

The Lankvatrastra in early Indian Madhyamaka literature

Autor(en): **Lindtner, Christian**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asien-gesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie**

Band (Jahr): **46 (1992)**

Heft 1: **Études bouddhiques offertes à Jacques May**

PDF erstellt am: **04.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-146957>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern. Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

THE LAṅKĀVATĀRASŪTRA IN EARLY INDIAN MADHYAMAKA LITERATURE

Christian Lindtner, Copenhagen

It seems to be the general opinion among scholars who have dealt with this issue, that the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* (LS) belongs to a period later than that of the early Madhyamaka authors Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva. This opinion is apparently above all based on the observation that the LS contains doctrines about the three *svabhāva*-s, *tathāgatagarbha*, *ālayavijñāna*, *vijñaptimātra*, etc., in other words, ideas that are generally associated with a more recent stage of development of Mahāyāna philosophy, in particular Yogācāra/Vijñānavāda. Moreover, the LS seems to refer to Nāgārjuna (p. 286) and even to passages in Vasubandhu's *Trimśikā* (p. 169).¹

Let me add, before proceeding further, that when I here refer to the LS, I refer to the *textus receptus* in Sanskrit as edited by Bunyiu Nanjio way back in 1923.² P.L. Vaidya's edition from 1963 with its poor *apparatus criticus* is no improvement upon the first edition.³ I am, of course, very well aware that this edition is in no way sufficient for critical purposes, not only because it is replete with wrong or uncertain readings, but also because it often differs considerably from the other (earlier) source materials at our disposal, that is, the three Chinese versions (the earliest still available from 443 A.D.) and the two Tibetan versions (one of them made from the earliest available Chinese), not to speak of the variants

- 1 See, most recently, Jikido Takasaki: "Analysis of the Laṅkāvatāra. In search of its original form.", in: *Indianisme et Bouddhisme. Mélanges offerts à Mgr Étienne Lamotte*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1980, pp. 339-352, and the same author: "Sources of the Laṅkāvatāra and its position in Mahāyāna Buddhism", in: L.A. Hercus et al. (eds.): *Indological and Buddhist Studies. Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*, Canberra, 1982, pp. 545-568.
- 2 Bunyiu Nanjio (ed.): *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, Kyoto 1923 (reprinted Kyoto 1956). — Unfortunately, J. Takasaki (ed.): *A Revised Edition of the Laṅkāvatāra-Sūtra. Ksanika-Parivarta*, Tokyo 1981, was of no use to us since it only covers chapter VI. For this edition Prof. Takasaki uses 17 Sanskrit manuscripts. Many more are available in Nepal as well as in China (Tibet).
- 3 P.L. Vaidya (ed.): *Saddharmalaṅkāvatārasūtram*, Darbhanga 1963. — There has been some uncertainty about the meaning of the title. It probably means: Introduction, or presentation, of Buddhism (*saddharma*) in (the island of) Laṅkā. The *sūtra*, in some early form, may well be associated with the propagation of Vetullavāda in Śrī Laṅkā, cf. Karen Lang (ed.): *Āryadeva's Catuḥśataka*, Copenhagen 1986, pp. 7-9.

found in the old Indian commentaries and in numerous quotations in various Indian *śāstra*-s.⁴

D.T. Suzuki's *Studies in The Laṅkāvatārasūtra* (London 1930), and his *An Index to The Laṅkāvatārasūtra* (Kyōto 1934) are still very helpful contributions. On the other hand his translation (London 1932) often repeats Nanjio's mistakes and adds many new ones, and is thus almost without any philological value at all. One day, when more ancient Sanskrit manuscripts from Nepal and Tibet become available, it will be an interesting task to prepare a reliable critical edition of this important *sūtra*.⁵

What I wish to establish in this paper, is, first of all, that the LS – or rather: an early recension of the LS, an “Ur-LS” – was known to and influenced the writings of Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva. Moreover, I wish to point out in what respect the Ur-LS influenced the early Madhyamaka authors, viz. with regard to 1) their notion of *nirvāna*, 2) their attitude to debate, and 3) their negative attitude to “archaic Yogācāra”.

To show this the text of Nanjio will suffice, though minor textual details still remain uncertain. My main argument will not be affected by the lack of a good critical edition of the LS. If I am justified in maintaining that an early edition (be it oral or written) of the LS was known to and influenced the founding fathers of Madhyamaka in India, rather than vice versa, as hitherto generally assumed, several quite important conclusions can be drawn from this fact. More about this later.

In order to establish my thesis I intend to proceed as follows. First I will point out a number of passages showing *direct connection* between, on the one hand, the LS, and, on the other, some basic early Madhyamaka texts the authenticity of which I shall have to take for granted and

4 The Chinese versions I have consulted in the Taishō edition. For the Tibetan versions I have used the Beijing edition: No. 775 (from the Sanskrit) and No. 776 (from the Chinese). I have also consulted the *Laṅkāvatāravṛtti* (Beijing ed. No. 5519) by Jñānaśrībhadrā (not to be confounded with Jñānaśrīmitra, as some modern authors have done). There is also an Indian commentary by Jñānavajra (Beijing ed. No. 5520). It refers to Jñānaśrībhadrā by name (Pi 19b3). Both commentaries are very late and without any value from our more historical point of view. One may, however, note that Jñānaśrī's commentary contains numerous quotations from Indian grammarians, especially from *Vākyapadīya*. — For further information about the various translations, etc. see Suzuki (1930), pp. 3-37.

5 The laudable efforts of the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (NGMPP) have brought many new manuscripts to light. The lists can be checked in Berlin, Hamburg and Kathmandu. The manuscripts recently discovered in Tibet are not so numerous but may be expected to be of a much better quality.

well-established. Then, since none of the parallels are absolutely identical (with quotations it is otherwise), I shall have to account for these differences. If, in each case, the differences can most convincingly be explained by assuming that Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva base themselves on the LS, and not vice versa (or, third possibility: common source), it is clear, then, that the LS, in some form, was known to these authors.

Close or literal allusions, or even explicit references mentioning the source, i.e. the LS, are to be found in the following early Madhyamaka texts: *Madhyamakakārikā* (MK), *Vigrahavyāvartanī* (VV), *Yuktiśaṣṭikā* (YŚ), *Catuhstava* (CS) III (= *Acintyastava*), *Sūtrasamuccaya* (SS), *Bodhicittavivarana* (BV), *Mahāyānavimśikā*, *Bhavasamkrānti* and *Bhāvanākrama* – all ascribed to Nāgārjuna.⁶ In case of Āryadeva we have the *Catuhśataka* (CŚ) and two minor treatises (Taishō 1639 and Taishō 1640) to which I shall revert later.⁷

Since some scholars and reviewers of my *Nagarjuniana* (Copenhagen 1982) have expressed doubts about the authenticity of BV and SS (and, less important, *Mahāyānavimśikā*, *Bhavasamkrānti* and *Bhāvanākrama* – all, in my opinion, of dubious authenticity), I shall not base my arguments on these controversial sources, but come back to these later. I shall, in other words, confine my attention to a number of cases of close textual connections between the LS and MK, YŚ, VV, CS III and CŚ.

1.

Let us first have a look at MK XVIII.12:

*sambuddhānām anutpāde śrāvakānām punaḥ ksaye /
jñānam pratyekabuddhānām asamsargāt pravartate //*

This is the final verse of MK XVIII, and, like several other concluding verses in MK (e.g. IV. 8-9, V. 8, VII.34, X.16, XI.8, XIII.8 and XVII.33) it is introduced without any direct connection with the preceding arguments, but, like these, contains a clear allusion, or reference, to some authority, i.e. to some *sūtra*. This is an important point to be aware of

6 For further details I may refer to my: *Nagarjuniana. Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nāgārjuna*, Copenhagen 1982 (reprinted New Delhi 1987 and 1990). There is also a somewhat rearranged American edition: *Master of Wisdom*, Oakland 1986. See also my: *Nāgārjunas filosofiske Vaerker*, Copenhagen 1982.

7 Cf. Karen Lang, *op. cit.*, p. 10 with ref.

when reading MK. Unless the *sūtra* referred to is identified it is hard to understand the context properly, and indeed, in this case I believe that the verse has been misunderstood by all commentators, ancient as well as modern. The verse does not mean: “Mais si toutefois les illuminés n’apparaissent pas dans le monde et si les auditeurs ont disparu... Un savoir spontané se produit isolément chez les Bouddha individuels.”⁸ The verse, in fact, refers to an old canonical distinction between various kinds of *jñāna*.⁹ See, for instance, *Dīgha-Nikāya* III, p. 214: *khaye ñāṇam anuppāde ñāṇam*. Notice also how *jñānam* construed with the locative case has escaped the commentators and translators. The internal proof for the correctness of our interpretation is provided by a parallel passage in *Ratnāvalī* IV. 86ab where Nāgārjuna also refers to two kinds of (cognition of) emptiness:

anutpādo mahāyāne pareṣāṃ śūnyatā kṣayah /

The canonical passage that Nāgārjuna has in mind is LS X.488:

*śrāvakānām kṣayajñānam buddhānām janmasambhavam/
pratyekajinaputrānām asamkleśāt pravartate //*

To this verse should be added to the passage LS, p. 99: ...*punar aparam, Mahāmate, śrāvakapratyekabuddhānām nirvāṇam – svasāmānyalakṣaṇāvābodhād asamsargato viṣayāviparyāsadarśanād vikalpo na pravartate...*

No other Buddhist *sūtra* known to me comes so close in form and content to MK XVIII.12 as these two LS passages in the light of which the verse becomes convincingly clear. But not only so. Now we can also, in the light of MK, drop the reading *asamkleśāt* and adopt the variant reading *asamślesāt* (= *asamsargāt*) supported by the Chinese also.

Moreover, the preceding verse, i.e. MK XVIII.11:

8 The translation of J.W. de Jong: *Cinq Chapitres de la Prasannapadā*, Leiden 1949, p. 34; it follows La Vallée Poussin. Basically the same translation is given by all other translators (Streng, Sprung, Inada, Kalupahana, etc.).

9 Cf. e.g. the *Bhāṣya* to *Abhidharmakośa* VI.67ab: *kṣayajñānam anutpādajñānam ca/ pudgalabhedenā tisro bodhaya utpadyante: śrāvakabodhiḥ pratyekabodhir anuttarā samyaksambodhir iti*. — For *kṣayajñāna* versus *anutpādajñāna* see Ryusho Hikata (ed.): *Suvikrāntavikrāmi-pariprechā Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*, Fukuoka 1958, p. 12. — The three kinds of *jñāna* are also known to the Pāli commentators, see e.g. *Sumaṅgala-Vilāsini*, I, p. 100. — For *samsarga* see *Cullaniddesa*, p. 659 and the *Index* to LS, s.v.

*anekārtham anānārtham anucchedam aśāśvatam /
etat tal lokanāthānām buddhānām śāsanāmṛtam //*

which also, obviously, refers to a canonical source, can now also be understood in its proper context. Like MK XXV.3-5 (see below) it refers to the passage found LS, p. 99, q.v.

2.

