Ostasien

Cheng, Hsueh-li: **Nāgārjuna's Twelve Gate Treatise**, transl., with Introductory Essays, Comments, and Notes. Dordrecht — Boston — London: Reidel [1982]. XV, 151 S. 8° = Studies of Classical India, ed. by B. K. Matilal, J. M. Masson, 5. Lw. hfl. 85.—. Bespr. von Chr. Lindtner, Nærum (Dänemark).

Along with the *Chung-lun* 中論 (T. 1564, **Madhyamakaśāstra*), and the *Pai-lun* 百論 (T. 1569, **Śataśāstra* or **Śataka*) the *Shih-erh-men-lun* 十二門論 (T. 1568, **Dvādaśanikāyaśāstra*, **Dvādaśamukhaśāstra*, **Dvādaśadvāraśāstra*, or simply **Dvādaśadvāraka*) forms the textual basis of what in China, Korea and Japan 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 Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva, though these attributions pose several problems. The "Three Treatises" also had a decisive influence upon other schools of Buddhism than the Mādhyamika, 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 Mādhyamika influence to be found in the "Pure Land School" (Ch'ing-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 Mādhyamika has always been more of an academic discipline than a popular movement. Among the most outstanding exponents of Mādhyamika in China, apart from Kumārajīva himself, are his pupils Seng-jui (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-hsüan-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. Walleser, *Die Mittlere Lehre des Nāgārjuna, nach der chinesischen Version übertragen*, Heidelberg 1912) and the *Pai-lun* (see G. Tucci, *Pre-Diṅnāga Buddhist 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 (see below), accurate English. The utility of his translation has been enhanced by comments, notes and three concise introductory essays dealing with "Nāgārjuna 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 presentation of the *Shih-erh-men-lun*. It mainly stems from the translator's insufficient acquaintance with Indian Mādhyamika 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 **Dvādaśadvāraka* is never mentioned in Indo-Tibetan sources (unless it is identical with the *sTon pa ñid kyi sgo bcu gñis pa* listed in the lDan dkar ma Catalogue, No. 595) there can be no doubt about its Indian origin. Not only are (most of) its verses taken over from Nāgārjuna's *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* (MK) and *Śūnyatāsaptati* (ŚS) (see below) but the prose style is also typical of early Indian Mādhyamika (cf. e.g. *Akutobhayā*, *Vigrahavyāvartanīvṛtti*, *Vaidalyaprakaraṇa*, *Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti*, etc.). It contains numerous stock-examples well-known from similar Indian *śāstras* and, moreover, quotations from **Saptatiśāstra* (i.e. ŚS) and **Īśvarasūtra*—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 Mahāyānārtha (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 these 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 ŚS. 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. Robinson (*Early Mādhyamika in India and China*, Madison 1967, p. 32):

1. (=I.i) 159*c* 24←MK, I, 3?
2. (=I.ii) 160*a* 22←ŚS, 8
3. (=II.i) 160*b* 18←MK, I, 7
4. (=III.i) 162*b* 3←MK, I, 11
5. (=III.ii) 162*b* 8←MK, I, 2
6. (=III.iii) 162*b* 23←MK, I, 12
7. (=IV.i) 162*c* 3←ŚS, 30?
8. (=IV.2) 162*c* 12←MK, VII, 1
9. (=IV.3) 162*c* 23←MK, VII, 4
10. (=IV.4) 163*a* 1←MK, VII, 5
11. (=IV.5) 163*a* 5←MK, VII, 6
12. (=IV.6) 163*a* 12←MK, VII, 7
13. (=IV.7) 163*a* 18←MK, VII, 9
14. (=IV.8) 163*a* 27←MK, VII, 10
15. (=IV.9) 163*b* 2←MK, VII, 11
16. (=IV.10) 163*b* 9←MK, VII, 12
17. (=IV.11) 163*b* 16←MK, VII, 13
18. (=V.1) 163*c* 16←MK, V, 4
19. (=VI.1) 164*a* 10←MK, II, 21?
20. (=VII.1) 164*b* 27←ŚS, 19
21. (=VIII.1) 165*a* 10←MK, XIII, 3
22. (=IX.1) 165*b* 28←?
23. (=X.1) 165*c* 10←MK, XII, 1
24. (=X.2) 165*c* 24←MK, I, 13
25. (=XI.1) 166*c* 21←ŚS, 6?
26. (=XII.1) 167*a* 23←ŚS, 5?

