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, ālayavijñāna, viññaptimātra, 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

---


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.): *Saddharmalāṅkāvatārasūtram*, 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 Śri Laṅkā, cf. Karen Lang (ed.): *Āryadeva’s Catuḥṣataka*, Copenhagen 1986, pp. 7-9.
found in the old Indian commentaries and in numerous quotations in various Indian śāstra-s.  

D.T. Suzuki’s *Studies in The Lankaśvatarārasūtra* (London 1930), and his *An Index to The Lankaśvatarārasūtra* (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.

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

---

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 *Lankaśvatarārvrtti* (Beijing ed. No. 5519) by Jñānaśrīñīhadra (not to be confounded with Jñānaśrīmitra, as some modern authors have done). There is also an Indian commentary by Jñānāvajra (Beijing ed. No. 5520). It refers to Jñānaśrīñīhadra 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 Nagarjuna and Aryadeva 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), Vigrahavyāvartani (VV), Yuktisastika (YS), Catuḥṣṭava (CS) III (= Acintyastava), Śūtrasamuccaya (SS), Bodhicittavivarana (BV), Mahāyānavimśikā, Bhavasamkrānti and Bhāvanākrama — all ascribed to Nagarjuna.6 In case of Aryadeva we have the Catuḥśataka (CS) 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 CS.

1.

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

\[
\begin{align*}
sambuddhānām anutpāde śrāvakānām punah kṣaye / \\
jñānām pratyekabuddhānām asaṃsargāt pravartate //
\end{align*}
\]

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

---


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 *jñāna*. See, for instance, *Dīgha-Nikāya* III, p. 214: khaye ṅāṇam anuppāde ṅāṇam. Notice also how ṅāṇam 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 paresāṁ sūnyatā kṣayaḥ /```

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

```
śrāvakāṇām kṣayajñānām buddhānāṁ janmasambhavam/
pratyekajinapatrāṇāṁ asamklesāḥ pravartate //```

To this verse should be added to the passage LS, p. 99:...punar aparāṁ, Mahāmate, śrāvakapratyekabuddhānāṁ nirvānāṁ — svasāmānyalakṣaṇāvabodhād asamsargato viśayāviparyādarsāsanād 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 *asamklesāt* and adopt the variant reading *asamslesāt* (= *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 *Abhidhammakośa* VI.67ab: *ksayajñānam anutpādadajñānam ca/pudgalabhedenā tīro bodhaya utpadyante: śrāvakabodhih pratyekabodhir anuttarā samyakasambodhir iti. — For ksayajñāna versus anutpādadajñāna see Ryusho Hikata (ed.): *Suvikrāntaviṇkrāmi-paripṛcchā Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*, Fukuoka 1958, p. 12. — The three kinds of *jñāna* are also known to the Pāli commentators, see e.g. *Sumanīgala-Vilāsinī*, I. p. 100. — For *samsarga* see *Cullaniddesa*, p. 659 and the Index to LS, s.v.
An opponent has just objected that Nāgarjuna’s doctrine of śūnyatā and nirvāṇa is problematic. Nāgarjuna 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 nāsō na marañām. yadi punar, Mahāmate, mahāparinirvāṇam marañām syāt punar api janmaprabandhāḥ syāt. atha vināśāḥ syāt samśkritalakṣaṇapatiṁ syāt. ata etasmāt kāraṇān, Mahāmate, mahāparinirvāṇam na nāśam (sic!) na marañām cyutīvigate marañām adhigacchanti yogināḥ. punar apiṁ, Mahāmate, mahāparinirvāṇam aprahīnāsamprāptito '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 śāstrākāra, of course, being to support āgama by means of yuktī.

Just for the sake of argument, assuming that LS took this passage from Nāgarjuna, and not vice versa, we would have to explain 1) what authority Nāgarjuna 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:

\[
\text{atra brūmah śūnyatāyāṁ na tvam vetsy prayojanam /} \\
\text{śūnyatāṁ śūnyatārtham ca tata evam vihanyase //}
\]

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:

\[
\text{sarvabhāvo 'svabhāvo hi sadvacanam tathāpy asat /} \\
\text{śūnyatā<ś> śūnyatārtham vā bālo 'paśyan vidhāvati //}
\]

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 oisunyata. 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:

\[
yah praṇītyasamupādah śūnyatāṁ tāṁ pracaksmahe / \\
sā praṇāpyartham tu kathyate saiva madhyamā //
\]

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: praṇāpyartham 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 prajñāna 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. prajñāna in the sense of prajñā. We find the same usage of the verb yojyate in MK XVII.13. In other words: śūnyatā is just an upādāyaprajñānapatti, everything is empty, including this very statement. Nāgārjuna’s words are merely “suggestive”.

4.

MK XVII.33:

kleśāḥ karmāṇī dehaś ca kartāraś ca phalāṇi ca /
gandharvanagarākārā marīcīśvapnasambhāḥ //

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

kleśāḥ karmapathāḥ dehaḥ kartāraḥ ca phalam ca vai /
marīcīśvapnasamkāśā 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.

