Zeitschrift: Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft =

Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft

Band: 46 (1992)

Heft: 1: Études bouddhiques offertes à Jacques May

Artikel: The Lankvatrastra in early Indian Madhyamaka literature

Autor: Lindtner, Christian

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-146957

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 20.11.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

THE LANKĀVATĀRASŪTRA 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 Lankāvatārasūtra (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, ālayavijnāna, vijnāptimātra, etc., in other words, ideas that are generally associated with a more recent stage of development of Mahāyāna philosophy, in particular Yogācāra/Vijnānavāda. Moreover, the LS seems to refer to Nāgārjuna (p. 286) and even to passages in Vasubandhu's Trimśikā (p. 169).

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 Lankavatara. 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 Lankavatara and its position in Mahayāna 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 Lankāvatāra Sūtra, Kyoto 1923 (reprinted Kyoto 1956). Unfortunately, J. Takasaki (ed.): A Revised Edition of the Lankāvatāra-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.): Saddharmalańkāvatārasūtram, 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) Lańkā. The sūtra, in some early form, may well be associated with the propagation of Vetullavāda in Śrī Lańkā, cf. Karen Lang (ed.): Āryadeva's Catuhśataka, 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 Lankāvatārasūtra (London 1930), and his An Index to The Lankāvatārasūtra (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 nirvāṇa, 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

- 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 Lankāvatāravrtti (Beijing ed. No. 5519) by Jñānaśrībhadra (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 Jñānaśrībhadra 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.
- 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), Yuktisastikā (YS), Catuhstava (CS) III (= Acintyastava), Sūtrasamuccaya (SS), Bodhicittavivarana (BV), Mahāyānavimsikā, Bhavasamkrānti and Bhāvanākrama — all ascribed to Nāgārjuna. In case of Āryadeva we have the Catuhsataka (CS) and two minor treatises (Taishō 1639 and Taishō 1640) to which I shall revert later.

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, YS, VV, CS III and CŚ.

1.

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

sambuddhānām anutpāde śrāvakānām punah 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." The verse, in fact, refers to an old canonical distinction between various kinds of jnāna. See, for instance, Dīgha-Nikāya III, p. 214: khaye nānam anuppāde nānam. Notice also how jnānam 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 paresām śūnyatā ksayah /

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

śrāvakānām ksayajñānam buddhānām janmasambhavam/ pratyekajinaputrānām asamklešāt pravanate //

To this verse should be added to the passage LS, p. 99:...punar aparam, Mahāmate, śrāvakapratyekabuddhānām nirvānam — svasāmānyalaksanāvabodhād asamsargato visayāviparyāsadarśanād 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 Bhāsya to Abhidharmakośa VI.67ab: ksayajñānam anutpādajñānam ca/pudgalabhedena tisro bodhaya utpadyante: śrāvakabodhih pratyekabodhir anuttarā samyaksambodhir iti. — For ksayajñāna versus anutpādajñāna see Ryusho Hikata (ed.): Suvikrāntavikrāmi-pariprcchā Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra, Fukuoka 1958, p. 12. — The three kinds of jñāna are also known to the Pāli commentators, see e.g. Sumangala-Vilāsinī, I. p. 100. — For samsarga see Cullaniddesa, p. 659 and the Index to LS, s.v.

```
anekārtham anānārtham anucchedam aśāśvatam / etat tal lokanāthānām buddhānām śāsanāmrtam //
```

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 asamprāptam anucchinnam aśāśvatam / aniruddham anutpannam etan nirvānam ucyate // bhāvas tāvan na nirvānam jarāmaranalaksanam / prasajyetāsti bhāvo hi na jarāmaranam vinā // bhāvaś ca yadi nirvānam nirvānam samskrtam bhavet / nāsamskrto hi vidyate bhāvah kva cana kaś cana //

An opponent has just objected that Nāgārjuna's doctrine of śūnyatā and nirvāna 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, mahāparinirvānam na nāśo na maranam. yadi punar, Mahāmate, mahāparinirvānam maranam syāt punar api janmaprabandhah syāt. atha vināśah syāt samskrtalakṣanapatitam syāt. ata etasmāt kāranān, Mahāmate, mahāparinirvānam na nāśam (sic!) na maranam cyutivigatam maranam adhigacchanti yoginah. punar aparam, Mahāmate, mahāparinirvānam aprahīnāsamprāptito 'nucchedaśāśva < ta > to naikārthato < na > nānārthato nirvānam 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> sūnyatārtham vā bālo 'pasyan 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:

```
yah pratītyasamutpādah śūnyatām tām pracaksmahe / 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: prajñaptyartham 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" 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 upādāyaprajūapti, everything is empty, including this very statement. Nāgārjuna's words are merely "suggestive". 11

4.

MK XVII.33:

kleśāh karmāṇi dehāś ca kartāraś ca phalāni ca / gandharvanagarākārā marīcisvapnasamnibhāh //

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

kleśāh karmapathā dehah kartāraś ca phalam ca vai / marīcisvapnasamkāśā gandharvanagaropamāh //

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

- This is the version of Jacques May: Candrakīrti Prasannapadā Madhyamakavrtti, 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).
- 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-pañāatti (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-pañāatti, "designation of something irreal" (sic!), and s.v. upanidhā(ya)-pañāatti, "description with or after comparison (opp. upādāya-p.)". The def. we are looking for is this: evan ti ca me ti ca tam tam upādāya vattabbato upādāyapañāatti, 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 bāliśāh / 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 YS 3:

