Ostasien


Along with the Chung-lun 中論 (T. 1564, *Madhyamakāsāstra), and the Pat-iun 百論 (T. 1569, *Sūtatsāstra or *Sataka) the Shih-erh-men-lun 十二門論 (T. 1568, *Dvaitasatkāyāsāstra, or *Dvaitasamkhāyāsāstra, or *Dvaitasamkhārāsāstra, or simply *Dvaitasadhāvāsāstra) forms the textual basis of what in China, Korea, Japan and India is commonly known as the “Three Treatise School”, or San-lun-Tsung 三論宗. All three works were translated—more or less freely—from the Sanskrit by the celebrated Kumārajīva (344–413 or perhaps 350–409) and are usually ascribed to Nāgarjuna and Āryadeva, though these attributions pose several problems. The “Three Treatises” also had a decisive influence on other schools of Buddhism than the Mahāyāna, such as T’ien-t’ai 天台 founded by Hui-wen 慧文 (550–577), and Hua-yen 華嚴 founded by Fa-tsang 法藏 (643–712), who even composed a commentary (T. 1826) to the Shih-erh-men-lun. There is also a good deal of Mahāyāna influence to be found in the “Pure Land School” (Chi’ng-t’u-Tsung 淨土宗), and, of course, in Ch’an though here not so much directly based on the San-lun texts themselves. After all Mahāyāna has always been more of an academic discipline than a popular movement. Among the most outstanding exponent of Mahāyāna in China, apart from Kumārajīva himself, are his pupils Seng-jiu (353–436) and Seng-chao (374–414) and, above all, Chi-tsang 吉藏 (549–623) a student of the Indian translator Paramārtha (500–569) whose scholastic works dealing with the Three Treatises, the Two Truths, etc. are of particular importance. An indication of this is the fact that in the course of time more than fifty commentaries to his magnum opus, the San-lun-hsūan-i 三論玄義 (T. 1852) were composed in Japan (cf. Buddhist Text Information, 25 (1980)). Since these three texts are of a great historical and philosophical importance, and since only two of them, the Chung-lun (M. Wallese, Die Mittle Lehre des Nāgarjuna, nach der chinesischen Version übertragen, Heidelberg 1912) and the Pat-iun (see G. Tucci, Pre-Diināgu Buddhists texts on logic from Chinese sources, Baroda 1929), have been generally accessible to Western readers, the appearance of an English version of the Shih-erh-men-lun obviously fills a long-felt lacuna in Mahāyāna studies. Under these circumstances Hsueh-li Cheng deserves credit for providing us with a version of the “Twelve Gate Treatise” which not only stays very close to the Chinese but also (mainly by adding the subject or predicate when not explicitly expressed in the Chinese) comes out in a clear, readable and, on the whole, accurate English. The utility of his translation has been enhanced by comments, notes and three concise introductory essays dealing with “Nāgarjuna and the Spread of His Teachings”, “San-lun Approaches to Emptiness”, and “The Nature and Value of the Text”.

In spite of these merits it cannot be denied that there is a general weakness throughout this presenta-

tion of the Shih-erh-men-lun. It mainly stems from the translator’s insufficient acquaintance with Indian Mādhyaṃka and the achievements of recent continental scholarship. Let me therefore offer but a few additional observations on the text and authenticity of the Shih-erh-men-lun and its place in the history of Mādhyamika literature. In its present form the Shih-erh-men-lun is divided into twelve chapters and consists of twenty-six verses with a commentary in prose. Even though the *Dvaitasadhāvāsāstra is never mentioned in Indo-Tibetan sources (unless it is identical with the *Avvatāsāstra found in the T’u lin pa niid leyi sgo boh yis pa listed in the IIn dkar ma Catalogue, No. 595) there can be no doubt about its Indian origin. Not only are (most of) its verses taken over from Nāgarjuna’s Mālāmādhyamakārikā (MK) and Śūnyatāsaptati (SS) (see below) but the prose style is also typical of early Indian Mādhyamika (cf. e.g. Akutobhāyā, Viprahavavartamārtiyā, Vaidyaprapkaraṇa, Śūnyatāsaptatī, etc.). It contains numerous stock-examples well-known from similar Indian sāstras and, moreover, quotations from *Saptatīsāstra (i.e. SS) and *Iśvarasūtra—two texts otherwise unknown in Chinese tradition. Many of its polemical passages are unintelligible to a Chinese reader not acquainted with the Indian background. According to its own words (op. rec., p. 53) our text was composed in order to give an introductory summary of Mahāyānārthā (cf. Ratnāvalī, IV, 81); if it was written by a Chinese (or Serindian) scholar as an introduction for Chinese readers, it would, again, obviously not contain all the elements only intelligible or familiar to an Indian reader.

