

Étienne Lamotte, *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra)*, avec une nouvelle Introduction. Tome III, chapitres xxxi–xlII. Publié avec le concours de la Fondation Francqui. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain, Vol. II, pp. lxviii + 1119–1733. Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, 1970. Fr. 1100.

In 1944 Professor Lamotte published the first volume of his translation of the *Ta-chih-tu-lun* (Taishō 1509) followed in 1949 by a second volume (cf. W. Baruch, *AM*, III, 1952–3, pp. 109–12). The third volume contains the translation of chapters 31–42 (chūan 19–26 and the beginning of 27). In the Taishō edition the *Ta-chih-tu-lun* occupies about 700 pages of which 200 have been translated by Professor Lamotte in these three volumes. One cannot possibly expect L. to translate the entire work. However, the most important part is the first 34 chūan which, according to the colophon, contain a complete translation of the first *parivarta* of the Sanskrit text. The other *parivarta* have been abridged by the translator (cf. P. Demiéville, *JĀ*, 1950, p. 388). It is to be hoped that L. will publish a fourth volume containing a translation of the final part of Kumārajīva's translation of the first *parivarta* (the remainder of chūan 27 and chūan 28–34). On completion of these four volumes only one desideratum would remain: a detailed index which would make this translation one of the most important reference works available to students of Buddhism and India.

The third volume is preceded by a long introduction (pp. v–lx) in which L. deals with several problems relating to the author and the sources of the *Ta-chih-tu-lun*. In his review of Volume II Demiéville had suggested that the original title must have been *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-upadeśa* (*JĀ*, 1950, p. 375, n. 1). In his subsequent publications L. has used this title but without discussing the arguments advanced by Demiéville. On pp. vii–viii he states his reason for assuming that the title must have been *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa* or *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsūtropadeśa* (cf. also his note in Jacques May's review of K. V. Ramanan's *Nāgārjuna's Philosophy*, *TP*, LIV, 1968, pp. 334–5). Demiéville quoted a biography of Nāgārjuna which is traditionally attributed to Kumārajīva: *Lung-shu p'u-sa chuan* (Taishō 2047). According to L., Kumārajīva is not the author of this biography (cf. pp. liv–lv). Already in his *L'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti* (henceforth: *Vk.*), Lamotte mentions the “rocambolésque Biographie de Nāgārjuna (*Long-chou p'ou-sa tchouan*, T 2047), attribuée abusivement à Kumārajīva” (p. 71). In his *Early Mādhyamika in India and China*,¹ Richard H. Robinson believes that “In so far as it is genuine, this *Biography* must consist of Kumārajīva's oral account as worded by his disciples” (p. 25; cf. also pp. 21, 22). This conclusion agrees with Demiéville's description of the biography as belonging to “les biographies chinoises de Nāgārjuna, qui doivent émaner de Kumārajīva” (*op. cit.*, p. 375, n. 1). The authorship of the biography is not without importance, because it says at the end that one hundred years have lapsed since Nāgārjuna's death. If this statement is due to Kumārajīva himself, it would indicate that Kumārajīva believed Nāgārjuna to have lived in the third century. However, even in this case it seems difficult to consider it as a decisive argument for

¹ Lamotte does not refer to Robinson's book; neither is it mentioned in the “Supplément à la bibliographie” (pp. lxi–lxviii), although this lists many publications to which no reference is made in the text.

determining the date of Nāgārjuna. Rather surprisingly, L. quotes this statement, although he attaches no value to the biography (*cf.* Vk., p. 76).²