```
/ ji ltar byis pas mam brtags bźin // dnos po gal te bden gyur na / de dnos med pas mam thar du // gan gis mi 'dod rgyu ci źig /
```

With this we may compare LS III.16:

```
na bhāvo vidyate satyam yathā bālair vikalpyate / abhāvena tu vai moksam katham necchanti tārkikāh //
```

The LS says that fools are forced to consider moksa as a sort of $abh\bar{a}va$ because they think that its opposite (here, from the context, $sams\bar{a}ra = bh\bar{a}va$ really exists. The following YS verses provide arguments - yukti - to explain why the opponents are wrong in their claim. So once again we see the $s\bar{a}stra$ (i.e. YS) first referring to the $s\bar{u}tra$ and then supporting its statement by means of arguments not found in the canonical text itself.

7.

YŞ 21:

```
/de ltar ci yan skye ba med// ci yan 'gag par mi 'gyur ro/
/skye ba dan 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 atrotpadyate kim cit pratyayair na nirudhyate / utpadyante nirudhyante pratyayā eva kalpitāh //
```

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 samvrtih /
paratantra iti proktah paramārthas tv akrtrimah //
svabhāvah prakrtis tattvam dravyam vastu sad ity api /
nāsti vai kalpito bhāvah paratantras tu vidyate //
astīti kalpite bhāve samāropas tvayoditah /
nāstīti krtakocchedād ucchedas ca prakāsitah //
```

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 paratantras ca vidyate / samāropāpavādam hi vikalpanto (sic!) vinasyati //
```

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 pratijīnā*. 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 satkotiko vāda, a sixfold dilemma, which, to judge from the

context, Nāgārjuna would not want to run into. This satkotiko 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 Nagarjuna believes that he solves the problem by launching the famous words: I have no pratijnā (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 satkotiko 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:

kim cānyat/ sarvabhāvāntargatam ca tvadvacanam/ kasmāc sūnyesu sarvabhāvesu tvadvacanam asūnyam, yenāsunyatvāt sarvabhāvasvabhāvah pratisiddhah / evam satkotiko vādah prasaktah/ sa punah katham iti/ (1) hanta cet punah sūnyāh sarvabhāvās tena tvadvacanam sūnyam sarvabhāvāntargatatvāt/ tena sūnyena pratisedhānupapattih/ tatra yah pratisedhah sūnyāh sarvabhāvā iti so 'nupapannah/

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 pratijnā na karanīyā is from the Beijing ed. (No. 775, Nu 134a1-134b3). It corresponds, with a few exceptions, to LS, pp. 166-167, q.v. — The other Tibetan version is found as No. 776, Nu 276a7-277a1, and corresponds to Taishō XVI, p. 502a27-502b14, q.v.

(2) upapannas cet punah sūnyāh sarvabhāvā iti pratisedhas tena tvadvacanam apy asūnyam / asūnyatvād anena pratisedho 'nupapannah / (3) atha sūnyāh sarvabhāvās tvadvacanam cāsūnyam yena pratisedhah, tena tvadvacanam sarvatrāsamgrhītam/tatra drstāntavirodhah/ (4) sarvatra cet punah samgrhītam tvadvacanam sarvabhāvās ca sūnyās tena tad api sūnyam/sūnyatvād anena nāsti pratisedhah / (5) atha sūnyam asti cānena pratisedhah sūnyāh sarvabhāvā iti tena sūnyā api sarvabhāvāh kāryakriyāsamarthā bhaveyuh/ na caitad istam/ (6) atha sūnyāh sarvabhāvā na ca kāryakriyāsamarthā bhavanti mā bhūd drstāntavirodha iti krtvā, sūnyena tvadvacanena sarvabhāvasvabhāvapratisedho nopapanna iti.

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

gźan yań blo gros chen po byań 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 yan dnos po thams cad kyi nan du 'du ba dan / de'i rgyus 'jug pa'i mtshan nid kyi phyir dnos po thams cad ma skyes pa'o zes dam bcas te smras na/blo gros chen po byan chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po dam bcas pa las ñams par 'gyur ro// dam bcas pa yañ de las ltos te 'byun bas na dnos po thams cad ma skyes pa'o zes dam gan bcas pa de'i dam pa de yan ñams par 'gyur ro// ci ste dam bcas pa de yan chos thams cad kyi nan du gtogs pa'i phyir ma skyes pa na dam bcas pa 'an 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 dan med pa las ma skyes so// blo gros chen po dam bcas pa de 'an dnos po thams cad kyi nan du gtogs pas yod pa dan 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 źes dam 'cha' bar byed na/ de ltar na yan dam bcas pa las ñams par 'gyur ro// dam bcas pa yan yod pa dan med pa las mi skye ba'i dnos po'i mtshan nid las dam bca' bar mi bya'o// blo gros chen po de dag gi dam bcas pa yan ma skyes pa'i ran bźin gyi mtshan nid yin te/ de lta bas na blo gros chen po nes pa man po'i skyon chags pa'i phyir khyod kyis dam bca' bar mi bya'o// yan lag mams kyan phan tshun rgyur gyur pa'i mtshan ñid mi 'dra ba dan/ 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 dan' de bźin du chos thams cad ston pa dan' no bo nid med pa'o źes byan chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen pos dam bca' bar mi bya mod kyi/ blo gros chen po byan chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen pos dnos po thams cad sgyu ma dan mi lam lta bur bstan par bya ste/ gźan du na blo gros chen po byis pa mams yod pa dan med par lhun ba de dag skrag par mi 'gyur ba dan' theg pa chen po las rin du mi 'gyur bar byis pa mams kyi skrag pa'i gnas span ba'i phyir snan ba dan' mi snan ba'i mtshan nid dan' lta ba dan' blo slu bar byed pa'i phyir chos thams cad sgyu ma dan mi 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 (CŚ XII.15ab):

vādasya krtašo 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:

```
sarvam vidyati samvrtyā paramārthe na vidyate /
bhāvā vidyanti samvrtyā paramārthe na bhāvakāh /
```

Āryadeva's allusion is partly literal. Moreover, he writes laukikam and laukike — very well chosen to cover the sūtra's bhāvā as well as sarvam (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 bhāvakāh. A juxtaposition of the variants shows that Āryadeva depends on the sūtra, not vice versa.

11.

CŚ IX.20 is even more clear:

```
/'chin dan beins dan thabs las gźan//thar pa gal te yod na ni/
/de las ci yan mi skye ste// des na de thar źes mi brjod/
```

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

```
bandhyabandhananirmuktā upāyais ca vivarjitāh / tīrthyā moksam vikalpenti na ca mokso hi vidyate //
```

The sūtra, which is obviously corruptly transmitted, simply states that certain fīrthya-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.

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." Like so many other passages about *nirvāṇa* 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 vismrtah/

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 pakso na vidyate / upālambhaś 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 moksa.

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).

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 laksanena ca / vikalpahetuvijnāne nirvne nirvno 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 YṢ 34, RĀ I. 96-98, and MK XVIII. 5 and 7.

The second passage (p. 131) deals with the śrāvakas and pratyeka-buddhas 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 sarvasūtrāntagatam...

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 *nirvāna* and *moksa*.

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 bźin ñid dan yan dag mtha'//mtshan ma med dan don dam ñid/ /byan chub sems mchog de ñid dan//ston ñid du yan bsad pa yin/

corresponds to Maitreya's Madhyāntavibhāga I.14:

tathatā bhūtakotiś cānimittam paramārthatā / dharmadhātuś ca paryāyāh śūnyatāyāh samāsatah // ²¹

We find a similar correspondence between BV 28ab:

/kun brtags dan ni gźan dban dan//yons su grub pa 'di ñid ni/

- 20 Entitled "On Śuddhamati's Pratītyasamutpādahrdayakārikā and on Bodhicittavivaraņa". It appeared in WZKS XXX (1986), pp. 109-122.
- 21 Among the various available editions I am using Gadjin M. Nagao (ed.): Madhyāntavibhāga-Bhāsya, 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."

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 sarvam vidhīyate /
sattvād asattvāt sattvāc ca madhyamā pratipac ca sā //
arthasattvātmavijňaptipratibhāsam prajāyate /
vijňānam nāsti cāsyārthas tadabhāvāt tad apy asat //
abhūtaparikalpatvam siddham asya bhavaty atah /
na tathā sarvathābhāvāt tatksayān muktir isyate //
kalpitah paratantras ca parinispanna eva ca /
arthād abhūtakalpāc ca dvayābhāvāc ca desitah // <sup>24</sup>
```

- 22 See e.g. M.D. Eckel's translation of *Prajāpradīpa 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.
- 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 JIABS II (1979), pp. 29-43. I tend to agree with Nagao that the notion of abhūtaparikalpa in MV "stands for" upādāya-prajāapti 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 Vimalakārtisūtra 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 pratityasamutpādah sūnyatām tām pracaksmahe / sā prajāaptir upādāya pratipat saiva madhyamā //
```

MK XIII.7:

yady asūnyam bhavet kim cit syāc chūnyam api kim cana / na kim cid asty asūnyam ca kutah sūnyam bhavisyati //

MK XXII.11:

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

And finally MK XVIII.5:

karmakleśaksayān moksah karmakleśā vikalpatah / te prapañcāt prapañcas tu śūnyatāyām nirudhyate //

In other words: Maitreya disagrees with Nāgārjuna's definition of madhyamā pratipat, with his opinion of how moksa comes about, and with his interpretation (naya) of the celebrated statement in the Prajāpāramitā: sarvam idam 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 samvrti 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 *Prajňāpāramitā* passage quoted in the *Bhāsya* (by Vasubandhu?) to MV I.2. Notice *prajňaptyartham*, an echo of LS X.89d: *vyavahāram tu kathyate*; it comes close to *upādāyaprajňapti*. — 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 mislead 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 śavabhūtaih kutarkikaih // <sup>26</sup>
```

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 $v\bar{a}da - n\bar{a}sti$ mama pratij $n\bar{a}$ — 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 Šāntaraksita, 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 ŚS, YṢ, 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.
- There are several editions and translations, see, most recently, Fernando Tola and Carmen Dragonetti: "Āryabhavasaṃkrāntināmamahāyānasūtra: 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 min tsam ste//'du ses tsam la rab tu gnas/
/brjod par byed las tha dad pa'i/brjod par bya ba yod ma yin/
/yan dag min pa'i chos 'di dag//mam par rtog pas kun nas bslan/
/gan gis ston pa zes brtags pa'i//rtog pa de yan 'di ston no/
```

The idea that all *dharma*-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 sarvam ity uccair bhāsitam tvayā / abhidhānāt prthagbhūtam abhidheyam na vidyate // kalpanāmātram ity asmāt sarvadharmāh prakāśitāh / kalpanāpy asatī proktā yayā śūnyam vikalpyate // 32
```

But there are other, more distant echoes of the *Bhavasaṃkrāntisūtra* 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*:

```
nivrttam abhidhātavyam nivrttas cittagocarah / anutpannāniruddhā hi nirvānam iva dharmatā // ^{33}
```

/brjod par bya ba'i chos mams kun//mya nan 'das mtshuns 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, samvrtimātra, and prajāaptimātra. The Bhavasamkrānti is more advanced in its "nominalism"
- In a we should read nivrtta's cittagocarah (not nivrtte 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 gan 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) nivrttah, 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 preksate rūpam mano dharmān na vetti ca/
etat tu paramam satyam 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." 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 gsuns/

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.