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. dgoṣ (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-pannatti, “designation of something irreal” (sic!), and s.v. upanidhā(ya)-pannatti, “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 upādāyapanñatti, 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.

We now turn to MK XXI.11:

\[
\text{drṣyate sambhavaś caiva vibhavaś caiva te bhavet} \\
\text{drṣyate sambhavaś caiva mohād vibhava eva ca}
\]

This reminds us of LS X.37:

\[
\text{sambhavam vibhavam caiva mohāt paśyanti bāliśāh} \\
\text{na sambhavam na vibhavam prajñāyukto vipaśyati}
\]

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:

\[
/\text{ji ltar byis pas mam brtags bzin} // \text{dnios po gal te bden gyur na} / \\
/\text{de dnios med pas mam thar du} // \text{gan gis mi 'dod rgyu ci zig} /
\]

With this we may compare LS III.16:

\[
\text{na bhavo vidyate satyaṁ yathā bālair vikalpyate} / \\
\text{abhāvena tu vai mokṣam katham nechchanī tārikīḥ} //
\]

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, saṁsāra =) bhāva 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 śāstra (i.e. YS) first referring to the sūtra and then supporting its statement by means of arguments not found in the canonical text itself.

7.

YS 21:

\[
/\text{de ltar ci yaṁ skye ba med} // \text{ci yaḥ 'gag par mi 'gyur ro} / \\
/\text{skye ba daṅ ni 'jig pa'i lam} // \text{dgos pa'i don du bstan pa'o} /
\]

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

\[
\text{na hy atrotpayate kim cit pratayair na nirudhyate} / \\
\text{upadyante nirudhyante pratayā eva kalpitāḥ} //
\]

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.
We now turn to CS III.44-46:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hetupratyayasambhūta paratantrā ca samvṛtiḥ /} \\
\text{paratantra iti proktah paramārthas tv akṛtrimah //} \\
\text{svabhāvah prakṛtis tattvam dravyam vastu sad ity api /} \\
\text{nāsti vai kalpito bhāvah paratantras tu vidyate //} \\
\text{asūtī kalpīte bhāve samāropas tvayoditaḥ /} \\
\text{nāśūti kṛtakocchedād ucchedaś ca prakāśitaḥ //}
\end{align*}
\]

This hymn to a very large extent consists of literal allusions to a large number of śūtra-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:

\[
\begin{align*}
nāśī vai kalpito bhāvah paratantraś ca vidyate / \\
samāropāpavādām hi vikalpanto (sic!) vinaiyatt //
\end{align*}
\]

The rest is obviously an explanation, or a piece of śūtra-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 pratiṣṭhā. 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 satkotiiko vāda has puzzled the previous scholars: Tucci, Yamaguchi and Bhattacharyya, none of whom was able to offer a solution.\textsuperscript{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 satkotiiko 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:

\begin{quote}
kim cānyat/ sarvabhāvāntargatam ca tvadvacanam/ kasmāc śūnyesu sarvabhāvesu
tvadvacanam aśūnyam, yenāśunyatvāt sarvabhāvasvabhāvah pratisiddhah / evam
ṣatkoṭiko vādaḥ prasaktah/ sa punah katham iti/ (1) hanta cet punah śūnyāh
sarvabhāvās tena tvadvacanam śūnyam sarvabhāvāntargatavit/ tena śūnyena
pratisedhānupapatthāt/ tatra yah pratisedhāḥ śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti so 'nupapannah/
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{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 (Virgrahavyāvartani), New Delhi 1978.) — The Tibetan passage on pratijñā na karāṇiyā 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.
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):

\[ \text{vādasya kṛśā dharmaṃ nāyam utkataṃ tathāgataiḥ} / \]
10.

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{varam laukikam evedam paramārtho na sarvathā} \\
\text{laukike vidyate kim cit paramārtho na vidyate} \\
\end{align*}
\]

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sarvam vidyati samvṛtyā paramārtho na vidyate} \\
\text{bhāvā vidyanti samvṛtyā paramārtho na bhāvakāḥ} \\
\end{align*}
\]

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 bhāvakāḥ. A juxtaposition of the variants shows that Āryadeva depends on the sūtra, not vice versa.

11.

CS IX.20 is even more clear:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{/'chiṅ daṅ bcīṅs daṅ thabs las gzan//thar pa gal te yod na ni/} \\
\text{/de las ci yaṅ mi skye ste// des na de thar žes mi brjod/} \\
\end{align*}
\]

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bandhyabandhananir Mukta upāyaish ca vivarjitāḥ} \\
\text{fīrthya mokṣaṁ vikalpenti na ca mokṣa hi vidyate} \\
\end{align*}
\]

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 yuktī, for the bare statement in the sūtra. We have already noticed a similar procedure several times above: The sūtra gives the statement, the sāstra supplies the reason.