The *Shih-erh-men-lun* sets out to prove *śūnyatā (pudgaladharmanairātmya)* through twelve gates, i.e. from twelve important angles. Accordingly each chapter is formed as a critical examination *(parīkṣā)* of:

I. *pratītyasamutpāda-* (yin-yüan)
II. *satkāryâsatkārya-* (yu-kuo-wu-kuo)
III. *pratyaya-* (yüan)
IV. *lakṣaṇa-* (hsiang)
V. *salakṣaṇâlakṣaṇa-* (yu-hsiang-wu-hsiang)
VI. *ekâneka-* (i-i)
VII. *bhāvâbhāva* (yu-wu)
VIII. *svabhāva-* (hsing)
IX. *hetuphala-* (yin-kuo)
X. *kāraka-* (tso-che)
XI. *kālatraya-* (san-shih)
XII. *utpatti-* (sheng)

Now, while there can be no doubt that Nāgārjuna is the author of all the *kārikās* found in the *Shih-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 青目 or Pin-lo-ch'ieh 賓羅伽, perhaps *Vimalākṣa (see May in *Hôbôgirin*, 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 *Shih-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 *Shih-erh-men-lun* is concerned, it hardly contains anything which could not have been said by Nāgārjuna. It is in fact a reshuffled summary of MK and ŚS with some additional passages criticizing *Satkāryâsatkārya-* and *Īśvara-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 date 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 *Shih-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 *Shih-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 *Catuḥśataka*. Since it seems quite probable that the *Shih-erh-men-lun* as well as the *Chung-lun* in their critique of Sāṃkhya depend on Vṛṣagaṇa's *Ṣaṣṭitantra*, 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 *Akutobhayā*) and for his **Dvādaśadvāraka*, an independent introductory summary of Nāgārjuna's thought loosely based on the latter's basic philosophical works, MK and ŚS.

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 *Shih-chu-p'i-p'o-sha-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 *Shih-erh-men-lun*, the "Twelve Gate Treatise":

p. 54, 33: On the assumption that this verse is taken over from MK, I, 3 we should read "how can there be other-nature" for "how can there be such things", changing *shih* (159*c* 25) to *t'a* (cf. 160*a* 10). Cf. also *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā*, 19.

p. 55, 9: Hardly "causal conditions", but "causes and conditions", *hetupratyaya*.

p. 55, 28: For "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 *Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti* (see my *Nāgārjunas filosofiske værker*, København 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 producer"~~. Here *sheng che* renders *nirvartako hetur* in MK, I, 7*c*.

p. 60, 7: For "there is no principle of production", read "in that case it would follow that non-being is produced" (. . . *wu-yu-sheng-li*).

p. 62, 18: Cf. **Śataka*, p. 68; *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 7 (← *Ṣaṣṭitantra*); *Prajñāpradīpa*, 246*a* 4.

p. 66, 27: Critique of *Asatkāryavāda* (Vaiśeṣika). — For the *dṛṣṭāntas*, see MK, VII, 31; **Śataka*, p. 83; *Ālokamālā*, 115.

p. 67, 33: "is yet to be established" seems too vague for what literally renders *saṃśayasama(hetu)* but actually probably renders *sādhyasamahetu*, see *Chung-lun*, IV, 8–9 and *Vigrahavyāvartanī*, 28.

