CHAPTER - III

LIFE AND WORKS OF NĀGĀRJUNA

Nāgārjuna occupies a unique position in the evolution of Buddhist thought and practices. Indeed, everything about Nāgārjuna remains a mystery - his identity, date, place of birth as well as activities remaining subject to keen controversies. He has held a continuous attention of Buddhists and non-Buddhists since his own day and deserved attention also of the modern scholars during the first half of nineteenth century when the manuscript of his 'magnum opus' - Mūlamadhyamaka - Kārikā with one of its commentaries 'Prasannapadā' by Candrakīrti has been found among the 381 bundles of Sanskrit manuscripts on Buddhism, discovered from Kathmandu in Nepal by Mr. Brian Houghton Hodson, appointed resident there in 1833-42.1 In the Eastern World he exerted a historical influence of such vastness and depth that it can only be said to have been surpassed by that of the Buddha. Nāgārjuna's influence could be compared with that of Jesus Christ and St. Paul in the West or that of the prophet Mohammad in West Asia. Devout Buddhists of China, Japan and Tibet, in fact, actually consider him to be the second Buddha who had once again set in motion the wheel of Dharma (Truth and righteousness). Laṅkāvatāra - Sūtra spoke of him as "the glorious and greatly renowned monk who expounded in

1. Stcherbatsky, Th. 'The Conception of Buddhist Nirvana', pp. 3-4.
this world Buddha's teaching as that of the Great Path, higher than which there is none." He became its "putative father", Bodhisattva who for the salvation of all, it is said, brought it out from within the Buddhist Order (Sañgha) to the external world. Thus, Nāgārjuna's historical figure was mystified and to his substantial achievements the Indian, the Tibetan and the Chinese traditions added magical and Tantrik accomplishment and produced biographies of this image far a reality to the faithful. The one composite Nāgārjuna or the Nāgārjuna image was the (1) Philosopher or Logician, (2) Bodhisattva, (3) Tantrik, (4) Siddha, (5) Magician & Alchemist. Though the traditions of his life are greatly overlaid with legendary details, there is no reason to doubt that Nāgārjuna was a historical personality. Because his writings, the extraordinary impact he made on the development of Buddhism and religious thought in the East and the images of him formed by generation of Asians and recorded by some of the best minds, constitute his historical reality. Historicity of a person is to be determined in accordance with the age and circumstances responsible for his


3. Even, Alberuni who visited India about 1030 A.D. wrote that one Nāgārjuna, native of fort Daihak near Somnāth, lived hundred years before his own time, and that he was "a famous representative" of the art of rejuvenation (rasāyana) in which he excelled and on which he wrote a book containing the substance of all the literature on it. He may have recorded a tradition about the composite Nāgārjuna, or a practitioner of rasayana may have actually lived in Western India about 900 D.A. It may be recalled that according to tradition Nāgārjuna knew this art, and one source speaks of his belonging to Western India. So Alberuni's story may be about that composite figure, Ibid, p-39.
emergence. So the period of Nāgarjuna is to be looked for. In this connection, it may be mentioned that all accounts of Nāgarjuna, incidents relating to the great philosopher as well as others which might have occurred at various times between the seventh and the tenth centuries, are all attributed to one and the same person. If we are looking for authentic biographical data we can find none, for no reliable historical account of him is left. Therefore, in recounting the life of Ācārya, modern scholars have invariably included element which though facts of religious history, are difficult to establish in actuality. Problem lies in the fact that there is no direct archaeo-logical evidence for Nāgarjuna's association with any Sātavāhana king or decoration of Amārāvati, renovation or the construction of monastery for him on Śrīparvata etc., supplied by various sources like Indian, Chinese or Tibetan. Nor Prajñāpāramitā, Mahāyāna or Nāgarjuna's philosophical school Mādhyamika is mentioned in any of the Amārāvatī or Śrīparvata inscriptions. There is, however only one solitary epigraph which mentions Nāgarjuna.4 This Sanskrit inscription of Jaggayapetta records

4. This inscription is found about 30 miles north-west from Amārāvati, on the Paler river, a tributary of the river Kṛishṇa, and 4 miles from their junction. In the ancient times it was known Vellagiri. Now it is called Jaggayapeta or Betavolu. Excavations there have yielded a number of Prakrit inscriptions of Iksaku king 'Sīrī Virapurisadata (A.D. 235/240-255/265 A.D.) and only aforesaid Sanskrit inscription is incised below the feet of an outstanding Buddha image in a high relief in a panel. Vide Dutt. N. Notes on the Nāgarjunikondā Inscriptions, IHQ. VII., 1931, pp. 633ff and K. Gopalachari Early History of the Andhra Country (Univ. of Madras, 1941) p. 125-126, n. 8. also Sastri, K.A.N. South India And South East Asia, p. 85. He also refers that "This Nāgarjuna was obviously the latter Tāntrik guru (siddha Nāgarjuna, who was one of the 84 Siddhas) and not the great founder of the Mādhyamika school. This Nāgarjuna was perhaps living in the fifth. Century A.D."
that one Chandraprabha had the image installed for the attainment of Buddhahood and that he was a disciple of Jayaprabhācārya, who in turn was a disciple of Bhadanta Nāgārjuna. About this inscriptional evidence K. Satchidananda Murty mentioned that 'Burgers, who discovered it, thought it was “in an alphabet of about 600 A.D.,” while T.N. Ramachadran had held that the script was "Brahmi of about 450-500 A.D." Some scholars have conjectured that the Nagarjuna referred to here was “the tantric Nagarjuna”, a disciple of Saraha. If so, he must have lived, say, about 550 A.D. or 400 A.D. That would appear to be impossible because: (i) the tantric Nagarjuna, even if he was historical reality cannot be assigned such an early date; (ii) the names of Jayaprabha and Chandraprabha are not found in the lists of tantric relating to Saraha; (iii) only men like Asvaghosha and Nagarjuna, and not tantric siddhas, were styled 'Bhadanta'; and (iv) the spirit of the deed commemorated as also the image itself are pure Mahayanic. The principle of parsimony obliges us not to postulate more than one Nagarjuna during that period, as there is no evidence that there were two Nagarjunas by then, and as available data can also be explained without a duplication of Nagarjuna. There is no certainty that the epigraph was not inscribed in 300 or 350 A.D., or that Jayaprabha was an immediate disciple of Nagarjuna.' Finally 'As Jayaprabha and Chandraprabha are not known from any other source, this record does not even help us to determine Nagarjuna's date. It should, however, dissolve scepticism about his
historicity. Kumarajiva (A.D. 344-413) introduced Nāgārjuna and the Madhyamika philosophy to China in the first half of fifth century A.D. His immediate disciples, Seng-jui and Seng-chao and Hui-yuan, a contemporary scholar who was in correspondence with him, have stated that Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva flourished in the 9th Century after the Buddha’s Nirvāṇa. In view of the date which they take as that of the Buddha’s Nirvāṇa, this works out to be the first half of the third century A.D. It is to be noted that based on a Chinese author Tao-an (568 A.D.). Kumārajīva’s account and his date for the Buddha’s Nirvāṇa and other material, a Japanese scholar Hakaju - Ui concluded that Nāgārjuna lived about 113-213 A.D. and Āryadeva about 163-263 A.D. Another Japanese scholar Hikata-Rhusho, on the basis of Kumārajīva’s biography of


6. Kumārajīva was a native of Kucha born in 343/344 A.D. of an Indian father and a mother who was a princes of the Kucha royal family. The fame of Kumārajīva as a Buddhist scholar induced the ruler of Chin to bring him to his country. As a scholar, his principal work seems to have been the translations of Buddhist texts. He translated four of the principal works attributed to Nāgārjuna, viz. the Madhyamakaśāstra with the commentary of Piggala, the Dvādasamukhaśāstra, the Daśabhūmi-vibhāṣā-sastra and the Mahāprajñāpāramitā-Sastra. We are told he commenced the translation of the Sastra in 402 A.D. and finished 405; Ramanan. K.V. Ibid, pp. 14-16 and also pp-335; Robinson, R.H. ‘Early Madhyamikas In India and China’ Ch- III, pp. 71-95.


8. According to Theravāda Buddhism, the Mahāparinirvāṇa of Buddha occurred in 544 B.C. (The Bodhagayā inscription gives 544 B.C. as the date of parinirvāṇa). Though the different Buddhist schools have their independent systems of Chronology, they have agreed to consider the full moon day of May 1956 to be the 2500 th anniversary of the Mahāparinirvāṇa of Gautama, the Buddha. 2500 years of Buddhism, ed. by P.V. Bapat, Foreward, p.-V; Dates of The Buddha by Sriman Sathe and 'The Dates of The Buddha's Mahaparinirvana' by Sonam Morup are very important regarding this issue.
Nāgārjuna, one of Nāgārjuna’s epistles, and what Dharmarakṣa (266-313 A.D.), and early translator of Mahāyāna scriptures has mentioned, concluded that "Nāgārjuna was a man living from the latter half of the second century to the first half of the third century." 9 Further E. J. Eitel, an early sinologist gave 194 A.D. as one of the two alternative dates found in Chinese material for Nāgārjuna, and J. Edkins has recorded that, .... 'birthday of Nāgārjuna is the 25th day of the 7th lunar month of their national almanac.' 10 However it is clear from the above information that philosopher Nāgārjuna must have appeared prior to Kumārajīva i.e. before fourth century A.D. The period suggested above for the Nāgārjuna can be termed as being relatively certain in the light of other evidences. There is hardly any reasonable doubt about Āryadeva being the principal and direct disciple of Nāgārjuna. According to Mahāvamsa,* 11 a Sri lankan chronicle Āryadeva was contemporary of king Voharika - Tissa, who have

---

10. Ibid, p.-16.
11. Mahāvamsa, XXXVI, 27ff. King Vohārika Tissa is said to have listened to the doctrine preached by a therā called Deva. The Dīpavaṃsa, (XXii, 41), giving the same information, says that king Tissaka (i.e. Vohārikatissa) heard the Gilāna-Sutta from therā Deva. Again in Dīpavaṃsa (XXii, 50), King Sarṅgha Tissa is said to have heard the Andhakavinda Suttanta from Thera Deva. The accounts that follow in these records show that both these kings were greatly impressed by these preachings and consequently increased their patronage to the Sāsana. Here it should be noted that both king lived during the 3rd century A.D. vide Āryadeva's date is given as 4th Century A.D. by S.c. Vidyabhusana in his History of Indian Logic, P.261, and also by R. K. Mookerjee in his Ancient Indian Education, pp-557, 576, Chronological table at the end of E. Conze's Buddhism, and also T.R.V. Murti. The Central Philosophy of Buddhism, p.92 and foot note 3 on the same page.
Indian and Tibetan traditions speak of Nāgārjuna as a 'Tāntrik' and according to Chinese accounts he was a 'Mystic' (Vidyas) of high attainments. There is nothing contradictory if a great philosopher is also a 'Yogi'. Tāntrik' or 'Worshipper' or a 'Bhakta'. But the history of Tantra gives us a negative answer. Tantra contains some very ancient elements of belief and practice, but it did not emerge as a distinctive trend much before the fourth century A.D. The first clear evidence of the appearance of tantra in Buddhism is found in Asaṅga's (C.450 A.D.) works. On the otherhand, Udyotakara (C.635 A.D.) of the Nyāya school seems to have been the first important Hindu thinker who declared himself a Tāntrik. All these show that tantra had emerged as an identifiable trend by the fourth century A.D. and had developed by the seventh century A.D. Afterwards

12. For Asaṅga, 'A History of Indian Logic, S.C. Vidyabhusana, pp. 265-266, Tibetan historian Tāranātha informs that Tantra was handed down secretly from the time of Asaṅga down upto the age of Dharmakirti. Tāranatha's Geschitche der Buddhisimus Von. Schiefer, P. 201; Cf. Benoytosh Bhattacharyya (Indian Historical Quarterly, Ill, 1927, p. 736f and Sādhanaamala, pp. XXXiiff) believes that Asaṅga had something to do with the rise of the Vajrayāna. The earliest full fledged Buddhist Tantric works are probably the Guhyasamājatantra and the 'Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa'. The Guhyasamājatantra was also attributed to Asaṅga but M. Winternitz has pointed out that there is no basis for taking it to be such an early work. It was apparently confused with Tathāgataguhya, an earlier work about which much is not known. Hil, Vol-II, Pt-I, P.331f. For Tathāgataguhya vide Nepalese Buddhist Literature of Rajendralal Mitra, p. 261ff; also K. Watanabe, JRAS, 1907, P. 694, who considers Nanjio No. 1027 as corresponding to the 'Śṛgūhyasamāj - Tantraraja'.

it became an India wide movement, and in all its forms viz. Saiva, Sākta, Vaiśnava and of course Buddhists with their various branches - it reached its peak in the eighth century A.D. What is interesting that "Nāgārjuna" was incorporated into their lists of Siddhas by sa:va tantrik sects as well as Buddhists. After a thorough investigation K. Satchidananda Murty has suggested - "As the Buddha was adopted into the Hindu pantheon, and then a mythology developed about him, so was Nagarjuna taken over by the Saiva-Siddha Traditions and tales woven about him. It does not seem probable that there was a real Kapalika or Saiva-Siddha called Nagarjuna, and that stories about him and the Buddhist philosopher were fused together." He also says - "The Buddha of the Puranas is not the Sakymuni whom the Buddhists venerate, nor are the two different; for the former is almost a distortion of the latter but not a different person. The case of Nagarjuna Bodhisattva-siddha Nagarjuna is analogous." A large number of Tantric works are attributed to Nāgārjuna. Nevertheless many of these works


15. Murty, K. S. (Nagarjuna pp. 31-32) has reached this conclusion on the basis of the romantic tales and legends complexes recorded in the 'Bṛhatkathāmārjari of Ksemendra (about 1037-1066 A.D.), the 'Kathāsarītsāgara' of Somadeva (written
enjoy great esteem. But this Nāgārjuna is not the same as the one who founded Mādhyamika School.\textsuperscript{16} It is said that this Nāgārjuna imported a Śādhanā from Tibet (Bhoṭa). There is a large number of works, no less than 122, ascribed to him in Tānjur and Kānjur.\textsuperscript{17} There can hardly be any doubt that all these works were written long after the time of Nāgārjuna and Mahāyāna - Sūtras. Indeed the great Nāgārjuna cannot be said to have ever written a work on the Tantra as well though five of the six sections of the work on Pañcakrama is ascribed to him and Burnouf calls it a work that appears as a summary of the Guhyasamāja Tantra.\textsuperscript{18} M. Winternitz pointed out that "In case one Nāgārjuna is actually the author of this section IV, he is certainly different from the founder of the Mādhyamika system."\textsuperscript{19} Regarding this very book K.S. Mutry also suggested that a commentary on Guhyasamāja attributed to Nagarjuna obviously cannot be his as it deals with topics which came to the fore only in the middle of the 7th

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{16} B. Bhattacharyya, Sādhanamāla, Introduction, xvi. CVL ff, I. Louvain 1944, p.x-xiv and G. Tucci in JASB, N.S. XXVI, 1930, 138ff, where are mentioned different teachers of the name Nāgarjuna.