As said, the stanzas in the Shih-erh-men-lun are mainly taken over from the Chung-lun (which is cited by its title) or, more precisely, from MK and SS. Compare the following concordance and note that Kumārajīva often translates more ad sensum than ad verbum so that in a few cases the identification remains uncertain. The commentary is often very useful for identifying the sources of the verses. The list is a revision of the one proposed by Richard H. Robin-son (Early Mādhyamika in India and China, Madison 1967, P. 32):

1. (= LI) 159c 24—MK, I, 3.
2. (= LI) 160a 22—SS, 8.
4. (= LI) 161b 5—MK, I, 11.
6. (= LI) 162b 23—MK, I, 12.
7. (= IV) 162e 3—SS, 30.
8. (= IV) 162e 12—MK, VII, 1.
10. (= IV) 163a 1—MK, VII, 5.
11. (= IV) 163a 5—MK, VII, 6.
13. (= IV) 163a 18—MK, VII, 10.
14. (= IV) 163a 27—MK, VII, 10.
15. (= IV) 163b 2—MK, VII, 11.
16. (= IV) 163b 9—MK, VII, 12.
18. (= V) 163b 16—MK, V, 4.
19. (= VII) 164a 10—MK, II, 21?
20. (= VII) 164b 27—SS, 19.
22. (= IX) 165b 23—?
23. (= XI) 165c 10—MK, XII, 1.
25. (= XI) 166a 21—SS, 6.
26. (= XI) 167a 23—SS, 5?

The Shih-erh-men-lun sets out to prove śūnyatā (śūnyatādharmaṃsvārdhamatrīmya) through twelve gates, i.e. from twelve important angles. Accordingly each chapter is formed as a critical examination (parikṣā) of:
I. pratītyasamutpāda (yin-yuan)
II. sakkāyāsakkārāyā (yu-kuo-wu-kuo)
III. pratyaya (yu-yan)
IV. laṅkāya (haiang)
V. salakṣṇādakṣāya (yu-hsiang-wu-hsiang)
VI. ekāneka (i-i)
VII. bhāvābhāva (yu-wu)
VIII. svabhāva (haiang)
IX. hetuphala (yu-kuo)
X. kāraka (tsu-chhe)
XI. kālāraya (san-shih)
XII. utpatti (sheng)

Now, while there can be no doubt that Nāgārjuna is the author of all the kārikās found in the Shīh-erh-men-lun, we still have to consider whether he also compiled them from his own works and then composed the commentary in prose. As for the external evidence the Chinese tradition is not unanimous concerning the authorship of the commentary. As in the case of Chung-lun it sometimes attributes it to Nāgārjuna, sometimes to Ch'ing-mu. Perhaps Vimalākṣa (see May in Hēbōgörin, pp. 481, 489 with ref.).

First of all, I assume, to be sure, that the compiler of the verses and the author of the prose commentary is one and the same person. The main reason for this assumption is that v. 13 is a reply to an objection only given in the prose, and v. 21 is really (a rhetorical) objection. In both cases the verses are bound not to be correctly understood without a commentary. Another indication to the effect that verses and commentary form an inseparable whole is the fact that the verses taken by themselves hardly convey a full or coherent summary of Nāgārjuna's thought. Actually the commentary forms the core of the Shīh-erh-men-lun.

Let us then briefly see if any internal evidence can help us come to an opinion concerning the authorship. As far as the doctrine of the Shīh-erh-men-lun is concerned, it hardly contains anything which could not have been said by Nāgārjuna. It is in fact a reshuffled concern of MK and SS with some additional passages criticizing Sākyamunisākyā and Švara-vāda (II and X). This indicates a somewhat later author than Nāgārjuna. Again the very idea of giving an introduction to the basic works of the Mādhyamika points to a somewhat later stage than that of the founder of the school. Moreover there are no other precedents for Nāgārjuna (or Āryadeva for that matter) compiling from his own works. Again the Shīh-erh-men-lun, as a whole, is composed in a much more systematic style than any of Nāgārjuna's or Āryadeva's authentic works, a fact which again indicates a somewhat later stage of development in Mādhyamika. Moreover there are, as been pointed out, several close parallels to Shīh-erh-men-lun to be found in the commentary to Chung-lun sometimes attributed to Ch'ing-mu, who certainly belongs to a later period than Nāgārjuna, above all because he quotes from Āryadeva's Catuk-hāsāka. Since it seems quite probable that the Shīh-erh-men-lun as well as the Chung-lun in their critique of Śāṃkhyā depend on Vṛṣagana's Sośṭasūtra, this, again, indicates an author later than Nāgārjuna (cf. E. Frauwallner, Kleine Schriften, Wiesbaden 1982, pp. 270; 278, etc.).

For these reasons I incline to give the Chinese tradition ascribing these commentaries to Ch'ing-mu the benefit of doubt. In fine I would suggest it a good working-hypothesis to assume that Vimalākṣa was a fourth-century Mādhyamika now only known for his commentary to Nāgārjuna's MK (a commentary which is closely related to the Aṅkutobhāyā) and for his *Duṣṭakadāvāraka, an independent introductory summary of Nāgārjuna's thought loosely based on the latter's basic philosophical works, MK and SS.