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

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

p. 72, 17: For "are not formed by characteristics", read e.g. "cannot be established by characteristics", *lakṣaṇāsiddha*.

p. 72, 18: For "created characteristics", read "characteristics of created things", *saṃskṛtalakṣaṇa*.

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

p. 73, 31: For "there are", read "including itself it creates". The commentary is virtually identical with the one found *ad* 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*, VII, 5 & 6 wrongly read *maulena janitas* (for *maulenājanitas*) and *tena janitas* (for *tenājanitas*). Note that the commentary to *Shi-erh-men-lun* presupposes the correct reading in both verses whereas the commentary to *Chung-lun*, VII, 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 (4×5 characters!) as it undoubtedly renders MK, VII, 8.

p. 77, 4: Again, "created characteristics" cannot render *saṃskṛtalakṣaṇa*.
p. 80, 19: Possibly the Chinese text (164*a* 3–4) wrongly renders MK, V, 5*cd*–6*ab* as if prose.
p. 84, 10: For "of various causal conditions" it seems better to read "for various reasons".
p. 85, 14: Cf. the Tibetan versions of ŚS, 19, which differ considerably. Possibly the Chinese is most faithful to the original.
p. 91, 4: For "no goal", read "no candidate", as *hsiang* here renders *pratipannaka*, cf. e.g. *Chung-lun*, 32*b* 18, etc.
p. 95, 16: For "The Tīrthikas", read "Acela-Kāśyapa". See e.g. *Saṃyutta-Nikāya*, II, 19.
p. 95, 18: For "clean and pure", read "permanent and pure".
p. 96, 2: Read "body" for "self" *bis*.
p. 99, 2: Cf. *Chung-lun*, XVII, 23: XXIV, 36 for the idea and the technical terms.
p. 99, 7: For "according to causal conditions", read "because of his good karma".
p. 103, 16: Here (167*a* 17) "a doubtful cause" hardly renders *sādhyasamahetu*. Cf. p. 67, 1. 33.
p. 104, 27: The verse corresponds to ŚS, 5 (not to MK, VII, 15).
p. 106, 1: For „that which does not produce produces", read „that which is unproduced is not produced". Similarly *infra*.
p. 106, 4: For "indestructible", read e.g. "steadfast", *akopyadharman*.
p. 106, 23: For "That which is producing does not produce either", read "That which is being produced is not produced either". Similarly *infra*. — There is a good deal of confusion in this chapter due to the fact that *sheng* can be taken in the active as well as the passive mood. It can only be translated properly in the light of the corresponding passages in Sanskrit and Tibetan.

Chan, Hok-lam, and Theodore **de Bary** [Ed.]: **Yüan Thought.** Chinese Thought and Religion under the Mongols. New York: Columbia University Press 1982. XV, 545 S. gr. 8°. Lw. $45.50. — Bespr. von P. Ratchnevsky, Berlin.

Im 13. Jahrhundert war China dem Ansturm der Mongolen erlegen. Es war nicht das erste Mal, daß Nordchina von Nomadenvölkern erobert wurde, aber zum ersten Mal war auch Südchina unter Fremdherrschaft geraten, und im Gefolge der Mongolen waren Vertreter alter innerasiatischer Kulturen gekommen, die fremdes Ideengut ins Land brachten und als Berater und Finanzsachverständige einen dominierenden Einfluß auf die Regierung ausübten. Nie war die Gefahr für den Fortbestand der traditionellen Ordnung in China größer gewesen. Der zur Rezension stehende Sammelband vermittelt einen Einblick in das Geistesleben jener Zeit; die Beiträge illustrieren an dem Verhalten markanter Persönlichkeiten die Wege, die die Chinesen beschritten, um das nationale Kulturerbe lebendig zu halten und die traditionellen Institutionen zu bewahren.