\textsuperscript{17} N. Dutt in 'IQH, 7, 1931, p. 635ff; Joshi also has listed the works of Siddha Nāgarjuna preserved in the Tanjur, 'Studies in the Buddhistic Culture of India', Ch.-VII, p-167.

\textsuperscript{18} Winternitz, M. Ibid, pp. 330-332ff.

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid, p-333ff.
\end{flushright}
Century.\textsuperscript{20} M. Winternitz on the basis of Taranath’s information reached this conclusion that Sākyamitra, a contemporary of Devapāla of Paladynasty in Bengal (approximately about 850 A.D.) is the author of third section of the Pañcakarma and the entire work may possibly be assigned to this age.\textsuperscript{21} There is a tendency to consider the Tantras and Tantīk-Buddhism as old. But there is no evidence still now to support this view.\textsuperscript{22} Therefore it would not be impertinent to accept the suggestion made by Prof. P. L. Vaidya in the introduction of his edition of Madhyamakāśāstram that “Nāgārjuna is rightly regarded as the founder of the Mādhyamika School of Buddhists, and must be distinguished from another Nāgārjuna whose contribution is mainly, if not solely, to the field of Tantra including Vaidyaka (Chemistry and Metals). Mahāvyūptatti, 177. 1-2, clearly mentions Nāgārjuna and Nāgahvaya as two distinct ācāryas of Buddhism, at the head of 36 other ācāryas, many of whom have left their work to us.\textsuperscript{23} Now our great difficulty is to locate exact age of philosopher Nāgārjuna. We have already pointed out that Nāgārjuna’s biography was first translated into Chinese by Kumārajīva in fifth century A.D. (Approximately 409 A.D.).\textsuperscript{24} Therefore Nāgārjuna

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{20} Nagarjuna, pp. 25-26.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Winternitz, M. Ibid. p-333; For Sākyamitra. The Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit MSS in the Royal Asiatic Society by E.B. Cowell and J. Eggeling (JRAS 1876, Reprint, P. 28) One Pañcakarmopadesa of Sṛghanta is mentioned here.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Sastri, H. P. JASB, Proceedings 1900, P. 100ff., tries to prove the Tantra literature to belong to the 5th or 6th Century A.D. Rapson, also in the JRAS 1898, p. 909 ff.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Vaidya, P. L. (ed) Mūlamadhyamaka - Śāstram, Introduction, p. XXVI.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Kumārajīva, 'The Biography of Nāgārjuna (T. 2047); the biographical account of Hsuan - Tsang’s 'Hsi-yu-Chi’ (T 2087), 929a - 936a (Watters, on Yuan Chwang, II, 200-208). (T-Taisho-Shinshu-daizokkyo, Ed.Takakusu and Watanabe, Tokyo, 1922-1933). also Ramanan, K.V. Nāgārjuna’s Philosophy, Introduction, pp. 25-30.
\end{enumerate}
was a man living prior to Kumārājīva i.e. before the fourth century A.D. In this respect how two letters viz. 'Suhrīllekha' and 'Ratnāvalī' may be mentioned.

According to unanimous tradition, the king to whom Nāgārjuna had written two epistles was in intimate life-long friendship with him though he himself did not mention the name of that king. The Chinese translators of the "Suhrīllekha had given the king's personal name as 'Sh' - yen, toh-kai' Or 'Shan-tho-kia', restorable as Jetaka, Jantaka, Santaka or Sindhuka. S. Beal has suggested that the Chinese translation of the Sanskrit name was wrong and that the original name was 'Sātavāhana'. According to Ajitamitra, commentator of Ratnavali, it was written to whom the other epistle Suhrīllekha has also been written. On the other hand Sanskrit Buddhist works did not appear prior to the period of Menander and Patañjali (150 B.C.) Mahāyāna scriptures are mainly in Sanskrit and many of them are Sanskrit versions of works in original Prākrit and other dialects. Some of the Prajñāpāramitā Sūtras were among the earliest Mahāyāna scriptures. The oldest Indian and Chinese commentators considered Nāgārjuna's

25. Suhrīllekha was translated third times, first by Guṇavarman (A.D. 43), secondly by Sanghavarman (A.D. 434) and thirdly by I-tsing (A.D. 700-712). I-tshing also says that the letter was addressed by the Bodhisattva Nāgārjuna to old patron (Dānapati), a great king of the South, who was called 'So-to-pho-han-na, i.e. Sātvāhana and whose proper name was Sh - 'yen-toh-kia' or 'Shan-tho-kia'. JPTS, (1883), pp.72-73.

26. It is to be noted that S. Beal has translated it into English after the Chinese translation of Guṇavarman (about A.D. 424-431) under the heading - 'Some remarks on Suhrīllekha or Friendly Communication of Nāgārjuna Bodhisattva to king Shatopohana', published in the Indian Antiquary, 16, May, 1887, pp. 167-172.

27. Murty, K. S. Nagarjuna, p.19f.
philosophy to be a systematisation of Prajñāpāramitā doctrines.\textsuperscript{28} One of his epistles testifies to the fact that he was an worshipper of Amitābha.\textsuperscript{29} So his time must have been prior to that of the development of Prajñāpāramitā and the rise of the Amitābha cult. i.e. definitely after 1000 A.D. In view of the above discussion Sātavāhanas prior to the 100 A.D. are not relevant in this connection. So Nāgārjuna was s contemporary of the kings who ruled after 100 A.D. Bāna, the famous author of Harṣacarita refers that this Sātavāhna king was the 'Lord of the three seas.'\textsuperscript{30} The king was Gautamiśputra Sātakarni who is called the only 'Buddhist' in his lineage as well as "the lord of the three seas" in the Nāsik edict issued by his mother Bālasūri.\textsuperscript{31} This is the king that won a victory over Kuśāha Nāhāpāna, and this victory was proclaimed in the Edict issued from the king's victorious camp in the year 18 of his reign i.e. 12 A.D.\textsuperscript{32} M. Winternitz

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{28} Winternitz. M. History of Indian Literature, vol. - II, p-l, pp. 259ff.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Of the other types of Mahāyāna scriptures, one of the earliest was the greater Sukhāvati - Vyuha, first translated into Chinese between 147 and 170A.D. It teaches for the first time that faith in Amitābha Buddha leads to salvation. This next must have been finalised at least two or three decades before its translation into Chinese. History of Indian Literature, Vol - II, pp. 274 specially foot note, 639 for details.
\item \textsuperscript{30} ‘trisamudrādhīpataye Sātavāhana - nāmne narendra sa dadau’ Kane, P. V. edited ‘The Harṣa-carita of Bāṇabhṛṭṭa’ Ch. VIII/82, (Aṣṭamaṁcchvāsah). Divākaramitra, a converted Buddhist, made to Harṣa a present of a necklace named Mandrakīrī, brought by Nāgārjuna from the Nāgas of Pātalaloka and handed over to friend Sātavāhana, overlord of the three oceans - Ibid, p. 258-259.
\item \textsuperscript{31} tisamudatoyapāvāhanasa ............ ekabahanāsas. Epigraphica Indica, Vo. - VIII (1905-6), P. 60.
\item \textsuperscript{32} On the question whether the year 46 in the reign of Nāhāpāna with which the year 18 of Gautamiśputra coincides is taken as referring to the Saka-era or simply to one of his regnal years. Those who accept the year 46 as referring to the Saka era assign this Edict of Victory to 124 A.D. and consider Gautamiśputra to have reigned from 106 A.D. to 130 A.D.
\end{itemize}
holds that "this Sātavāhana was the first prominent king who was king to both the Brāhmaṇas and Buddhists, he was Gautamiputra whose age is given as 119-128 A.D. One of his successors was Gautamiputra Yajñasrī whose period of reign is from 116 A.D. to 196 A.D., and so Nāgārjuna obviously refers in his Suhṣṭilekha to this Sātavāhana." On that very point S. V. Sohni supplies a valuable information that Hala Sātavahana was a contemporary of Nāgārjuna. He refers that Hāla and Nāgārjuna were contemporaries and 'Suhṣṭilekha or 'The Epistle' sent by a well-wisher - the sender was Nāgārjuna and the recipient was Hāla. In view of the fact we may mention there is a late Prākrit work 'Lilavati Parinaya' by Kutuhala which narrates the marriage of the Sātavahana king Hāla with Lījavati, a Simhala princess. It says that Bhikṣu Nāgārjuna was Hāla's teacher and adviser. Regarding this matter, Prof. K. S. Murty says - "The oldest North Indian manuscript of Lilavati Parinaya is of 1208 A.D., and it may have been composed one or two centuries earliest at the most. As Hāla ruled from 19 to 24 A.D., and as this date is much too early for Nāgārjuna, what it says about his being the teacher of that king to be dismissed as pure fiction. It is not possible for Nāgārjuna to have preceded Kanishka and Asvaghosa by more than half a century." But S.V. Sohoni points out that Hāla was supposed

33. Based on V.A. Smith's Early History of India' (p-221ff) he had reached that conclusion vide. History of Indian Literature, Vol-II, P-I, 293, also foot note 671a.
35. Ibid. Page, 205.
to have gone along with his contemporary, Nāgärjuna. Pādalip’s poem states that Hāla Sātavāhana had gone along with Nāgārjuna to Pātalaloka. According to Sri S. V. Sohoni it should be realised that both had gone to Nāgadvipam, the inhabitants of the Pātāla region being conventionally assumed to be Nāgas. He has further referred that the Jaffna peninsula of island of Ceylon, was called Nāgādvipa. In Ptolemy’s Geography, there is reference to Nāgadidoi, identical with Nāgadvīpa of the Mahāvamsa. The earlier Greek geographers had expressed their belief that the island of Ceylon was a region belonging to the opposite portion of the world (Pliny, Mv, VI, CXXII). Even Kalidāsa, has referred to Samudra-Gupta’s fame having entered into the areas occupied by Bhujangamas (=Nāgas). Samudra-Gupta had political relationship with Ceylon resulting in his obtaining a tribute of jewels, for granting permission to build a Mahāvihāra at Bodhgaya. Based on the above information he has reached the conclusion that “the joint visit of Hāla and Nāgārjuna to Pātalaloka really meant their trip to Ceylon.”37 Now, it is clear that Nāgārjuna was a man living prior to Kumārajīva (C.344-413 A.D.) - the renowned Chinese translator of Nāgārjuna’s biography, i.e. before the fourth century A.D. The king to whom Nāgārjuna had addressed in his two epistles viz. Suhṛṭlekha and Ratnāvali was in intimate life long friendship with him. Though he did not mention the name of that king, there is no controversy about the fact that he was a king of the Sātavāhana line of Andhra. Perhaps S. Beal in 1886, was the first to identify Nāgārjuna’s royal friend with Yajñāsī (178-

37. Mitra Shastri, Ajaya (ed.) Ibid.
207 A.D.) M. Winternitz and E. Lamotte also think that to be probable, the former assigning this king to 166-196 A.D., and the latter to the 3rd Century A.D. M. Walleser assumed that the king was Vijayasī, who he thinks ascended the throne in 213 A.D. None of these conjectures can either be proved or disproved. Recent archaeological excavations as well as literary materials throw a new flood of light on the age of the Sātavāhanas. About Nāgārjuna’s Sātavāhana connection S.V. Sohoni, on the basis of those recent explorations has pointed out that Nāgārjuna was a contemporary of the king Hāla instead of Gautamī-putra Sātakarṇi (C.60-90 A.D.) or Gautamī-putra Yajñāsī (C. 171-199 A.D.). There are also evidence which may conflict with what has been stated above. I-tsing mentions that Nāgārjuna was a contemporary of Kaṇiśkṛ, and Lama Tāranātha says he was born in Kaṇiśka’s time. According to Kalhana, Nāgārjuna was a contemporary of the kings, Huśka, Juśka and Kaṇiśka, - which means Nāgārjuna was living round about A.D. 119, for Kaṇiśka - II was a rival of Huviśka, who in turn succeeded Vaśiśka, the immediate successor of