We now turn to MK XXV.3-5:

*aprahīnam asaṃprāptam anucchinnaṃ aśāśvatam /
aniruddham anutpannam etan nirvāṇam ucyate //
bhāvas tāvan na nirvāṇam jarāmaraṇalakṣaṇam /
prasajyetāsti bhāvo hi na jarāmaraṇam vinā //
bhāvaś ca yadi nirvāṇam nirvāṇam saṃskṛtam bhavet /
nāsaṃskṛto hi vidyate bhāvaḥ kva cana kaś cana //*

An opponent has just objected that Nāgārjuna's doctrine of *śūnyatā* and *nirvāṇa* is problematic. Nāgārjuna then, naturally, calls upon the authority of a *sūtra* to support his standpoint. This is verse 3 and indicated by an *ucyate*, invariably used by him to indicate what an authority (in this case the Buddha) has to say. This is almost a literal reference to LS, p. 99 (same page as above!):... *punar, Mahāmate, mahāparinirvāṇam na nāśo na maraṇam. yadi punar, Mahāmate, mahāparinirvāṇam maraṇam syāt punar api janmaprabandhah syāt. atha vināśah syāt saṃskṛtalakṣaṇapatitam syāt. ata etasmāt kāraṇān, Mahāmate, mahāparinirvāṇam na nāśam (sic!) na maraṇam cyutivigatam maraṇam adhigacchanti yoginah. punar aparam, Mahāmate, mahāparinirvāṇam aprahīnāsaṃprāptito 'nucchedaśāśva <ta> to naikārthato <na> nānārthato nirvāṇam ity ucyate...*

Only two of the terms that define *nirvāṇa* are missing in MK XXV.3 – but they were already given in the reference to LS above, i.e. in MK XVIII.11.

The following verses, i.e. MK XXV.4 ff. provide the *arguments* in support of the statement in the *sūtra*, brief and rather obscure as it is taken in itself. This is exactly what one would expect, the task of the *śāstrakāra*, of course, being to support *āgama* by means of *yukti*.

Just for the sake of argument, assuming that LS took this passage from Nāgārjuna, and not vice versa, we would have to explain 1) what authority Nāgārjuna then is referring to in MK XXV.3, and 2) why LS left out

Nāgārjuna's arguments. I cannot think of any good answer to any of these questions.

3.

MK XXIV.7 runs:

*atra brūmah śūnyatāyām na tvam vetsi prayojanam /
śūnyatām śūnyatārtham ca tata evam vihanyase //*

Again, as above, an opponent has just (verses 1-6) claimed that Nāgārjuna's doctrine of *śūnyatā* is problematic. Again we see Nāgārjuna introducing his reply by calling upon the authority of a *sūtra*, in this case LS II.145:

*sarvabhāvo 'svabhāvo hi sadvacanam tathāpy asat /
śūnyatā <m> śūnyatārtham vā bālo 'paśyan vidhāvati //*

In a somewhat archaic fashion the *sūtra* launches a general statement about "a fool" which Nāgārjuna specifies by making it refer to a second person (-*se*) in a particular situation (*evam*), namely his opponent. LS, like MK, mentions, but does not *explain* the two concepts *śūnyatā* and *śūnyatārtha*, Nāgārjuna, however, *does* explain the terms in the sequel, exactly as a *śāstrakāra* is expected to do. Apparently he also introduces a third concept not mentioned in the LS verse: the *prayojana* of *śūnyatā*. But this is only apparently. The LS says that all things lack *svabhāva*, including this perfectly true and sound statement itself. As we recall, Nāgārjuna expresses exactly the same idea several times elsewhere, above all in VV and in this very chapter, verse 18. This is the celebrated stanza:

*yaḥ praṭīyasamutpādaḥ śūnyatām tām pracakṣmahe /
sā prajñaptir upādāya pratīpat saiva madhyamā //*

This verse, in other words, is an explanation of what Nāgārjuna understands by the *prayojana* of *śūnyatā*. So, once again, it would have been very hard to understand what Nāgārjuna means by the *prayojana* of *śūnyatā* had we not had the LS verse to guide us on the right track supported by many similar passages in Nāgārjuna, cf. e.g. MK XXII.11: *prajñaptiyartham tu kathyate...* with LS II.144: *vyavahāras tu kathyate....* Once again we note that the commentators are on the wrong track having no accurate idea of

what Nāgārjuna refers to with the words about the *prayojana* of *śūnyatā*. Thus Candrakīrti, for instance, refers to MK XVIII.5 – entirely out of context. The term, to be sure, does not occur elsewhere in Nāgārjuna or Āryadeva. We now understand that the expression does not mean “le but de la vacuité”¹⁰ but rather the application of *śūnyatā*, i.e. *prayojana* in the sense of *prayoga*. We find the same usage of the verb *yojyate* in MK XVII.13. In other words: *śūnyatā* is just an *upādāyaprajñapti*, everything is empty, including this very statement. Nāgārjuna’s words are merely “suggestive”.¹¹

4.

MK XVII.33:

*kleśāḥ karmāṇi dehās ca kartāraś ca phalāni ca /
gandharvanagarākārā maṛcīsvapnasamñibhāḥ //*

To this we have a close parallel in LS X.279:

*kleśāḥ karmaṭhā dehaḥ kartāraś ca phalam ca vai /
maṛcīsvapnasamkāśā gandharvanagaropamāḥ //*

I have already pointed out the close connection to LS X.279 in my *Nagarjuniana* and in an extensive review of that work Paul Williams has been good enough to offer some remarks on the relationship here.¹² In

10 This is the version of Jacques May: *Candrakīrti Prasannapadā Madhyamakavṛtti*, Paris 1959, p. 222. Streng’s “the point of emptiness”, Sprung’s “the purpose of devoidness”, and Kalupahana’s “the purpose of emptiness” are not much better, but all are at least consistent with Tib. *dgos (pa)*.

11 For some interesting remarks on “metaphorical designation” see Jacques May in *JIP* VI (1978), pp. 240-241. But otherwise one has to turn to the Pāli commentators. See *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, s.v. *upādāya-paññatti* (II. p. 494). Unfortunately this entry is a small mass of confusion: It leaves out part of the quotation, and gives a wrong definition of the term. We are actually dealing here with a list of various kinds of descriptions (cf. CPD s.v. *avijjamāna-paññatti*, “designation of something unreal” (*sic!*), and s.v. *upanidhā(ya)-paññatti*, “description with or after comparison (opp. *upādāya-p.*)”. The def. we are looking for is this: *evan ti ca me ti ca taṃ taṃ upādāya vattabbato upādāyapaññatti*, i.e. when we say of certain things that they are “thus”, or “mine”, this is not really the case, but merely an “approximative description”, taking something for something that it really is not, an “abstract concept” useful for communication only. Cf. *upacāra* (note 34).

12 In *JIP* XII (1984), pp. 73-104. On BV and LS see pp. 85-95.

his opinion “It is not obvious that here, as in other verses, LS couldn’t have been inspired by Nāgārjuna.”

If we assume, hypothetically, that Paul Williams is right, we immediately face two problems. First of all, this verse, the final one in Chapter XVII, belongs to that group of verses, as mentioned above, that conclude a chapter by referring to some *sūtra* as authority. It contains no argument but reflects the axiomatic authority of tradition, often quite literally. If Paul Williams is right, we shall then have to go searching for another *sūtra* – of which we have, however, no idea. The unknown *sūtra* should then have inspired Nāgārjuna, who again inspired the LS. But why make things unnecessarily complicated by introducing without any good reason a complicated hypothesis when a simple is readily available? Secondly, if we compare the variants in the two verses, it is clear that the LS disturbs the balance by mixing the singular and the plural number. Moreover, it has an unnecessary verse-filling *vai*. If the LS copied Nāgārjuna why would it make changes for the worse? It would, in my opinion, be more reasonable to regard the more polished verse as the more recent one.

5.

We now turn to MK XXI.11:

drśyate sambhavaś caiva vibhavaś caiva te bhavet /
drśyate sambhavaś caiva mohād vibhava eva ca //

This reminds us of LS X.37:

sambhavam vibhavam caiva mohāt paśyanti bālīśāḥ /
na sambhavam na vibhavam prajñāyukto vipaśyati //

Here a well-known Mahāyāna idea is stated in a general and simple style in the LS. In almost the same words it also occurs in MK with two noticeable differences. As above (MK XXIV.7) the “fool” in general has been dropped and turned into the second person so as to fit the situation where Nāgārjuna addresses his opponent directly. Secondly, the syntax has been made somewhat more crisp and complicated by changing the *ordo naturalis*. As I see it, it is more natural to regard the MK as an “improvement” of the LS, than to regard LS as a vague paraphrase of MK. Again, we find the arguments in MK but not in the LS. This would

also have to be explained if we chose to regard the MK as the source of LS and not vice versa.

6.

Let us now turn to YṢ 3:

*/ ji ltar byis pas mam brtags bzin // dños po gal te bden gyur na /
/ de dños med pas mam thar du // gañ gis mi 'dod rgyu ci zig /*

With this we may compare LS III.16:

*na bhāvo vidyate satyaṃ yathā bālair vikalpyate /
abhāvena tu vai mokṣaṃ kathaṃ necchanti tārikāḥ //*

The LS says that fools are forced to consider *mokṣa* as a sort of *abhāva* because they think that its opposite (here, from the context, *samsāra* =) *bhāva* really exists. The following YṢ verses provide *arguments* – *yukti* – to explain *why* the opponents are wrong in their claim. So once again we see the *śāstra* (i.e. YṢ) first referring to the *sūtra* and then supporting its statement by means of arguments not found in the canonical text itself.

7.

YṢ 21:

*/de ltar ci yañ skye ba med// ci yañ 'gag par mi 'gyur ro/
/skye ba dañ ni 'jig pa'i lam//dgos pa'i don du bstan pa'o/*

With this we compare LS X.85 or II.140:

*na hy atropadyate kiṃ cit pratyaṃyair na nirudhyate /
utpadyante nirudhyante pratyaṃyā eva kalpitāḥ //*

Here the *de ltar*, Sanskrit **evam*, is the important word that provides us with the clue. It means, of course, “so”, i.e. it introduces a conclusion after a long line of arguments. We could translate: “This, then, is why the *sūtra* says so and so...” Again the author is commenting upon a *sūtra*, namely the LS, which must, therefore, have been available to him in some form.

8.

We now turn to CS III.44-46:

*hetupratyayasambhūtā paratantrā ca samvṛtiḥ /
paratantra iti proktaḥ paramārthas tv akrtrimah //
svabhāvah prakṛtis tattvaṃ dravyaṃ vastu sad ity api /
nāsti vai kalpito bhāvah paratantras tu vidyate //
asīti kalpīte bhāve samāropas tvayoditah /
nāsīti kṛtakocchedād ucchedaś ca prakāśitah //*

This hymn to a very large extent consists of literal allusions to a large number of *sūtra*-s. The Buddha is hailed as having stated so and so. Several of the quotations can be traced back to their Mahāyāna sources. Some are still not identified, but I gather that this is probably just a question of time. CS III.45cd is identical to LS II.191ab with the only exception that Nāgārjuna writes *tu* for *ca*, which is very nice because he thus makes the intended adversative sense more clear:

*nāsti vai kalpito bhāvah paratantraś ca vidyate /
samāropāpavādam hi vikalpanto (sic!) vinaśyati //*

The rest is obviously an explanation, or a piece of *sūtra*-exegesis. It can all only be seen as CS being based on LS, not vice versa. The importance of these three verses lies in the fact that we here have proof that Nāgārjuna was acquainted with theory of three *svabhāva*-s. We shall come back to this in connection with BV. I need not add that LS II.191 is quoted almost *ad nauseam* in many later sources, always from the LS.

9.

We now turn to the *Vigrahavyāvartanī* and to the main canonical source for Nāgārjuna's peculiar attitude to debate: *nāsti mama pratijñā*. In this connection we also want to keep in mind MK XXIV. 18 and the parallel passages noted above.