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 Kamalaṣīla, 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 nes D: nos P. – 19a kyi P: kyis D. – 19c sems dan sems byun P: sems byun sems dan D. – 25d du yan D: du'an 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

```
mṛgatṛṣṇā yathā grīsme spandate cittamohanī /
1.
         mrgā grhnanti pānīyam vastum tasya na vidyate // (~ X.7)
/ ji ltar so ga'i smig rgyu ni//gyo la 'khrul pa'i ses pa yis /
/ ri dags chu ru 'dzin pa gan// dnos de yod pa ma yin no /
2.
         evam vijnānabījo 'yam spandate drstigocare/
         bālā grhnanti jāyantam timiram taimirā yathā // (~ X.8)
/ de bźin rnam śes sa bon gan//gyo ba mthon ba'i spyod yul la /
/ rab rib mun pa gan yin pas//byis pa yi ni 'dzin pa 'byun /
3.
         dhyātā dhyānam ca dhyeyam ca prahānam satyadarśanam /
         kalpanāmātram evedam yo budhyate sa mucyati // (~ X.9)
/ gton dan btan dan de bźin sbyin//spans dan bden par lta ba rnams /
/ 'di dag rtog pa tsam ñid du// ses pas rnal 'byor pa de grol /
4.
         asārakā ime dharmā manyanāyāh samutthitāh /
         sāpy atra manyanā śūnyā yayā śūnyeti manyate // (~ X.10)
/ sñin po med pa'i chos 'di ni//rtog pa las ni ma lus byun /
/ gan rtog de yan ston pa nid// de ltar ston nid grol ba yin /
5.
         yathā ksīne mahaty oghe tarangānām asambhavah /
         tathā vijñānavaicitryam niruddham na pravartate // (~ X.26)
/ ji ltar mtsho chen stons pa la// rlabs ni 'byun ba yod ma yin /
/ de bzin sna tshogs rnam ses ni// dnos med pa la 'jug pa med /
6.
         śūnyāś ca nihsvabhāvāś ca māyopamā ajātakāh /
         sadasanto na vidyante bhāvāh svapnopamā ime // (~ X.27)
/ stoň žiň dňos po ma grub pas//sgyu ma'i dňos po skye ba med /
/ de bźin yod pa ma yin te// dnos po rmi lam lta bu yin /
7.
         svabhāvam ekam deśemi < tarkavijňaptivarjitam > /
         āryāṇām gocaram divyam svabhāvadvayavarjitam // (~ X.28)
/ ran gi no bo gcig mthon ba// + + + + + + /
/ 'phags pa'i spyod yul mthon ba yis//gñis kyi dnos po spon 'gyur te/
8.
         na grāhako na ca grāhyam na bandhyo na ca bandhanam /
         māyāmarīcisadrśam svapnākhyam timiram yathā // (~ X.31)
/ 'dzin pa med ciń gzuń ba med//bcińs pa med ciń 'chiń ba med /
/ sgyu ma smig rgyu 'dra ba ste//rmi lam brjod pa rab rib bźin /
9.
         yadā paśyati tattvārthī nirvikalpo nirañjanah /
         tadā yogam samāpanno draksyate mām na samśayah // (~ X.32)
/ gan tshe de nid don mthon ba//de tshe rnal 'byor mnam gzag pas /
/ mi rtog brjod pa yod ma yin//ran gi mthon ba the tshom med /
10.
         na hy atra kā cid vijňaptir nabhe yadvan marīcayah /
         evam dharmān vijānanto na kim cit pratijānati // (~ X.33)
/ nam mkha'i chos ni 'ba' źig bźin//gan la rnam rig cun zad med /
/ de bźin chos 'di rnam śes pa//cun zad śes pa yod ma yin /
```

```
sambhavam vibhavam caiva mohāt paśyanti bāliśāh /
11.
         na sambhavam na vibhavam prajñāyukto vipaśyati // (~ X.37)
/ 'byun ba dan ni gnas pa nid// byis pa rmons pa rnams la snan /
/ ses rab rigs pas lta ba la//skye ba dan ni gnas pa med /
12.
         akanisthabhavane (!) divye sarvapāpavivarjite /
         nirvikalpāh sadā yuktāś cittacaittavivarjitāh // (~ X.38)
/ rtag tu mi rtog rigs pa yis// sems dan sems byun rnam spans nas /
/ bdag ñid lta ru śin tu gnas//sdig pa thams cad rnam par spańs /
         balābhijñāvaśiprāptāh tat samādhigatim gatāh /
         tatra budhyanti sambuddhā nirmitas tv iha budhyate // (~ X.39)
/ de ltar mkhyen pa rdzogs sańs rgyas//'di dag sprul par thugs su chud /
/ minon ses stobs la dban thob nas//des ni 'gro ba mñam par mkhyen /
         ādimadhyāntanirmuktam bhāvābhāvavivarjitam /
         vyāpinam acalam śuddham acitram citrasambhavam // (~ X.41)
/ dan po dbus dan mtha' las 'grol// dnos dan dnos med rnam par spans /
/ mñam pa ñid kyi go 'phan brñes//dnos po med las sna tshogs byun /
15.
         cittam pratyayasambaddham pravartati śarīrinām /
         pratyayebhyo vinirmuktam na paśyāmi vadāmy aham // (~ X.52)
/ sems kyi rkyen de dan 'brel bas//lus rnams 'jug par 'gyur ba yin /
/ rkyen rnams las ni nes 'byun ba//bdag ni yod par mi smra'o //
16.
         nimnonnatam yathā citre drśyate na ca vidyate /
         tathā bhāvesu bhāvatvam drśyate na ca vidyate // (~ X.61)
/ ji ltar ri mo'i mtho dman ni// snan yan yod pa ma yin no /
/ de ltar dnos rnams no bo nid// mthon ba yod pa ma yin no /
         gandharvanagaram yadvad yathā ca mrgatrsnikā /
         drśyam khyāti tathā nityam prajñayā ca na vidyate // (~ X.62)
/ ji ltar dri za'i gron khyer dan// ri dags chu ru 'dzin pa bźin /
/ rtag tu snan źin dmigs pa ni// śes rab kyis ni yod ma yin /
18.
         māyopamasamādhim ca kāyam manomayam punah /
         abhijñā vaśitā tasya balā cittasya citritā // (~ X.68)
/ bris pas bris dan 'dri ba yi//mnon ses la dban de dag gi /
/ sgyu ma lta bu'i tin 'dzin gyi//'bras bu'an sgyu ma lta bu yin /
19.
         evam hi dūsitā bālāś cittacaittair anādikaih /
         māyāmarīciprabhavam bhāvam grhnanti tattvatah // (~ X.82)
/ smig rgyu sgyu ma'i stobs kyi ni//dnos med de nid 'dzin pa na /