---

Now, this and the following five verses in CS IX, all of them discussing various notions relating to nirvāṇa 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 nirvāṇa. It is only available in Chinese (Taishō 1640), just like another small piece, which refutes various Hinayāna 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 nirvāṇa and mokṣa in MK, CS, 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:

\[
asvam evābhīrūdhah sann asvam evāsi vismṛtah/
\]

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 nirvāṇa (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 CS XVI. 25:

\[
sad asat sadasac ceti yasya pakśo na vidyate /
upālambhaś cireṇāpi tasya vaktum na śakyate //
\]

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.

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, nirvāṇa 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 prapanca, 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, ČŚ, etc. that refer to LS (or Ur-LS) are concerned with the conception of nirvāna and moksa. 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 nirvāna:

\[
\text{nāham nirvāmi bhāvena kriyāyā lakṣanena ca /}  
\text{vikālpahetuvijnāne nirvṛte nirvṛto hy āham //}
\]

The conception of nirvāna 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 acintyadharma. To this there are parallels in MK XVIII.12, RĀ II, and *Bodhisambhdraka, 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 Ratnapāli, 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 *Bodhisambhdraka, 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, RA IV.94-6, BV 98-99, etc. The final passage (p. 175) is brief enough to be quoted: etad dhi, Mahāmate, śūnyatānupādāvayaniḥsvabhāvalakṣaṇaṁ sarvabuddhānāṁ 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 nirvāṇa and mokṣa.

**EXCURSUS 2**

In a recent paper, 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 ŋid daṅ yāṅ dag mtha'//mtshan ma med daṅ don dam ŋid/
/byan chub sems mchog de ŋid daṅ//stoṅ ŋid du yāṅ bṣad pa yin/

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

tathātā bhūtakoṭīś cānimittam paramārthatā /
dharmadhūtuś ca paryāyāḥ śūnyatāyāḥ samāsataḥ //

We find a similar correspondence between BV 28ab:

/kun brtags daṅ ni gzlan dбаṅ daṅ//yoṅs su grub pa 'di ņid ni/


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 Tarkajñāla, Prajñāpradīpa, etc. Here Maitreya et al. are criticized by Bhavya for thinking that they are smarter (abhimanin) than Nāgārjuna. And it was also noticed by Erich Frauwallner who said of MV I: “Dieses Kapitel enthält die Auseinandersetzung Maitreyanāthis 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 asattvād sattvāc ca madhyamā pratīpāc ca sā //
arthasattvatmāvijñānapratibhāsam prajāyate /
vijñānam nāsti cāsyārtha tadabhāvāt tad apy asat //
abhūtaparikālpavam siddham asya bhavaty atah /
na tathā sarvathābhāvāt tatksayān muktir isyate //
kalpiṭaḥ parantarāś ca parinispāna eva ca /
arthād abhūtakalpāc ca dvayābhāvāc ca desitah //

22 See e.g. M.D. Eckel’s translation of Prajñāpradīpa XXV in Miscellanea Buddhica, pp. 25-75. Here and in Tarkajñāla 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 JIABS II (1979), pp. 29-43. — I tend to agree with Nagao that the notion of abhūtaparikalpa in MV “stands for” upādāya-prajñāpāti 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:

\[
yah praŚīyasamutpādah śūnyatām tām pracaksmahe / 
sā praŚānīpīr upādāya pratipat saiva madhyamā //
\]

**MK XIII.7:**

\[
yady aŚūnyam bhavet kim cito syāc cānīnam api kim ca / 
na kim cid asty aŚūnyam ca kutaḥ śūnyam bhavisyati //
\]

**MK XXII.11:**

\[
śūnyam iti na vaktavyam aŚūnyam iti vā bhavet / 
ubhayaḥ nobhayaḥ ceti praŚānīpratipatam tu kathyate //^{25}
\]

And finally MK XVIII.5:

\[
karmakleśaksayān mokṣah karmaklesā vikalpataḥ / 
te praŚānīcaḥ praŚāncas tu śūnyatāyāṁ nirudhyate //
\]

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 idam na śūnām nāpi cāsūnyam (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 samvṛti 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 praŚānīpratipatam, an echo of LS X.89d: vyavahāram tu kathyate; it comes close to upādāya-praŚānapītī. — 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 citramātra 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:

\[\text{pudgalah samtatiḥ skandhāḥ pratyayāḥ hy anavas tathāḥ} /\
\text{pradhānām īśvarāḥ kartā citramātreet kalpyate} //\
\text{na svabhāvo na vijñaptir na vastu na ca ālayah} /\
\text{bālair vikalpitaḥ hy ete śavabhūtaiḥ kutarkikaiḥ} // \text{26}\]

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, ālayavigñāna, vijñaptimātra, etc., but accepts citramātra 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.\text{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 nirvāṇa 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.

\text{26} Cited repeatedly by Bhavya and Candrakīrti. Here I have used Masamichi Ichigō (ed.): \textit{Madhyamakālaṃkāra of Śāntarakṣita}, Kyoto 1985, p. 126 and p. 176 (with further ref.).