As will be recalled, an opponent (a Buddhist opponent) in VV 2 maintains that Nāgārjuna is getting himself into trouble when he says that everything is empty. Either this statement is also empty or it is not empty. Either alternative is problematic. Nāgārjuna runs into what the opponent calls the *ṣaṭkoṭiko vāda*, a sixfold dilemma, which, to judge from the

context, Nāgārjuna would not want to run into. This *ṣaṭkotiko vāda* has puzzled the previous scholars: Tucci, Yamaguchi and Bhattacharya, none of whom was able to offer a solution.¹³

In his reply to the objections Nāgārjuna believes that he solves the problem by launching the famous words: I have no *pratijñā* (VV 23). This remark provides us with the clue we need. The LS (pp. 166-167) has an interesting passage recommending a bodhisattva, i.e. a Mahāyānist, to abstain from making a *pratijñā* to the effect that all things lack *svabhāva*. By doing so he runs into different sorts of logical problems. He should instead simply point out that all things are similar to *māyā* and *svapna*. This is actually what Nāgārjuna does and this passage in the LS in all essential respects corresponds exactly to the passage in VV. In the VV the *ṣaṭkotiko vāda* is introduced by the opponent as being familiar to Nāgārjuna and as something that he would, at the same time, prefer not to be reminded about. Even though the *textus receptus* of the LS in Sanskrit is sometimes a bit obscure and in places corrupt, there can, in my opinion, be no doubt that the VV is not only referring to the LS passage, but at the same time, as we would in fact expect, is making it more coherent and systematic. It is a formalized and rationalized representation of the LS.

If we alternatively, for the sake of argument, assume that the LS depends on the VV we face several problems: What then, we must ask, is the scriptural passage referred to in the VV, if not the LS? How can we explain that the LS passage, compared to that of the VV, is obscure, unsystematic and really quite crude?

In other words, I stick to the opinion that VV is referring to and clarifying the LS. We have already seen this pattern before.

Here are the passages in question, first VV.2:

*kiṃ cānyat/ sarvabhāvāntargatam ca tvadvacanam/ kasmāc śūnyesu sarvabhāvesu
tvadvacanam aśūnyam, yenāśūnyatvāt sarvabhāvasvabhāvaḥ pratiśiddhaḥ / evaṃ
ṣaṭkotiko vādaḥ prasaktaḥ/ sa punaḥ katham iti/ (1) hanta cet punaḥ śūnyāḥ
sarvabhāvās tena tvadvacanam śūnyam sarvabhāvāntargatatvāt/ tena śūnyena
pratiśedhānupapattiḥ/ tatra yaḥ pratiśedhaḥ śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā itī so 'nupapannaḥ/*

13 For the references see *Nagarjuniana*, p. 70. — I quote the Sanskrit from the edition of E.H. Johnston and A. Kunst (adopted by K. Bhattacharya in his: *The Dialectical Method of Nāgārjuna (Virgrahavyāvartanī)*, New Delhi 1978.) — The Tibetan passage on *pratijñā na karaṇīyā* is from the Beijing ed. (No. 775, Ņu 134a1-134b3). It corresponds, with a few exceptions, to LS, pp. 166-167, q.v. — The other Tibetan version is found as No. 776, Ņu 276a7-277a1, and corresponds to Taishō XVI, p. 502a27-502b14, q.v.

(2) *upapannaś cet punaḥ śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti pratīśedhas tena tvadvacanam apy aśūnyam / aśūnyatvād anena pratīśedho 'nupapannaḥ / (3) atha śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvās tvadvacanam cāśūnyam yena pratīśedhaḥ, tena tvadvacanam sarvatrāsamgrhītam/ tatra dr̥ṣṭāntavirodhah/ (4) sarvatra cet punaḥ samgrhītam tvadvacanam sarvabhāvāś ca śūnyās tena tad api śūnyam/ śūnyatvād anena nāsti pratīśedhaḥ / (5) atha śūnyam asti cānena pratīśedhaḥ śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti tena śūnyā api sarvabhāvāḥ kāryakriyāsamarthā bhaveyuh/ na caitad iṣṭam/ (6) atha śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā na ca kāryakriyāsamarthā bhavanti mā bhūḍ dr̥ṣṭāntavirodha iti kṛtvā, śūnyena tvadvacanena sarvabhāvasvabhāvapratiśedho nopapanna iti.*

The Tibetan version of LS, p. 166-167 runs:

gzan yañ blo gros chen po byañ chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen pos chos thams cad ma skyes pa'o zes dam bca' bar mi bya'o//de ci'i phyir ze na/ dam bca' ba yañ dños po thams cad kyi nañ du 'du ba dañ/ de'i rgyus 'jug pa'i mtshan ñid kyi phyir dños po thams cad ma skyes pa'o zes dam bcas te smras na/ blo gros chen po byañ chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po dam bcas pa las ñams par 'gyur ro// dam bcas pa yañ de las ltos te 'byuñ bas na dños po thams cad ma skyes pa'o zes dam gañ bcas pa de'i dam pa de yañ ñams par 'gyur ro// ci ste dam bcas pa de yañ chos thams cad kyi nañ du gtogs pa'i phyir ma skyes pa na dam bcas pa 'añ mtshan ñid tha mi dad de/ ma skyes pa'i phyir chos thams cad ma skyes par smra ba ni rab tu ñams par 'gyur ro// dam bcas pa'i yan lag gi rgyus dam bcas pa yod pa dañ med pa las ma skyes so// blo gros chen po dam bcas pa de 'añ dños po thams cad kyi nañ du gtogs pas yod pa dañ med pa las ma skyes pa'i mtshan ñid do// blo gros chen po gal te dam bcas pa ma skyes pa des dños po thams cad ma skyes pa'o zes dam 'cha' bar byed na/ de lta na yañ dam bcas pa las ñams par 'gyur ro// dam bcas pa yañ yod pa dañ med pa las mi skye ba'i dños po'i mtshan ñid las dam bca' bar mi bya'o// blo gros chen po de dag gi dam bcas pa yañ ma skyes pa'i rañ bzin gyi mtshan ñid yin te/ de lta bas na blo gros chen po ñes pa mañ po'i skyon chags pa'i phyir khyod kyis dam bca' bar mi bya'o// yan lag mams kyañ phan tshun rgyur gyur pa'i mtshan ñid mi 'dra ba dañ/ byas pa'i phyir yan lag mams dam bca' bar mi bya'o//

blo gros chen po 'di lta ste/ chos thams cad ma skyes pa dañ/ de bzin du chos thams cad stoñ pa dañ / ño bo ñid med pa'o zes byañ chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen pos dam bca' bar mi bya mod kyi/ blo gros chen po byañ chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen pos dños po thams cad sgyu ma dañ rmi lam lta bur bstan par bya ste/ gzan du na blo gros chen po byis pa mams yod pa dañ med par lhuñ ba de dag skrag par mi 'gyur ba dañ/ theg pa chen po las riñ du mi 'gyur bar byis pa mams kyi skrag pa'i gnas spañ ba'i phyir snañ ba dañ/ mi snañ ba'i mtshan ñid dañ/ lta ba dañ/ blo slu bar byed pa'i phyir chos thams cad sgyu ma dañ rmi lam lta bur bstan par bya'o//

Some scholars, ancient as well as modern, have attempted to find a great profundity in the Madhyamaka attitude towards debate. This, however, is largely a vain attempt, for as Āryadeva, to whom we shall now turn our attention, phrases it (CS XII.15ab):

vādasya kṛtaśo dharmo nāyam uktas tathāgataih /

10.

CŚ IX.25 is the final verse in a chapter of arguments, and it alludes, which does not surprise us any more, to a *sūtra*:

*varam laukikam evedam paramārtho na sarvathā /
laukike vidyate kim cit paramārthe na vidyate //*

In LS X 120ab and X. 429ab we find what we are looking for:

*sarvaṃ vidyati samvṛtyā paramārthe na vidyate /
bhāvā vidyanti samvṛtyā paramārthe na bhāvakāḥ /*

Āryadeva's allusion is partly literal. Moreover, he writes *laukikam* and *laukike* – very well chosen to cover the *sūtra*'s *bhāvā* as well as *sarvaṃ* (i.e. the five *skandha*-s). Note also the *sūtra*'s rather odd *vidyati/vidyanti* for the more correct *vidyate*. Āryadeva also drops the unelegant *bhāvakāḥ*. A juxtaposition of the variants shows that Āryadeva depends on the *sūtra*, not vice versa.

11.

CŚ IX.20 is even more clear:

*/'chiñ dañ bcinś dañ thabs las gzan//thar pa gal te yod na ni/
/de las ci yañ mi skye ste// des na de thar žes mi brjod/*

The correspondence to LS III.70 was already pointed out by G. Tucci long ago:¹⁴

*bandhyabandhananirmuktā upāyais ca vivarjitāḥ /
tīrthyā mokṣam vikalpenti na ca mokṣo hi vidyate //*

The *sūtra*, which is obviously corruptly transmitted, simply states that certain *tīrthya*-s entertain a wrong notion about *mokṣa*, i.e. about *nirvāṇa*. Āryadeva supplies the reason, the *yukti*, for the bare statement in the *sūtra*. We have already noticed a similar procedure several times above: The *sūtra* gives the statement, the *śāstra* supplies the reason.

14 In his "Un Traité d'Āryadeva sur le "Nirvāṇa" des Hérétiques". It appeared in *T'oung Pao* XXIV (1926), pp. 16-31. Cf. also La Vallée Poussin in *MCB* I (1932), pp. 126-135.

Now, this and the following five verses in CŚ IX, all of them discussing various notions relating to *nirvāna* and *mokṣa*, and all of them having close parallels in LS, bring us directly to another work ascribed to Āryadeva. This is a small treatise explaining various heretical opinions about *nirvāna*. It is only available in Chinese (Taishō 1640), just like another small piece, which refutes various Hīnayāna theses also found in the LS (Taishō 1639). Both were translated by Bodhiruci who, as will be recalled, was also responsible for the Wei version of LS.

When it comes to the authenticity of these two works I agree with Tucci: “Nous n’avons pas de bonnes raisons pour nier l’attribution de ces traités à Āryadeva.”¹⁵ Like so many other passages about *nirvāna* and *mokṣa* in MK, CŚ, they go to show the importance of the Ur-LS as a source of such views in early Madhyamaka.

Professor Takasaki, who shares the wide-spread fear of assigning (any of the parts of) the LS to an early date, thinks, however, that Āryadeva may be the real author of this work, i.e. of Taishō 1640.¹⁶ So far I fully agree, but when Professor Takasaki then suggests that it was written by Āryadeva and then introduced into the LS, without originally belonging there, he seems to be forgetting himself, and we cannot help recalling Nāgārjuna’s remark:

aśvam evābhirūdhah sann aśvam evāsi vismṛtah/

What we have in LS is *not* a text identical to Taishō 1640. The LS – the pattern is familiar to us by now – *only* gives the list of heretical views about *nirvāna* (pp. 182-187). The “explanation” – which clearly refers to the list in LS – is *only* found in the work ascribed to Āryadeva, i.e. in Taishō 1640. It was never introduced into the text of the LS, but, on the contrary, bases itself of the mere list of opinions found in the LS and requiring further explanation.

The same observation applies to the other small work ascribed to Āryadeva (Taishō 1639). A glance at this text shows that it is a refutation of various views briefly mentioned in the LS. As a motto of this text we could quote CŚ XVI. 25:

*sad asat sadasac ceti yasya pakṣo na vidyate /
upālabhaś cirenāpi tasya vaktum na śakyate //*

15 *Loc. cit.*, p. 16. — See also H. Nakamura: *A History of Early Vedānta Philosophy*, New Delhi 1983, pp. 165-180. This is a very valuable (but not always very critical) work.

16 Takasaki 1980, p. 346.

Again, there can be no doubt that Taishō 1639 is also based on LS, not vice versa.

It is now time for me to sum up. A number of passages have been pointed out where Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva seem to depend on LS. Again and again, when comparing the parallels, the *śāstra*-s have been seen to provide clarification and arguments whereas the *sūtra* is brief, laconic and not very clear, though, nevertheless, authoritative.

If, for the sake of argument, we take it the other way around, that is, that LS depends on Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva, we always run into two major puzzles: First we have to find another *sūtra* that says virtually the same as the LS. But to the best of my knowledge no such *sūtra* is to be found. Secondly, we would have to answer the question: What has become of all the explanations and clarifications found in the *śāstra*-s – because no trace of them is found in the LS?