/ sems dan sems byun bdag med pas// 'di ltar byis pa rnams ni skrag /
         na hy atrotpadyate kim cit pratyayair na nirudhyate /
         utpadyante nirudhyante pratyayā eva kalpitāh // (~ X.85)
/ gan na cun zad skye med la// 'gal ba'i rkyen ni yod ma yin /
/ skye ba dan ni 'gag pa la// rkyen ni rtog pa gcig pu yin /
21.
         prajñaptimātram tribhavam nāsti vastusvabhāvatah /
         prajňaptivastubhavena kalpayisyanti tarkikah // (~ X.86)
```

```
/ rnam rig tsam du 'byun ba rnams//dnos po'i ran bźin yod ma yin /
/ rtog par 'gyur ba'i rtog ge pa//brtags pa tsam du bsgom pa na /
22.
         na svabhāvo na vijňaptir na vastu na ca ālayah /
         bālair vikalpitā hy ete vašabhūtaih kutārkikaih // (~ X.91)
/ ran bźin med cin rnam rig med//dnos po med cin kun gźi med /
/ 'di dag byis pas rab tu brtags//rtog ge nan pas kun tu bskyed /
23.
         sarvarūpāvabhāsam 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 /
/ 'byun ba kun la gnas nas ni//gan tshe sems ni rab 'jug pa /
24.
         tadā yogī hy anābhāsam prajňayā paśyate jagat /
         nimittam vastuvijñaptir manovispanditam ca yat /
         atikramya tu putrā me nirvikalpāś caranti te // (~ X.94)
/ de tshe mi gnas rnal 'byor pas//'gro la rig pas lta ba na /
/ mtshan ma dnos po rnam rig dan//yid kyis gyo ba yod ma yin /
/ [bdag med dban po gan yin dan]// rnam par rtog pas 'jig par byed /
25.
         indriyāni ca māyākhyā visayāh svapnasamnibhāh /
         kartā karmakriyā caiva sarvathāpi na vidyate // (~ X.113)
/ <bdag med dban po gan yin dan > // yul rnams rmi lam lta bur gnas /
/ las dan 'bras bu bya ba nid// thams cad du yan dmigs ma yin /
26.
         dhyānāni cāpramānāni ārūpyāś ca samādhayah /
         samjňanirodho nikhilaś cittamatrena vidyate // (~ X.114)
/ bsam gtan rnams dan tshad med dan //gzugs med snoms par 'jug pa dan /
/ 'du ses 'gog pa ma lus pa//sems 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// yan dag lta la ston pa ñid /
/ 'phags pas 'khrul pa ma gzigs śiń//de ñid de las gźan pa'an min /
28.
         na bhūmayo na satyāni na ksetrā na ca nirmitāh /
         buddhāh pratyekabuddhāś ca śrāvakāś cāpi kalpitāh // (~ X.132)
/ sa rnams med ciń bden pa med//źiń dań sprul sku yod ma yin /
/ ran sans rgyas dan sans rgyas dan / nan thos kyan ni brtags pa yin /
29.
         pudgalasamtatiskandhāh pratyayā hy anavas tathā /
         pradhānam īśvarah kartā cittamātre vikalpyate // (~ X.133)
/ gan zag rgyud dan phun po dan // rkyen rnams gnas pa ma yin no /
/ gtso bo dban phyug byed po rnams//sems tsam la ni rnam par brtags /
30.
         abhāvāt sarvadharmānām samkleśo nāsti śuddhi ca /
         na [ca] te tathā yathā drstā na ca te vai na santi ca // (~ X.137)
/ chos kun no bo yod ma yin//kun nas non mons med cin grol /
/ ji ltar snan ba de ltar med//med pa ma yin yod pa min /
31.
         anutpannā hy amī dharmā na caivaite na santi ca /
         gandharvanagarasvapnamāyānirmānasādrśāh // (~ X.144)
```

```
/ skye ba med pa'i chos 'di ni//yod dan med pa ma yin no /
/ dri za'i gron khyer rmi lam dan //sgyu ma sprul pa lta bur gnas /
32.
         buddhyā vivecyamānām svabhāvo nāvadharyate /
         yasmāt tad anabhilāpyās [te] nihsvabhāvāś ca deśitāh // (~ X.167!)
/ gan zig sans rgyas lta bar na// ran bzin gyis ni nus ma yin /
/ de lta bas na thob pa med//ran bźin med par lta bar bya /
33.
         <aniruddhā hy anutpannāh prakrtyā gaganopamāh> /
         abhāvasvabhāvā ye tu te vikalpitalaksanāh // (~ X.172)
/++++++//++++++/
/ gan zig ran bzin ran bzin med// de ni brtags pa'i mtshan nid yin /
34.
         vākcittagocaram mithyā satyam prajñā vikalpitā /
         dvayāntapatitam cittam tasmāt prajñā na kalpitā // (~ X.175)
/ tshig dan sems kyi spyod yul brdzun//brdzun pa'i ses pas rnam brtags pa'i /
/ mtha' gñis su ni sems lhun bas//de phyir mi rtog ses rab kyis /
35.
         asti nāsti ca dvāv antau yāvac cittasya gocarah /
         gocarena vidhūtena samyak cittam nirudhyate // (~ X.176)
/ yod dan med pa'i mtha' gñis pa// gan zig sems kyi spyod yul ba /
/ spyod yul rnam par bsal nas ni//yan dag sems ni ldog par 'gyur /
36.
         visayagrahanābhāvān nirodhena ca nāsti ca /
         vidyate tathatāvasthā āryānām gocaro yathā // (~ X.177)
/ gzun dan 'dzin pa dnos med pas//'gag pa med pa ma yin no /
/ ji ltar gnas pa'i dnos po ni// de ltar 'phags pa'i spyod yul yin /
37.
         bālānām na tathā khyāti yathā khyāti manīsinām /
         manīsinām tathā khyāti sarvadharmā alaksanāh // (~ X.178)
/ ji ltar byis la mi snan ba// de ltar mkhas la snan ba yin /
/ ji ltar snan ba de ltar ni// sans rgyas chos rnams mtshan ñid med /
38.
         abhūtvā yasya cotpādo bhūtvā cāpi vinaśyati /
         pratyayair sadasac cāpi na te me śāsane sthitāh // (~ X.180)
/ gan zig ma skyes mi skye la// skyes pa yan ni ma yin no /
/ rkyen gyis yod dan med pa yan//de rnams de ltar mi gnas so /
39.
         na me yānam mahāyānam na ghoso na ca aksarāh /
         na satyā na vimoksā vai na nirābhāsagocaram // (~ X.188)
/ theg chen źes bya'i theg pa ni//sgra min yi ge ma yin te /