\text{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 \textit{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”\textsuperscript{28}. This may well have to do with the disdainful attitude expressed in such verses as LS II.137 and III.48, quoted above\textsuperscript{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 SS, YS, etc. and Āryadeva’s CS. 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.

\textit{EXCURSUS 3}

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

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

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{28} Takasaki 1982, p. 560.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Likewise, in the \textit{Samdhinirmocana} and in the \textit{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.
\item \textsuperscript{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 \textit{Buddhist Studies Review} III (1986), pp. 3-18. As known, the \textit{sūtra} has verses in common with other texts such as LS, Ghanavyūha, Pratyutpannabuddhasammukhāvasthitasamādhisūtra, etc. More materials will be found in a small text ascribed to Nāgārjuna in the Tibetan canon under the corrupt title \textit{Bhāvasamcāra}. There are also numerous citations to be found in later \textit{sāstra}-s.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Using the ed. of N.A. Sastri, Madras 1938 (which see for the variants).
\end{itemize}
The idea that all dharma-s are mere names, or concepts (nāmātra), 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:

nāmātram jagat sarvam ity uccair bhāsitam tvayā
abhidhānāṁ prthagbhūtam abhidheyaṁ nā vidyate //
kalpanānātram ity asmā sarvadharmāḥ prakāśiṣāh
kalpanāpy asaṁ proktā yayā śuṇyam vikalpyate //

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

rūpasyābhāvamātrarvād ākāśanām nāmātrakam /
bhūtair vinā kuto rūpaṁ nāmātrakam apy atah //

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

nivṛttam abhidhātavyam nivṛttaś cittagocarāḥ /
anutpannaṁ niruddhaḥ hi nirvāṇam iva dharmāḥ //

32 Nagarjuniana, p. 152. — The term nāmātra is found in several other texts before Nāgārjuna, usually in connection with vyavahāramātra, nāmadheyaṁātra, samketamātra, samvṛtāmātra, and prajñaptimātra. The Bhavasamkṛśnti is more advanced in its “nominalism”

33 In a we should read nivṛttas cittagocarāḥ (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 gani 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 niruddhaḥ (— which has been shown by āgama and yukti) [then] cittagocarāḥ 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):

\[
\begin{align*}
na \text{ caksuḥ prekṣate rūpam mano dharmān na vetti ca/} \\
etat tu paramāṁ satyam yatra loko na gāhate // \\
sāmagṛyā darśanam yatra prakāśayati nāyakah / \\
prāhopicārabhūmiṁ tāṁ paramārthasya buddhīmān //
\end{align*}
\]

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:

\[
/blo dañ ldan pas don dam gyi//ñe bar brtags pa'i sa de gsuris/
\]

In other words: buddhimān does not govern paramārtha. 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 upādāyaprajñāpī!
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 nirābhāsā (see verses 54-56).


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:


In the Sanskrit text, which tries to follow Nanjio through thick and thin, [ ] indicates delenda, < > addenda.
1. mrgatṛṣṇā yathā grīśme spandate cittamohanī / mṛgā grḥṇanti pāṇīyāṃ vastuṃ tasya na vidyate // (~ X.7) / ji ltar so ga'i smīg rgyu ni//gyo la "khrul pa'i šes pa yis / / ri dags chu ru 'dzin pa gaña//DNS de yod pa ma yin no / 2. evam vijñānabibjo 'yam spandate drṣṭigocare/ bāla grḥṇanti jāyantaṃ timirāṃ taimirā yathā // (~ X.8) / de bžin rmam šes sa bon gaña//gyo ba mthon ba'i spyod yul la / / rab rib mun pa gaña yin pas//byis pa yi ni 'dzin pa 'byuṅ / 3. dhyātā dhyānaṃ ca dhṛcyāṃ ca prahāṇaṃ satyadarśanam / kalpaṇāṃatraṃ evedam yo budhyate sa mucyatī // (~ X.9) / gtoṅ daṅ btaṅ daṅ de bžin sbyin//spaṅs daṅ bden par lta ba rmams / / 'di dag rtoṅ pa tsam ŋid du//šes pas rnal 'byor pa de grol / 4. asāraṅā ime dharmā manyaṇāyāḥ samuttithiḥ / sāpy atra manyanā śūnyā yatā śūneyati manyate // (~ X.10) / śnūṃ po med pa'i