The *Upadeśa* has traditionally been attributed to Nāgārjuna (*cf.* Demiéville, *op. cit.*, p. 381, n. 1). In his preface to the first volume L. wrote as follows: "Il [=Nāgārjuna] vécut probablement au II^e siècle de notre ère et joua un rôle de premier plan dans la formation du bouddhisme du Grand Véhicule. Originaire du Sud (pays d'Andhra), il étendit son influence jusqu'au Nord-Ouest de l'Inde" (p. x). In an article, published in 1954: "Sur la formation du Mahāyāna" (*Asiatica*, Leipzig, 1954, pp. 377-96), L. had changed his point of view and wrote: "La critique moderne y va de sa légende à elle et propose de chercher les origines du Mahāyāna dans l'Inde du Sud, en pays Andhra" (p. 386). Nāgārjuna exercised his activity in the north-west of India and his role in the formation of Mahāyāna Buddhism is not primordial: "Nāgārjuna est bien postérieur à l'écllosion des Mahāyānasūtra, car on trouve dans ses œuvres et notamment dans son *Upadeśa* (T 1509) et sa *Daśabhūmivibhāṣā* (T 1522) des références et des citations empruntées à une bonne cinquantaine de sūtra et śāstra mahāyānistes" (p. 391). L.'s change of opinion, which was characterized by Demiéville as a "volte-face" (*OLZ*, 1959, Sp. 248), is carried to a logical conclusion in his most recent discussion of the problem of the authorship. Whereas in 1954 he still considered Nāgārjuna to be the author of the *Upadeśa*, in the introduction to Volume III of this translation (henceforth: III, Intr.) the author is said to have lived after the first Mādhyamika: Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva and Rāhulabhadra, probably in the beginning of the fourth century (p. xl). L. even sketches in some detail the spiritual development of the author as a sarvāstivādin converted to the Madhyamaka (*cf.* also Demiéville, *J4*, 1950, p. 382). The date of the author depends on two lines of argument. The first shows that Nāgārjuna lived between A.D. 243 and 300. The second that the author of the *Upadeśa* quotes not only Nāgārjuna's works, but also those of his pupil, Āryadeva, and of his contemporary, Rāhulabhadra. The date of Nāgārjuna has been studied by L. in his Vk. (pp. 70-7). In III, Intr. L. quotes the same texts but the argumentation is not entirely the same (pp. li-lv). The texts, quoted by him, are well known (*cf.* Mochizuki, *op. cit.*, p. 4996a-b). According to Tao-an of the Later Chou Kumārajīva adopted 637 B.C. as the date of Buddha's Nirvāṇa (Vk. p. 73; III, Intr. p. li). Robinson rightly queries the authenticity of this passage which was written in A.D. 568, a century and a half after Kumārajīva (*op. cit.*, p. 23). In the second place L. quotes a preface to the *Satyasiddhiśāstra*, written by Seng-jui, a disciple of Kumārajīva. This preface is lost, but is quoted by Chi-tsang in his commentaries. According to this quotation Āsvaghoṣa was born 350 years after the Nirvāṇa of the Buddha and Nāgārjuna in the year 530. L. explains that this can be understood in two ways: (1) Āsvaghoṣa and Nāgārjuna were born, respectively, 350 and 530 years after the Nirvāṇa; (2) Āsvaghoṣa was born 350 years after the Nirvāṇa and Nāgārjuna 530 years after Āsvaghoṣa. L. tries to prove that the second alternative has to be preferred. However, Mochizuki has already pointed out two other quotations of the same preface, in which the addition of *hou* 後 or *ch'i hou* 其後 clearly indicates that 530 years after Āsvaghoṣa are meant.³ Consequently Nāgārjuna was born 880 years after the Nirvāṇa of the Buddha (637 B.C.) = A.D. 243. L. arrives at the date of A.D. 300 for his death by referring to the *Lung-shu p'u-sa chuan*, as mentioned above, and to the *Tibetische Lebensbeschreibung Śākyamuni's* (tr. A. Schiefner, St. Petersburg, 1848, p. 310) according to which Nāgārjuna lived 60 years. Schiefner's work is an abridged translation of a text written in 1734 (*cf.* T'oung Pao, XLIII, 1955, pp. 317-18). Moreover, L. quotes as "un indice, permettant de contrôler l'exactitude de la date 243 p.C. proposée pour la naissance de Nāgārjuna" the fact that

² Thomas Watters already referred to the Biography: "If we regard his Life as having been composed by Kumārajīva, its professed translator, he lived in the latter part of the 3rd century of our era" (*On Yuan Chwang's travels in India*, Vol. II, 1905, p. 204). *Cf.* also Mochizuki Shinkō's *Bukkyōdaijiten*, Vol. V, 1933, p. 4996b; Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 4996b1-2. Mochizuki refers to Taishō 1855 (p. 119a21 ff.) and to Hui-ying's commentary on the *Upadeśa* (*Dainihon bukkyō zensho*, Vol. XCIV, p. 110b).