/ bden pa med cin nes grol med// snan ba med pa'i spyod yul min /
         ajātaśūnyatā caikam ekam jātesu śūnyatā /
         ajātaśūnyatā śresthā naśyate jātaśūnyatā // (~ X.191)
/ ma skyes pa yi ston ñid gcig//gcig ni skyes pa ston pa ste /
/ ma skyes pa yi ston ñid mchog//skyes pa'i ston pa 'jig pa yin /
41.
         tathatā śūnyatā kotī nirvānam dharmadhātuvat /
         kāyo manomayam cittam paryāyair deśitam mayā // (~ X.192)
/ de bzin ñid ston yan dag mtha'//mya nan 'das dan chos kyi dbyins /
/ lus sems dper ni sgyu ma ñid//sgyu ma'i grans su bstan pa yin /
```

```
42.
         yasya notpadyate kim cin na kim cit tan nirudhyate /
         tasyāsti nāsti nopaiti viviktam paśyato jagat // (~ X.196)
/ gan źig cun zad skye med la// cun zad 'gag pa yod min la /
/ de yi yod med mtshuns pas na//'gro ba rnams kyis dben par mthon /
43.
         nirābhāso hi bhāvānām abhāvo nāsti yoginām /
         bhāvābhāvasamatvena āryānām jāyate phalam // (~ X.207)
/'di na dnos rnams mi dmigs pas//dnos med spans pa'i rnal 'byor pa /
/dnos dan dnos med mnam pa nid// 'bras bu 'phags pa'i spyod yul yin /
44.
         madīyam drśyate cittam bāhyam artham na vidyate /
         evam vibhāvayed bhrāntim tathatām cāpy anusmaret // (~ X.218)
/ gan gis bdag gi sems mthon na//phyi yi don ni yod ma yin /
/ de ltar dňos la ma 'khrul na//de bźin ñid kyań rjes su dmigs /
45
         yadā cittam manaś cāpi vijñānam na pravartate /
         tadā manomayam kāyam labhate buddhabhūmi ca // (~ X.226)
/ gan tshe yid dan sems dan ni// rnam par ses pa'an mi 'jug la /
/ de tshe sems 'di' 'bras bu ni// sans rgyas kyi ni sa yan 'thob /
46.
         pratyayā dhātavah skandhā dharmānām ca svalaksanam /
         prajňaptim pudgalam cittam svapnakešondukopamāh // (~ X.227)
/ rkyen gyi tshig dan phun po dan//rnam par rig pa gan zag sems /
/ chos rnams 'di dag mtshan ñid ni//rmi lam skra śad lta bu yin /
47.
         samsārabījam vijnānam sati dršye pravartate /
         kudye sati yathā citram parijñānān nirudhyate // (~ X.233!)
/ sna tshogs śes pas 'khor bar gnas//de las gnas pa 'byun ba yin /
/ rtsig pa yod par ri mo bźin//sna tshogs śes pas gnas pa yin /
48.
         yathā na bhāvo nābhāvo gaganam kathyate mayā /
         ālayam hi tathā kāye bhāvābhāvavivarjitam // (~ X.238)
/ ji ltar dnos med med dnos med// nam mkha'i ran bźin bźin du brjod /
/ de bźin kun gźi'i 'bras bu gan//dnos dan dnos med rnam spans te /
49.
         trisamtativyavacchinnam sattāsattāvivarjitam /
         cātuskotikayā muktam bhavam māyopamam sadā // (~ X.240)
/ rgyud gsum rnam par bcad nas ni// sems kyi rgyud ni rnam par spańs /
/ lus ni mtha' bźi dag las grol// dnos po rtag tu sgyu ma bźin /
50.
         triyanam ekayanam ca ayanam ca vadamy aham /
         bālānām mandabuddhīnām āryānām ca viviktatām // (~ X.245)
/ theg gcig la ni theg gsum du// 'phags rnams gsun ba bdag cag ni /
/ byis pa blo dman rnams la yin// 'phags pa rnams la de ñid ston /
51.
         pratyayair janitam lokam vikalpaiś ca vivarjitam /
         māyādisvapnasadršam vipašyato 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//gan gis rab mthon rnam par grol /
52.
         cittasya dharmatā śuddhā na cittam bhrāntisambhavam /
         bhrāntiś ca dausthulyamayī tena cittam na drśyate // (~ X.253)
```

```
/ sems kyi gñis med dag pa yis//sems ni 'khrul par 'gyur ma yin /
/ 'khrul pa'i ran bźin ñid ston pas//des na sems ni mthon ma yin /
53.
         laksyalaksananirmuktam yadā paśyati samskrtam /
         vidhūtam hi bhavet tena svacittam paśyato jagat // (~ X.255)
/ mtshan ñid mtshan gźi ldan par ni//gan tshe 'dus byas mthon ba yis /
/ gan gis 'khor ba rnam bsal nas//'gro ba ran gi sems su rtogs /
54.
         cittamātram samāruhya bāhyam artham na kalpayet /
         tathatālambane sthitvā cittamātram atikramet // (~ X.256)
/ sems tsam la ni brten nas su//phyi rol don ni mi brtag go /
/ de bźin ñid dmigs gnas nas ni//sems tsam las ni 'da' bar bya /
55.
         cittamātram atikramya nirābhāsam atikramet/
         nirābhāsasthito yogī mahāyānam sa paśyati // (~ X.257)
/ sems tsam las ni 'das nas su//snan ba med las 'da' bar bya /
/ snan med gnas pa'i rnal 'byor pa//de yis theg pa chen po mthon /
56.
         tadā prajñāyate śuddhah svabhāvah pāramārthikah/
         atyantam cāpy anispannam kalpitam na parodbhavam // (~ X.308cd
/ de ltar ses rab dag pa yis// ran gi no bo don dam 'di /
                                                                      +308ab)
/ śin tu yan ni grub pa na// brtags pa'i gźan dnos 'byun 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

very source of these passages in the *Lankāvatāra*." 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*, *Karmasiddhiprakarana*, *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, Tathāgataguhya, 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 no bo nid med chos mams ma skyes dan /
/ chos mams ma 'gags chos mams gzod nas zi ba dan /
/ chos mams thams cad ran bzin mya nan 'das par ni /
/ dgons pa med par mkhas pa su zig smra bar byed /
```