chos 'di ni//rtoṅ pa las ni ma lus byuṅ / / gaña rtoṅ de yaṅ stōṅ pa ŋid//de ltar stōṅ ŋid grol ba yin / 5. yathā kṣīne mahatā oghe taraṅgāṇāṃ asaṃbhāvah / tathā vijñānāvaiśṛtyāṃ niruddham na pravartate // (~ X.26) / ji ltar mtsho chen stōṅs pa la//rlabs ni 'byuṅ ba yod ma yin / / de bžin sna tshogs rmam šes ni//DNS med pa la 'jug pa med / 6. śūnyāś ca niḥsvabhāvāś ca māyopāmā ajātakaḥ / sudasaṃto na vidyante bhāvāḥ svapnopaṃā ime // (~ X.27) / stōṅ ŋiṅ DNS po ma grub pas//sgyu ma'i DNS po skye ba yin / / de bžin yod pa ma yin te//DNS po rmi lam lta bu yin / 7. svabhāvam ekam deśemi <tarkavijñānaptivarjitaṃ> / āryāṇāṃ gocaraṃ divyaṃ svabhāvāvadavyarjitaṃ // (~ X.28) / raṅ gi no bo gcig mthon ba//++ ++ ++ ++ ++ / / 'phags pa'i spyod yul mthon ba yis//gūṃs kyi DNS po spoṅ 'gyur te/ 8. na grāhako na ca grāhyāṃ na bandhya na ca bandhanam / māyaṃaricaksāṃ svapnākhyāṃ timirāṃ yathā // (~ X.31) / 'dzin pa med cin gzuṅ ba med//bcins pa med cin 'čiṅ ba med / / sgyu ma smig rgyu 'dra ba ste//rmi lam brjod pa rab rib bžin / 9. yadā pasyati tattvārthī nirvikālo niraṇjanaḥ / tadā yogam samāpanno draksyate māṃ na samśayaḥ // (~ X.32) / gaña tshe de ŋid don mthon ba//de tshe rnal 'byor mñam gzāg pas / / mi rtoṅ brjod pa yod ma yin//raṅ gi mthon ba the tshom med / 10. na hy atra kā cid vijñāptir nabhe yadvan maricayaḥ / evam dharman vijāṇanto na kīṃ cit pratijānati // (~ X.33) / nam mkha'i chos ni 'ba' žig bžin//gaña la rmam rig cuṅ zad med / / de bžin chos 'di rmam šes pa//cuṅ zad šes pa yod ma yin /
22. na svabhāvo na vijñaptir na vastu na ca ālayāḥ / 
   bālār vikālātīḥ hy ete vāsabhūtāḥ kutārkākāḥ // (~ X.91) / 
   raṅ bāziṃ med ciṃ nāṃ rīg med//dños po med ciṃ kun gīṃ med / 
   'di dag byis pas rab tu brtags//rtog ge 'nan pas kun tu bskyed / 

23. sarvarūpāvabhāsam hi yadā cītāṃ pravartate / 
   nātra cītāṃ na rūpānī bhrāntāṃ cītāṃ anādikam // (~ X.93) / 
   'dir ni sems med gzugs yod min//'khrol pa'i sems las lhag par med / 
   'byuṅ ba kun la gnas nas ni//gaṅ tshe sems ni rab 'jug pa / 

24. tadā yogī hy anābhāsam prajñāyā paśyate jagat / 
   nirmūttam vastuvijñaptir manovispanditam ca yat / 
   atīkramya tu putrā me nirvikālāḥ caranī te // (~ X.94) / 
   de tshe mi gnas rnal 'byor pas//'gro la rig pas lta ba na / 
   mtshan ma dños po rnam rig daṅ//yid kyi sgo ba yod ma yin / 
   [bdag med dbaṅ po gaṅ yin daṅ]// rnam par rtog pas 'jig par byed / 

25. indriyāṇi ca māyākhyā visāyāḥ svapnaasamnībhāḥ / 
   kartā karmakriyā caiva sarvathāpi na vidyāte // (~ X.113) / 
   <bdag med dbaṅ po gaṅ yin daṅ>// yul rnam rmi lam lta bur gnas / 
   las daṅ 'bras bu bya ba 'nīd// thams cad du yaṅ dmigs ma yin / 

26. dhyānāṇi cāpramāṇāṇi ārūpyāḥ ca samādhayaḥ / 
   samājānirūdo nikhilaḥ cītāṃtrenā vidyāte // (~ X.114) / 
   bṣam gtan rnam daṅ tshad med daṅ//gzugs med sños med 'jug pa daṅ / 
   'du 'ses 'gog pa ma lus pa//'sems 'nīd tsam du gnas pa yin / 

27. vikālpanāvīkālpena śunyatātattvadārśanam / 
   āryo na paśyate bhūrāṃ tīṃ nāpi tatvaṃ tārāntare // (~ X.125 cd. + 127ab) / 
   rnam par rtog pas kun brtags pa// yaṅ dag lta la ston pa 'nīd / 
   'phags pas 'khrol pa ma gzigs 'sin//'de 'nīd de las gzan pa'aṅ min / 

28. na bhūmaya no satyāṇi na kṣetra na ca nirmitāḥ / 
   buddhāḥ pratyekabuddhāḥ ca śrāvakāḥ cāpi kalpitāḥ // (~ X.132) / 
   sa rnam med ciṅ bden pa med//ziṅ daṅ sprul sku yod ma yin / 
   raṅ saṅs rgyas daṅ saṅs rgyas daṅ//fanan thos kyaṅ ni brtags pa yin / 

29. pudgalasamtatiskandhāḥ pratyayāḥ hy anavas tathā / 
   pradhānām īśvarāḥ kartā cītāṃtrenā vikālpyate // (~ X.133) / 
   gaṅ zag rgyud daṅ phun po daṅ// rkyen rnam gnas pa ma yin no / 
   gtso bo dbaṅ phyug byed po rnam//sems tsam la ni rnam par brtags / 

30. abhāvāt sarvadharmāṇāṃ samkleso nāsti sūddhi ca / 
   na [ca] te tathā yathā drṣṭā na ca te vai na santi ca // (~ X.137) / 
   chos kun no bo yod ma yin//kun nas niṅ mons med ciṅ grol / 
   ji ltar snaṅ ba de ltar med//med pa ma yin yod pa min / 

31. anutpamnā hy amī dharmā na caivaite na santi ca / 
   gandharvanagarasvapnamāṇīmāṇasādṛśāḥ // (~ X.144)
32. buddhyā vivecyamānānām svabhāvo nāvadharyate / 
   yasmāt tad anabhilāpyās [te] niḥsvabhāvās ca desitāḥ // (~ X.167!)