In view of all this I stick to my initial thesis that an Ur-LS was known to the early masters of Madhyamaka. Moreover, this Ur-LS exerted a deep influence upon their views about debate, *nirvāna* and *mokṣa*.

Let me now, as promised at the outset, point out a few interesting facts that follow from these observations.

There is a certain amount of technical terminology in early Madhyamaka that cannot be traced back to ancient canonical usage (though most of it can, let it be noted). Terms such as *prapañca*, *vikalpa*, *cittagocara*, and verbs such as *vibhāvate* and *prasajyate* are important in Nāgārjuna. Their meaning is taken for granted, the reader is expected to know their contextual background. Here I cannot go into details, but I believe that a careful analysis will confirm my opinion that LS (among others, perhaps) is the source of these technical terms. Several otherwise obscure passages in MK, especially XVIII and XXII, can be understood only if we read them in the light of parallel passages in LS.

LS often criticizes an early form of Yogācāra. To some extent Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva must have been aware of such criticism. Parts of Nāgārjuna's BV is written against Yogācāra exactly in the spirit, and in the words, of LS.¹⁷ Here, then, we have some of the initial background of the later controversies between Madhyamaka and Yogācāra. The early, more systematic, Yogācāra works by Maitreya, Asaṅga, Vasubandhu, etc. are aware of these tensions, which is one of the reasons that they do not quote (or only anonymously) the Ur-LS (from the time of Vasubandhu).

17 See *Nagarjuniana*, pp. 192-201 with notes. Also *Excursus 2*.

The *textus receptus* of LS is full of mistakes. Some of these can be corrected with the help of the works of Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva.

There are further observations to be made with regard to the LS (Ur-LS) and early Madhyamaka/Mahāyāna. Some of these I shall deal with in the following *excursus*.

EXCURSUS 1

I have deliberately postponed to discuss, if only quite briefly, the relationship between LS and *Sūtrasamuccaya* (SS) because, as said, some scholars have expressed their hesitation about the authenticity of this anthology of *sūtra*-s. For arguments in support of the traditional attribution I may refer to my *Nagarjuniana* (pp. 172-178) and Bhikkhu Pāsādika's edition and translation of SS.¹⁸

We have seen that most of the passages in MK, CŚ, etc. that refer to LS (or Ur-LS) are concerned with the conception of *nirvāṇa* and *mokṣa*. There are four quotations from LS to be found in SS. All of them (like some of the ones given above) are from LS II. The first of these (p. 125) is LS II.179, and to our pleasant surprise it deals with *nirvāṇa*:

*nāham nirvāmi bhāvena kriyayā lakṣaṇena ca /
vikalpaḥetuvijñāne nirvrte nirvrto hy aham //*

The conception of *nirvāṇa* as the extinction of *vijñāna* understood as the cause of *vikalpa* is found in several places in the works of Nāgārjuna. See especially YŚ 34, RĀ I. 96-98, and MK XVIII. 5 and 7.

The second passage (p. 131) deals with the śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas and their achievement of an *acintyadharmakāya*. To this there are parallels in MK XVIII.12, RĀ II, and **Bodhisambhāraka*, *passim*.¹⁹ The third passage (pp. 171-174) explains that the doctrine of *tathāgatagarbha*

18 Bhikkhu Pāsādika (ed.): *Nāgārjuna's Sūtrasamuccaya: A Critical edition of the mDo kun las btus pa*, København 1989. This fine work includes the Tibetan and Chinese texts, and a concordance. A second volume includes a study and a translation, Copenhagen 1992.

19 For RĀ see M. Hahn (ed.): *Nāgārjuna's Ratnāvalī*, Bonn 1982. This does not include the complete Sanskrit text which was only discovered recently in Tibet (in the library of the Norbulingka). — For the **Bodhisambhāraka*, see my *Nagarjuniana*, pp. 225-248. A few corrections may be found in my Danish version, *Nāgārjunas filosofiske Vaerker*, pp. 247-263.

is not to be confused with the *ātmavāda* of the heretics, it is just a means of attracting them to Buddhism. Similar ideas in MK XVIII.8, RĀ IV.94-6, BV 98-99, etc. The final passage (p. 175) is brief enough to be quoted: *etad dhi, Mahāmate, śūnyatānutpādādvayaniḥsvabhāvalakṣaṇaṃ sarvabuddhānām sarvasūtrāntagaṭam...*

And this, of course, was also the deep personal conviction of Nāgārjuna himself.

The quotations from LS in SS are not just in perfect accordance with our conclusions above, but they actually give further independent support to our opinion that the Ur-LS was one of the basic sources for the Madhyamaka conception of *nirvāṇa* and *mokṣa*.

EXCURSUS 2

In a recent paper,²⁰ where I have the honour of finding some of my opinions criticized, Carmen Dragonetti has tried to show that BV is not the work of Nāgārjuna but a “late work (VIIth - VIIIth centuries).” One of her arguments (“decisive testimony”) is that BV 71:

*/de bzin ñid dañ yañ dag mtha'//mtshan ma med dañ don dam ñid/
/byan chub sems mchog de ñid dañ//ston ñid du yañ bsad pa yin/*

corresponds to Maitreya's *Madhyāntavibhāga* I.14:

*tathatā bhūtakotiś cānimittam paramārthatā /
dharmadhātuś ca paryāyāḥ śūnyatāyāḥ samāsataḥ //*²¹

We find a similar correspondence between BV 28ab:

/kun brtags dañ ni gzan dbaṅ dañ//yoñs su grub pa 'di ñid ni/

20 Entitled “On Śuddhamati's Pratīyasamutpādaḥṛdayakārikā and on Bodhicittavivarāṇa”. It appeared in *WZKS* XXX (1986), pp. 109-122.

21 Among the various available editions I am using Gadjin M. Nagao (ed.): *Madhyāntavibhāga-Bhāṣya*, Tokyo 1964. A few corrections, all obvious, have been made. — Actually BV 71 and MV I.14 are not absolutely identical. The parallel was, in fact, already pointed out by me in a note to my edition of the *Ālokamālā*, see Chr. Lindtner (ed.): *Miscellanea Buddhica*, Copenhagen 1985, p. 125. Compare also S. Kurihara: “Asvabhāva's Commentary on *Ālokamālā*” in *JIBS* XXXVII (1989), pp. 1012-1015. (I am not convinced that Asvabhāva knew Dharmakīrti.)

and *Madhyāntavibhāga* I. 5ab which I shall quote below.

Therefore, Carmen Dragonetti argues, "BV must be located in a late period after Maitreya."

The idea that things may well be the other way around does not seem to strike my learned opponent.

In view of these critical remarks I shall have to discuss briefly the relationship between Nāgārjuna and Maitreya's *Madhyāntavibhāga* (MV). In general one can say that some of the verses in MV can best be understood as a sort of criticism of Nāgārjuna. This is not a new observation. This sort of relationship was taken for granted already by Bhavya in his *Tarkajvālā*, *Prajñāpradīpa*, etc.²² Here Maitreya *et al.* are criticized by Bhavya for thinking that they are smarter (*abhimānin*) than Nāgārjuna. And it was also noticed by Erich Frauwallner who said of MV I: "Dieses Kapitel enthält die Auseinandersetzung Maitreyanāthas mit der Madhyamaka-Lehre."²³

Let us have a look of some of the verses in question to see what is going on between Nāgārjuna and Maitreya (MV I.1-5):

*abhūtaparikalpo 'sti dvayam tatra na vidyate /
śūnyatā vidyate tv atra tasyām api sa vidyate //
na śūnyam nāpi cāśūnyam tasmāt sarvaṃ vidhīyate /
sattvād asattvāt sattvāc ca madhyamā pratipac ca sā //
arthasattvātmavijñaptipratibhāsam prajāyate /
vijñānam nāsti cāsyārthas tadabhāvāt tad apy asat //
abhūtaparikalpatvaṃ siddham asya bhavaty atah /
na tathā sarvathābhāvāt tatksayān muktir isyate //
kalpitaḥ paratantraś ca parinispāna eva ca /
arthād abhūtakalpāc ca dvayābhāvāc ca deśitah //*²⁴

22 See e.g. M.D. Eckel's translation of *Prajñāpradīpa* XXV in *Miscellanea Buddhica*, pp. 25-75. Here and in *Tarkajvālā* V (ed. and transl. in prep. by Eckel and Lindtner) there are several quotations from MV.

23 See E. Frauwallner's excellent: *Die Philosophie des Buddhismus*, Berlin 1969, p. 320. — The close relationship between MK and MV was also noticed by G.M. Nagao in Minoru Kiyota (ed.): *Mahāyāna Buddhist Meditation*, Honolulu 1978, pp. 66-82, and in *JLABS* II (1979), pp. 29-43. — I tend to agree with Nagao that the notion of *abhūtaparikalpa* in MV "stands for" *upādāya-prajñapti* in MK, but it is quite important to remember that even if Nāgārjuna does not, in his authentic works, mention the term *abhūtaparikalpa* it must have been known to him since it occurs in LS and *Vimalakīrtisūtra* with which, as we now know, he was familiar.

24 Using, as said, Nagao's ed. with slight corrections.

It goes without saying that the learned contemporary reader of MV would also have had the verses of MK in mind and thus be quite aware of the target of Maitreya's criticism. Let us recall a few of the verses from MK. First MK XXIV.18:

*yah praṭītyasamutpādaḥ śūnyatām tām pracakṣmahe /
sā prajñaptir upādāya pratipat saiva madhyamā //*

MK XIII.7:

*yady aśūnyam bhavet kim cit syāc chūnyam api kim cana /
na kim cid asty aśūnyam ca kutaḥ śūnyam bhaviṣyati //*

MK XXII.11:

*śūnyam iti na vaktavyam aśūnyam iti vā bhavet /
ubhayam nobhayam ceti prajñaptiyartham tu kathyate //*²⁵

And finally MK XVIII.5:

*karmakleśakṣayān mokṣaḥ karmakleśā vikalpataḥ /
te prapañcāt prapañcas tu śūnyatāyām nirudhyate //*

In other words: Maitreya disagrees with Nāgārjuna's definition of *madhyamā pratipat*, with his opinion of how *mokṣa* comes about, and with his interpretation (*naya*) of the celebrated statement in the *Prajñāpāramitā*: *sarvam idaṃ na śūnyam nāpi cāśūnyam* (quoted, e.g. by Vasubandhu *ad* MV I.2).

Instead Maitreya defends the doctrine of three *svabhāva*-s, a canonical doctrine, of course, by no means Maitreya's own innovation. We have already seen (CS III. 44-46) that Nāgārjuna was perfectly familiar with the doctrine of three *svabhāva*-s, and we have seen how he interprets them in the light of *saṃvṛti* and *paramārtha*, an interpretation which is, naturally, quite unacceptable to Maitreya.

And so it is clear that Maitreya has Nāgārjuna in mind with his allusions. His MV contains clear allusions, almost literal quotations not only from Nāgārjuna's MK, but also from his BV.

25 MK XXII.11 refers to a *Prajñāpāramitā* passage quoted in the *Bhāṣya* (by Vasubandhu?) to MV I.2. Notice *prajñaptiyartham*, an echo of LS X.89d: *vyavahāram tu kathyate*; it comes close to *upādāyaprajñapti*. — Cf. also my remarks in *JIP* XVIII (1990), p. 254.

Another matter that makes Carmen Dragonetti (and other scholars) somewhat hesitant about the authenticity and early date of BV is the fact that it contains “themes and ideas that are characteristic of late periods of the history of ideas in Buddhism, in which was realized the synthesis of the Madhyamaka and Yogācāra schools... among these...the great stress laid in the refutation of the fundamental doctrines of Vijñānavāda (verses 26-56), the interpretation of *cittamātra* as a doctrine of provisional and propedeutic value...”, etc. etc.