39. Winternitz referred “Gautamīputra Yajñāsī was the contemporary of philosopher Nāgārjuna - whose period of regin is 166A.D. to 196A.D. and so Nāgārjuna obviously, refers in his Suhṛdlekhya to this Sātavāhana”. HIL, Vol-II, p. 293, Recent archaeological discoveries indicate that the probably ruled during C. 171-199A.D. The Age of the Sātavāhanas’, Vol-I, P. -31.
40. Takakusu, J. (Tr.) "I-tsing’s Record", introduction, pp. lvii and lix.
41. Taranath’s Geschichte Des Buddhismus, A. Schiefner, pp. 82ff.
42. Rājatarangini, Ch. - I, 173ff.
Kaniska I (78 A.D.). Hiuen Tsang only said that in times of Kumāralabdhā who was the founder of the Sautrāntika school of Buddhism, Asvaghosa, Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva and Kumāralabdhā were "the four suns who illuminated the world." He did not say they were contemporaries but S. Beal, a famous translator of Hiuen Tsang's itinerary wrote that while Asvaghosa could have been Kanishka's contemporary, Nāgārjuna was certainly subsequent to Kanishka's time and lived towards the end of the 2nd century A.D. It is probable that Nāgārjuna was a contemporary of Kaniska - III. but he synchronized with Kaniska - I. This could not have been the Great Kaniska who ruled from C.78 to 101 A.D., as these dates are too early for Nāgārjuna in view of what has been previously discussed. Ramanana concludes - it could perhaps be taken as a highly probable working hypothesis that the upper and the lower limits of the philosophical activity

44. Watters, T. Ibid, Vol-II, p-104, Oldenberg initially considered the 'abhiseka' of Kaniska at Mathura as standing point of the 'Saka era, later inclines to Boyer's estimation (Journal Asia, 1900. I, P.579), who places the Kaniska era towards the end of the First Century A.D. Fleet also thinks so (JRAS, 1912, p. 785) - "Nahapāna... was overthrown by the great Sātavahana Sātakarni king Gautamīputra-Sri Sātakarni. The saka-era beginning A.D. 78, was certainly either by Nahapāna or by Chaṣṭana" - JRAS. 1907, p. 1043, note 2; I.C. 1910 p. 821. - Another view is taken by stein Konow - "It must then have been Wima Kadpheses who extended the empire of the Kuṣāṇa's to those parts of Western India where we find the Western Kṣatrapas. This would lead to the conclusion that the Śaka era, which was used by the Western Kṣatrapas, starts from this conquest" - Z.D.M.G. Vol. 68 (1914) P. 100, Date of Kaniska is a disputed point. Another view by J.W. Thomas - "The Śaka era, commencing A.D. 78, was introduced by Scytho - Parthian satrapas, who presumably were adopting an institution of their suzerain; - JRAS, 1913 (The Date of Kaniska") p. 627 also (p. 635) also vide Chattopadhyaya, S. Early History of North India, pp. 74-81 and 95-97;
of Nāgārjuna lay somewhere between 50 A.D. and 120 A.D. This, it has to be agreed even to day that an exact fixing of Nāgārjuna's life time must remain entirely doubtful having regard to the contradictory nature of the traditions, indicating irresistibly that a creative personality of this very name has existed at all.

We have the contents of the Buddhist sources for Nāgārjuna's life which can be divided in the following heads:-

Of them, the first kind may be called A) Siddha Accounts :- We have the following: (i) Grub-thob brgyadcu - rtsa - bshihiran - thar, rendered into German by A. Grunwedel with the title "The History of the 84 Sorcerers" (Die Gesekichte der 84 Zauberer, Leipzig, 1916). It claims to be based on a Sanskrit work, probably of the early 11th century, whose author might have been one Abhayadattasri. (ii) "The Book of Seven Revelations" by Cho-jung or Tāranāth, rendered by A. Grunwedel as 'Tāranāth's Edelsteinmiine (Petrograd, 1914). The German translation has been summarised by B. N. Datta and published under the title "Mystic Tales of Lama Taranath" (Calcutta 1957). (iii) The Nepalese Sanskrit 'Siddhanam Amnayah" or "The Mystical School of Siddhas" published by G. Tucci.46 B) Of the second kind, we have the following : (i) "History of

46. Murty K. S. Ibid - pp : 40-41; Chattopadhyaya D. (ed) and Chattopadhyay, Alaka and Lama Chimpa (Tr.) Taranaths History of Buddhism in India, p-381; Ramanana, K.V. Ibid, p-25ff; also Wallerser, M (ed.). 'The Life of Nāgārjuna from Tibetan And Chinese Sources'. pp-3-23.
Buddhism" by Bu-Ston (1290-1364 A.D.), translated by E. Obermiller (Heidelberg, 1931), (ii) Taranatha's History of Buddhism. Completed in 1608, translated by A. Schiefer under the title "Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien" (rgya-gar-chos-bhyun) (St. Petersburg, 1869). Its English translation has already appeared serially in Indian Studies: Past and Present, Calcutta, and is due for publication in book form from Simla. (iii) "History of Buddhism" by Sumpa Khampoymese Pal Jor (in 1747 A.D.). S. Pathak has translated the account.47 (iv) "The Mirror of Crystal: An Elegant Treatise On Philosophical Schools (Siddhānta)" by Thu'u-bkwan Blobzan - Chos-Kyi-ni-ma (1737-1802).48 (c) Of the third type of sources, we have the following: (i) The Mahāmegha Sūtra, lost in the original, but preserved in a Chinese version (414-421 A.D.) as also in a Tibetan version.49 (ii) There is a passage in the Saṅghaṭaka Chapter of the Lankāvatāra Sūtra,50 not found in the Gūṇabhadra's first Chinese translation (443 A.D.), but found in the translations of Bodhiruci (513 A.D.) and Siksānanda

47. 'Life of Nagarjuna (from Pag-sam-jon-Zang)' in Indian Historical Quarterly, XXX, 1954, p. 93.
48. Relevant articles from this is found in the article written by Sarat Chandra Das and Mr. Walleser, Ibid, pp. 6-8, M. Walleser also, mentioned about the article of S.C. Das as follows: "As stated, Sri Candra Das omitted to mention the sources for this account of the life of Nāgārjuna, but that may have been taken for a part from the 'Dub-thah-Set-kyi-me-Ion' from which the other texts in the article are for the greater part derived". p-8. For the text of this article Walleser referred the JASB, Vol-I, p. 187, note -1.
49. Murty, K. S. Ibid.
50. Lankāvatārāsūtra, Ch. - X, Verses - 764-166. Walleser, discussed with so many references that the Nāgahvaya in the Lankāvatāra is nobody but Nāgārjuna. The Life of Nāgārjuna from Tibetan and Chinese Sources', pp - 21ff.
(700-704 A.D.). Its Sanskrit original also is available, (iii) The Manjusri-mula-tantra in its present form was produced in the 7th or 8th century; translated into Chinese in between 900 and 1000 A.D., and into Tibetan in the 11th century. It is the chief source of the entire later Tibetan historical tradition (iv) The Mahamayā Sūtra and (v) the Mahābhārata Sūtra are not mentioned among the names of Mahāyāna scriptures (D) we now come to the last type of sources.

Among them Kumārīvā's (344-413 A.D.) biography of Nāgārjuna may be mentioned as the most informative and valuable source-material. It was first printed in China in 972 A.D., revised and published in Korea in the 11th Century, again revised thoroughly and published in China in 1239 A.D., and later reprinted twice with slight variations. Ivan wassiljew in "Der Buddhismus" Part-I. German edition p. 232 ct. seg. gave a brief summary of it. (ii) Hiuen-Tsang (596-664 A.D.), the famous Chinese pilgrim to India, in the eighth and tenth chapters of his Records, has provided less legendary material concerning Nāgārjuna. Hiuen-Tsang's statements, remarked Walleser, show that "the personality of Nāgārjuna sufficiently described to show that they relied upon reminiscences of a being of flesh and bone though legendary traits are not always wanting."

51. For Maṇjuśrī-mūla-tantra vide Walleser's Ibid. p-19, note -2. K.S. Murty mentions it as Maṇjuśrī- mūlakalpa. Ibid, p-45 : Noteworthy that K.S. Murty utilised the Walleser's information as a primary source for his work, Ibid.

52. Murty remarks on those two scriptures "The last two are not mentioned among the Mahāyāna scriptures given either by Santideva in Siksāsamuccaya, or the Mahāvyūpatti, they may not be genuine." Ibid.

53. Hsi-yu-Chi, Nanjio 1503, T.E. XXXV, 7 fol. 38b, l. 15 CT seq.

In 1905, T. Watters in On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India, Vol-II, has given a summary with critical comments on Hiuen-Tsang's material. In 1883 Beal translated the Records. (iii) Several works in Chinese Tripitaka give succession lists of patriarchs (Tsu Shih) of Buddhism, and each school of Chinese Buddhism has its own list.55 However, a work called 'Fü-fa-tsang-yin-yuan'-Ching based on Dharmapiitaka Sūtra and claimed to be a translation made in 472 A.D. of an Indian work, acquired much authority, because its Sanskrit original is not available and as the Tibetan cannon does not know it.56 It is probably only Chinese compilation of the sixth century. According to it, Nāgārjuna was the 13th patriarch, the 12th being Kapimala and the 14th Āryadeva (iv) Hui-Yuan (334-416 A.D.), a correspondent and follower of Kumārajīva, abridged Mahāprajñāpāramitā śāstra and in its preface he summarised Nāgārjuna's biography.57 (v) F-Yun's 'Dictionary of Sanskrit, Terms' Or 'Fan-i-ming-i-Chi', composed in 1151 A.D., gives a short condensation of the original Indian biography. A translation of it is given in Walleser's book.58

Among the above mentioned sources, the first kind viz. 'Grub-thob', 'The book of Seven Revelations' and 'Siddhanam - Amnayah' - these three works agree on the following points that he was a brāhmin by birth, born in

---

55. Ibid. p. 23ff. Walleser has given the accounts concerning the life of Nāgārjuna.
56. Ibid. pp. 30,32.
57. Ibid. p. 47
58. Ibid. pp. 23ff.
Dakṣiṇāpatha and also was a tāntrik, magician, alchemist beside a great scholar and philosopher who built innumerable temples and wrote many books. The former two further state that he studied in Nālandā University. He spent his later days on Śrīparvata and lived for hundred years. According to 'The Book of Seven Revelations', he brought Prajñāpāramitās from the World of serpents. According to Grub-thob, at the request of god Brahmā, Nāgārjuna gave up his life while the 'The Book of Seven Revelations' states that it was at the request of King's son. This king may be Nāgārjuna's close friend and was endowed by Nāgārjuna with perpetual youth and long life. The second type of sources broadly agree on the following points. Nāgārjuna was born in South India in Vidarbha or according to Sumpa Khampo, "in a place to the south of Vidarbha", 400 years after the Nirvāṇa of Buddha. He was Brāhmin by birth. His parents remained childless for a long time and offered a religious feast to a hundred Brahmins, in accordance with a dream or prophecy. After his birth, astrologers had declared that he would remain alive only for 7 years; when the seventh year was about to end, he was sent wandering along with a servant because his parents did not want him to die before them. In the course of his travels, he reached the Nālandā University where by Chanting of Sāmaveda he attracted Saraha's attention who gave him the mantra of Amitāyu, through whose propitiation, he became long lived. He studied at Nālandā first with Saraha and then with Rāhulabhadra, the abbot of Nālandā. According to Bu-Ston, Nāgārjuna

59. Ibid, pp. 4-8.
became a monk and rose to be the verger of the congregation, but, according to another account, he became the Head of Nālandā. In due course, he became a great tāntrik, alchemist and magician; he built thousands of temples; brought Prajñāpāramitās from the serpent-World; renovated and improved the temples at Bodhagaya as well as Amarāvatī. These accounts also recount his prophecy of kingship, friendship with a king, although it is not clear whether he was the same who became a king according to Nāgārjuna’s prediction. He endowed this king perpetual youth and longevity by giving him an elixir. Finally, it is stated in those accounts that Nāgārjuna gave up his life at the prince’s request. He lived for hundred years. These accounts also inform that he resided on Śrīparvata. On all these points, the sources differ only in details but on others, they entirely disagree. Among the third type of sources, the two versions viz. Chinese and Tibetan of the Mahāmegha-Sūtra do not agree. The Chinese version says that 1200 years after the passing away of Buddha, in the time of king Sātavāhana, a great monk “Nāgarāja” was born in a village Kusumamala or Sumanamala near the river Supaya in the Kingdom of Surastra in South India and he sacrificed his life for protecting the Dharma. As against this, the Tibetan version says that 400 years after the death of Buddha near the village Mahavaluka on the northern bank of the river Sundarabhuti in a country called Rishila in South-India on ground belonging to Vaisyas, a Licchavi was born in

60. Ibid, pp. 8-10.
king Vipattichikitsaka's time. He became a monk called "Nāga", bore also the Buddha's name and propagated Dharma and gave up his life for it.62

In the Sagāthakavarga of the Lankāvatāra - Sūtra, it says: A great monk called "Nāgahvaya", born in Vedalī in South India, put an end to the extreme views of being and not being, expounded Mahāyāna as the Buddha's teaching. Reached a high level of spiritual attainment and went to the Su-hāvati heaven after death.63

One important thing is to be noted that Sagāthakavarga is the last chapter of Lankāvatāra - Sūtra. P.L. Vaidya says: "This last chapter generally puts together the stanzas occurring in the first nine chapters of the Sūtra, but precisely these stanzas are not found in the first nine chapters, and therefore, their antiquity and genuineness become questionable."64 K. Satchidananda Murty observes that while the Chinese versions do not mention any dates, the extant Sanskrit text says he was born 400 years after the death of Buddha and lived for 600 years. In the Tibetan books we also come across another person "Nāgahvaya", so there is a doubt whether this scripture refers to Nāgarjuna.65 P.L. Vaidya

63. Nivrte sugate paścātālokaítite bhaviṣyati/
   mahāmate nibodha tvam yo netrīm dhārayiṣyati//
   dakṣiṇāpavade ṛṣiḥ bhikṣuḥ śrīmān mahāyāsaḥ/
   nāgahvayah sa nāma tu sadasatpakṣa-dārakāḥ/
   prakāśya loke maddānam mahāyānamuttaram/
   āsadya bhūmiḥ muditāṁ āsasyatesau sukhāvātāṁ//
   Lankāvatāra-Sūtra, Ch.-10, Verses 164-166.
64. Madhyamakalāstṛam, Introduction, pp XXVII-XXVIII
says "Mahāvyutpatti, 177. 1-2, clearly mentions Nāgarjuna and Nāgahvaya as two distinct acaryas of Buddhism, at the head of 36 acaryas many of whom have left their works to us." Prof. Walleser has opined that the part of the Lankāvatāra which contains this quotation has been added later, and this follows from the fact that the final chapter in quotation (question ?) which mentions the prophecies is wanting in the oldest Chinese version by Gunaabhadra (Nanjio No. 175, A.D. 443) and is only to be found in the one by Bodhiruci (No. 176, A.D. 513) and Sikṣānanda (No. 177, A.D. 700-704) and therefore probably added to the sanskrit text towards the middle of the fifth century A.D. Initially, though Prof. Walleser is skeptical about accepting the identification of Nāgarjuna and Nāgahvaya as one and the same person on the basis of Lāṅkāvatāra-Sūtra only he is forced to believe by the evidence of Tibetan and Chinese sources that both are identical.