This review is of course not the place to develop this hypothesis further. To do so we would also have to consider not only the evidence that might be derived from two other works translated by Kumārajīva and attributed to Nāgārjuna, viz. Ta-chih-tu-lun 大智度論 (T. 1509) and Shīh-chu-pi'ê-p'osha-lun 十住毗婆沙論 (T. 1521) but also the commentaries to Āryadeva's Pai-lun (T. 1569) and 百字論 Pai-tzu-lun (T. 1572) as well as several other early Indian Mādhyamika texts of uncertain authorship (cf. my Nagarjuniana, Copenhagen 1982, pp. 12-17).

Finally some observations on the text and translation of the Shīh-erh-men-lun, the "Twelve Gate Treatise":

p. 54, 33: On the assumption that this verse in taken over from MK, I, 3 we should read "how can there be non-clarity?" for "how can there be such things" changing shih (1590 25) to ta' (cf. 160 a 10). Cf. also Yuktissésettitha, 19, p. 55, 9: Hardly "causal conditions", but "causes and conditions", hetupratyaya.

p. 55, 28: "Because the so-called other-nature has, in fact, no self-nature", read "Because there can be no self-nature based on other-nature".

p. 56, 17: Here Ch'ing-mu seems to paraphrase Nāgārjuna's Śūnyatāsaptapatti (see my Nagarjuniana Filosofske vēra, Kobenhavn 1982, p. 222).

p. 57, 4: "Because of..." is here hardly adequate for the technical term upādāya.

p. 59, 23: For "How can there be production", read "How can there be a product?". Here sheng che renders nirvartaka hetur in MK, I, 70.

p. 60, 7: For "there is no principle of production", read "in that case it would follow that non-being is produced".

p. 62, 18: Cf. *Sataka, p. 68; Sāmkhyakārikā, 7 (Sās-ti-tantra); Prajñāprādēśa, 24 a 4.

p. 66, 27: Critique of Asatātīyāvāda (Vaisēsika). — For the Śāṅkāntas, see MK, VII, 31; *Sataka, p. 83; Āloka, 115.

p. 67, 33: "is yet to be established" seems too vague for what literally renders śāṃkayasamottaraha (hetur) but actually probably renders sūnyatāsamottaraha, see Chung-lun, IV, 8-9 and Vīrayavāgaratiti, 28.

p. 70, 14: "Briefly and broadly..." will hardly do for vṛṣastasamāta, MK, I, 11.

p. 71, 4: For "qualities of the mind", read e.g. "mind and mental phenomena", citācitā or citācitmasa us in the corresponding passages in Chung-lun (2é 4) and Ta-chih-tu-lun (296 b 14), etc. — The translations proposed for the four prataya are in need of revision.

p. 72, 17: For "are not formed by characteristics", read e.g. "cannot be established by characteristics", laṅkāyā-siddha.

p. 72, 18: For "created characteristics", read "characteristics of created things", sama krtptalasāya.

p. 73, 30: For "is originated by", read "originates in"; janayate as in MK, VII, 4. Cf. Ch'ing-mu's commentary.

p. 73, 31: For "there are", read "including itself it other-nature". The commentary is virtually identical with the one found in MK, VII, 4.

p. 74, 11: Here and in 1, 20 the negations are missing due to the fact that Kumārajīva here as in Chung-lun, VIII, 5, wrongly reads：<br>maulina janitas (for maulina janitas) and tensa janitas (for tenjanītās). Note that the commentary to Shīh-erh-men-lun presupposes the correct reading in both verses whereas the commentary to Chung-lun, VIII, 5 & 6 presupposes the wrong readings but seems to feel the difficulty.

p. 75, 4: Here the Chinese (163 a 15-16) is given in prose. It should however, have been printed as a verse (4 x 5 characters) as it undoubtedly renders MK, VII, 8.


Das neokonfuzianische Ideal des Weisen, der außerhalb des politischen Lebens sich der Selbstverwollkommnung hingibt, hat in der Yuanzeit zahlreiche Adepten gefunden. Das Gobet kam den Konfuzianern entgegen, die nicht willens waren, in den Dienst der Mongolen zu treten, aber zu einer offen Opposition sich nicht entschließen konnten. Liu Ying (1249–1293) beruft sich auf dieses Gobet, als er dem Ruf der Regierung nicht folgt, und wehrt sich dagegen, daß seine Haltung als politische Opposition gegen das Regime gedeutet wird. Liu teilt die für die Geistesschaffenden der Yuanzeit charakteristische Toleranz gegenüber den anderen Lehren. Er regt seine Schüler an, auch die taolistischen Klassiker sowie medizinische und militärische Werke zu studieren (Tu Wei-ming: Towards an Understanding of Liu Ying's Confucian Eremits, 233–277).


Einen Einblick in das Wirken der Konfuzianer auf lokaler Ebene bietet der Beitrag John W. Dardess'. Dieser schildert, wie in einem Bezirk der Provinz