This is a good example of how easily one can be misled by one’s preconceived notions. As a matter of fact all these elements are not just “characteristic of late periods of the history of ideas in Buddhism”, but are already present in the most ancient parts of the LS itself. Again and again later sources quote these verses, among others to the same effect, from LS II.137 and III.48:

*pudgalah samtatih skandhāh pratyayā hy anavas tathā /
pradhānam īśvarah kartā cittamātre vikalpyate //
na svabhāvo na vijñaptir na vastu na ca ālayah /
bālair vikalpitā hy ete śvabhūtaih kutarkikaih //*²⁶

The hostile attitude toward (early) Yogācāra/Vijñānavāda in certain parts of the LS could hardly be more unequivocal. So when BV refutes the absolute truth of the three *svabhāva*-s, *ālayavijñāna*, *vijñaptimātra*, etc., but accepts *cittamātra* for “pedagogic” purposes it is by no means innovative but simply bases itself on the authority of a *sūtra*, i.e. the LS. Like Nāgārjuna’s other works his BV is replete with allusions to the LS. At the same time he adds, as we must expect from the *śāstrakāra*, several independent *arguments* to support his *āgama*.²⁷

The conclusion to be drawn from this, then, is this: Just as Nāgārjuna’s (and Āryadeva’s) attitude toward *vāda* – *nāsti mama pratijñā* – and the concept of *nirvāna* were inspired by the LS thus the attitude toward the Śrāvakas and Yogācāras as representing steps on the ladder to Madhyamaka is palpably inspired by LS.

26 Cited repeatedly by Bhavya and Candrakīrti. Here I have used Masamichi Ichigō (ed.): *Madhyamakālamkāra of Śāntaraksita*, Kyoto 1985, p. 126 and p. 176 (with further ref.).

27 Carmen Dragonetti advances a few minor arguments against the authenticity of BV. In reply I can only refer to the notes of my edition. Her major arguments against the authenticity have to do with the MV and the elements of (early) Yogācāra. I now hope to have shown that such arguments rather tend to *support* the traditional attribution.

When we keep this circumstance in mind we can also provide some of the explanation – if any such is needed – why, as some scholars have already observed, the LS “was never regarded as an authority in the early days of Yogācāra”.²⁸ This may well have to do with the disdainful attitude expressed in such verses as LS II.137 and III.48, quoted above.²⁹ Also, we may ask ourselves why the extant commentaries on MK (including Avalokitavrata) never quote BV. Again, this may have to do with the fact that MK (whatever the reason for this may be) never sets out to criticize Yogācāra. The same goes for ŚŚ, YŚ, etc. and Āryadeva’s CŚ. These texts never criticize Yogācāra and their commentators never quote BV.

On the other hand we should not forget that the fact that a certain text of a certain author is not quoted by a certain commentator proves nothing at all about its authenticity.

Even nowadays we often find that what must – to judge from quotations, etc. – have been a very important text, has survived only in quotations, in fragments, in one or two Sanskrit manuscripts – or not at all, apart from *nāmamātram*.

EXCURSUS 3

Among the numerous canonical Mahāyāna scriptures that influenced Nāgārjuna we also find the *Bhavasamkrāntisūtra*. The textual transmission of this small and interesting text is extremely confused and complicated but need not detain us here.³⁰

Some of the verses that interest us here are still available in Sanskrit, others only in Tibetan (and Chinese).³¹

28 Takasaki 1982, p. 560.

29 Likewise, in the *Samdhinirmocana* and in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* we find Nāgārjuna and his ilk criticized for not understanding *śūnyatā* properly. This is only what one would expect in the light of LS II.137 and III.48, etc.

30 There are several editions and translations, see, most recently, Fernando Tola and Carmen Dragonetti: “Āryabhavasamkrāntināmamahāyānasūtra: The Noble Sūtra on the Passage through Existences”, in *Buddhist Studies Review* III (1986), pp. 3-18. As known, the *sūtra* has verses in common with other texts such as LS, *Ghanavyūha*, *Pratyutpannabuddhasammukhāvasthita-samādhisūtra*, etc. More materials will be found in a small text ascribed to Nāgārjuna in the Tibetan canon under the corrupt title *Bhāvasamcāra*. There are also numerous citations to be found in later *śāstra*-s.

31 Using the ed. of N.A. Sastri, Madras 1938 (which see for the variants).

*yena yena hi nāmnā vai yo yo dharmo 'bhilapyate /
na sa samvidyate tatra dharmānām sā hi dharmatā //*
*/'di dag thams cad miñ tsam ste//du śes tsam la rab tu gnas/
/brjod par byed las tha dad pa'i//brjod par bya ba yod ma yin/
/yañ dag min pa'i chos 'di dag//mam par rtog pas kun nas bslar/
/garñ gis ston pa śes brtags pa'i//rtog pa de yañ 'di ston no/*

The idea that all *dharmā*-s are mere names, or concepts (*nāmamātra*), and those names, too, are empty, is a theme we often meet in Nāgārjuna, and there can be no doubt that he is inspired by this *sūtra*. Most clear is CS III. 35-36 addressed to the Buddha:

*nāmamātram jagat sarvaṃ ity uccair bhāṣitam tvayā /
abhidhānāt pṛthagbhūtam abhidheyam na vidyate //*
*kalpanāmātram ity asmāt sarvadharmāḥ prakāśitāḥ /
kalpanāpy asaṅgā proktā yayā śūnyam vikalpyate //*³²

But there are other, more distant echoes of the *Bhavasamkrāntisūtra* in the works of Nāgārjuna. In *Ratnāvalī* I.99, for instance, the doctrine of *nāmamātra* is applied to the six *dhātu*-s:

*rūpasyābhāvamātratvād ākāśam nāmamātrakam /
bhūtair vinā kuto rūpam nāmamātrakam apy atah //*

In MK XVIII.7 and ŚS 2 we also find some interesting terminological echoes of the *Bhavasamkrāntisūtra*:

*nivṛttam abhidhātavyam nivṛttaś cittagocarah /
anutpannāniruddhā hi nirvānam iva dharmatā //*³³

/brjod par bya ba'i chos mams kun//mya nian 'das mtshuis ran bzin ston/

32 *Nagarjuniana*, p. 152. — The term *nāmamātra* is found in several other texts before Nāgārjuna, usually in connection with *vyavahāramātra*, *nāmadheyamātra*, *samketamātra*, *samvṛtimātra*, and *prajñaptimātra*. The *Bhavasamkrānti* is more advanced in its “nominalism”

33 In a we should read *nivṛttaś cittagocarah* (not *nivṛtte cittagocare* as read by La Vallée Poussin, J.W. de Jong, D. Seyfort-Ruegg, *et al.*). This is not only the reading of our best manuscript (“R”), but also supported by Bhavya and Avalokitavrata who introduce the sentence by *garñ gi phyir (yasmāt)* which must presuppose a nominative, not a locative. Actually the verse should be read in connection with the foregoing: Even though the Buddhas etc... *still*, [when] *abhidhātavyam* is *niruddham* (— which has been shown by *āgama* and *yukti*) [then] *cittagocarah* is (also) *nivṛttah*, for (*hi*) [as the *āgama* says...].

In the light of these parallels it seems fair to assume that MK III also is inspired by the *Bhavasamkrāntisūtra*, from which Candrakīrti gives us these two verses in Sanskrit in his *Prasannapadā* (p. 120):

*na caksuh prekṣate rūpaṃ mano dharmān na veti ca/
etat tu paramaṃ satyaṃ yatra loko na gāhate //
sāmagryā darśanam yatra prakāśayati nāyakah /
prāhopacārabhūmim tām paramārthasya buddhimān //*

The first of these two stanzas is also quoted by Bhavya in his *Prajñāpradīpa* ad MK III.9. Avalokitavrata, *ad loc.*, gives the source as *Bhavasamkrāntisūtra*, to be sure.

Let me finally note that Jacques May translates the two last *pāda*-s as follows: “il s’exprime au niveau métaphorique, lui qui a l’intelligence de la réalité absolue.”³⁴ I would prefer to construe the syntax with the Tibetan translation of the *sūtra* as follows:

/blo dan ldan pas don dam gyi//ñe bar brtags pa'i sa de gsuis/

In other words: *buddhimān* does not govern *paramārthasya*. The Buddha has stated that *paramārtha* is the *bhūmi* of *upacāra*.

EXCURSUS 4

The *Bhāvanākrama* (BK) consists of 56 verses, and is, in a sense, only available in a Tibetan translation. The colophon ascribes the text to Nāgārjuna. Each verse, however, has its more or less exact parallel in the final chapter of LS. It is impossible to say whether BK is an extract from (some recension of) LS X, or whether it draws from the same source as LS X.

A juxtaposition (given below) of the Sanskrit of LS and the Tibetan of BK enables us to make numerous emendations in both texts. I have, however, decided to refrain from doing so until more is known of the transmission of the LS and more affiliated materials have become available.

34 Thus Jacques May 1959, p. 86. Good ref. to *upacāra*, *ibid.*, n. 168. Again, an expression that comes close to *upādāyaprajñapti*!

BV is definitely not written by Nāgārjuna, partly because the speaker (see verses 7, 24, 38, 39, 41, 48, 50) is the Buddha, partly because of the numerous metrical and linguistic irregularities for which we cannot hold Nāgārjuna responsible. On the other hand it cannot be excluded that either Nāgārjuna (cf. SS, a compilation) or one of his students may have *compiled* this work from some canonical source (“Ur-LS”) now only known to us from LS X.

The purpose of this compilation is clearly to show how one, i.e. how a Mahāyānist, can use the canonical doctrine of *cittamātra* (already in the *Daśabhūmikasūtra*, etc.) as a means of meditation in order personally to realize emptiness, or *nirābhāsa* (see verses 54-56).

There are numerous parallels to BK in other early Madhyamaka works. Here are some of the most interesting: BK 1-2 cf. RĀ I. 52-55, II.12, and CŚ XIV.25 (for *vijñāna* as *bīja*). – BK 3-4 cf. CS III.36. – BK 11 cf. MK XXI.11 (discussed above). – BK 20 cf. YṢ 21 (above). – BK 26 cf. RĀ I.24. – BK 35 cf. MK XVIII.7 and XXVI.12. – BK 49 cf. CS III.23.

The value of BK is obvious. First of all it shows, again, the importance of LS in early Madhyamaka literature. Moreover, it is indispensable as a help towards understanding the history of the transmission of LS X. Finally, being in fact a *bhāvanākrama* manual, the very existence of BK proves that already in the early days of Madhyamaka *cittamātra* was used as a means of meditation (as opposed to those who took it as a doctrine of ontology). In other words, this idea, so familiar to us from the works of Bhavya, Jñānagarbha, Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla, etc., has its roots far back in time.

For establishing the Tibetan text I have compared the editions from Derge (No. 3908) and Beijing (No. 5304). I have omitted the introductory lists, in prose, giving the names of the ten *bhūmi*-s (corresponding to the *Daśabhūmika* list). As in most such cases the variants are few and trivial: 7c yis P : yin D. – 11c rigs P : rig D. – 12a rigs D : rig P. – 15c ñes D : ños P. – 19a kyi P : kyis D. – 19c sems dañ sems byuñ P : sems byuñ sems dañ D. – 25d du yañ D : du'añ P. – 26e rnam par rtog pa rnam rtog pa ad. D. – 29a rgyud : rgyu DP. – 32a na P : ni D. – 51a 'brel pa'i : 'phel ba'i DP. – 53b yis P : yin D. – 53d rtogs P : rtog D. – 54b brtag P : rtag D. – 56d brtags P : brtag D.

In the Sanskrit text, which tries to follow Nanjio through thick and thin, [] indicates *delenda*, < > *addenda*.