66. Mūlamadhyamakasastram, Introduction, p.-XXVI.

67. He has mentioned another reason for this assertion is that this chapter includes in form of prophecies particulars referring to a much later time, for instance the one mentioned in the J.R.A.S. 1905, p. 385. Mauryā Nandaśa Guptas ca tato Mleccha nṛpādhamāḥ / Mlecchante śāstrasamksobhah śāstrānte ca kaler-yugah/ibid. p. - 20.

According to him, if that note of Lāṅkāvatārasūtra on Nāgārjuna takes us to much older period than may supposed by the quoted late Tibetan sources, that is to the beginning of the sixth century, or the end of the fifth, yet one has to consider that Nāgahvaya mentioned in that note may have nothing at all to do with Nāgārjuna'. Also "For this reason the quotation from the Lāṅkāvatāra sūtra should not be used without warning for the chronological fixing of Nāgārjuna, especially as the Lāṅkāvatāra commentary by Jñānaśīrī, Tanjur mdo. V. +2 (ni) NE fol. 291a : Klu hphaga sogs-pa mkhas-pa-rnams// tshe rin-ba yan med-pa (hi) mams// presumes the simpler form of "Nāga"" ibid. pp. 20-23.
The Manjusrīmūlakalpa (or Manjusṛī-mūla-tantra) informs us that 400 years after the Buddha passed away, monk called ‘Nāghavaya’ appeared, lived for 600 years, attained a high spiritual level and did much good to Buddhism. He was a great soul, proficient in different sciences and a master of Mayurīvidyā. He expounded the truth of non-substantiality. After death he went to the Sukhāvatī heaven, and finally he would become a Buddha.68

The Mahāmāyā Sūtra and Mahābhērā Sūtra, more or less refer to his spiritual attainment. The Mahāmāyā says that, 700 years after the death of Buddha, the monk Nāgārjuna appeared, extinguished false views and held aloft the torch of Dharma.69

About these three types of sources it may be stated that all these scriptures, refer to Nāgārjuna in the form of prophesies. All these books are like a legend, and to built up history from such legendary records is very difficult. But they testify the (1) high position of Nāgārjuna as a great teacher of Mahāyāna, (2) founder of Mādhyamika or Sūnyavāda, They all are agreed on this very point that (3) Nāgārjuna was a South - Indian Brahmin and after his conversion to Buddhism, he went to the North upto Kāśmīra and became renowned as a scholar. It is also said that (4) he spent his last days on Śrīśaila in Modern Andhrapradesh. Besides these, there are some of the facts that (5) he was a polymath and became legendary and paradigmatic by the fifth century.

69. Ibid.
Therefore Kumārajīva and later scholars could not be completely free from that legendary influence. Even Chandrakīrti, in his Bhāṣya on Madhyamakavatāra records, a tradition that Nāgārjuna was of incarnation of Ānanda, the upāsthaṭḍapaka (attendant) of Buddha.

Discussion in the previous part enables us to draw a short sketch of his life. Nāgārjuna was born in Daksināpatha in a Brāhmin family. His birth place was Vedali or Vidarbha. We do not know in what year he was born. But he probably became influential sometime between 150-200 A.D. It is possible that the name which his parents gave him was not Nāgārjuna and this might not have been also the name given him during his ordination (Prabrayā). The Lakhāvatāra calls our philosopher Bhikṣukarmī (literally a glorious monk). But Sumpakhampo writes that after ordination he was called Śrīprajñādhara. The older Chinese sources translated the name Nāgārjuna as 'Lung-Shu' (Serpent - Tree); according to Kumārajīva's explanation, he was born under a tree of the Arjuna species and obtained the Way (to salvation) from Serpents.

In some books, it was translated as "Lungspeng" (Serpent-prevailing), while

70. Lichavikumāro ayam sarvasāthvaṇādyaṁ darśanendaka ityānandah
nirvāṇāccatusaśateṣu varṣesu vyātri teṣa teṣu Nāgahvayo
bhikṣurbhūtva maddeśānam vistareṇa prakāśya anupurvena /
suvisūddhaprabhābhūminakālokādhatau tathāgatoarhaṁ
samyaksambuddhaḥ bhāvanākaraprabhāḥ bhidhau bhavisyati//
71. footnote 63
72. Murty, K. S. Ibid. p.56.
Huen-Tsang and I-tsing translated it as "Lung-meng" (Serpent-valiant). Tibetans translated it as "Klusgrub" (the one perfected by serpents). Bu-ston thought that after the ordination he was known as monk Śrīman. Based on the Čādākhīṭi's verses of homage to Nāgārjuna, Bu-Ston explained the name in the following way: As a serpent (Nāga) is born from the sea and avoids both the shores, our philosopher was born from the ocean of enlightenment (Sambuddhādi-sagara) and avoided both shores (Is and Is not); as a serpent possesses diamond and gold, he possessed the treasury of true Dharma (sadharmakośa) and as a serpent's fiery eyes and poison burn, his fiery insight and dialectic burnt down the opponent's doctrines and lighted up the minds of all. So he was called Nāga. as the arrows of Arjuna, the Pāṇḍava prince, destroyed enemy forces and acquired kingdoms, our philosopher's incomparable knowledge and words destroy the forces of evil and establish the kingdom of righteousness for all men and gods who hearken to him. So he was called Nāgārjuna. He was thus, says Bu-Ston, a Nāga as well as an Arjuna. If this was connotative name acquired later, we do know the name during his childhood before he acquired reputation. Therefore his family name is also lost.

74. The reports of the Fan-i-ming-chi 1.c. 9a, 1.20 further refer to the account of Hsuan-Chuang in the eighth chapter of his "Records of the Western World" (Hsi-yu-chi, Nanjio 1503, T.E. XXXV, 7 fol. 38 b. 1. 15 et seg) on the occassion of his visit to the so-called "Bell-sound Stupa". From this work the explanation of the name Nāgārjuna as 'Lung-meng' i.e. "Dragon Hero" is taken under rejection of the rendering of the name by 'Lung-Shu' i.e. "Dragon-Tree" declared by Hiuen-Tsang to be incorrect. Ibid. P.-24.

75. Bu-Ston, The History of India and Tibet, p.124. also pp. 122-130, for the The Life of Nagarjuna.
We cannot know his parent's names or anything about them. An unreliable source - the Nepalese 'Amnyah' says their names were Tivikrama and Savitri.\(^\text{76}\)

He studied the Veda and other usual Brāhmanical lore. By the time he was twenty, he had become quite a celebrity for his erudition. In his youth, he was overcome with lust and through the art of invisibility seduced women in the royal palace. He was detected and ordered to be put to death. Kumārajīva tells us, bored with life Nāgārjuna sought adventure and thrill, learnt magic and used to enter a royal palace incognito and carry on an affair with princesses, but one day he was caught. This produced in him a revulsion for life and he vowed that if he escaped he would become a monk. So having miraculously escaped, he forthwith became a monk.\(^\text{77}\) The Tibetan accounts state that at his birth, astrologers prophesied that the child would not live beyond the age of seven. Unable to bear the sight of his premature death, his parents sent the boy to a Buddhist monastery, where by reciting 'Aparimāyatīdharanā' he succeeded in espacing his fate. Nāgārjuna became a student of the great sage Rāhulabhadra who was then the abbot of University of the Nālanda.\(^\text{78}\) He seems to have participated in Mahāyāna religious life consisting of the worship of the

---

\(^\text{76}\) Murty, K. S. Ibid, p-50.


\(^\text{78}\) The respective reports of the Tibetan are specially detailed, Walleser, M. p. 1-23; The real importance of Nālanda began during the rule of the Guptas in the fifth century A.D. Mitra, Devala, Buddhist Monuments, pp. 85ff. But R. K. Mookerjee an other scholars based on Taranāth, reported that Nāgārjuna spent a large part of his life at Nālanda, with which he also associates his pupil, Ārya Deva, p. 557.
Buddhas, adoration of the Bodhisattvas, and the circumambulation as well as the making of obeisance and offerings to Stūpas. He inspired the building of many temples, provided protection to the holy spot at Bodh-Gayā against erosion by river Nairājjanā, surrounded the Bodhi - Tree and temple with a stone edifice having ornamental latticework (vajragavākṣa) and enclosed the stūpa of Dhānyakoṭaka (in Anārāvat) with a ornamented railing. He was probably a devotee of Amitābha. Through Dhyāna he ascended the spiritual summit, while his mystic attainments, great insight recognise him as a Bodhisattva. It is credible that his wanderings in search of enlightenment took him to the Himālayas and holy places connected with the Buddha. He might have travelled propagating Dharma and disputing with non-Buddhist scholars. He spent his last days on Sṛiparvata. Before moving to Sṛiparvata, Nāgārjuna probably lived in a monastery in or near Amarāvatī or Dhānyakoṭaka. We do not know how long Nāgārjuna lived and how he died. There are so many incredible and worthless stories about his death. According to Kathāsaritsāgara, Nāgārjuna was murdered by the crown-prince probably of Sātavahana dynasty. This account was repeated by Hiuen-Tsang. It is probable that Nāgārjuna lost his life in a Brāhmanical upsurge that convulsed the Satavahana empire in its last stage. However, there is a near unanimity that he spent several years on Sṛiparvata and died there. Kumārajīva informs us that a hundred years after Nāgārjuna's death,

80. Ibid.
81. Ibid.
temples were built for him in South Indian States and he was worshipped like a Buddha.  

There is a large number of works, no less than 122, ascribed to him in Tānjur and Kanjur. Leaving apart works on Tantra or Vaidyaka, most of which seem to have been composed by another and positively later Nāgarjuna, (C. 700 A.D.), Prof. P. L. Vaidya gave us a list of works composed by philosopher Nāgarjuna as follows:

1) Prajñā or Kārikās of the Madhyamakaśāstra and its commentary called Akutobhāyā.

2) Vigrahavyāvartanī and its commentary.

3) Yuktisāstikā.

4) Śūnyatāsapatati and its commentary.

5) Mahāyānavimsikā.

6) Aksarasataka and its commentary.

7) Prajñyasamutpādahṛdaya and its commentary.

8) Catuhstava.

9) Prajñāpāramitāstava (found at the beginning of Astasahasrikā)

---

82. Walleser, M. Ibid, p-30, Murty informs us that during archaeological excavations at Nāgarjunikonda in 1938, in a monastic cell, in a vihāra, a limestone 'pūrṇakumbha' (15' high 10' wide in diameter at the body and 4' at the mouth) was found. It contained two small teeth. Some think that these are Nāgarjuna’s relics. Ibid. p-69.
10) Bhavanākrama

11) Sūtrasamuceaya.

12) Suhrillekha or Ārya Nāgārjuna Bodhisattva Suhrillekha.

13) Ratriāvalī

14) Bhavasamkrānti

15) Vaidalyaparakaraṇa

The biography of Nāgārjuna by Kumārajīva records five types of works by the author:

A) Upadeśa in Gāthās numbering hundred thousand.

B) Buddhamārgalāṅkāra-śāstra in Gāthās numbering five thousands.

C) Mahākarunopāyaśāstra in Gāthās numbering give thousands.