- I am using the Derge edition (No. 4061, Śi 123b6-124a4). I here wish to thank Mr. Hartmut Büscher 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.
- 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 nas bsad de /
/ mkhas pa gan źig dgons pas 'di dag śes 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 (gźan las). It comprises 9 stanzas all of which are to be found in LS:

```
(1)
                  na hy ātmā vidyate skandhe skandhāś caiva hi nātmani /
                  na te yathā vikalpyante na ca te vai na santi ca // (X.135)
        / phun po dag la bdag med do // phun po dag ni bdag ma yin /
        / de dag brtags pa bźin du med// de dag med pa'an ma yin no /
        (2)
                  astitvam sarvabhāvānām yathā bālair vikalpyate /
                  yadi te bhaved (!) yathādrstāh sarve syus tattvadarsinah// (X.136)
        / ji ltar byis pas brtags pa bzin// dnos po thams cad yod pa ste /
        / ji ltar mthon bzin de yin na// thams cad yan dag mthon bar 'gyur /
        (3)
                  abhāvāt sarvadhārmānām samklešo nāsti šuddhi ca /
                  na ca te tathā yathādrstā (!) na ca te vai na santi ca // (X.137)
        / dnos po thams cad med pa'i phyir // kun nas non mons dag pa med /
        / ji ltar mthon bzin de med do// de dag med pa'an ma yin no /
— and it goes on (yań gsuńs pa):
        (4)
                  parikalpitam svabhāvena (!) sarvadharmā ajānakāh /
                  paratantram samāśritya vikalpo bhramate nrnām // (X.150)
        / kun tu brtags pa'i ran bzin gyis//chos mams thams cad ma skyes pa /
        / gźan gyi dban la gnas nas ni// mi yi mam rtog khyams pa yin /
        (5)
                  paratantram yathā śuddham vikalpena visamyutam /
                  parāvrttam hi tathatā viharah kalpavarjitah // (X.151)
        / nam źig gźan gyi dban dag ste// mam par rtog dan bral na ni /
        / śin tu gyur pa de bźin ñid//rtog pa spańs par gnas pa'o /
                  ma vikalpam vikalpetha vikalpo nāsti satyatah /
        (6)
                  bhrāntim vikalpayantasya (!) grāhyagrāhakayor na tu // (X.152!)
        / mam brtags bden par yod min gyis//mam par rtog pas ma rtog śig /
        / gzun dan 'dzin pa'i mtshan nid du//nor par de dag mam rtog na /
                  bāhyārthadarsanam kalpam svabhāvah parikalpitah /
                  yena kalpena kalpenti svabhāvah pratyayodbhavah // (X.153!)
        / phyi rol don mthon brtags na ni//kun tu brtags pa'i ran bzin no /
        / rtog pa gan gis rtog byed pa//rkyen las skyes pa'i ran bzin no /
        (8)
                  bāhyārthadarsanam mithyā nāsty artham cittam eva tu /
```