according to two Chinese catalogues Dharmarakṣa translated between 265 and 313 a work described as an extract of the *Daśabhūmikāśāstra* (cf. Vk., p. 76). It is difficult to see how this information, even assuming that it is correct and that Nāgārjuna is indeed the author of the *Daśabhūmikāśāstra*, can confirm 243 as the date of birth of Nāgārjuna. Hikata, from whom L. has taken this indication, argues that the *Daśabhūmika* must have reached Tun-huang before 265 (the date of Dharmarakṣa's departure from Tun-huang) and that the text must have come into existence by 250 at the latest. In that case Nāgārjuna would have written the text at the age of seven at the latest! In III, Intr. L. does not refer any more to the *Lung-shu p'u-sa chuan*, the *Tibetische Lebensbeschreibung Śākyamuni's* and Dharmarakṣa's translation of an extract of the *Daśabhūmika*, but he still seems to consider Tao-an's information concerning the date of Nirvāṇa, accepted by Kumārajīva, and Seng-jui's preface to the *Satyasiddhiśāstra*, as indications sufficient to determine which dates Kumārajīva and his disciples adopted for the Nirvāṇa of the Buddha and the lives of Āśvaghoṣa and Nāgārjuna. However, one must remark that Tao-an wrote in 568 and that Seng-jui's preface is only known from quotations. Even admitting that this information is reliable and that it originated in Kashmir where Kumārajīva studied in his youth, it is still difficult to attach much value to it. L. himself points out that the period of more than 500 years ("près de 500 ans" is probably a slip of the pen for "plus de 500 ans") between Āśvaghoṣa and Nāgārjuna is not acceptable. He continues: "On n'échappe pas à l'impression que toutes ces datations relèvent de vues théoriques sur les étapes successives de la Bonne Loi et que, en chronologie absolue, leur valeur est plutôt faible" (p. liii).

Much more important is the internal evidence which can be gained from the *Upadeśa* itself. On p. 1370 occurs the following passage: "Tous les dharma dépendent des causes et conditions: dépendant des causes et conditions, ils ne sont pas autonomes; puisqu'ils ne sont pas autonomes, il n'y a pas de Moi, et le caractère du Moi est inexistant, ainsi qu'il est dit dans le *P'o-wo-p'in* (Ātmapratishedhaprakaraṇa) 'Chapitre de la réfutation du Moi'." This passage is followed by a long note (pp. 1370-5) in which L. maintains that *P'o-wo-p'in* 破我品 refers to the tenth chapter of Āryadeva's *Catuhśataka*: "Le *Traité* ne se réfère pas davantage ici à un chapitre des *Mūlamadhyamakārikā* (ou *Madhyamakāśāstra*) de Nāgārjuna car le chapitre XVIII qui y traite de l'Ātman est intitulé 'Examen de l'Ātman' (*Ātmaparikṣā* en sanskrit, *Bdag brtag pa* en tibétain, *Kouan-wo* en chinois). Le seul chapitre entrant ici en ligne de compte est l'*Ātmapratishedhaprakaraṇa* du *Catuhśataka* d'Āryadeva." L. continues: "Cette citation est d'importance car elle prouve que les premiers auteurs *Mādhyamika* (Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva, Rāhulabhadra) étaient connus de l'auteur du *Traité* et que par conséquent ce dernier leur est postérieur." There is not the slightest doubt that the author of the *Upadeśa* quotes Nāgārjuna's *Mūlamadhyamakārikā* and Rāhulabhadra's *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* (cf. pp. 1060-5).⁴ However, this fact in itself does not prove that Nāgārjuna cannot have been the author of the *Upadeśa*. He may well have quoted his own work. As to Rāhulabhadra, his relation to Nāgārjuna is not well established. The Indian tradition seems to consider him as Nāgārjuna's teacher (cf. Lamotte, "Sur la formation du Mahāyāna", p. 391; *Upadeśa* pp. 1373-4). This is followed by the Tibetan tradition (cf. Bu-ston's *History of Buddhism*, tr. E. Obermiller, II, Heidelberg, 1932, p. 123; *The Blue Annals*, tr. George N. Roerich, I, Calcutta, 1949, p. 35). L. quotes two Chinese texts to prove that Rāhulabhadra was a contemporary of Nāgārjuna and a commentator of his works (*ibid.*), but not much value can be attached to texts written in China in the seventh and eighth centuries.⁵ In any case, there is not enough evidence to

⁴ On this stotra see Ui Hakuju, *Indo tetsugaku kenkyū*, I, Tōkyō, 1924, pp. 339-54 (first published in 1920-1 in the *Tetsugaku zasshi*); W. Baruch, *Asia Major*, III, 1952, p. 112; Edward Conze (ed.), *Buddhist Texts through the Ages* (Oxford, 1954), pp. 147-9. Rāhulabhadra is also the author of 20 ślokas in honour of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. The text of these verses has been published in the edition of the SP by Wogihara and Tsuchida (Tōkyō, 1934-5, pp. 37-9).