D) Madhyamakaśāstra in Gāthās numbering one lac.84

Some of the works attributed to Nāgārjuna in the Chinese Collection are Aksarasataka, Mahāyānavisākā, Aṣṭadāsa-sūnyatā-śāstra, Bodhi-Caryāvatāra, Upāyahṛdaya, Laksañavimukt-bodhi-hṛdaya(Citta) - śāstra and Mahāyānavyākhyā - śāstra.85


84. Reference may be made to the observations of K. Venkata Ramanan, Nāgārjuna's Philosophy, Introduction, P. 34.

85. Ibid. pp. 34-36.
After a critical and careful observation of the Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese sources, Mr. K. Venkataramanan has classified the works of Nagarjuna under the following heads:-

A) Texts composed specifically to refute the doctrine of other Buddhist and non-Buddhist schools of thought:
   i) Mūlamadhyamakakārikā
   ii) Vigrahavyāvartani
   iii) Ekoślokaśāstra
   iv) Dvādaśamukhasāstra
   v) Śūnyatāsaptati

B. *Texts of expository nature:*
   vi) Prañtyasamutpadahṛdayaśāstra
   vii) Yuktiśaṭṭikā
   viii) Bodhisattavatpateyaśāstra

C. *Commentaries and records of Oral preachings - Upadesa:*
   ix) Mahāprajñāpārami tāŚāstra
   x) DaśabhūmivibhūsāŚāstra

86. For details Ibid. pp. 36-37.
xi) Bhāvasaṃkrāntisāstra

xii) Āryadharmadṛśtugarbha - vivarāṇa

xiii) Vaidalya

D) Devotional Verses:

xiv) Niraupamya - stava

xv) Lokāṇītastava

xvi) Acintyastava

xvii) Stūyāṇītastava

xviii) Paramārthastava

xix) Dharmadṛśtastava

E) Letters:

xx) Suhrīlekha

xxi) Ratnāvalī
ds

F) Collection of Sūtras

xxii) Sūtrasamuccaya

After a thorough study of different sources, Chr. Lindtner⁸⁷ has declared

---

⁸⁷. Lindtner, Chr. Nagarjuniana, Introduction, pp. 9-27 also contents of the Text.
that the following writings may be considered as genuine works of Philosopher Nāgārjuna:

1) Mūlamadhyamaka - Kārikā
2) Śūnyatāsaptati
3) Vigrahavyāvartani
4) Vaidalyaprakaraṇa
5) Vyāvahārasiddhi
6) Yuktisāstikā
7) Catuhstava
8) Ratnāvalī
9) Praṇīyasamutpādahādaya-kārikā
10) Sūtrasamuccaya
11) Bodhicittavivarana
12) Sührillekha
13) Bodhisambhāraka
14) Mahāyānavimśika

Variety of Nāgājuna's authentic writings available from the various lists and the observations of the scholars in regard to his style, theme and philosophical insight reveal the fact that Nāgārjuna never changed his
fundamental outlook essentially and accordingly observed that Buddha delivered his teachings on the basis of two truths - the conventional or phenomenal (lokasaṃvyrti) and the absolute (paramārtha). He clearly declared -

Dve satye samupaśritya buddhānāṃ dharmaṁ desṇā, loka-samvyrti-satyam ca satyam ca paramārthataḥi/
Ye'nayor na vijānanti vibhāgam satyayadvayoh/
te tattvam na vijānanti gambhīrām buddha-śāsane.//
Vyāvahāram anāśritya paramārtho na desyate, paramārtham anāgārmya nirvānam nādhigamyate//
(Mūlamadhyamakārikā, Ch.-XXIV, ka. nos. - 8, 9, 10).

i.e. The teaching of the doctrine by the Buddhas is based upon two truths; truth relating to worldly convention and truth in terms of ultimate realization. Those who do not understand the distinction between these two truths do not understand the profound truth embodied in the Buddha's message. Without relying upon convention, the ultimate truth, Nirvāṇa cannot be attained. Only a few of his works are available as original. There is, however, a Tibetan translation of all these books. Based on the secondary sources it may be stated that Mūlamadhyamakārikā, Sūnyatāsaptati, Vigrahavyāvartanī, Yuktisāstikā,

88. Lindtner, Chr. Nāgārjunianā. Here he has given Tibetan Text with English translation as well as different terms in Sanskrit also, Recent scholars have utilized his work in their discussion. Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, pp. 97-184.
Vaidalyaprakaraṇa, Vyāvahārasiddhi are mainly dialectical works and the remaining ones such as Suhṛřlekha, Ratnāvali, Pratītyasamutpāda-dhāṛdaya-kārikā, Śūtrasamuccaya are didactic. Chr. Lindtner opines "The decisive reasons for the said variety of Nāgārjuna's writing is to be sought in the author's desire, as a Buddhist, to address himself to various audiences, at various levels and from various angles. This motive would of course be quite consistent with the Mahāyāna ideal of Upāyakausālā." According to his suggestion Mādhyamikakārikā, Śūnyatāsaptati and Vigrahavyāvartani were intended to be studied by philosophically minded monks. Vaidalyaprakaraṇa was written as a challenge to Naiyāyikas. Yuktisastikā, Vyāvahārasiddhi and Pratītyasamutpāda-hṛdayakārikā are contributions to Buddhist exegesis. Catuḥśtava is a document confessing its author's personal faith in the Buddha's desanā, while Śūnyatāsaptati, Suhṛlekha, Ratnāvali, Bodhicitta-vivarāṇa and Bodhisambharaka on the whole addressed themselves to a wider Buddhist audience, monks as well as lay devotees. Thus our main sources for an understanding of Nāgārjuna and his cultural background are his own works and the documents belonging to the tradition in which he was active as a creative writer. Nāgārjuna wrote in Sanskrit. While some of his main works are still extant in that language, some are now only available in later Chinese or Tibetan translations. The Mūlamadhyamaka-Kārikā is well known as a major contribution.
of Nagarjuna. Before we take a closer look at this 'magnum-opus' of Nagarjuna, it will be worth while to recall the other works of the author, which, after all, expose the various aspects of his thinking.

2. **SUNYATASAPTATI**

It is one of the six works of Nagarjuna the study of which is required by the Tibetan Buddhist tradition for a proper comprehension of the Madhyamaka philosophy which is an indispensable part of the Mahāyāna. Sunyatasaptati contains 73 verses in āryā metre accompanied by a 'Svavṛtti'. Bhavya, Candrakīrti, Sāntarakṣita take Nagarjuna's authorship granted. But there is some confusion about the auto-commentary (Svavṛtti). Lindtner opines "I have seen no references or allusions to the svavṛtti, but as its prose-style (i.e., to be sure, in Tibetan) is quite similar to that of the commentaries on VV and VP, there is no good reason to impeach its authenticity." It is significant that there is no salutary verse (Mangalacāraṇa) in the beginning of the work. Ārya Candrakīrti in his


92. T. R. V. Murti says - "Sunyatasaptati expounding the theory of the unreality of things in 66 anustub stanzas;" Ibid. p.89, Lindtner differs from that, Ibid, p.31 (Specially, f. n-94)

93. Lindtner, Ibid. p.31.
'yuktiṣāstikāvṛtti' suggests that Śūnyatāsaptati should not be considered as an independent treatise. It must be treated as an appendix of Mūlamadhyamaka Kārika. Besides that auto-commentary (Svaprajaṇavṛtti), there are also two commentaries on the Śūnyatāsaptati, one by Candrakīrti and another by Parahita - lost in the original but preserved in Tibetan.

As its name indicates, the Śūnyatāsaptati is devoted to an exposition of emptiness by means of the refutation of independent reality of factors. Like Mūlamadhyamaka - Kārika, it treats a number of concepts from the Mādhyamika standpoint but it mainly concentrates on the true import of the saṃskṛta dharmas. In the introductory verse, it is very aptly presented by the author as follows:

Utpādasthitibhangāstīṣṭahīnasamottamam/
laukikavyāvahārattu Buddhenoktam na tattvataḥ/

Origination, duration, cessation, existence, non-existence, bad or good etc. are declared by Buddha from empirical point of view, not from the absolute standpoint.

In the Seventh Chapter of Mūlamadhyamaka-Kārika-'Sāṃskṛta Parikṣā' (The Examination of The conditioned), ācarya Nāgārjuna initiated to reject the Sarvāstivāda and Sautrāntika interpretations of Saṃskṛta dharma. In the first line of the first verse of this chapter Nāgārjuna indicate that the Saṃskṛta is

characterized by the three characteristics\(^\text{96}\) origination, duration and cessation.\(^\text{97}\)

This indeed is a statement at tribute to Buddha. In the early discourses of Buddha, it is said "Monks, there are these three characteristics of the saṃskṛta dharma. The origination of that saṃskṛta dharma is evident. Its cessation is also evident. Change of what has come to endure is also evident."\(^\text{96}\) The equation of saṃskṛta dharma and pratiṣṭhita samutpanna occurs for the first time in interpretation of the Abhidharma. It was this latter tradition that Vasubandhu was recording when the said - sametya sambhuya pratyayaḥ Kṛtā iti saṃskṛtaḥ - "those that are made by the conditions having come together are called samskratas". The Sarvāstivādins seem to have understood the concepts of Saṃskṛta as mere reputation of the belief in the production of an event by a single cause - 'eka pratyaya Janitam'. Yasomitra, also, commenting upon this statement, go on to say that saṃskṛta and pratiṣṭhita samutpanna are, therefore, synonymous, thereby, obliterating the semantic difference between "made" (kṛta) and 'Origination' (utpanna). This erroneous equation was to lead to further

---


\(^\text{97}\) Utpāda-sthiti-bhāṅgānāṁ anyat saṃskṛta-laksanam/  
astī ced anavasthaivām nāsti cet te na saṃskṛtaḥ//  
Ibid. Verse-3.

Here it also indicates that 'if there are to be no such (characteristics), these would not be conditioned. MKV(P)p.147 and MKV(V), p-60.

complications. For early Buddhism, both samskrta and asamskrta are prafityasamutpanna. Yet if, as explained by the Sarvastivādins, samskrta is identical with prafityasamutpanna, then one cannot speak of these three characteristics in the context of the asa skrta. Nagarjuna points out this departure of the realists from the original teaching of the Master and says -

Yathā māyā yathā svapno gandharvanagaraṇaḥ yathā/
tathotpādastathā sthānaḥ āthā bhaṅga udāhṛtaṁ//

Ch. - VII, ka. - 34.

d. i.e. as an illusion, a dream, a city of gandharvas, so have origination, duration and cessation been exemplified. Ācārya Candrākīrti, in his commentary on Yuktisastikā indicates very clearly that the Śunyata-saptati was written by Nāgārjuna to solve those problems in connection with 'yathāmayaḥ yatha svapno' .... etc. That is why, Śunyatāsaptati could not be considered as a separate text. However, the method of argument employed by Nāgārjuna in this very work, is the same as to be found in the Mūlamadhyamakā-kārikā and other fundamental works of the Mādhyamika school. It may briefly be described as a method of argument which employs the tenets of the opponent of the system in order to demonstrate the ultimate inconsistency of the doctrine advocated by the opponent. Therefore, with few exceptions, it is the doctrines advocated by Ābhidharmika schools of Buddhism, or in other words, the Buddhist realists,

100. Vide, previous page, f. n-94.
that are refuted in the Sûnyatasaptati. In the Sûnyatāsaptati, the reality of factors (dharma), aggregates (Skhandha), senses (āyatana) as well as that of causality, Karma and impermanence (anityatā) is systematically refuted. On the basis of the facts that the reality of which is accepted by the opponent, Nāgārjuna establishes the impossibility and relativity of the concepts which make up his universe of discourse, thereby revealing the nature of the ultimately real which is empty and devoid of conceptualization. It may be said that the very interdependently originated nature of phenomena constitutes their ultimate lack of independent existence and therefore their emptiness. Thus, interdependent origination and emptiness, far from being contradictory, are in reality identical in import.¹⁰¹ Peter Della Santina, rightly evaluates it - "Like the Mûlamadhyamaka - Kârikas, the Sûnyatasaptati treats a number of concepts from the Mûdhyamaka standpoint. However, because of its brevity, consisting of only seventy stanzas along with their auto-commentary, the ideas presented in the Sûnyatāsaptati are more easily assimilated than those found in the Mûlamadhyamaka-kârikâ".¹⁰²

¹⁰¹. This summary is mainly based on the Hindi translation of the Sûnyatā - Saptati by Sempa Dorje (1985) and English translation on the same (The Septuagint on Emptiness) by Christian Lindtner, in his Nāgārjuniana, pp. 35-69. The translation by Tola and Dragonetti in Journal of Indian Philosophy, 15 (1987) pp. 1-55 and English translation by L. Jamspal and Peter Della Santina made for the Sakya Institute of Tibetan Philosophy in Missouri in 1978 are also used.

3. VIGRAHAVYĀVARTANĪ:

The text\textsuperscript{103} is available with the commentary of Nāgārjuna. We have the evidence of Candrakīrti to say that the Ācārya wrote his commentary on the work.\textsuperscript{104} It consists of seventy verses in the aryā metre and provided with Svāyrtti in a simple and clear prose. Like Śūnyatāsaptati it was probably composed later than Mūlamadhyamakakārikā. Nāgārjuna, himself quotes the verse - 10 of the Chapter XXIV of Mūlamadhyamakakārikā to consolidate his opinion in connection with the verse - 25 of the Vigrahavyāvartanī.\textsuperscript{105} According to


\textsuperscript{104} 'Vigrahavyavartanya vṛttim kurvatapya acaryena prayogavakyakhyanabhidhanat. Mūlamadhyamaka - Karika-vṛtti (Prasannapada), p. 25 Bhavya (Ratnapradipa. 33a) and Sanstaraksita (Madhya-makalambakavṛtti, 72, quotes vigrahavyavartani, verse 70) also ascribed it to Nāgarjuna. Later testimonies are also known, such as - Atisa’s Panjika to Bodhipadhapradipa, padas 205-208, translated by Lindtner, ref. to n. 49 of Nāgarjuniana, Lindtner’s Ibid, pp. 70ff.