Bhāvanākrama

1. mṛgaṭṛṣṇā yathā grīṣme spandate cittamohanī /
mṛgā gr̥hṇanti pānīyaṃ vastuṃ tasya na vidyate // (~ X.7)
/ ji ltar so ga'i smig rgyu ni//gyo la 'khrul pa'i śes pa yis /
/ ri dags chu ru 'dzin pa gañ// dños de yod pa ma yin no /
2. evaṃ vijñānabījo 'yaṃ spandate dr̥ṣṭigocare /
bālā gr̥hṇanti jāyantam timiraṃ taimirā yathā // (~ X.8)
/ de bzin rnam śes sa bon gañ//gyo ba mthoñ ba'i spyod yul la /
/ rab rib mun pa gañ yin pas//byis pa yi ni 'dzin pa 'byuñ /
3. dhyātā dhyānaṃ ca dhyeyaṃ ca prahāṇaṃ satyadarśanam /
kalpanāmātram evedaṃ yo budhyate sa mucyati // (~ X.9)
/ gtoñ dañ btañ dañ de bzin sbyin//spañs dañ bden par lta ba rnam /
/ 'di dag rtog pa tsam ñid du// śes pas rnal 'byor pa de grol /
4. asārakā ime dharmā manyanāyāḥ samutthitāḥ /
sāpy atra manyanā śūnyā yayā śūnyeti manyate // (~ X.10)
/ sñiñ po med pa'i chos 'di ni//rtog pa las ni ma lus byuñ /
/ gañ rtog de yañ stoñ pa ñid// de ltar stoñ ñid grol ba yin /
5. yathā kṣīṇe mahaty oghe taraṅgānām asaṃbhavaḥ /
tathā vijñānavaicitryaṃ niruddhaṃ na pravartate // (~ X.26)
/ ji ltar mtsho chen stoñs pa la// rlabz ni 'byuñ ba yod ma yin /
/ de bzin sna tshogs rnam śes ni// dños med pa la 'jug pa med /
6. śūnyāś ca niḥsvabhāvāś ca māyopamā ajātakāḥ /
śadasanto na vidyante bhāvāḥ svapnopamā ime // (~ X.27)
/ stoñ žiñ dños po ma grub pas//sgyu ma'i dños po skye ba med /
/ de bzin yod pa ma yin te// dños po rmi lam lta bu yin /
7. svabhāvam ekaṃ deśemi <tarkavijñaptivarjitaṃ> /
āryānaṃ gocaraṃ divyaṃ svabhāvadvayavarjitaṃ // (~ X.28)
/ rañ gi ño bo gcig mthoñ ba// + + + + + /
/ 'phags pa'i spyod yul mthoñ ba yis//gñis kyī dños po spoñ 'gyur te/
8. na grāhako na ca grāhyaṃ na bandhyo na ca bandhanam /
māyāmarīcisadr̥śaṃ svapnākhyāṃ timiraṃ yathā // (~ X.31)
/ 'dzin pa med ciñ gzuñ ba med//bcinś pa med ciñ 'chiñ ba med /
/ sgyu ma smig rgyu 'dra ba ste//rmi lam brjod pa rab rib bzin /
9. yadā paśyati tattvārthī nirvikalpo nirañjanaḥ /
tadā yogaṃ samāpanno drakṣyate māṃ na saṃśayaḥ // (~ X.32)
/ gañ tshe de ñid don mthoñ ba//de tshe rnal 'byor mñam gzag pas /
/ mi rtog brjod pa yod ma yin//rañ gi mthoñ ba the tshom med /
10. na hy atra kā cid vijñaptir nabhe yadvan marīcayāḥ /
evaṃ dharmān vijānanto na kiṃ cit pratijānati // (~ X.33)
/ nam mkha'i chos ni 'ba' žig bzin//gañ la rnam rig cuñ zad med /
/ de bzin chos 'di rnam śes pa//cuñ zad śes pa yod ma yin /

11. sambhavaṃ vibhavaṃ caiva mohāt paśyanti bālīśāḥ /
na sambhavaṃ na vibhavaṃ prajñāyukto vipaśyati // (~ X.37)
/ 'byuñ ba dañ ni gnas pa ñid// byis pa rmoñs pa rnam la snañ /
/ śes rab rigs pas lta ba la//skye ba dañ ni gnas pa med /
12. akaniṣṭhabhavana (!) divye sarvapāpavivarjite /
nirvikalpāḥ sadā yuktāś cittacittavivarjitāḥ // (~ X.38)
/ rtag tu mi rtog rigs pa yis// sems dañ sems byuñ rnam spañs nas /
/ bdag ñid lta ru śin tu gnas//sdig pa thams cad rnam par spañs /
13. balābhijñāvaśiprāptāḥ tat samādhigatiṃ gatāḥ /
tatra budhyanti sambuddhā nirmitas tv iha budhyate // (~ X.39)
/ de ltar mkhyen pa rdzogs sañs rgyas//di dag sprul par thugs su chud /
/ mñon śes stobs la dbaṅ thob nas//des ni 'gro ba mñam par mkhyen /
14. ādimadhyāntanirmuktaṃ bhāvābhāvavivarjitam /
vyāpinam acalam śuddham acitraṃ citrasambhavam // (~ X.41)
/ dañ po dbus dañ mtha' las 'grol// dños dañ dños med rnam par spañs /
/ mñam pa ñid kyi go 'phañ brñes//dños po med las sna tshogs byuñ /
15. cittaṃ pratyayasambaddhaṃ pravartati śārīriṇām /
pratyayebhyo vinirmuktaṃ na paśyāmi vadāmy aham // (~ X.52)
/ sems kyi rkyen de dañ 'brel bas//lus rnam 'jug par 'gyur ba yin /
/ rkyen rnam las ni ñes 'byuñ ba//bdag ni yod par mi smra'o //
16. nimnonnataṃ yathā citre dṛśyate na ca vidyate /
tathā bhāveṣu bhāvatvaṃ dṛśyate na ca vidyate // (~ X.61)
/ ji ltar ri mo'i mtho dman ni// snañ yañ yod pa ma yin no /
/ de ltar dños rnam ño bo ñid// mthoñ ba yod pa ma yin no /
17. gandharvanagaram yadvad yathā ca mṛgatṛṣṇikā /
dṛśyaṃ khyāti tathā nityaṃ prajñayā ca na vidyate // (~ X.62)
/ ji ltar dri za'i groñ khyer dañ// ri dags chu ru 'dzin pa bzin /
/ rtag tu snañ zin dmigs pa ni// śes rab kyis ni yod ma yin /
18. māyopamasamādhim ca kāyaṃ manomayaṃ punaḥ /
abhijñā vaśitā tasya balā cittasya citritā // (~ X.68)
/ bris pas bris dañ 'dri ba yi//mñon śes la dbaṅ de dag gi /
/ sgyu ma lta bu'i tiñ 'dzin gyi//bras bu'añ sgyu ma lta bu yin /
19. evaṃ hi dūṣitā bālās cittacittair anādikaiḥ /
māyāmarīciprabhavaṃ bhāvaṃ gṛhṇanti tattvataḥ // (~ X.82)
/ smig rgyu sgyu ma'i stobs kyi ni//dños med de ñid 'dzin pa na /
/ sems dañ sems byuñ bdag med pas// 'di ltar byis pa rnam ni skrag /
20. na hy atropadyate kiṃ cit pratyayair na nirudhyate /
utpadyante nirudhyante pratyayā eva kalpitāḥ // (~ X.85)
/ gañ na cuñ zad skye med la// 'gal ba'i rkyen ni yod ma yin /
/ skye ba dañ ni 'gag pa la// rkyen ni rtog pa gcig pu yin /
21. prajñaptimātraṃ tribhavaṃ nāsti vastusvabhāvataḥ /
prajñaptivastubhāvena kalpayiṣyanti tārīkikāḥ // (~ X.86)

- / rnam rig tsam du 'byuñ ba rnams//dños po'i rañ bzin yod ma yin /
/ rtog par 'gyur ba'i rtog ge pa//brtags pa tsam du bsgom pa na /
22. na svabhāvo na vijñaptir na vastu na ca ālayaḥ /
bālair vikalpitā hy ete vaśabhūtaiḥ kutārkikaiḥ // (~ X.91)
/ rañ bzin med ciñ rnam rig med//dños po med ciñ kun gzi med /
/ 'di dag byis pas rab tu brtags//rtog ge ñan pas kun tu bskyed /
23. sarvarūpāvabhāsaṃ hi yadā cittam pravartate /
nātra cittam na rūpāni bhrāntam cittam anādikam // (~ X.93)
/ 'dir ni sems med gzugs yod min//'khrul pa'i sems las lhag par med /
/ 'byuñ ba kun la gnas nas ni//gañ tshe sems ni rab 'jug pa /
24. tadā yogī hy anābhāsaṃ prajñayā paśyate jagat /
nimittam vastuvijñaptir manovispanditam ca yat /
atikramya tu putrā me nirvikalpās caranti te // (~ X.94)
/ de tshe mi gnas rnal 'byor pas//'gro la rig pas lta ba na /
/ mtshan ma dños po rnam rig dañ//yid kyis gyo ba yod ma yin /
/ [bdag med dbaṅ po gañ yin dañ]// rnam par rtog pas 'jig par byed /
25. indriyāni ca māyākhyā viśayāḥ svapnaśamñibhāḥ /
kartā karmakriyā caiva sarvathāpi na vidyate // (~ X.113)
/ <bdag med dbaṅ po gañ yin dañ> // yul rnams rmi lam lta bur gnas /
/ las dañ 'bras bu bya ba ñid// thams cad du yañ dmigs ma yin /
26. dhyānāni cāpramānāni ārūpyās ca samādhayaḥ /
sañjñānirodho nikhilās cittamātreṇa vidyate // (~ X.114)
/ bsam gtan rnams dañ tshad med dañ//gzugs med sñoms par 'jug pa dañ /
/ 'du śes 'gog pa ma lus pa//sams ñid tsam du gnas pa yin /
27. vikalpenāvikalpena śūnyatātattvadarśanam /
āryo na paśyate bhrāntim nāpi tattvam tadantare // (~ X.125 cd. + 127ab)
/ rnam par rtog pas kun brtags pa// yañ dag lta la stoñ pa ñid /
/ 'phags pas 'khrul pa ma gzigs śiñ//de ñid de las gzan pa'añ min /
28. na bhūmayo na satyāni na kṣetrā na ca nirmitāḥ /
buddhāḥ pratyekabuddhās ca śrāvakās cāpi kalpitāḥ // (~ X.132)
/ sa rnams med ciñ bden pa med//ziñ dañ sprul sku yod ma yin /
/ rañ sañs rgyas dañ sañs rgyas dañ//ñan thos kyañ ni brtags pa yin /
29. pudgalasaṃtatiskandhāḥ pratyaḥ hy aṇavas tathā /
pradhānam īśvaraḥ kartā cittamātre vikalpyate // (~ X.133)
/ gañ zag rgyud dañ phuñ po dañ// rkyen rnams gnas pa ma yin no /
/ gtso bo dbaṅ phyug byed po rnams//sams tsam la ni rnam par brtags /
30. abhāvāt sarvadharmāṇaṃ saṃkleśo nāsti śuddhi ca /
na [ca] te tathā yathā drṣṭā na ca te vai na santi ca // (~ X.137)
/ chos kun ño bo yod ma yin//kun nas ñon moñs med ciñ grol /
/ ji ltar snañ ba de ltar med//med pa ma yin yod pa min /
31. anutpannā hy amī dharmā na caivaita na santi ca /
gandharvanagarasvapnamāyānirmāṇasādrśāḥ // (~ X.144)

