankind in three types:

- I) A Person with average intellectual
- II) A person with high intellect to excel others.
- III) The mediocre having less intellectual than the second one and more intellectual than the first one.

In the Vinaya Pitaka written in Pali an analogy is found. A water-place is full of lotuses; some lotuses are blossomed arising out of water. Some are at the water level where as the rest are in the mud in the seed form. The analogy is significant for allowing. Everyone is to be blossomed in due course; it implies that every person hold the body mind. In other words, the seed of the awakement lays in all beings i.e. '*Bodhi Bija*' the text in as following:

The above paragraph suggests that the Gautama the Buddha admitted the excellence of the intellectuals. That might be in consistence with his contempionious society. By the sixth century B.C. the Vedic teachers flourished and claimed they advanced them the others. It had been expressed in two ways in the Vedic literature and in the Buddhist literature. Buddha had come from an affluent society of the *Shakyas* of Uttara Koshala, present day Tarai border in Nepal. According to the tradition an eminent intellectual Asita the sage had visited Shuddhodana's palace and he prophesied that in newborn baby would be a great person in his life. It suggested that high intellectual enterprise had prevailed when Siddhartha was born'

Again Buddha had to face many intellectual contemporaries of his age. Those are Brahmins in the most cases because the intellectuals were known as the Brahmin in his days.

Brahmana the intellectual class:

The word Brahmana in ancient literature has been used in various contexts.

1. A wise man
2. A superior cast born out of the mouth of purusa
3. The great creature.
4. A person who speak truth an observed moral conduct,
5. An identity of the intellectual class as a whole.
6. A brahmana is born with Brahmin parents

In the Buddhist literature however a Brahmin is defined not by birth. In the Dhamma Pada Sutra Buddha defines the brahmans quality. These are following.

- i) He who is free from evils or shine i.e. *vahita papa*
- ii) Efficiency in crossing the ignorance by complaisance and insight i.e. *dvayo-dhamma Paragu.*
- iii) The unfettered; *visama-yuttam.*
- iv) A meditative stainless and settled by attaining the high goal i.e. *jhani-visaja-asina-uttama-atthama-anutpattam.* And so an

The above characteristics show that a Brahmana is wise and meditative person with high moral conduct. Despite that he is different from a Shramanas whose conduct is unchangeable *carsamuiya* (i.e. pure in all respect). That means straight forwardness in conducting the moral life is the primary quality of a brahamana.

Among the contemporary the Buddha like the Kashapa brothers who wanted to kill Buddha by allowing the Buddha in a respect house. The crookedness of the Brahmana mind has been defeated by the Buddha straight forwardness *uju pati panna.* Obviously the Brahmana was appraised in the Buddhist literature. In that respect the *manusmriti* and other Brahmanic cod books had been described by the Buddhist many times because the *Brahmana* by birth claims superiority to others like *Ksatriya, Vaishya* and *shudra*. But the Brahmana claimed that a Brahmana would not tell a lie. In due course the Brahmana loss the purity in practice and serenity in character but the claimed to be superior to be others it was a pity.

Intellectual in Buddhist logic:

Knowledge consists simply in the manifestation (*prakāśa*) of object. All phenomenon's are appeared or revealed to us when they become objects of knowledge. Knowledge is said to be the property of manifestation that belongs to the self. It is regarded as the ground of a living being. A living being behaves differently due to the different objects because he knows them to be in different.

In this connection that knowledge means awareness or apprehension of objects. It includes all cognitions that have a more or less determinate objective reference. Knowledge consists simply in the manifestation

(*prakāśa*) of object. It is said that *artha prakāśa buddhi*¹. All things are made manifest or revealed to us when they became objects of knowledge. Knowledge is property of illumination or manifestation that belongs to the self. Without this illumination of light of knowledge we loss the ground of all rational practice and intelligent activity.²

It is alleged that Buddha did not favor ontology; epistemology and logic form their limitations that may not be true always. T.V. Murti, N. Datt, mentions its reference as the silence of the Buddha. In the first Dharma Cakra Pravartana is based on the primary law of the cause and effect in the series:

The suffering is.

It is caused.