\textsuperscript{105} Vyavaharam anasritya paramartho ma disyatā/ paramartham anagamya nirvanam nadhigamyate
MMK, Ch - XXIV; ka. - 10.
Athavā sadhyasamoayam haturna hi vidyate dhvaneh satta /
Samvyavaharam ca vayam nanubhyupagamyā kathayamah //
Kamaleshwar Bhattacharya, one can see, however, even from this imperfect material, that the prose of the commentary, like that of other commentaries of Nāgārjuna, is modelled on that of Patanjali's Mahābhāṣya.106 According to M. Winternitz, it is a polemical treatise on logic.107 However, it is divided into two parts, the first twenty verses setting forth the opponent's (opponents') objections, and the remainder Nāgājuna's own replies, a searching critique of the opponent's logical and epistemo-logical assumptions, and a demonstration of the validity of the Mādhyamika theory and method. Thus, the purpose of the text is to defend in accordance with the prevailing rules of debate Nāgājuna's thesis that all things are empty (Śūnya) because devoid of an essential nature (nihsvabhāva)108. It is a perfect specimen of contemporary dialectics but does not include discussion of the more general problems. Every point, has to be stated in the full and every objection has to be taken in its proper order and refuted. The objections are not in fact all made by the same critic. Arnold Kunst observes - 'The dharmavāsthāvid theorists of verse-7 are clearly Buddhist; though it is difficult to determine their school, the details in the commentary exclude the possibility of their being Sarvāstivādins, to whose theory of the dharmas much of the argument elsewhere would apply.109 The polemic against

107. History of Indian Literature, Vol - II, p. 282
the validity of the Naiyāyika pramāṇas in verses 30-51 is more important, because it raises by its parallelism with Nyāyasūtras, II, i, 8-19, the question whether Adhyāya : ii of that composite work was in existence when Nāgārjuna wrote. The parallelism has already been dealt with Viograhavyāvartanī in his notes, by Tucci on pp. 34ff. Of the notes on his translation and by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana in his introduction. Without going into details it may be remarked that Vātsyāyana’s Bhāṣya clearly has Nāgārjuna’s position in mind, but it is not obvious that Nāgārjuna knew the sūtras or vice versa; till the matter is more fully examined all that can safely be said is that the two works reflect the dispute between the two schools at much the same stage, but not necessarily with reference by one to the other.110 To search out the dialectic as a system of philosophy specially Mādhyamika philosophy, Murti concentrates on the Vigrahavyāvartanī and opines that “He has to urge and bring home to the opponent the consequences of a view. This can be done only by accepting principles of logic and canons of evidence. If without argument and evidence any statement, even this that ‘Everything is relative’, could be proved, then the most extravagant statement about the reality of all things would be valid.”111 It is

to be noted that opinions vary as to the identify of the opponent, a Naiyāyika and a Buddhist, according to Johnson and Kunst\textsuperscript{112} and Tucci\textsuperscript{113}, a Naiyāyika, who occasionally assumes the standpoint of the Buddhist realists\textsuperscript{114}; an Ābhidharmika following, of course, the rules of debate prescribed in some Buddhist work on logic such as Upāyahṛdaya\textsuperscript{115}, etc. At any rate, it was very much related to the Nyāyasūtras.

4. VAIDALYAPRAKARĀṆA

This work contains 73 brief sutras with a svavṛtti. With Nāgārjuna's own commentary together they form a prakaraṇa. Lindtner observes that references to this work are found in Bhavya and Candrakīrti, but "I have never noticed any quotation from VP" \textsuperscript{116} i.e. Vaidalya Prakarana. Judging solely from the text itself, he opines that the style and tenets would indicate the same author as for Vigrahavyāvartani, "the work where the parallels are closest out of all those ascribed to Nāgārjuna."\textsuperscript{117} This is really surprising that Vaidalyaprakaraṇa has received the attention about its historical importance after such a long time.

\textsuperscript{112} In the preface to Jhonston and Kunst's edition.
\textsuperscript{113} Tucci, G. "A Sanskrit biography of he Siddhas and some questions connected with Nāgājuna", Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal 6, 1930, 125-160; reprinted in Tucci's, Ópera Minore (Roma 1971-72), pp. 229-244.
\textsuperscript{114} Murti, T.R.V. Ibid. p. 154, specially f.n. 2b. Here he quotes from Vigrahavyāvartani the realist's contention. Also Vigrahavyāvartani, ka. 11-12.
\textsuperscript{115} Lindtner, Ibid. op. Cit. p. 71 note - 10.
\textsuperscript{116} Nagarjuniana, p-87.
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid.
Unlike the Vigrahavyāvartanī to which it forms a pendant, this work is solely addressed to non-Buddhist logicians, more specifically, to the adherents of "the subtle Nyāya." Nāgārjuna begins by quoting the following well-known passage,

"...pramāṇa-prameya-saṃśaya-prayojana-drṣṭānta-siddhānta - avayava - tarka - nīnaya - vāda - jalpa-viṭaṇḍā - hetvābhāsa - ċchala - jāti - nigrahaṣṭhaṇā - nām ..." Nyāyasūtra. I. II. 118 It clearly indicates who these sophists are and in what their conceit consists. The introductory verse indicated the scope of Vaidalyaprakaraṇa. Here it is said - 'In order to put an end to the arrogance of those logicians (tarkika) who out of conceit of their knowledge are keen to debate, I shall grind them to little pieces.'119 The title of the work "The Pulverization", alludes to the epithet "subtle" used in those days for the followers of Aksapāda.120

However, the work is organised so as to deal successively with each of the sixteen categories set forth in Nyāyasutra I.1. His initial hypothesis is that the instrument of knowledge (Pramāṇa) and the object known (Prameya) are indissolubly joined and therefore they cannot be established independently.121 The opponent allows that they are correlates, but thinks all the same that they can establish each other. Therefore Nāgārjuna must refute the three ways in

119. Encyclopedia of India Philosophies, p. -143
120. Ibid.
121. Ibid also Nāgārjuniana, p. - 83.
which this could, hypothetically, come about. Neither what exists, what does not exist, nor what exist and does not exist can enter into relation. This argument is of geneal application, including, of course, instrument and object of knowledge.\textsuperscript{122} If the objector insists that everything is established by instruments of knowledge, then this must include the instruments as well, which leads to infinite regress.\textsuperscript{123} Alternatively, the instrument of knowledge may be denied altogether, but this means giving up the hypothesis. But the objector persists in maintaining that instruments of knowledge are self-established because they "illuminate" themselves, like a lamp.\textsuperscript{124} Nāgārjuna, refutes it since a lamp cannot illuminate anything, itself or anything else, whether it is in contact with its object or not. Besides, the relationship between instrument and object cannot be established in any of the three periods of time.\textsuperscript{125} If the objector thinks that Nāgārjuna then instead maintains his denial, and the objector accepts this, he by that very fact accepts that the instrument and object must be denied; then, in a flash, all disputes are settled. But actually Nāgārjuna neither accepts a denial nor something to be denied, he merely tries to indicate the absence of essential being. Nāgārjuna asks how one can be sure that an object exists independently

\textsuperscript{122} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{123} Cf. Vigrahavyavarttanī, verse -2
\textsuperscript{124} Pradīpavat. Cf. Nyāyasūtra, II, I.19
\textsuperscript{125} Cf. Nyāyasūtra, II, I, 8-125; Lahūkavatāsūtra, X, 779; the papers of Bhattacharya and Oberhemmer, ref. 'On the relationship between Nāgārjuna's Vigrahavyāvartanī and Nyāyasūtras, JIES, V, pages 265-273.
of awareness, the objector claims that the awareness of a jar is the instrument, whereas the jar as such is the object. Nāgārjuna replies that the objector recognizes that awareness arises from the contact of organ and objet of sense, and since jar must be a specific condition of awareness beforehand, awareness cannot be the instrument of it, and the jar is not the object. Besides, the objector himself categorizes awareness as an instrument, not as an object of knowledge.\footnote{Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. - VIII, p - 144.} About doubt (saṃśaya), purpose (prayojana), example (drṣṭānta), Nagarjuna's refutations remain the same as above.\footnote{Ibid, also Nagarjuniana. p. 89.} When Nāgārjuna claims that everything is unestablished must not he himself accept something as established, namely his own tenets (siddhānta). No, not at all, for without something established at the beginning, how can he accept something established at the end?\footnote{Ibid.} Members of an Inference (avayava) are refuted in general. Next, the five members are refuted one by one. A hypothesis is impossible since it is neither identical with nor different from its reason. A reason is impossible since it either must have another reason and so forth infinitum, or else a reason is present without a reason. But that is absurd and would lead to a total confusion. So since there is no hypothesis, no reason, and no example, the remaining two members of an inference, application and conclusion, simply lapse. Even if a hypothesis could be established without a reason, that would mean that the other three members were established without reason. The

\footnote{126. Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. - VIII, p - 144.}
\footnote{127. Ibid. also Nagarjuniana. p. 89.}
\footnote{128. Ibid.}
objector's specific hypothesis, that the self is eternal because it is without body, like space, it refuted. Further since hypothesis and reason can only be denominated successively, a hypothesis cannot be a hypothesis to its (coexisting) reason, and vice versa. Thus the sixteen topics or categories have been made the objects of denial. Finally denial is also rendered impossible. Hence there is no talk and nothing to talk about. Lindtner observes that for Nagarjuna, the Nyaya apavarga and the Vaiseshika nihreyasa are more or less synonyms for the Buddhist Nirvana. This "inclusivistic" attitude suggests the orthodox Brahmanical background of Nagarjuna.

5. VYAVAHARA - SIDDHI:

The sixth work, according to Bu-Ston, is Vyavahara - Siddhi. No references to such a title in any writings of Bhavya or Candrakirti or any other Indian works have yet been detected. Santaraksita, in his Madhyamakalamkaraavrtti, quotes six verses; the source of which is mentioned by his pupil Kamalasila as Nagarjuna's Vyavaharasiddhi. Modern scholars,

129. Ibid. pp. 90-93.
131. Tibetan historian Bu-ston writes that Nagarjuna wrote a work called 'Ttta snad grub pa, or Vyavaharasiddhi, in order to show that though there is no svabhava in the ultimate sense (paramartha), still laukika-vyavahara is justified samvritatam.' Bustom, I, p.-51, vide Lokesh Chandra (ed.) 'The collected works of Bu-Ston (Satapitaka series, LXIV), ya fol. 670 for the Tibetan text. Also vide Nagarjuniana, pp. 96-99 for the Tibetan text as well as English translation on the same.
132. Nagarjuniana, p.-94.
in this field, do not hesitate to accept this fragment as a genuine work of Nāgārjuna. Comparing with the other authentic writings of Nāgārjuna, Lindtner considers that it not only displays very close parallels to other passages in Nāgārjuna’s authentic works, but also that one would beforehand have expected the author to express himself in more detail on this topic, clearly of paramount importance to him.133 The work called Vyāvahārasiddhi, (Tib. Ttta snad grub pa) in order to show that though there is no svabhava in the ultimate sense (Paramārthataḥ), still laukika-vyāvahāra justified. In short, the subject matter is—though all phenomena, such as mantras etc., arise dependently and thus neither are existing nor non-existing, they are none the less efficient. Likewise no medicine (ausadha) appears independently of its specific ingredients (Svanga). It is not identical with them nor is it absolutely different from them. Actually, it arises in dependent co-origination (pratītyasamutpanna) : who would be so ignorant as to maintain that it is existent (sat) or non-existent (asat), Similarly caksuvijñāna arises when it is based upon eye (caksu) and form (rūpa). Projected by the power of his Karma (of the previous birth) and passions (Kleśa), the appropriator (sopādāna) arises out of existence (bhavat). Form also arises in the same manner. Similarly all the (twelve) members of existence (bhavāṅga) are simply conventional designations (Vyāhārātāhprajñāpta). Consequently all phenomena have been advocated by the Buddhas with a specific purpose.

133. Ibid.
Thus neither of the two (i.e. hetu and phala) can be established as existing independently.\textsuperscript{134}

6. YUKTISASTIKĀ :

It is, on the whole, a collection of aphorism loosely tied together by a subject matter in common: pratītyasamutpāda. The author sets himself to establish this principle by means of arguments (yukti) occasionally supported by reference to āgama. Yuktisastikā contains 61 verses. It is one of the most frequently quoted of the texts ascribed to Nāgārjuna, not only by Bhavya, Candrakīrti and Sāntarakṣita, but especially in the later commentarial literature. It was also lost in original language. Based on Chinese and Tibetan translation, Tola and Dragonetti have reconstructed the first twelve verses into Sanskrit.\textsuperscript{135}

Regarding its style, scope and doctrine, Yuktisastikā recalled that of Mūlamadhyamaka - kārika, Ratnāvalī and especially Catuhstava and Bodhicittavivarana.\textsuperscript{136} Here, Nāgārjuna demonstrates that reality (tattva) is beyond all ontological and epistemological dualities while empirical world of

\textsuperscript{134} Lindtner, Nagarjuniana, pp. 97 & 99, Cf. in particular Mūlamadhyamaka - Karika, Ch. - XXIV, Verse - 36, "Sarva-sāmvyāvahārāṁśca laukikān Pratibādhase, yat pratītyasamutpāda - sūnyatāṁ pratibādhase. Bhavya (Prajñāpradīpa, 292b-293a) and Avolokitabrata (Prajñāpradīpaṭikā, 293b) connect 36ab with the previous lines and take 36cd as the protasis of the following verses whereas Candrakīrti. (Prasannapadā, p. 513) subordinates 36cd to 36ab by taking yat as kriyāvīśesaṇa. Akutobhayā, here quoted by Buddhapālita, similarly.


\textsuperscript{136} Nagarjuniana, p. 100.
origination, cessation etc. is illusory and merely due to ignorance (avidyā). When one correctly understands that things are conditioned by ignorance one realises there is no origination and no cessation. This is liberation through understanding dharma. It completes one's task. However, if after knowing dharma one still thinks there are distinctions, believes in eternality of even the most subtle things such a person does not understand the meaning of dependent origination.