yuktyā vipasyamānānām grāhagrāhyam nirudhyate // (X. 154!)

```
/ phyi rol don mthon log pa ste// don med sems ni 'ba' źig go /
/ rigs pas mam par gźigs na ni// gzun ba dan 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 snan ba śin tu 'byun /
```

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 nihsvabhāvatām / samdhāya sarvadharmānām deśitā nihsvabhāvatā // prathamo laksanenaiva nihsvabhāvo 'parah punah / na svayambhāva etasyety aparā nihsvabhāvatā // dharmānām paramārthaś ca sa yatas tathatāpi sa/ sarvakālam tathābhāvāt saiva vijnaptimātratā //
```

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 nihsvabhāvatā 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 pratyayodbhavah /
nispannas tasya pūrvena sadā rahitatā tu yā //
ata eva sa naivānyo nānanyah paratantratah /
```

On this background I do not hesitate to asumme 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 dhruvah / sukho vimuktikāyo 'sau dharmākhyo 'yam mahāmuneh //
```

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):

```
/ gań grol de dag mams kyi zag pa med pa'i dbyińs /
/ phra źiń bsam gyis mi khyab mñam źiń bye brag med /
```

```
/ thams cad don grub sdug bsnal ñon mons spans pa ste / gñis su brjod pa ma yin bde (!) źin 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. *vijnānaparināma*. T 1 and 15 run:

```
ātmadharmopacāro hi vividho yah pravartate / vijñānaparināme 'sau parināmah sa ca tridhā // pañcānām mūlavijñāne yathāpratyayam udbhavah / vijñānānām saha na vā tarangānām 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 vijnānam svalaksanavisamyutā (!) // yathā ksīne mahaty oghe tarangānām asambhavah / tathā vijnānavaicitryam niruddham na pravartate // udadheh parināmo 'sau tarangānām vicitratā / ālayam hi tathā citram (!) vijnānākhyam pravartate // udadheś ca tarangānām yathā nāsti višesanam / vijnānānām 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.

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

```
/ gan dan gan gi min mams kyis//chos mams gan dan gan brjod pa /
/ de ni de na yod pa min// kun tu brtags pa'i ran bźin no /
/ 'di dag thams cad min tsam ste//'gro ba 'di ni min tsam mo /
/ brjod pa dan ni tha dad pa// brjod pa bya ba gan yan med /
/ ji ltar khab lon mthon ba dan// lcags ni myur bar kun tu 'khor /
/ 'on kyan de la sems pa med// sems ldan bźin du'an rab tu snan /
/ de bźin kun gźi mam śes kyan//sems med sems can ji bźin du /
/ 'gro dan 'on bar gyo ba ste// sa mams 'bri bar rab tu byed /
/ ji ltar rgya mtsho dza ru ni//srog med par yan gyo mgul te /
/ de bźin kun gźi mam śes pa//lus la gnas śin gyo bar gyur /

(1)
```

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 daṅ ñe bas// lcags ni myur du yoṅs su 'khor /
/ de la sems ni yod min te// sems daṅ ldan bźin snaṅ bar 'gyur /
/ de bźin kun gźi mam śes ni// bden min bden pa bźin du ni /
/ gaṅ tshe 'gro 'oṅ gyo bar 'gyur//de tshe srid pa 'dzin par byed /
/ ji ltar rgya mtsho daṅ ni śiṅ// sems ni med kyaṅ gyo bar 'gyur /
/ de bźin kun gźi mam śes ni// lus bren 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 *ālayavijnāna*).

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 samtosa that I finally see it published in a Festschrift for Jacques May whose Candrakīrti Prasannapadā Madhyamakavrtti, Paris 1959, still stands out as a model of clarity and precision in the field of Madhyamaka studies.