Der südchinesische Historiker Ma Duanlin (1254–1324/5), dem der erste Beitrag gewidmet ist, hat aus den historischen Geschehnissen die Lehre gezogen, daß die traditionellen chinesischen Institutionen sich den veränderten gesellschaftlichen und wirtschaftlichen Verhältnissen anpassen müßten. In seiner Universalgeschichte der chinesischen Institutionen (*Wenxian tongkao*) legt Ma seine Auffassung des geschichtlichen Ablaufs dar, der durch die Begriffe der Kontinuität (*teng*) und des Wechsels (*bian*) gekennzeichnet wird (Hok-lam) Chan: „Comprehensiveness" (*t'ung*) and „Change (*pien*) in Ma Tuan-lin's Historical Thought, 27–87).

John D. Langlois Jr. hebt die Bedeutung hervor, die den „Frühlings- und Herbstannalen" (*Chunqiu*) von den Konfuzianern in der Yuanzeit zugemessen wird. Die in das Konfuzius zugeschriebene Werk von den Exegeten hineingedeuteten moralischen Werturteile sollten als bindende Verpflichtungen, als Ersatz für die gesetzlichen Vorschriften eines Gesetzbuches dienen (Law, Statecraft, and The Spring and Autumn Annals in Yüan Political Thought, 89–152).

Die Veröffentlichung eines Gesetzbuches war schon mehrmals von den chinesischen Beratern am Hofe der Yuan-Kaiser beantragt worden. Sie sahen in einem Gesetzbuch das effektivste Mittel, um die traditionelle gesellschaftliche und wirtschaftliche Ordnung in China zu sichern. Die Yuan-Kaiser waren dazu nicht geneigt. Ein die chinesischen Verhältnisse sanktionierendes Gesetzbuch war für die Regierung eines multinationalen Reiches als Kodex nicht geeignet. Als auch Wang Yüns diesbezügliches Ansuchen ohne Erfolg blieb, suchte Wang die konfuzianische Lehre der „guten Regierung" in Schriften im Stil der Fürstenspiegel-Literatur zu propagieren. Wangs Bemühungen dürften nicht ohne Erfolg geblieben sein. Einige Schriften wurden sogar ins Mongolische übersetzt (Herbert Franke: Wang Yün (1227–1304)/, A Transmitter of Chinese Values, 153–196).

Die Lehre des südchinesischen konfuzianischen Reformers Zhu Xi ist während der Teilung Chinas in Nordchina wenig bekannt gewesen. Zu ihrer Verbreitung auch im Norden hat Xu Heng, der wohl einflußreichste Konfuzianer am Hofe Qubilais, maßgeblich beigetragen. Der Nachdruck, der in dieser Lehre auf die ethischen Prinzipien gelegt wurde, kam dem Anliegen der mongolischen Herrscher entgegen. Zhu Xis Lehre wurde als orthodoxe Auslegung des Konfuzianismus anerkannt. Die Kleine Lehre (*xiao xue*) ist während der Yuanzeit das verbreitetste konfuzianische Werk gewesen und ist ins Mongolische übersetzt worden (Wing-tsit Chan: Chu Hsi and Yüan Neo-Confucianism, 197–231).

Das neokonfuzianische Ideal des Weisen, der außerhalb des politischen Lebens sich der Selbstvervollkommnung hingibt, hat in der Yuanzeit zahlreiche Adepten gefunden. Das Gebot kam den Konfuzianern entgegen, die nicht willens waren, in den Dienst der Mongolen zu treten, aber zu einer offenen Opposition sich nicht entschließen konnten. Liu Yin (1249–1293) beruft sich auf dieses Gebot, 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 taoistischen Klassiker sowie medizinische und militärische Werke zu studieren (Tu Wei-ming: Towards an Understanding of Liu Yin's Confucian Eremitism, 233–277).

Eine ähnliche Einstellung hatte auch der bedeutende südchinesische Gelehrte Wu Cheng (1249–1333), der das Streben nach Selbstvervollkommnung über die Gelehrsamkeit stellt (David Gadelecia: Wu Ch'eng's Approach to Internal Self-cultivation and External Knowledge-seeking, 279–326).

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