The cause of suffering has a remedy.

A remedy has its ways.

The above logical structure is syllogistic in order. To understand the above, Buddha appeared before five intellectuals who had been colleagues ones. Similarly in the second Dharma Cakra Pravartana the sixteenth orthodox who had been advanced in the reasoning were present. He deliberated the highest wisdom theory of the *prajna-paramia*. Lastly in the third Dharma Cakra Pravartana the Buddha is said to have contributed the subtle *tantra* teaching in which the esoteric model had been laid. None of them remained without their logical efficacy.

The above suggests that Buddha's teaching had developed among intellectuals since his lifetime. Eventually the Buddhist logic developed among the intellectual through the ages. But none of them favor the Brahmanic social order as stated above. A brief list of the eminent Buddhist Logician and their contributions has been shown separately in the appendix. Also a statement of Buddha is belied to be the core of Indian intellectual. The verse states that, do not accept my teachings by faith, but adjudicate them by reasoning, as the purity of gold is examined by rubbing, burning and melting in fire.

Tapat chedacca nikasat suvaramova panditaih I

Pariksyā bhiksava grahyam madvaco na tu gauravad II

(Tattavasamgraha 3588)

In fine, the ancient India had legacy of philosophical rational with the experience of reality. That was however pluralistic with dialectics in many cases. As the result of that logic and epistemology became

¹ . Tarka-kaumudi. Edited by Niranaya Sagar. P-6.

² . miti samyakaparcchittistadṛattā ca pramatṛatāI tadyogavyavaccedah pramāṇyam Gautama mate II Nyāya-kushumāñjali. 4/5.

“Right knowledge is accurate comprehension and right knowledge is the possession thereof; authoritativeness is according to Gautama's school, the being separated from all absence thereof.”

important in order to justify each and every by the orthodox Vedist intellectual and by the non –Buddhist intellectual. Even the Classical Materialist of the ancient India like the Carvaka School could not escape from logic. The science of reasoning therefore became a branch of the learning among the Vedist Ashramics and the non-Vedic Buddhist and Jaina centers of education.

The former deals with the logical methods, which refer to the Upanisadic concept of the existence of the all-immanent Brahaman as the reality and its numerous manifestations in the forms of gods and goddesses. Mimamsaka and Vedanta schools out of the Vedic thoughts applied logic strongly. On the other hand non-Buddhist and the Carvaka intellectual provided logical arguments to justify their respective concept through the ages. The logical analysis thereby became diverse for different views regarding the reality and their respective justifications. In other words no intellectual goes without of logic. It is therefore necessary to examine the logical methodology of the Buddhist in the present paper as the denounce three basic viewpoints of their opponent like the Vedist.

1. The reality here Brahaman is permanent and all immanent.
2. The Vedas are the authority in support of their permanent Brahaman since the Vedas are revelations by the immanent.
3. Four fold social order is created by the great person *purusha* such as, the intellectuals are said to be out of mouth i. e. the brahmana intellectuals are formed the superior most; the *ksatriya* born of arms the warrior groups are comparatively inferior the *vaishya* traders and agriculturist producers from originated from his thigh and lastly the *shudras* born out of his feet from the working of shorts of a manual labour are the inferior most.

Buddhist intellectual who had been either Brahaman by birth or Kshatriya warring groups being Buddhistically reasonable divided the above three points vehemently because the rationale is never dependent to birthright. For instance Gautama Buddha and Mahavira belonged to the warring class. Many other worrying class personalities like.

Also many Buddhist logician inspite of being born in a Brahaman family voluntarily accepted Buddhism and discarded the above three Vedist intellectual understanding with logical procedure. Among them the Buddhist logicians like Nagarjuna, Dignaga, Dharmakirti etc may be recalled. Intellectual understanding is never cordoned by birthright. A verse from the Dhammapada may be cited.

chindu sotaim parakkamma, kāme panuda brāhmana I

sankhāram khayam ñatvā akataññusi brāhmana I

O Brāhman stop the stream of river, having overcome the craving and have to remove the sensual desire. The compounded phenomena have to give up. O Brāhman be a knower of the un compounded phenomena. Brahaman Varga, Verse -1.