- / skye ba med pa'i chos 'di ni//yod dañ med pa ma yin no /
/ dri za'i groñ khyer rmi lam dañ//sgyu ma sprul pa lta bur gnas /
32. buddhyā vivecyamānānām svabhāvo nāvadharyate /
yasmāt tad anabhilāpyās [te] niḥsvabhāvās ca deśitāḥ // (~ X.167!)
/ gañ žig sañs rgyas lta bar na// rañ bžin gyis ni nus ma yin /
/ de lta bas na thob pa med//rañ bžin med par lta bar bya /
33. <aniruddhā hy anutpannāḥ prakṛtyā gaganopamāḥ> /
abhāvasvabhāvā ye tu te vikalpatalakṣaṇāḥ // (~ X.172)
/ + + + + + // + + + + + /
/ gañ žig rañ bžin rañ bžin med// de ni brtags pa'i mtshan űid yin /
34. vācittagocaram mithyā satyaṃ prajñā vikalpitā /
dvayāntapātitaṃ cittaṃ tasmāt prajñā na kalpitā // (~ X.175)
/ tshig dañ sems kyi spyod yul brdzun//brdzun pa'i šes pas rnam brtags pa'i /
/ mtha' gñis su ni sems lhuñ bas//de phyir mi rtog šes rab kyis /
35. asti nāsti ca dvāv antau yāvac cittasya gocaraḥ /
gocarena vidhūtena samyak cittaṃ nirudhyate // (~ X.176)
/ yod dañ med pa'i mtha' gñis pa// gañ žig sems kyi spyod yul ba /
/ spyod yul rnam par bsal nas ni//yañ dag sems ni ldog par 'gyur /
36. viśayagrahaṇābhāvān nirodhena ca nāsti ca /
vidyate tathatāvasthā āryānām gocaro yathā // (~ X.177)
/ gzuñ dañ 'dzin pa dños med pas//gag pa med pa ma yin no /
/ ji ltar gnas pa'i dños po ni// de ltar 'phags pa'i spyod yul yin /
37. bālānām na tathā khyāti yathā khyāti manīṣiṇām /
manīṣiṇām tathā khyāti sarvadharmā alakṣaṇāḥ // (~ X.178)
/ ji ltar byis la mi snañ ba// de ltar mkhas la snañ ba yin /
/ ji ltar snañ ba de ltar ni// sañs rgyas chos rnam mtshan űid med /
38. abhūtvā yasya cotpādo bhūtvā cāpi vinaśyati /
pratyaair sadasac cāpi na te me śāsane sthitāḥ // (~ X.180)
/ gañ žig ma skyes mi skye la// skyes pa yañ ni ma yin no /
/ rkyen gyis yod dañ med pa yañ//de rnam de ltar mi gnas so /
39. na me yānaṃ mahāyānaṃ na ghoṣo na ca akṣarāḥ /
na satyā na vimokṣā vai na nirābhāsagocaram // (~ X.188)
/ theg chen žes bya'i theg pa ni//sgra min yi ge ma yin te /
/ bden pa med ciñ nes grol med// snañ ba med pa'i spyod yul min /
40. ajātaśūnyatā caikam ekaṃ jāteṣu śūnyatā /
ajātaśūnyatā śreṣṭhā naśyate jātaśūnyatā // (~ X.191)
/ ma skyes pa yi stoñ űid gcig//gcig ni skyes pa stoñ pa ste /
/ ma skyes pa yi stoñ űid mchog//skyes pa'i stoñ pa 'jig pa yin /
41. tathatā śūnyatā koṭī nirvānaṃ dharmadhātuvaṭ /
kāyo manomayaṃ cittaṃ paryāair deśitaṃ mayā // (~ X.192)
/ de bžin űid stoñ yañ dag mtha'//mya nan 'das dañ chos kyi dbyiñs /
/ lus sems dper ni sgyu ma űid//sgyu ma'i grañs su bstan pa yin /

42. yasya notpadyate kiṃ cin na kiṃ cit tan nirudhyate /
tasyāsti nāsti nopaiti viviktaṃ paśyato jagat // (~ X.196)
/ gañ žig cuñ zad skye med la// cuñ zad 'gag pa yod min la /
/ de yi yod med mtshuñs pas na//'gro ba rnams kyis dben par mthoñ /
43. nirābhāso hi bhāvānām abhāvo nāsti yoginām /
bhāvābhāvasamatvena āryānām jāyate phalam // (~ X.207)
/'di na dños rnams mi dmigs pas//dños med spañs pa'i rnal 'byor pa /
/dños dañ dños med mñam pa ñid// 'bras bu 'phags pa'i spyod yul yin /
44. maḍīyaṃ drśyate cittam bāhyam artham na vidyate /
evaṃ vibhāvayed bhrāntim tathatām cāpy anusmaret // (~ X.218)
/ gañ gis bdag gi sems mthoñ na//phyi yi don ni yod ma yin /
/ de ltar dños la ma 'khrul na//de bžin ñid kyañ rjes su dmigs /
45. yadā cittam manaś cāpi vijñānam na pravartate /
tadā manomayaṃ kāyaṃ labhate buddhabhūmi ca // (~ X.226)
/ gañ tshe yid dañ sems dañ ni// rnam par šes pa'añ mi 'jug la /
/ de tshe sems 'di' 'bras bu ni// sañs rgyas kyi ni sa yañ 'thob /
46. pratyaḃ dhātavaḥ skandhā dharmānām ca svalakṣaṇam /
prajñaptim pudgalaṃ cittam svapnakeśoṇḍukopamāḥ // (~ X.227)
/ rkyen gyi tshig dañ phuñ po dañ//rnam par rig pa gañ zag sems /
/ chos rnams 'di dag mtshan ñid ni//rmi lam skra šad lta bu yin /
47. saṃsārabījaṃ vijñānam sati drśye pravartate /
kuḍye sati yathā citraṃ pariñānān nirudhyate // (~ X.233!)
/ sna tshogs šes pas 'khor bar gnas//de las gnas pa 'byuñ ba yin /
/ rtsig pa yod par ri mo bžin//sna tshogs šes pas gnas pa yin /
48. yathā na bhāvo nābhāvo gaganam kathyate mayā /
ālayam hi tathā kāye bhāvābhāvavivarjitam // (~ X.238)
/ ji ltar dños med med dños med// nam mkha'i rañ bžin bžin du brjod /
/ de bžin kun gži'i 'bras bu gañ//dños dañ dños med rnam spañs te /
49. trisamtativyavacchinnaṃ sattāsattāvivarjitam /
cātuṣkotikayā muktaṃ bhavaṃ māyopamaṃ sadā // (~ X.240)
/ rgyud gsum rnam par bcad nas ni// sems kyi rgyud ni rnam par spañs /
/ lus ni mtha' bži dag las grol// dños po rtag tu sgyu ma bžin /
50. triyānam ekayānam ca ayānam ca vadāmy aham /
bālānām mandabuddhīnām āryānām ca viviktatām // (~ X.245)
/ theg gcig la ni theg gsum du// 'phags rnams gsuñ ba bdag cag ni /
/ byis pa blo dman rnams la yin// 'phags pa rnams la de ñid stoñ /
51. pratyaḃ air janitam lokam vikalpaiś ca vivarjitam /
māyādisvapnasadrśam vipaśyato vimucyate // (~ X.251)
/ rnam par rtog pa ñid 'brel pa'i// rkyen las skyes pa'i 'jig rten ni /
/ sgyu ma la sogs rmi lam 'drar//gañ gis rab mthoñ rnam par grol /
52. cittasya dharmatā śuddhā na cittam bhrāntisaṃbhavam /
bhrāntiś ca dauṣṭhulyamayī tena cittam na drśyate // (~ X.253)

- / sems kyi gñis med dag pa yis//sams ni 'khrul par 'gyur ma yin /
 / 'khrul pa'i rañ bzin ñid stoñ pas//des ná sems ni mthoñ ma yin /
53. lakṣyalakṣaṇanirmuktaṃ yadā paśyati saṃskṛtaṃ /
 vidhūtaṃ hi bhavet tena svacittaṃ paśyato jagat // (~ X.255)
 / mtshan ñid mtshan gzi ldan par ni//gañ tshe 'dus byas mthoñ ba yis /
 / gañ gis 'khor ba mnam bsal nas//'gro ba rañ gi sems su rtogs /
54. cittaṃmātraṃ samāruhya bāhyam arthaṃ na kalpayet /
 tathatālabane sthitvā cittaṃmātraṃ atikramet // (~ X.256)
 / sems tsam la ni brten nas su//phyi rol don ni mi brtag go /
 / de bzin ñid dmigs gnas nas ni//sams tsam las ni 'da' bar bya /
55. cittaṃmātraṃ atikramya nirābhāsam atikramet/
 nirābhāsthito yogī mahāyānaṃ sa paśyati // (~ X.257)
 / sems tsam las ni 'das nas su//snañ ba med las 'da' bar bya /
 / snañ med gnas pa'i mnal 'byor pa//de yis theg pa chen po mthoñ /
56. tadā prajñāyate śuddhaḥ svabhāvaḥ pāramārthikaḥ/
 atyantam cāpy anīṣannaṃ kalpitaṃ na parodbhavam // (~ X.308cd
 / de ltar śes rab dag pa yis// rañ gi ño bo don dam 'di / +308ab)
 / śin tu yañ ni grub pa na// brtags pa'i gzan dños 'byuñ ma yin /

EXCURSUS 5

Vasubandhu's *Trimśikā* (T) is an odd, and, in a sense, very complicated text; scarcely a single word in T is his own, each single item can be traced back to some canonical source (*Yogācārabhūmi*, etc.). And yet this work has always been considered one of the most original and influential of all Yogācāra texts. Its importance is to be found in the original and closely reasoned way in which Vasubandhu (already a great authority when he wrote T) organizes initially heterogeneous materials into one fairly coherent system where everything can be explained on the basic assumption of *vijñānaparināma*, or *vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*.

Several scholars have already pointed out that T 20 (*yena yena vikalpena...*) and 28 (*yadā tv ālambanam...*) have close and striking parallels in LS p. 163 (*yena yena vikalpena...*) and p. 169 (*yadā tv ālambanam...*). How, then, are we to account for these similarities?³⁵

In the opinion of Professor Takasaki: "We may then assume, or at least the possibility cannot be denied, that Vasubandhu's *Trimśikā* is the

35 See Takasaki 1982, p. 553, for the full quotation.

very source of these passages in the *Laṅkāvatāra*.” And this means, of course, that “the date of Vasubandhu must again be called into question.” Other scholars have expressed similar opinions.

In my view, however, LS (or rather: “Ur-LS”) is one of the sources of Vasubandhu’s T.

In order to justify this opinion we shall first have a closer look at one of Vasubandhu’s other works, the very important and very much neglected *Vyākhyāyukti*.³⁶ There is, to be sure, no good reason to deny the authenticity of this work, nor am I aware that anyone has attempted to do so. As far as terminology, style, quotations etc. is concerned VY has a lot in common with the other works of Vasubandhu, i.e. *Abhidharmakośa*, *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa*, *Pañcaskandhaka*, *Vimśatikā*, etc. The main argument, however, is provided by the fact that *Karmasiddhi* (§ 37) mentions *Vyākhyāyukti* by name.³⁷

The numerous references in VY to authorities such as *Prajñāpāramitā*, *Kāśyapaparivarta*, *Bhavasamkrāntisūtra*, *Tathāgataguhyā*, etc. make it abundantly clear that the author is a Mahāyānist. Assuming that VY (partly because it is quoted in the *Karmasiddhi*) is one of Vasubandhu’s earlier works, these quotations also serve to undermine the widespread assumption of Vasubandhu’s “personal development” from that of a Hīnayānist to that of a Mahāyānist. The author of the *Kośa*, *Karmasiddhi*, etc. is rather a “crypto-Mahāyānist”.³⁸

Here, however, we shall have to confine our attention to some citations from two Mahāyāna sources.³⁹ The first of these is the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* corresponding to the two initial verses in VII.24:

/ chos mams ño bo ñid med chos mams ma skyes dañ /
 / chos mams ma 'gags chos mams gzod nas źi ba dañ /
 / chos mams thams cad rañ bźin mya ñan 'das par ni /
 / dgoñs pa med par mkhas pa su źig smra bar byed /

36 I am using the Derge edition (No. 4061, Śi 123b6-124a4). I here wish to thank Mr. Hartmut Bűscher for providing me with a copy of the latter. Only some of the verses seem to have been noticed by previous scholars.