⁵ Chi-tsang's *Chung-kuan-lun shu* (Taishō, 1824) was probably written in 602, cf. Satō Tatsugen, "Kichizō no senjutsusho ni tsuite," *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, X, 1962, p. 566.

consider Rāhulabhadra "un successeur proche ou lointain" of Nāgārjuna. For this reason, the quotation from Āryadeva is much more important because in India, China and Tibet Āryadeva is unanimously considered to be a disciple of Nāgārjuna. However, does *P'o-wo-p'in* really refer to the tenth chapter of the *Catuhśataka*? The *Upadeśa* contains a long passage on the ātman (pp. 734-40). L. remarks in a note (p. 734, n. 1): "Il est à remarquer que le Mppś [= *Upadeśa*], attribué à tort ou à raison à Nāgārjuna, ne manifeste, dans sa réfutation de l'Ātman, aucune ressemblance spéciale avec les Madh. kārikā de Nāgārjuna, et, pour tout dire, semble les avoir négligées, alors qu'en d'autres endroits il y a eu fréquemment recours." This passage is not based on the eighteenth chapter of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, nor is it based on the tenth chapter of the *Catuhśataka*. The passage, quoted on p. 1370, is too short to enable us to determine its source, but I have not found any evidence in the tenth chapter of the *Catuhśataka* to prove that it has been used by the author of the *Upadeśa*. L.'s only argument seems to be the title of the tenth chapter of the *Catuhśataka* in the Chinese translations (Taishō 1570-1). However, both translations were made by Hsüan-tsang in 650-1 (cf. p. 1371). The name of the Sanskrit version has not been handed down; that of the Tibetan version is **Ātmapratīṣedhabhāvanāśamdarśana* (*Bdag dgag-pa bsgom-pa bstan-pa*).⁶ There is no evidence that the author of the *Upadeśa* was able to use a text of this chapter bearing the name **Ātmapratīṣedhaprakaraṇa*. Therefore, neither the contents of the tenth chapter of the *Catuhśataka* nor its name confirm L.'s hypothesis.

On the other hand, the possibility is not to be ruled out that *P'o-wo-p'in* refers to the eighteenth chapter of Nāgārjuna's *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. In Sanskrit this text is transmitted together with Candrakīrti's commentary, the *Prasannapadā*. According to this commentary the title of the eighteenth chapter is *Ātmaparīkṣā* (in Tibetan: *Bdag bṛtag-pa*). Nāgārjuna's *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* are transmitted separately in a Tibetan translation, but this version has been corrected with the help of the Tibetan translation of Candrakīrti's commentary (cf. P. Cordier, *Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la bibliothèque nationale*, III, Paris, 1915, pp. 290-1: Mdo-'grel, XVII, 1). Therefore the fact that, in this version, the name of the eighteenth chapter is **Ātmaparīkṣā* does not prove that this was the original name of this chapter. The Tibetan Tanjur contains three other commentaries on the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*: the *Akutoḥbhayā* (Peking edn. No. 5229; Cordier, *op. cit.*, XVII, 6), Buddhapālita's commentary (Peking edn. No. 5242; Cordier, *op. cit.*, XVII, 20) and Bhāvaviveka's *Prajñāpradīpa* (Peking edn. No. 5253; Cordier, *op. cit.*, XVIII, 8). Both Buddhapālita's and Bhāvaviveka's commentaries are quoted by Candrakīrti. In all these three commentaries the name of the eighteenth chapter is **Ātmadharmaparīkṣā* (Tib. *Bdag dan chos bṛtag-pa*). According to the Chinese versions of the commentary ascribed to Pin-lo-chieh (Taishō 1564) and of Bhāvaviveka's commentary (Taishō 1566) the name of this chapter is **Dharmaparīkṣā* (*kuan-fa p'in* 觀法品). Therefore, only Candrakīrti's commentary and the revised Tibetan version of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* give the name *Ātmaparīkṣā* to the eighteenth chapter. According to the other commentaries the title is either **Ātmadharmaparīkṣā* or **Dharmaparīkṣā*. It is impossible to decide whether the original title was *Ātmaparīkṣā*, *Ātmadharmaparīkṣā* or *Dharmaparīkṣā*. The chapter itself contains a refutation of the Ātman. It is quite possible that the author of the *Upadeśa* has referred to it by the name **Ātmapratīṣedhaprakaraṇa*, even though the real name is probably different. Another possibility is that Kumārajīva translated **Ātmaparīkṣāprakarana* as *P'o-wo-p'in*. For a similar instance one may compare the Chinese translation of Pin-lo-chieh's commentary (Taishō 1564), in which the names of chapters three and five are **Śaṇḍindriyaparīkṣā* and **Śaḍdhātuparīkṣā* (*Kuan-liu-ch'ing p'in* 觀六情品; *Kuan liu-chung p'in* 觀六種品). However, the text itself refers to these two chapters as **Indriya-pratīṣedhaprakaraṇa* (*P'o-ken p'in* 破根品, p. 24b24) and **Śaḍdhātupratīṣedhaprakaraṇa* (*P'o liu-chung p'in* 破六種品, p. 24a26). In this case, too, it is impossible to know