33. <aniruddhā hy anutpannāh prakṛtyā gaganopamāḥ> /
   abhāvasvabhāvā ye tu te vikalpitalakṣaṇāḥ // (~ X.172)

34. vākcittagocaram mithyā satyaṃ prajñā vikalpī / 
   dvayāntapatitaṃ cittām tasmāt prajñā na kalpitā // (~ X.175)

35. asti nāsti ca dvāv antau yāvac cittasya gocaro / 
   gocanāṃ ca nirodhena ca nāsti ca / 
   yod daṅ med pa'i mtā' gniś pa// gaṅ žig sems kyi spyod yul ba / 
   spyod yul rnam par bsal nas ni// yaṅ dag sems ni ldog par 'gyur /

36. visayagrāhanābhāvān nirodhena ca nāsti ca / 
   vidyate tathātavastha āryānāṃ gocaro yathā // (~ X.177)

37. bālānāṃ nā tathā khyātī yathā khyātī maniśīnām / 
   maniśīnāṃ tathā khyātī sarvadharma alaksanāḥ // (~ X.178)

38. abhūtvā yasyā cotpādo bhūtvā cāpi vinaśyati / 
   pratyayair sadasaṃ cāpi na te me āsāne sthitā // (~ X.180)

39. na me yānāṃ mahāyānāṃ na ghoṣo na ca āksaraḥ / 
   na satyā na vimokṣa vai na nirābhāsagocaram // (~ X.188)

40. ajātaśūnyatā caikam ekam jāteṣu śūnyatā / 
   ajātaśūnyatā śreṣṭhā naśyate jātāśūnyatā // (~ X.191)

41. tathātā śūnyatā kotī nirvānām dharmadhātuvat / 
   kāyo manomayaṃ cittam paryāyaḥ desitām mayā // (~ X.192)
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42. יasya notpadyate kim cin na kim cit tan nirudhyate /
    tasyastī nāsti nopaiti viviktam pāsyato jagat // (~ X.196)
/ gan zig cuñ zad skye med la// cuñ zad 'gag pa yod min la /
/ de yi yod med mtshuñs pas na//'gro ba rnams kys dben par mthoñ /

43. nirābhāso hi bhāvānām abhāvo nāsti yoginām /
    bhāvabhāvasamatvena āryānāṁ jāyate phalam // (~ X.207)
/ 'di na dños rnams mi dmigs pas//dños med spāns pa'i māl 'byor pa /
/ dños dañ dños med mānām pa ŋid// 'bras bu 'phags pa'i spyod yul yin /

44. madīyaṁ drśyate cittāṁ bāhyām arthām na vidyate /
    evaṁ vibhāvayed bhṛantāṁ tathātāṁ 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 ŋid kyi ni sa yañ 'thob /

45. yadā cittām manaś cāpi viññāṇāṁ na pravartate /
    tadā manomayaṁ kāyaṁ labhate buddhabhūmi ca // (~ X.226)
/ gañ tshe yid dañ sems dañ ni// rnam par śes pa'añ mi 'jug la /
/ de tses 'di 'bras bu ni// saṅs rgyas kyi ni sa yañ 'thob /

46. pratyayaḥ dhātavaḥ skandhā dharmānāṁ ca svalaksanam /
    praṇāptiṁ pudgalaṁ cittāṁ svapnakeśoṇḍukopamāḥ // (~ X.227)
/ rkyen gyi tshig dan phuh po dañ//rnam par rig pa gañ zag sems /
/ chos rnams 'di dag mtshan ŋid ni//rmi lam skra śad lta bu yin /

47. saṃsārabījam viññāṇāṁ sati drśye pravartate /
    kūḍye sati yathā cittāṁ pariññāṇāṁ nirudhyate // (~ X.233!)