Name of the Buddhist logicians and their works:

Dignaga (c.450-520 A.D.)

a. Pramana samuccaya; **b.** Pramana Samuccaya Virtti; **c.** Hetu-cakra-Hamaru; **d.** Nyaya Pravesa; **e.** Alamban Pariksa; **f.** Alamban Pariksa Vrtti; **g.** Trikala-pariksa

2. Paramartha(c. 498-569 A .D)

Translated *Vasubandhu's Tarka-Shastra*

3. Dharmakirti (c.635-650 A.D.)

a. *pramana vartika-Karika*; **b.** *Pramana-Vartika-Vrtti*; **c.** *Nyaya-bindu*; **d.** *Pramana viniscaya*; **e.** *Hetu-bindu-vivarana*; **f.** *Vada-nyaya*; **g.** *Sambandha-pariksa*; **h.** *Sambandha-pariksa-vrtti*;
i. *Santanantara-siddhi*.

4. Devendrabodhi (c.650 A.D.)

Pramana-vartika-panjika,

5. Vinita Deva (c.700 A.D.)

a. *Nyaya-bindu-tika*; **b.** *Hetu-bindu-tika*; **c.** *Vada-nyaya-vyakhya*,

d. *Sambandha-pariksa-tika*; **e.** *Alamban Pariksa-tika*

6. Shanta Raksita (c.749 A.D.)

a. *Vada-naya-vrtti-vipancitartha*; **b.** *Tattva-samgraha-krika*.

7. Kamala Shila (c. 750 A.D.)

a. *Nyaya-bindu-purva-pakse-samksipta*, **b.** *Tattva-samgraha-panjika*.

8. Dharmottaracarya (c. 847 A.D.) **a.** *Nyaya-bindu-tika*; **b.** *Pramana-priksa*; **c.** *Alambana-praksi*; **d.** *Apoha-nama-prakarana*; **e.** *Para-loka-siddhi*, **f.** *Ksana-bhanga-siddhi*

9. Mokshakara Gupta (11th century): *Tarka-Bhasa*

Bibliography:

1. A history of Indian logic: Satish Chandra Vidyabhusana; Motilal Banarasidass Publisher; Delhi; 1997.
2. The Buddhist Philosophy of Universal Flux: Satkari Mukherjee; Motilal Banarasidass Publisher; Delhi; 1993.
3. The Madhyamike Mind: Harsh Narain: (Motilal Banarasidars Publishers, Delhi, 1997.
4. Mulamadhyamakakarika of Nagarjuna: David J Kalupahana: Motilal Banarasidars Publishers, Delhi, 1999.
5. Acharya Shanta Raksheta's Madhyamakalankara: Trns-Nyingma Students Welfare Committee. Sarnath, 1986.
6. Indian Buddhist Pandits: Losany Norbu Tsonawa: Library of Tibetan Works & Asschives, Delhi, 1985.
7. Cousality & its Application samkhya, Bauddha & Nyaya: J.L Shaw Punthi Pustak Calcutta, 2001.

8. Tibetan Sanskrit Dictionary (Vol. 1-12): J.S. Negi. Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Saranath, 2003.
9. Taranathas History of Buddhim in India: Lama Chimpa & Alaka Chatto Padhyaya: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Delhi, 1997.
10. Tibbat (in Bangli): Dr. S.K. Pathak.: G. Pathak. Santiniketan W.B. 1960.
11. An Analytic view of Buddhist Logic: Suniti Kumar Pathat (Nabe chatantika, Calcutta, 2001.
12. Ernest Steinkellner: Jinendra Buddhis Visalamalavati Pramanasamuccaya Tika, Pul – China Tibetology Publishing house: Beinging Vienma, 2005.
13. Mahavagga pali Vinaya Pitaka: Viksu J. Kasyapa; Palli Publication Board, Bihar, 2956.
14. Dhammapada: ChhiMed Rig Dzin Lama, Central Institute of Higher Studies, Sarnath, 1982.
 - a. Early Monastice Buddhism: Nalinaksha Datt, Calcuta Orintal Book Agency, Calcutta, 1960.