⁶ The fragments of the Sanskrit text, published by Haraprasad Sastri, do not contain the name of this chapter. The name *Ātmasuddhyūpāyasaṃdarśana*, which is mentioned by L., is a rather fanciful reconstruction from the Tibetan by P. L. Vaidya. Probably Vaidya has misread *dag-pa* for *dgag-pa*.

if this is due to the author or to the translator.⁷ Therefore, it is certainly possible that *P'o-wo p'in* refers to the eighteenth chapter of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*.

There is not enough evidence to support L.'s supposition that the *Upadeśa* was written in the beginning of the fourth century in north-western India. According to Kumārajīva's biography, he studied in Kashmir between the age of nine and twelve (cf. Robert Shih, *Biographies des Moines éminents*, Louvain, 1968, pp. 62-3). Whichever dates we adopt for his life (344-413 or 350-409),⁸ Kumārajīva must have lived in Kashmir in the beginning of the second half of the fourth century, about half a century after the composition of the *Upadeśa*. It seems difficult to admit with L. that Kumārajīva did obtain reliable information on the dates of Nāgārjuna but not on the authorship of the *Upadeśa*. If this work had really been written in the beginning of the fourth century in north-western India, Kumārajīva would almost certainly have met younger contemporaries of the author. For this reason, it seems preferable not to attach too much value both to the computation of the dates of Nāgārjuna and to the attribution of the authorship of the *Upadeśa* to him by Kumārajīva. From the *Upadeśa* itself it is obvious that the author was well-versed in the Abhidharma literature of the *Sarvāstivādin* and that he lived in north-western India. It does not seem necessary to assume that he was a former Sarvāstivādin converted to the Madhyamaka. As L. indicates (III, Intr. p. xlii), even for a Mādhyamika the Abhidharma remained important as belonging to the *saṃvṛtisatya*.

The author of the *Upadeśa* often quotes the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* but, to my knowledge, he does not seem to refer to any of the other works attributed to Nāgārjuna. It is difficult to give a satisfactory explanation of this fact for it seems probable that Nāgārjuna is the author of several works. Some information about the works attributed to Nāgārjuna can be obtained from Candrakīrti's *Madhyamakasāstrastuti* to which L. refers twice (III, Intr. pp. xliii-xliv; pp. 1373-4). Candrakīrti lived several centuries after Nāgārjuna, but if we compare the list of eight works mentioned by him to the long lists of works enumerated as Nāgārjuna's works by Tibetan and Chinese catalogues, it makes a much more reliable impression. It is not an exhaustive list of the works attributed to Nāgārjuna by Candrakīrti. Recently, Uryūzu Ryūshin has shown that, in his commentary on the *Catuhśataka*, Candrakīrti refers twice to the *Bodhisambhāra* (Taishō 1660), a work also mentioned by Bu-ston (*op. cit.*, II, p. 126 where *Bodhigaṇa* must be corrected to *Bodhisambhāra*).⁹ Bu-ston attributes six works to Nāgārjuna (*op. cit.*, I, p. 51) as mentioned by L., but attention must be drawn to the fact that Bu-ston considers these six to be his logical works. Among other works of Nāgārjuna he enumerates the *Ratnāvalī*, stotras, works dedicated to the practical side of the doctrine: the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, the *Svapnacintāmaṇiparikathā* and works on the conduct of householders and of monks: *Suhyllekha* and *Bodhisambhāra* (*op. cit.*, II, pp. 125-6). The authorship of the *Akutobhayā* is disputed among the Tibetans. Obermiller refers to Mkhas-grub's discussion of the fact that the *Akutobhayā* quotes from the *Catuhśataka* with the words: "It has thus been said by the venerable Āryadeva" (*Acta Orientalia*, XI, 1933, p. 4, n. 9). Walleser has already observed that the same quotation occurs at the same place in Pin-lo-chieh's commentary (tr. Walleser, Heidelberg, 1912, p. 189). L. considers Pin-lo-chieh's work to belong to the authentic works of Āryadeva (cf. p. 1373), but it seems more likely that both the *Akutobhayā* and the commentary attributed to Pin-lo-chieh have been written by authors who knew Āryadeva's works.¹⁰

⁷ According to Seng-jui, Kumārajīva has taken great liberties with the text (cf. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 29).