/ sna tshogs śes pas 'khor bar gnas//de las gnas pa 'byuñ ba yin /
/ rtsig pa yod par ri mo bžin//sna tshogs śes pas gnas pa yin /

48. yathā na bhāvo nābhāvo gaganāṁ kathyate mayā /
    ālayaṁ hi tathā kāye bhāvābhāvavivarjitaṁ // (~ X.238)
/ ji ltar dños med med dños med// nam mkha'i rañ bžin bžin du brjod /
/ de bžin kun gzi'i 'bras bu gañ//dños dañ dños med rnam spāṅs te /

49. trisamvatīvyavacchinnam sattāsattāvivarjitaṁ /
    cātuśkotiṣaḥ muktaṁ bhavam māyopamaṁ sadā // (~ X.240)
/ rgyud gsum rnam par bcad nas ni// sems kyi rgyud ni rnam par spāṅs /
/ lus ni mtha' bži dag las grol// dños po rtag tu sgyu ma bžin /

50. triyānāṁ ekāyānāṁ ca ayānāṁ ca vadāmy aham /
    bālānāṁ mandabuddhānāṁ āryānāṁ ca viviktatām // (~ X.245)
/ theg gcig la ni theg gsum du// 'phags rnam gsuñ ba bdag cag ni /
/ byis pa blo dman rnam la yin// 'phags pa rnam la de ŋid stoñ /

51. pratyayar janitāṁ lokāṁ vikalpaś ca vivarjitaṁ /
    māyādisvapnaśadṛśaṁ vipāsyato vimucyate // (~ X.251)
/ rnam par rtag po ŋid 'brel pa'i// rkyen las skyes pa'i 'jug rten ni /
/ sgyu ma la sogs rmi lam 'drar//gañ gis rab mthoñ rnam par grol /

52. cittasya dharmaṁ śuddhā na cittāṁ bhṛantiśambhavam /
    bhṛantiś ca dauṣṭhulyamayi tena cittāṁ na drśyate // (~ X.253)
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 vijnānaparināma, or vijnaptimātratāsiddhi.

Several scholars have already pointed out that T 20 (*yena yena vikalpena...*) and 28 (*yadda tv ālambanam...*) have close and striking parallels in LS p. 163 (*yena yena vikalpena...*) and p. 169 (*yadda 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.* 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, Pañcasandhaka, Vimśatikā,* etc. The main argument, however, is provided by the fact that *Karmasiddhi* (§ 37) mentions *Vyākhyāyukti* by name.

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 Hinayānist to that of a Mahāyānist. The author of the *Kośa, Karmasiddhi,* etc. is rather a "crypto-Mahāyānist".

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

/ chos mams Ṉo bo Ṉid med chos mams ma skyes daś /
/ chos mams ma 'gags chos mams gdod nas ti ba daś /
/ chos mams thams cad raṅ bzin mya rian 'das par ni /
/ dgonis pa med par mkhas pa su 'zig smra bar byed /

36 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.


39 See ref. in note 37. A few emendations have been made in Lamotte's text.
The second source quoted by Vasubandhu immediately after these verses is anonymous (gzan las). It comprises 9 stanzas all of which are to be found in LS:

(1) na hyātāmā vidyate skandhe skandhās caiva hi nātmanī 
    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 bzin du med // de dag med pa'an ma yin no /

(2) astitvam sarvabhāvānām yathā bālair vikalpyate /
    yadi te bhaved (!) yathādṛṣṭāḥ sarve syus tattvadarśinah // (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 ya'i dag mthon bar 'gyur /

(3) abhāvāt sarvadhārmānām samkleśo nāsti suddhi ca /
    na ca te tathā yathādṛṣṭā (!) na ca te vai na santi ca // (X.137)
    / dnos po thams cad med pa'i phyir // kun nas non moṅs dag pa med /
    / ji ltar mthon bzin de med do // de dag med pa'an ma yin no /

— and it goes on (ya'i gsuris pa):

(4) parikalpitaṁ svabhāvena (!) sarvadharmā ajānakāḥ /
    parantarāṃ samōṣānīya vikalpo bhramate niṁnām // (X.150)
    / kun tu brtags pa' rai bzin gyis//chos mams thams cad ma skyes pa /
    / gzan gyi dba'i la gnas nas ni// mi yi mam rtog khyams pa yin /

(5) parantarāṃ yathā suddham vikalpena visanyutam /
    parāvṛttaṁ hi tathātā viharah kalpavārjitaḥ // (X.151)
    / nam zig gzan gyi dba'i dag ste//mam par rtog dari bral na ni /
    / sin tu gyur pa de bzin niid//rtog pa spaus par gnas pa'o /

(6) ma vikalpam vikalpetha vikalpo nāsti satyataḥ /
    bhṛantim vikalpayantasya (!) grāhyagraḥakayor na tu // (X.152 !)