Why does the Buddha deny that transmigration has any beginning? Replies Nāgārjuna against this objection: that there is a beginning for transmigration is a wrong view. How can something dependently orginated have a beginning or end? Things appear illusorily like a mirage, without any start or finish. A thing dependently arisen has not actually arisen. A thing that has ceased because its causes are terminated is considered terminated itself, but how can something that has not naturally ceased he called 'terminated'? So there is no origination and no cessation. The paths of origination and cessation are spoken of by the Buddha for practical purposes. By understanding origination one can gradually understand cessation. Thus one understands impermanence and correct dharma. The truth-seeker should first be told "everything exists" so that when he understands he will attain discrimination without attachment. People who don't understand discrimination, who merely hear the words without doing good, are lost. He has explained very clearly that the Buddhas have spoken of "I" and "mine", "aggregates", "senses" and "elements" for practical purposes.
The great elements, etc. exist only in consciousness; when understood they dissolve .... so they are imaginary. Since the Buddha has told us nirvana is true, how could one not conclude the rest is false? Since he has told us the world is caused by ignorance, why not admit that it is a conceptual construction? When ignorance stops it must be clear that what stops was constructed from ignorance. People who think there is an underived self or world are captivated by view about permanence and impermanence, etc. Those who think that positive things are established as real, they too are subject to the same mistakes. But those who think things are neither real nor unreal, like the moon reflected in the water, are not carried away by theories. Those with false awareness take what is not true as true; for them a series of appropriating and contention arises. The great ones have their neither thesis nor contention; for them their can be no contrary thesis nor contention; for them their can be no contrary thesis. Practically, taking a position breeds defilements, but one who takes no stand is not caught. When a fool sees reflections he thinks they are true, but when a great soul sees that things are reflections he is not misled. Finally, Acarya Nagarjuna says - "May everyone, having through this work attained merit and insight, gain the benefits that accrue from those two - namely, the two bodies of a Buddha."  

137. The summary is based on the translation by Christian Lindtner in Nagarjuniana, pp. 103-109 and Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, pp. 150-153.  
138. Ibid, also Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, P. -153.
The collection of four hymns ascribed to Nāgārjuna titled Lokārtha, Niraupamya, Acintya and Paramārtha are the only ones among several others, still available in Sanskrit. The comprehensive name of those four hymns is Catuḥstava or Catustava.\(^{139}\) According to T.R.V. Murti there is no reasonable doubt with regard to Catuḥstava (namely Nirupamāstava, Lokārthatstava, Cittavajrastava and Paramārthatstava in anuṣṭūpa metre) being the work of Nāgārjuna.\(^{140}\) But Lindtner has a bit hesitation to accept its authenticity. First, the Sanskrit text of Catuḥstava is available in four manuscripts and the titles and order of the hymns given here are without exception Lokārthatstava, Niraupamya, Acintya and Paramārthatstava. 'This coincides with the testimony given by the Catuḥstavasamāśārtha by a certain Amṛtākāra. Finally, precisely, these four hymns are in fact those that are quoted by the commentators, not only Bhavya, Candrakīrti and Sāntarakṣita, but also several lesser-known Indian authors.\(^{141}\) However, these are devotional verses of the highest order, if we define Buddhism as bhakti to the Bhagavān Buddha as a compassionate preacher of an eternal dharma that point the way to Svarga and to moksa by means of good deeds and tattvajñāna respectively. It is only to be expected that his grateful devotees would compose hymns in praise of their preacher. T.R.V.Murti says that they

\(^{139}\) The Catuḥstava is quoted at many places in Madhyamaka-kārikāvṛtti, p. 55, p. 64, p. 215 and in Bodhicaryāvatāra Pāñjikā by Prajñākaramati at numerous places.

\(^{140}\) Ibid, p. 90.

\(^{141}\) JRAS, (1932) p. 309 and Nagrajuniana, p. 121f.
show that Nāgārjuna like Saṅkara, had the religious strain also well-developed in him. Both these great Ācāryas have the same felicity of language and capacity to express their thoughts even in shorter pieces. In short, 'Catuhstava' contains some fundamental ideas of Mahāyāna doctrine. Here, it is said that due to ignorance there seem to be two worlds, one unreal rules by Karmic laws, and the real, profound and empty like space, only accessible by waking up as a Buddha. Out of compassion the Buddha plays along by trying to awaken all beings from their ignorance. For this he deserves our bhatkti and endless hymns of praise. Through the yoga of emptiness one should remove the unreal barrier of ignorance that separates microcosm from macrocosm. Here, Nāgārjuna, in a lucid way, creates an image of Buddha contained in the later Mahāyāna works. Reading the hymns, one may guess behind the difference of denomination the analogy of doctrine and it will not be difficult to identify the Niraupamya with Nirmāṇakāya, Lokatita with Saṁbhogakāya, Acintya (Or Cittavajra by G. Tucci) with Dharmakāya and Paramārtha with Svabhāvakāya. Thus each stava related to a particular aspect of truth, of which one of the four bodies of the Buddha is to be considered as the symbol. This process is indicated by the Catuhstava. This implies analogy between Nāgārjuna and Maitreya, and it shows that the four kāya theory is much older and more diffused than is

142. Ibid. The Niraupamya stava an the Paramārthastava have been edited by Tucci int he JRAS (1932), pp.312ff. Prabhubhai Patel has restored the entire Catuhstava from Tibetan into Sanskrit in the IHQ. Vol. - VIII (1932), pp. 316-331 and 689-705. According to Patel the titles of the four hymns are : Nirupama, Lokatita, Acintya and Stūtyatita.
generally supposed. The Buddha is really unborn, so he can only be praised out of bhakti and based on relative lokaprajñapti in negative terms as neither this nor that. He is neither permanent nor impermanent, he has no colour, no size, no location etc. He has, however, attained 'profundity'. Finally, everything being empty, who has praised whom, and for what? The purpose of teaching the ultimate truth, emptiness, is simply to heal people from their wrong belief in relative reality. This is appropriate. The Buddha's teaching is always based on two truths (Satyadvaya). By means of Prajñāpāramitā one eventually becomes a Buddha. The Buddhas have liberated numerous beings or so it seems. In reality not one has been liberated; the agent and his works are empty. The entire world (i.e. the five aggregates) is but 'names' and opinions; there is no object and subject in and by itself. Emptiness is an inconceivable reality that cannot be grasped. It is the same as the Buddha and his dharma. The Buddha, in fact, has or seems to have two bodies. The spiritual body is permanent and full of bliss. It cannot really be seen. It is not at all like his beautiful physical body which can be seen and which he compassionately displays in order to guide the Buddhists. Without doing anything, as it were, he accomplishes his liberating duty as a Buddha. On this very point, G. Tucci opines that it seems to me that the Catuhstava codifies, as it were, the buddhology of Nāgārjuna, showing at the same time that the great doctor knew the system of the four bodies of

143. Also these hymns show Nagarjuna's conception of Buddha consistent with Madhyamaka - kārikā, Ch. - XXII, verse 15... 'buddham prapârthitaṁ avyayaṁ' - also JRAS (1932) pp. - 322ff.
Buddha, though he gives each one of them a name different from the usual one.144

3. RATNAVALI:

The Ratnavali145, in a tune with other Mādhyamika texts emphasizes that Buddha preaches his doctrines to different classes of persons after taking consideration of the capacity of the persons to grasp the same.146 Ratnavali or Ratnavala belongs to the class of literature having characteristics of Lekha

144. JRAS (1932) p. 311.
146. Yathaiva vaiyākaraṇo mātrakāṃ api pāṭhayey / Buddho' vadat tatha dharmāṃ vineyānāṃ yathākṣamamam / Ch. IV. 94
Keśāntcit avadad dharmāṃ pāpebhyo vinirvṛttaye / Kesāntcit punyāsiddhyartham keśāṃ cid dvayaniśritam // Ch.IV. 95
Cf. Mūlamādhyamakakārikā, Ch.-XVIII. ka-6. Catuvāsādaka, VIII, 15. and the commentary of Candrakīrtti on MMK, XVIII. 6. Where they quote this (Ch. -IV, 95) verse.
(Letter), being partly of the nature of *Suhrllekha* of the same author. This verse text composed in five hundred *Anuṣṭup* meter with an extra verse added at the end. It has been attributed to *Nāgārjuna* by *Candrakīrtti*. He also quotes, several stanzas from the text. An *Ratnāvali* is only partially extant in Sanskrit. An Indian commentary composed by certain Ajitamitra is available in a Tibetan translation.

It contains five chapters or *Pariccheda*, viz -

1. *Abhyudayanaihśreyasopadesa*

2. *Miśraka*

3. *Bodhisamābhāra*

4. *Rājovṛttopadesa*

147. Chr. Lindtner mentions "It is not ascribed to Nāgārjuna in the colophons of its Tibetan and Chinese versions but also by authorities like Bhava, Candrakīrtti, Śāntarakṣita and may other later authorities". But Dr. H. Chatterjee Sastri Categorically points out that Candrakīrtti referred to Nāgārjuna as Ācaryapāda (commentary on the Madhyamaka sūtra-XVIII,2). That Ācaryapāda refers to Nāgārjuna is evident from his reference to Nāgārjuna by the same epithet while quoting from *Vgrahavyāvartanī* (his commentary on MS 1-3). also his article on 'Catuhśataka' in the 'Encyclopedia of Buddhism' ed. by G.P. Malalasekera Ceylon.


149. In Sanskrit extant we did not get any names of the Chapters. Scholars may omit it. Chr. Lindtner mentions the name of each chapter by following Tibetan and Chinese sources. Here I also like to mention the names of those chapters, obviously by following his way.
5. Bodhisattvavācyopadeśa

The purpose of this text is to rouse in the mind of the king concerned the feeling of Dharma and the role of the author of the text has been very clearly expressed in the following verse -

Durlabhā pathasyavaktāraḥ
śrotārastvati durlabhāḥ/

Tebhya' atidurlabhatamā ye pathyasasukarinaḥ//

Ch. - II, Verse - 41.

Therefore in the first Chapter named Abhyudayanaisreyaśopades, we notice, after a brief introduction about abhyudaya (=sukha) and naisreya (=mokṣa), the author stresses on faith by stating that one possessing faith waits on dharma (śrāddhatvād bhajate dharmam, Chapter-I, verse-V). After enumerating the effects of pure and impure acts it has been advised for the king that one should refrain from those acts that are impure and cling to the pure ones. Now, Nāgarjuna has spoken of the means of true Sukha in Samsāra and the foremost Mokṣaśādharana i.e. prajñā.\(^{150}\)

150. The nature of Nirvāṇa has been delineated in this connection thus - one should acquire this sukha by realising pudišanairātma and bhāvabhavaparāmarśaksaya or freedom from rebirth in Samsāra. This concept of Sukha has been repeatedly mentioned by Ācārya Nāgarjuna in his different writings - Here he referers -

Mokṣaṁātma na ca skandhā mokṣaś cid idreṣaḥ priyāḥ/ ātmaskandhā mantraṁ kimihaṁ tāvāpriyām //

Ch. - I, V-41.

Nacā'bhāvo api nirvānam kuta eva tasya (cāsya) bhāvataḥ/ bhāvabhavaparāmarśaksayo nirvānāmucyute //

Ch. - II, V - 42.

Cf. Madhyamakasātra - XXV. 3.

It is also to be noted that this is a specific Mahayana concept.
The next important elaboration of this pariceheda is author's own doctrine about transcending being and non-being.\textsuperscript{151} Then Nāgārjuna finally lays down a method according to āgama of how one can agree that there is neither a pudgala (Pudgalanairātma) nor any dharma (Dharmanairātma), such as the śākandha, Mahabhuta, Dhatu etc. and thus personally realize the Nairātmyadvaya of Mahāyāna.\textsuperscript{152} In the same strain it is also stated the Praṇītyasamutpāda in the true spirit of Mādhyamika as well as specific Buddhist doctrines.\textsuperscript{153}

The second chapter Mīśraka proceeds with the same discussion and it is observed that an individual when split down along with its constituents (Dhātu) turns into naught.\textsuperscript{154} Then, we get some remarks concerning all objects - devoid of self-nature,\textsuperscript{155} the illusory nature of the world.\textsuperscript{156} After this, Nāgārjuna again instructs a king to comprehend the true nature of this Dharma. This chapter contains forty six verses.

The third chapter entitled Bodhisambhāra\textsuperscript{157} resumes the traditional

\textsuperscript{151} Ibid. Ch. - I, Verses. 46-75.
\textsuperscript{152} Ibid. Verses. 76-100
\textsuperscript{153} These items also occur in other Abhidharma text specially in 'Abhidhammattha - Saṁgaha'. Therefore, it will not be impertinent if we point out that correct analysis of this chapter will throw a new light on the question of the relationship between early Mādhyamika and the traditional Abhidhammika.
\textsuperscript{154} Ch.-II, Verse-I.
\textsuperscript{155} Ch.-II, Verse-9, 11, 19, 20 etc., c.f. M.S. XXIV Verse-II.
\textsuperscript{156} Ch.-II, Verse-25, 28 etc.
\textsuperscript{157} This chapter is discussed on the basis of Chr. Lindtner and later translation of the text. Dr. H. N. Chatterjee Sastri does not discuss the third chapter in his philosophical discussion on this text. He points out here tha 'The third chapter of Ratnavali is missing to us'. p-75.
doctrine of 'Mahāpurusālakṣaṇa' (1-10 verses). Then a couple of significant verses (12-13) summarise the entire purpose of Mahāyāna in theory and practice, viz. attainment of Buddhahood. After this culmination, the remaining eighty six verses depict some of the endless forms of Bodhisattvācārya. Above all, here he mainly advises king to benefit himself as well as others by developing the pāramitās.

Rājyṛttopadesa - the fourth chapter has been started where Nāgārjuna left off the previous chapters. Here king is admonished to practice Dānapāramitā in various ways (7-17) and adhere to the principles of justice in the field of state and law. Punishment should only be inflicted out of compassion. Thus in this chapter, besides the Rājadharma, Nāgārjuna advises that a king as a grhastha should above all practise four Pāramitās, viz. Dāna (Charity), Śīla (Moral conduct), Kṣānti (Forbearance) and Satya (Truth).