⁸ The dates 350-409 have recently been proposed by Tsukamoto Zenryū, cf. Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 244-7. Robinson discusses in detail Tsukamoto's arguments.

⁹ Uryūzu Ryūshin, "Bodaishiryōron no Ryūju shinsen ni tsuite", *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, XVII, 1969, pp. 513-19.

¹⁰ On Pin-lo-chieh and his commentary (Taishō 1564) see Mochizuki, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 2793b-4a; Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-30. On the relation between chapters xxiii-xxvii of the *Akutobhayā* and the corresponding chapters of Buddhapālita's commentary,

—Continued on following page

The authenticity of Āryadeva's *Śatakaśāstra* (Taishō 1569) is also open to grave doubts. Ui listed 17 quotations from Āryadeva in Chinese Buddhist texts. He was able to identify 9 with verses of the *Catuḥśataka*, but did not discover a single quotation from the *Śatakaśāstra* (*op. cit.*, pp. 277–81). The fact that Candrakīrti often quotes the *Catuḥśataka* by the name *Śataka* seems also to indicate that Āryadeva did not write both a *Catuḥśataka* and a *Śataka*.¹¹

The uncertainty regarding the authenticity of the works attributed to Nāgārjuna makes it difficult to form a reliable picture of his philosophical and religious ideas. In his review of Frederick J. Streng's *Emptiness, A Study in Religious Meaning* (Nashville, New York, 1967) Jacques May rightly remarks that Nāgārjuna has been studied until now chiefly as a philosopher or as a logician (*Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques*, XXIV, 1970, p. 69). The interpretation of the *śūnyatā* concept has given rise to many discussions among scholars. Perhaps it is necessary to study not only the *Mūlamadhyamakahikārikā*, but also the other works, attributed by Candrakīrti to Nāgārjuna, in order to determine the place of this concept in Nāgārjuna's thought. In any case, one is rather surprised to see L. describe the *śūnyatā* as "rien que ce soit (*akimcid*), 'une simple inexistence' (*abhāvamātra*)" (III, Intr. p. xxxi). L. does not give any references to texts and, as far as I have been able to ascertain, the *Mūlamadhyamakahikārikā* do not use these terms to characterize *śūnyatā*.¹² On page 1229 L. quotes a verse from Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra* in which the words *kiṃcin nāstīti* are to be found; however, they do not describe the *śūnyatā*. As the commentary explains, the practice of meditating on the idea that "nothing exists" brings about the cessation of all ideas of voidness and existence (*cf. Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā*, ed. L. de La Vallée Poussin, Calcutta, 1901–14, p. 414). As to the expression *abhāvamātra*, this has been discussed by L. in his introduction to his translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra* (p. 57; *cf. J. May, T'oung Pao*, LI, 1964, p. 95), but the *cittam acittam* of the *Prajñāpāramitāsūtra* is not identical with the *śūnyatā* of the *Madhyamaka*.

It is impossible to discuss fully the many topics treated by L. in his introduction. Two points of minor importance have to be mentioned. On p. xiii L. states that the name Mahāyāna never occurs in inscriptions, but one finds the expression *mahāyānika-Śākyabhiṣṭu-ācāryya* in an inscription from East Bengal dated A.D. 507–8 and inscriptions of the Pāla period mention *mahāyāna-anuyāyin* "followers of Mahāyāna" (*cf. Shizutani Masao, Gupta jidai bukkyō himei mokuroku*, Kyōto, 1968, pp. 12–13, where further bibliographical references are given). On pp. xxxviii–xxxix L. translates a

Continued from previous page—

see Hirano Takashi, "Muichū to Butsugo-chū to no idō ni tsuite", *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, III, 1954, pp. 236–8. The biography of Nāgārjuna, attributed to Kumārajīva, attributes to him an *Akutobhayaśāstra* in 100,000 verses (*cf. M. Walleser, "The Life of Nāgārjuna from Tibetan and Chinese Sources", Hirth Anniversary Volume*, p. 447). L. does not believe that this work is identical with the *Akutobhayā* (III, Intr. p. iv), but the similarity in name and the fact that this work is said to contain the *Chung-lun* 中論 rather suggest a connexion between the two works. Walleser mentioned the possibility that Pin-lo-chieh's commentary was based upon the *Akutobhayā*, but ruled it out because, in that case, Kumārajīva would not have mentioned the *Akutobhayaśāstra* in the way he did in his biography of Nāgārjuna. However, if this biography is not written by Kumārajīva, but reproduces information obtained from Kumārajīva, the mention of an *Akutobhayaśāstra* may well indicate a connexion between Pin-lo-chieh's commentary and the *Akutobhayā* (*cf. Walleser, Die Mittlere Lehre des Nāgārjuna*, Heidelberg, 1912, pp. ix–x).