    / mam brtags bd'en par yod min gyis//mam par rtog pas ma rtog šig /
    / gzuñ dañ 'dzin pa'i mthon niid du//nor par de dag mam rtog na /

(7) bāhyārthadārśanam kalpam svabhāvah parikalpitāh /
    yena kalpena kalpenti svabhāvah pratayodbhavah // (X.153 !)
    / phyi rol don mthon brtags na ni//kun tu brtags pa' rai bzin no /
    / rtog pa gañ gis rtog byed pa//rkyen las skyes pa' rai bzin no /

(8) bāhyārthadārśanam mithyā nāsty artham cittam eva tu /
    yuktyā vipaṣyamānānām grāhagrahyam nirudhyate // (X. 154 !)
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:

are clearly based on SN VII.24, quoted above. The main source for vijnaptimātra(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:

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:

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):

/gan grol de dag mams kyi zag pa med pa'i dbyiins /
/phra zin bsam gyis mi khyab mnaam zin bye brag med/
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. *vijñānaparīṇāma*. T 1 and 15 run:

ātmadharmopacārā hi vividho yah pravartate /
vijñānaparīṇāme 'sau parīṇāmah sa ca triḍhā //
pancānām mūlavijñāne yathāpratyayam udbhavah /
vijñānānāṁ saha na vā taraṅgānāṁ 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 desayāmy aham /
cittam manaś ca vijñānāṁ svalaksanavisamyutā (!) //
yathā kṣīne mahaty oghe taraṅgānāṁ asambhavah /
tathā vijñānāvaicitryam niruddham na pravartate //

udadheḥ parīṇāmo 'sau taraṅgānāṁ vicitratā /
ālayam hi tathā cītām (!) vijñānākhyaṁ pravartate //
udadheḥ ca taraṅgānāṁ yathā nāsti viśesānam /
vijñānānāṁ tathā cīte parīṇāmo 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

\[
\begin{align*}
/ & \text{gani da\r{\i} gan gi mi\r{\i} mams kyis//chos mams gani da\r{\i} gan brjod pa /} \\
/ & \text{de ni de na yod pa min// kun tu brags pa'i ra\r{\i} bzin no /} \\
/ & \text{di dag thams cad mi\r{\i} tsam ste//gro ba 'di ni mi\r{\i} tsam mo /} \\
/ & \text{brjod pa da\r{\i} ni tha dad pa// brjod pa bya ba gari yan med /} \\
/ & \text{ji ltar khab lo\r{\i} mtho\r{\i} ba da\r{\i}// lcags ni myur bar kun tu 'khor /} \\
/ & \text{'on kyi\r{\i} de la sens pa med// sens ldan bzin du'ari rab tu sna\r{\i} /} \\
/ & \text{de bzin kun gai mam ses kyi\r{\i}//sens med sens can ji bzin du /} \\
/ & \text{'gro da\r{\i} 'on bar gyo ba ste// sa mams 'bri bar rab tu byed /} \\
/ & \text{ji ltar rgya mtsho dza ru ni//srog med par yai gyo mgul te /} \\
/ & \text{de bzin kun gai mam ses pa//lus la gnas s\r{\i}n gyo bar gyur /}
\end{align*}
\]

The first two verses are also found e.g. *Bhavasamkr\r{\i}ntis\r{\i}tra* 1-2:

\[
\begin{align*}
sarvam etan namam\r{\i}tram samjn\r{\i}natre prati\r{\i}sthitam / \\
abhidh\r{\i}n\r{\i}n prtha\r{\i}gh\r{\i}huta\r{\i}m abhidheya\r{\i}m na vidyte // \\
yena yena hi n\r{\i}m\r{\i}n\r{\i} vai yo yo dharmo 'bhilapyate / \\
n\r{\i}nasau samvidyte tatra dharm\r{\i}n\r{\i}m s\r{\i}h dharmat\r{\i}m //\r{\i}2
\end{align*}
\]

The three final verses correspond to BV 33-35:

\[
\begin{align*}
/ & \text{ji ltar khab len da\r{\i} ne bas// lcags ni myur du yonis su 'khor /} \\
/ & \text{de la sens ni yod min te// sens da\r{\i} ldan bzin sna\r{\i} bar 'gyur /} \\
/ & \text{de bzin kun gai mam ses ni// bden min bden pa bzin du ni /} \\
/ & \text{gai tshe 'gro 'on gyo bar 'gyur//de tshe srid pa 'dzin par byed /} \\
/ & \text{ji ltar rgya mtsho da\r{\i} ni s\r{\i}n// sens ni med kya\r{\i}i gyo bar 'gyur /} \\
/ & \text{de bzin kun gai mam ses ni// lus brten nas ni gyo ba yin /}
\end{align*}
\]

Compare also LS X.14.

41 I am using the Beijing edition of the *Ghanavy\r{\i}ha* (No. 778). The citations are found Cu 47a3-4, and Cu 49b7-50a2 (among many others about *ālayavijñ\r{\i}na*).

42 Ref. given in note 30. Again, there are several interesting variants, all obvious.
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It is with a true feeling of *samtośa* 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.