37 The *Karmasiddhi* was first edited and translated by Étienne Lamotte in *MCB IV* (1936), pp. 151-288. See also S. Anacker, *Seven Works of Vasubandhu*, New Delhi 1984, pp. 83-156. The edition of Lamotte is not quite satisfactory. — In the sequel I am also using Étienne Lamotte’s edition and translation of SN: *Samdhinirmocanasūtra*, Louvain/Paris 1935.

38 As was already pointed out by the author of the *Abhidharmadīpa* (ed. P.S. Jaini, Patna 1959). Cf. also P.S. Jaini in *BSOAS XXI* (1958), pp. 48-53.

39 See ref. in note 37. A few emendations have been made in Lamotte’s text.

/ mtshan ñid no bo ñid med skye ba no bo med /
 / don dam no bo ñid med do zes ñas bsad de /
 / mkhas pa gañ zig dgoñs pas 'di dag ses pa ni /
 / rab tu ñams par 'gyur ba'i lam du de mi 'gro /

The second source quoted by Vasubandhu immediately after these verses is anonymous (*gžan las*). It comprises 9 stanzas all of which are to be found in LS:

- (1) *na hy ātmā vidyate skandhe skandhās caiva hi nātmani /
 na te yathā vikalpyante na ca te vai na santi ca // (X.135)*
 / phuñ po dag la bdag med do // phuñ po dag ni bdag ma yin /
 / de dag brtags pa bžin du med // de dag med pa'añ ma yin no /
- (2) *astitvam sarvabhāvānām yathā bālair vikalpyate /
 yadi te bhaved (!) yathādrstāḥ sarve syus tattvadarśinah // (X.136)*
 / ji ltar byis pas brtags pa bžin // dños po thams cad yod pa ste /
 / ji ltar mthoñ bžin de yin na // thams cad yañ dag mthoñ bar 'gyur /
- (3) *abhāvāt sarvadhārmānām samkleśo nāsti śuddhi ca /
 na ca te tathā yathādrstā (!) na ca te vai na santi ca // (X.137)*
 / dños po thams cad med pa'i phyir // kun nas non moñs dag pa med /
 / ji ltar mthoñ bžin de med do // de dag med pa'añ ma yin no /

— and it goes on (*yañ gsuñs pa*):

- (4) *parikalpitaṃ svabhāvena (!) sarvadharmā ajānakāḥ /
 paratantraṃ samāśrītya vikalpo bhramate nṛnām // (X.150)*
 / kun tu brtags pa'i rañ bžin gyis // chos mams thams cad ma skyes pa /
 / gžan gyi dbaṅ la gnas nas ni // mi yi mam rtog khyams pa yin /
- (5) *paratantraṃ yathā śuddham vikalpena visamyutam /
 parāvṛttam hi tathatā viharah kalpavarjitah // (X.151)*
 / nam zig gžan gyi dbaṅ dag ste // mam par rtog dañ bral na ni /
 / śin tu gyur pa de bžin ñid // rtog pa spañs par gnas pa'o /
- (6) *ma vikalpaṃ vikalpetha vikalpo nāsti satyataḥ /
 bhrāntim vikalpayantasya (!) grāhyagrāhakayoṛ na tu // (X.152 !)*
 / mam brtags bden par yod min gyis // mam par rtog pas ma rtog śig /
 / gzuñ dañ 'dzin pa'i mtshan ñid du // nor par de dag mam rtog na /
- (7) *bāhyārthadarśanam kalpaṃ svabhāvah parikalpitaḥ /
 yena kalpena kalpenti svabhāvah pratyayodbhavaḥ // (X.153 !)*
 / phyi rol don mthoñ brtags na ni // kun tu brtags pa'i rañ bžin no /
 / rtog pa gañ gis rtog byed pa // rkyen las skyes pa'i rañ bžin no /
- (8) *bāhyārthadarśanam mithyā nāsty artham cittam eva tu /
 yuktyā vipaśyamānānām grāhagrāhyam nirudhyate // (X. 154 !)*

/ *phyi rol don mthoñ log pa ste*// don med sems ni 'ba' žig go /
/ *rigs pas mam par gžigs na ni*// gzuñ ba dañ ni 'dzin pa 'gag /

(9) *bāhyo na vidyate hy artho yathā bālair vikalpyate /*
vāsanair luditam cittam arthābhāsam pravartate // (X. 155)

/ *ji ltar byis pas brtags pa ltar*//*phyi rol gyi ni don med do /*
/ *bag chags kyis ni dkrug pa'i sems*//*don du snañ ba śin tu 'byuñ /*

The conclusion to be drawn from this is, I imagine, very clear. Vasubandhu knew not only SN but also the verses we now find in LS. And there are clear traces in his T also. Thus T 23-25:

trividhasya svabhāvasya trividhām niḥsvabhāvatām /
samdhāya sarvadharmānām deśitā niḥsvabhāvatā //
prathamo laksanenaiva niḥsvabhāvo 'parah punah /
na svayambhāva etasyety aparā niḥsvabhāvatā //
dharmānām paramārthaś ca sa yatas tathatāpi sa/
sarvakālam tathābhāvāt saiva vijñaptimātratā //

are clearly based on SN VII.24, quoted above. The main source for *vijñaptimātra(tā)* is SN VIII.7, *q.v.* And just as SN is Vasubandhu's main canonical source for the three kinds of *niḥsvabhāvatā* thus it is reasonable to look upon LS as his main source for T 20-22ab:

yena yena vikalpena yad yad vastu vikalpyate /
parikalpita evāsau svabhāvo na sa vidyate //
paratantrasvabhāvas tu vikalpah pratyayodbhavaḥ /
niḥspannas tasya pūrvena sadā rahitatā tu yā //
ata eva sa naivānyo nānanyah paratantrataḥ /

On this background I do not hesitate to assume that T 20 is based on the (almost metrical) passage found LS, p. 163, and that T 28 likewise is based on the passage found LS, p. 169.

Once Vasubandhu's dependency in T on SN and LS is thus established, we are entitled to proceed even further.

The final verse of T runs:

sa evānasravo dhātur acintyah kuśalo dhruvaḥ /
sukho vimuktikāyo 'sau dharmākhyo 'yam mahāmuneḥ //

There can hardly be any doubt that this is based on verse 5 in SN VII.24 (from which paragraph, as we have seen, two verses were quoted in VY):

/ *gañ grol de dag mams kyi zag pa med pa'i dbyiñs /*
/ *phra žiñ bsam gyis mi khyab mñam žiñ bye brag med /*

*/ thams cad don grub sdug bsñal ñon moñs spañs pa ste /
/ gñis su brjod pa ma yin bde (!) žiñ brtan pa yin /*

When we finally turn to LS, this *sūtra* has not just provided Vasubandhu with an authority for the doctrine of three *svabhāva*-s and a mode of meditation but also with the key concept in his T, viz. *vijñānaparināma*. T 1 and 15 run:

*ātmadharmopacāro hi vividho yaḥ pravartate /
vijñānaparināme 'sau parināmah sa ca tridhā //
pañcānām mūlavijñāne yathāpratyayam udbhavaḥ /
vijñānānām saha na vā taraṅgānām yathā jale //*

These verses in T were inspired by, among others,⁴⁰ such passages as LS X. 414; X.26; II.103 and II.105:

*ātmendriyopacāram hi tricitte deśayāmy aham /
cittam manaś ca vijñānam svalakṣanavisamyutā (!) //
yathā ksīne mahaty oghe taraṅgānām asambhavaḥ /
tathā vijñānavaicitryam niruddham na pravartate //*

*udadheḥ parināmo 'sau taraṅgānām vicitratā /
ālayam hi tathā citram (!) vijñānākhyam pravartate //
udadheś ca taraṅgānām yathā nāsti viśeṣanam /
vijñānānām tathā citte parināmo na labhyate //*

These observations permit us to read T with a greater degree of understanding than has hitherto been the case. In T we see Vasubandhu at work not just as a great systematizer but also as an orthodox and shrewd Mahāyānist. To Vasubandhu LS was almost as great an authority as it was to Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva, but in an entirely different way.

EXCURSUS 6

Along with the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* the *Ghanavyūhasūtra* is one of the most important canonical sources for Yogācāra, and a critical edition of this (in its present form probably fairly late) text is a great desideratum.

40 See, in particular, LS, p. 46.

Here, without delving deeper into the matter, I merely wish to point out a few samples showing that the *sūtra* to some extent is closely related to other Mahāyāna texts, *sūtra*-s as well as *śāstra*-s. To determine the exact nature and extent of these similarities is a task for future research. Here are a few verses chosen more or less at random:⁴¹

- / gañ dañ gañ gi miñ mams kyis//chos mams gañ dañ gañ brjod pa /
/ de ni de na yod pa min// kun tu brtags pa'i rañ bzin no / (1)
- / 'di dag thams cad miñ tsam ste//'gro ba 'di ni miñ tsam mo /
/ brjod pa dañ ni tha dad pa// brjod pa bya ba gañ yañ med / (2)
- / ji ltar khab loñ mthoñ ba dañ// lcags ni myur bar kun tu 'khor /
/ 'on kyañ de la sems pa med// sems ldan bzin du'añ rab tu snañ / (3)
- / de bzin kun gzi mam ses kyañ//sems med sems can ji bzin du /
/ 'gro dañ 'oñ bar gyo ba ste// sa mams 'bri bar rab tu byed / (4)
- / ji ltar rgya mtsho dza ru ni//srog med par yañ gyo mgul te /
/ de bzin kun gzi mam ses pa//lus la gnas śiñ gyo bar gyur / (5)

The first two verses are also found e.g. *Bhavasamkrāntisūtra* 1-2:

*sarvam etan nāmamātram samjñāmātre pratisthitam /
abhidhānāt prthagbhūtam abhidheyam na vidyate //*
*yena yena hi nāmnā vai yo yo dharmo 'bhilapyate /
nāsau samvidyate tatra dharmānām sā hi dharmatā //*⁴²

The three final verses correspond to BV 33-35:

/ ji ltar khab len dañ ñe bas// lcags ni myur du yoñs su 'khor /
/ de la sems ni yod min te// sems dañ ldan bzin snañ bar 'gyur /
/ de bzin kun gzi mam ses ni// bden min bden pa bzin du ni /
/ gañ tshe 'gro 'oñ gyo bar 'gyur//de tshe srid pa 'dzin par byed /
/ ji ltar rgya mtsho dañ ni śiñ// sems ni med kyañ gyo bar 'gyur /
/ de bzin kun gzi mam ses ni// lus brten nas ni gyo ba yin /

Compare also LS X.14.

*

41 I am using the Beijing edition of the *Ghanavyūha* (No. 778). The citations are found Cu 47a3-4, and Cu 49b7-50a2 (among many others about *ālayavijñāna*).

42 Ref. given in note 30. Again, there are several interesting variants, all obvious.

Acknowledgment. Earlier versions of this paper were read at the University of Virginia, Harvard University, University of California, Berkeley, and Université de Lausanne.

It is with a true feeling of *samtoṣa* that I finally see it published in a *Festschrift* for Jacques May whose *Candrakīrti Prasannapadā Madhyamakavṛtti*, Paris 1959, still stands out as a model of clarity and precision in the field of Madhyamaka studies.