¹¹ Richard R. Gard's discussion of the authenticity of the *Śatakaśāstra* is conducted along different lines: "On the authenticity of the *Pai-lun* and *Shih-erh-mên-lun*", *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, II, 1954, pp. 751–42.

¹² Candrakīrti rejects nihilistic interpretations of *śūnya*, *cf. Prasannapadā*, p. 495. 12–13: yadi tāvat sarvam idaṃ śūnyam sarvaṃ nāstīti parikalpayet tadāśya mithyādr̥ṣṭir āpadyate; tr. J. May, p. 231: s'il suppose que "le donné empirique tout entier est vide" veut dire "tout est non-être", il tombe dans la vue fausse par excellence.

passage from the *Hsi-yü-chih* as quoted in the *Fa-yüan-chu-lin* (Taishō 2122). According to L. this passage is taken from Tao-an's *Hsi-yü-chih* and contains the oldest mention of Nāgārjuna. The same passage is quoted in Mochizuki (*op. cit.*, p. 4996a), but he does not attribute this *Hsi-yü-chih* to Tao-an, because it is well known that the *Hsi-yü-chih*, quoted in the *Fa-yüan-chu-lin*, has nothing to do with Tao-an's *Hsi-yü-chih*. Sylvain Lévi, who translated several passages of the *Hsi-yü-chih* from the *Fa-yüan-chu-lin*, has given the following information on this work: "Les mémoires de Wang Hiuen-ts'ue et de Hiouen-tsang servirent de base à une compilation officielle, le *Si-iu-tchi* (appelé aussi *Si-kouo-tchi*) en cent chapitres, soixante de textes, quarante de cartes et dessins, qui fut exécutée en 666" (*JA*, 1900, I, p. 298).

In this third volume of his translation of the *Upadeśa* L. shows his great knowledge of the Abhidharma literature. As shown in the table on pp. lxvi-lxvii, chapters xxxi-xlii deal with the *dharma*s of the Way of Nirvāṇa and with the attributes of the Buddha. The systematic nature of these chapters have made it possible for L. to add preliminary notes, in which useful information is given on the *dharma*s, their treatment in canonical literature, Abhidharma texts and Mahāyāna texts. One must admire L.'s extensive knowledge of the Buddhist literature in Pāli, Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese. L. gives numerous references to the original sources but mentions only rarely secondary sources in Western languages. It is only by consulting these works that one realizes to what extent L.'s knowledge surpasses that of his predecessors. However, one cannot but regret the fact that L. does not seem to have made great use of the works of Japanese scholars apart from reference works. To mention only one example: chapter xli of the *Upadeśa* treats in great detail of the eighteen *āveṇīkadharma* of the Buddhas. L. mentions that the wording of these *dharma*s is not always the same and that their order varies according to the texts. He refers to many texts but does not indicate in which order they are listed in them (*cf.* pp. 1626-7). This problem has been examined very carefully by Mizuno Kōgen in his study on the classification of the eighteen *āveṇīkadharma* (*cf.* Miyamoto Shōson, ed., *Daijō bukkyō no seiritsushiteki kenkyū*, Tōkyō, 1954, pp. 292-302).¹³ Mizuno points out, for instance, that the same list of *dharma*s is to be found in two biographies of the Buddha (Taishō 184, p. 472a1-10; Taishō 185, p. 478b16-25) and in Dharmarakṣa's version of the *Lalitavistara* (*cf.* Lamotte, p. 1627). He demonstrates that this list was copied from Taishō 184 by the translator of Taishō 185 which, in its turn, is the source for the list in Dharmarakṣa's translation. In such and similar instances references to Japanese publications would have been very welcome. There is much to be learned from the excellent work done by Japanese scholars, just as Japanese scholars can derive much profit from studying the work of Western scholars. Probably, Japanese scholars could considerably facilitate the access to their publications, which are widely scattered in innumerable periodicals, by publishing regularly annotated bibliographies in a Western language.

L.'s translation of this volume is superior even to that of the two preceding ones. Only rarely would one like to suggest a different rendering, as, for instance, in the following passages:

P. 1140: Les êtres sont dignes de pitié; je dois les sauver et les attacher au séjour inconditionné (*asaṃskṛtapada*) 衆生可愍。我當拔出著無爲處 (p. 197c14-15). The beings are to be pitied. I must extirpate my attachment to the unconditioned place. Similar instances of the use of *chu* 著 can be found in Gadgin M. Nagao's *Index to the Mahāyāna-sūtrālamkāra* (Tōkyō, 1961), Vol. II, p. 232b: 著財 *bhoga-sakti*; 著諸有 *bhavābhirāma*.

P. 1144: les choses qu'ils aiment ou dont ils se détachent sont multiples 所樂所解法亦種種 (198a14). The things which they like and which they understand are manifold.

P. 1211: caravancier (*sārthavāha*) 御者 (206a16). Charioteer (*sārathi*).

¹³ One must add to Mizuno's references to Pāli texts the recently published *Vimuttimaggā* (Colombo, 1963, p. 17), a text closely related to Upatissa's *Chieh t'o tao lun* (Taishō 1648). Some information on this text, mainly on the basis of the Sinhalese introduction, can be found in Mori Sodō, "Shin-shiryō Vimuttimaggā", *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, XVII, 1968, pp. 132-3.

P. 1263: Le bonheur (*sukha*) aimé par tous les êtres est important (*guru*) 樂是一切衆生所愛重 (211a13). Happiness is liked and esteemed by all beings.

P. 1377: Supposons un homme chaussant des sandales: si celles-ci étaient neuves dès le premier jour, elles ne vieillirent jamais; après coup, elles seraient toujours neuves et n'auraient pas de vieillissement. 如人著履。若初日新而無有故。後應常新不應有故 (222c10-12). Suppose that a man puts on sandals. If, on the first day, they were new and without aging, then later they would be always new and would not become old.—This is explained in the preceding passage: "tout dharma dont on constate après coup le caractère de destruction doit évidemment posséder dès sa naissance ce caractère de destruction".

P. 1511: qui n'a pas encore détruit les impuretés 未斷結使 (235b8). Who has not yet cut off his bonds (*samyojana*).

P. 1601: le Buddha qui a atteint les félicités du Sommet de l'existence (*bhavāgra*) y a renoncé 佛乃至有頂樂已離 (245a16). The Buddha has given up even the joys of the Summit of existence.—The expression *nai chih* 乃至 has presented difficulties to the translator, cf. p. 1691: le présent qui ne dure qu'un instant 現在乃至一念中無住時 (254c12). The present does not possess duration even during one moment (Vasumitra admits that *saṃskāras* possess duration during one instant but not the Sautrāntikas, cf. L. de La Vallée Poussin, *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, V, 1937, p. 155); p. 1694: Ainsi des saints comme Avalokiteśvara 乃至觀世音 (255a29). Even saints such as Avalokiteśvara.

P. 1692: Dès qu'il se trouverait dans des dispositions mauvaises (*duṣṭacitta*) et transgresserait ses engagements (*śīla*) antérieurs, ce religieux ne serait plus un bhikṣu. 若現在惡心中住。過去復無戒。是爲非比丘 (255a6-7). If at the present moment [the monk] were in an evil disposition, in the past, too, he would be without morality. He could not be a monk [at all].—The Sarvāstivādin argues that, if past and future were non-existent, all three times would be identical. Therefore, if somebody is sinful at the present moment, he is also sinful in the past. Consequently, it is impossible to be a monk.

P. 1709: qu'est-ce que la petite bienveillance et la petite compassion? Après ces petites, pourquoi parler des grandes? 何等是小慈小悲。因此小而名爲大。 (256b18). What are the small benevolence and the small compassion by reason of the smallness of which [the great benevolence and the great compassion] are called great?

The *Upadeśa* contains the following quotation from the *Kāśyapapariprechā*: "L'Ātman est un extrême, l'Anātman est un autre extrême: éviter ces deux extrêmes est nommé le Chemin du milieu" (p. 1684). In a note L. refers to *Kāśyapaparivarta* §56 but he has overlooked §57: ātmeti kāśyapa ayam eko ntaḥ nairātmyam ity ayam dvitiyo ntaḥ yad ātmanerātmyayor madhyam tad . . . iyaṃ ucyate kāśyapa madhyamā pratipad dharmāṇāṃ bhūtapratyavekṣā. L. believes that the *Upadeśa* quotes the *Sūtra of Kātyāyana*. The *Upadeśa* contains also a long quotation from *Kāśyapaparivarta* §§82-4 (266c28-267a15). Kuno Hōryū has drawn attention to the interesting fact that the quotation in the *Upadeśa* contains the beginning of §84, a passage which is missing in the three oldest Chinese translations of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* (*Bukkyō kenkyū*, II, 3, 1938, p. 95).

The publication of the third volume of the translation of the *Upadeśa* is an important milestone in the history of Buddhist studies. To conclude we express the wish that Professor Lamotte may find the courage and energy to continue his admirable work on this important text!

J. W. DE JONG