Accordingly, the final chapter is named - ‘Bodhisattva-carvopadesa’. It has been shown how a grhastha should abstain from the ten akusaladharma and collect punya by engaging himself in the perfection of Dāna (Charity), Śīla (moral conduct), Kṣānti (Forbearance) etc. Thus he shows the way of ‘Nivṛtti’ and ‘Pravṛtti’ - ‘the two aspects of Dharma’ (mentioned in the Ch-1-verse). Then

158. Cf. MMK, Ch. XXIV, 32.
159. These instructions (reflected in the verses - 6, 9, 23, 24, 27, 31, 40, 42 of the Ch. - IV of Ratnavallī), which so to speak form an Arthaśāstra* Dr.H. N. Chatterjee Sastri mentions the code of conduct of the king, which are mostly of general nature."
the author throws light on the duties of a Pravrajita. Here he gives a list of upaklesas and Pañcamityājīvas etc. A Bodhisattva having also abandoned these and other dosas, performs six paramitā in spirit of Karuṇa. Doing so, he will gradually advance through the ten Bodhisattvabhūmis and accomplish his task by finally becoming a Buddha - 'the highest goal of Mahāyāna'.

After analysis of all the chapters it is clear that Ratnāvali contains the same philosophy of Nāgārjuna which can be found in his other works. This is very clearly referred by Chr. Lindtner in his analysis, - "The Philosophical tenents of Ratnāvali do not differ from those advanced in MkŚS-YŚ etc. but it supplements these dialectical texts affording a code of Mahāyāna principles - practical as well as theoretical with particular regard to a grhaṇa, more specifically to a king (Sec Ch-I, 2; 78 etc.). It thus places Nāgārjuna's philosophy within a wider framework."163

160. The Saptapancasaddosāh of Ratnāvali, Ch. V, verses 3-33, Chr. Lindtner has also given a list of these dosāh based on Tibetan versions. Nagarjuniana, pp.167-169.
162. Acc. to Chr. Lindtner here Nāgārjuna follows Daśabhūmika - Śūtra.
9. PRATīTYASAMUTPĀDĀHRDAYAKĀRIKĀ :

The Prafītyasamutpāda-hṛdayakārikā,164 in seven aryas, is widely attributed to Nāgājuna on the basis of the fact that Candrakīrti quotes a Kārika from the work in his Prasannapada. The Bodhicaryāvatārapāñjika quotes a couplet and a half to the effect that in the phenomenal sphere, pratītyasamutpāda, or the twelve link causal chain with its three sub-divisions, continues without intermission in this and other lives conditioned as it is by Klesa and Karma165 T.R.V. Murti informs us without any reference that there is a commentary on this by Candrakīrti.166 Peter Della Santina remarks about these traditional attribution that it seems reasonable to assume that only the first five of the seven verses found in the Tibetan actually belong to the original period of composition.167 This assumption follows from the fact that the commentary

165. The Central Philosophy of Buddhism, p. - 90.
166. Ibid.
vyākyāna, by one Suddhamati, covers only the first five stanzes. Christian Lindtner opines that apparently a piece of counter-evidence is provided by the fact that one of the Chinese versions (Taisho, No. 1651) attributes Pratītyasamutpāda - Kārika and its Vyākyāna to a certain Bodhisattva called Jing yi, 'clear Mind'. But if we take this as a somewhat interpretative rendering of Sanskrit Sumati or the like on the basis of Tib. blogrosbzon po, which on the authority of Śāntarakṣita and Kamalasīla is known to have been another name of Nāgārjuna, or perhaps merely an epithet as suddhi, dhimat etc. are stock terms for Bodhisattvas, we may concludes that Pratītyasamutpādhāryakārikā is ascribed to this author by all sources known to us.¹⁶⁸

However, Nāgājuna does not show any originality in this text. The treatment accorded to the doctrine of dependent origination by him in the present work has to be seen as having a formative function for the whole of the Mahāyāna tradition. Though Nāgārjunācārya does not show anything new in Pratītyasamutpādhāryakārika the theory expounded here is of vital importance inasmuch as it marks an exegetical attemps to reconcile the traditional

¹⁶⁸. Nagarjuniana, p. 170 also note 162 where he discusses the interpretation of the Chinese term jing and Tibetan bzan po based on the Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary by Lokesh Chandra, New Delhi, 1961, p. - 2094. According to this source, the skt. equivalent of the Chinese term Jing as Viśuddha, śuddha, svaccha, niraffāja, śubha etc. and Tibetan bzan po, usually means bhadra, Su- as well as śubha, prāṇīta etc.
dvādaśaṅga pratiṣṭhaksamutpāda\textsuperscript{169} with the śunyad doctrine. In Abhidharma avidyā and saṃskāra are generally assigned to the past, viññāṇādi to the present and jātyādi to the future.\textsuperscript{170} Here the formula may also be understood in another sense so as to accord with Nāgārjuna's opinion. In order to do so the twelve aṅga or sectors are first reduced to three groups - Kleśāvartman, Karmavartman and Duḥkhavartman. Thus, avidyā, ṭṛṣṇā and upādāna constitute klesāvartman, saṃskāra and bhava make up karmāvartman. The remaining seven viz - Viññāna, Nāmarūpa, saḍāyatana, sparsa, vedana, jāti and jārāmaṇa and duḥkhāvartam.

From these three aspects originate two - hetu (cause) and Phala (effect). Avidyā, ṭṛṣṇā, upādāna (belonging to Kleśāvartman) and saṃskāra (belonging to Karmavartman) are in the hetu, in short Kleśa and Karma are hetu; whereas the remaining aṅgas are phala. Being hetu phala the 'entire world' (i.e. the Pañcaskhandha) \textsuperscript{171} are pratiṣṭhaksamutpāna, i.e. sūnya, like illusions etc.
the 'hrdaya' (tattva or theory) of Pratītyasamutpāda amounts to the Nairātmyavāda specific to Mahāyāna, not only is there no sattva (sentient being) but the skandhas (constituent beings) are also empty, because the factors (āṅgas) are declared to be empty; but this does not contradict the causal dependence of factors, because from factors which are empty, empty factors originate. Thus Nāgārjuna has introduced his notion of Bhavacakra or Samsāramandala obviously based on his predecessors' scheme.

10. SŪTRA-SAMUCCAYA:

Sūtra - Samuccaya - anthology of sutras is ascribed to Nāgārjuna by Candrakīrti and Śāntideva. Some quotations are found in Kamalaśīla's Bhāvanākrama. Otherwise it is only available in Tibetan and Chinese translations. There were two texts of the Sūtra Samuccaya, one by Śāntideva and other by Nāgārjuna, and that Śāntideva regarded the work of Nāgārjuna as of great importance and recommended its more careful study than that of his own. T.R.V. Murti says on the strength of a verse from Śāntideva, it may be hazarded that Nāgārjuna was the author of Mahāyāna Sūtra— Sūtra Samuccaya. Buston too includes it in the list of the works of Nāgārjuna.

174. Śāntideva, pāśyet śūtra - samuccayam; ārya - Nāgārjunābaddham dūtiyaṃ ca prayatinataḥ॥ - Bodhicaryāvatāra, Ch. V, 106.
176. IHQ. Vol - XVII, pages 121ff. Hre Anukulchandra Banerjee draws our attention about that remark of Santideva.
177. The Central Philosophy of Buddhism, p. 90f.
According to Chr. Lindtner Nagarjuna felt the need to present an authoritative selection of Mahāyāna not only because he himself is one of the earliest and certainly the foremost exponent of that school, but also, as we gather from Ratnāvali (IV, 67-68), because in his days Mahāyāna still met with severe criticism from various quarters. He also observes that Sūtra-Samuccaya is a most significant document for at least two reasons. First of all, the abundance of quotations from Mahāyāna scriptures at such an early date lends it a historical value that future translators and editors of these sūtras are bound to take into account. Secondly the outspoken religious convictions found in the Sūtra - Samuccaya contribute considerably to our understanding of the author himself.178

However, it is an exposition of Mahāyāna as a duṣkaracarya and is addressed to bodhisattvas, pravrajitas as well as upāsakas like Ratnāvalī Bodhisambhāra and Bodhicitta vivarana.179 As Sūtra-Samuccaya is intended to expound Mahāyāna in the words of āgama it must not expect to discover much of a more philosophical interest.

11. BODHICITTAVIVARANA :

Bodhicittavivarana is never mentioned or cited by authoritative commentators of Nāgārjuna like Buddhāpālita or Candrakīrti except Bhavya; it forms one of the basic authorities for Bhavya in his more mature work, the
Ratnapradīpa. It is never quoted in his earlier works, Tarkajayālā, Prajñāpradīpa and Karatalaratna. It might have been a solid reason to the earlier scholars not to accept it as a composition of Nāgārjuna more specifically Mādhyamikācārya. It has been sometimes grouped as a tāntric work. But contents of Bodhicittavivarana show that such a classification is not quite justificied. At a glance, we notice that the text opens with salutation to Vajrasattvas. Vajrasattva regarded by the Vajrayana pantheon as the priest of the Five Dhyāni Buddha, is widely represented in Tibet and China. It is heardly necessary

181. Among good 'authors' citing Bv (i.e. Bodhicittavivarana) are especially Advabhava and Sāntaraksita. Both quote the celebrated verse 20. Ibid.
182. P. Patel identified some quotations from it in IHQ, VIII, pp. 790-793; also Lindtner in his paper WZKS, XXVI (1982).
184. 'Vajra' and 'Sūnya' are equivalent in Tāntrik Buddhism where Sūnya is used in a special sense to represent 'Vajra'. In the Advayavajra samgraha, it is explained very clearly and the English translation on the same is found in 'The Indian Buddhist Iconography' of Benoytosh Bhattacharya as follows:

"Sūnyatā is designated as Vajra
because it is firm and sound, and
cannot be changed, cannot be pierced
cannot be penetrated, cannot be burnt
and cannot be destroyed." - Introduction, p. - 11.

This explanation of Sūnya or Sūnyatā is not far away of the concept of Sūnyatā of Mādhyamikas. But their practice is quite different. In the Bodhicittavivarana, homage is paid to Vajrasattva not Vajrasattva. It may be said that here Vajrasattva's indicated Bodhisattvas who are meditating on Sūnyatā. Mind of Bodhisattvas is defined in this very text as 'By understanding truth one obtains liberation (mokṣa). It is also defined as reality (tattva), real limit (bhutokoti) signless (animitta), ultimate meaning (paramārtha), the highest Bodhicitta and emptiness" (verses - 70-71), i.e. tathatā = bhutokoti animitta = paramārtha = paramabodhicitta = Sūnyatā. Cf. Sūnyatāsaptati, verse - 69, Catuḥstava, I, verses - 1, 27; III, verses 41, 45.
now to speak that Vajrayāna, the famous tāntric Buddhist school, introduces many innovations; for instance, the theory of Five Dhyāni Buddha as embodiments of the five skandhas or cosmic elements and formulated the theory of the kulas or families of them from which deities emerge according to need.¹⁸⁵ Tāranāth is reported to have said that Tāntricism existed from very early times and was transmitted in a secret manner from the time of Asaṅga (300 A.D.) down to the time of Dharmakīrti (625-675 A.D.).¹⁸⁶ According to Benoytosh Bhattacharya the tantras were a development of the Yāgācāra which was inspired by the Śūnyavāda of the Madhyamakas.¹⁸⁷ On this very point, the suggestion of Christian Lindtner is tenable that it is a composition of Ācārya Nāgārjuna. According to him this is to some extent a natural consequence of fact that the theme is at once simple and comprehensive: Bodhicitta. It has relative aspect consisting in the desire (Prārthana) for the bodhi of all living beings, and an absolute consisting in unlimited cognition of Śūnyata or bodhi.¹⁸⁸ The idea of a Mahāyānist finds expression in the Kārandaśavyūha where the ideal Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara is represented as refusing his well earned Nirvana until all being of the world were in possession of the Bodhi knowledge and obtained freedom from worldly miseries.¹⁸⁹ This then may be considered to be the goal of every

¹⁸⁵. The Indian Buddhist Iconography, P. 11.
¹⁸⁶. Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India., Ch. - 22, P. 15ff, also Bhattacharya, Benoytosh, Buddhist Esoterism, p. - 24.
¹⁸⁷. The Indian Buddhist Iconography, p. 10.
¹⁸⁹. Sāmasrāmi, (ed), Kārandaśavyūha, pp. 21-22, also. The Indian Buddhist Iconography, p. - 11,
Bodhisattva, which can be reached by following the tenets either of Śūnyavāda or of Viśṇūnavāda. The Madhyamika theory postulated a transcendental state but the Yogācārā added the element of Viśṇūna ‘consciousness’ to Śūnya. The Bodhimind in a chain of Viśṇūna which is changing every moment, the viṣṇūna of the previous moment giving rise to the viṣṇūna of succeeding moment with the same memory the same conformations and same qualities, and this process goes on till viṣṇūna attains liberation (Nirvāṇa).190 Lindtner observes that how vehemently Nāgārjuna attacks those who might have thought themselves justified in maintaining the absolute existence of Viśṇā (Citta). Thus, from a historical point of view the most significant feature of this neglected text of Nāgārjuna is its extensive critique of Viśṇunavāda, i.e. Buddhist idealism as testified in the Lankavatāra.191 The Bodhisattavavaraṇa comprises 112 verses in Apustup metre and the style of it is similar to that of Yuktisastikā, Ratnavalī and Catuḥstava.

However, the text commences with a few words about no self concerning the development (bhāvanā) of bodhicitta which abolishes the three kinds of existence (bhāva) in samsāra. The Buddhas maintain that bodhicitta is not enveloped (nivṛtta) in notions (Kalpanā), conscious of a self, aggregates etc. (ātmakandhaṇi) but is always characterised by being empty (Śūnyādilakṣaṇa) of any such notions. This bodhicitta is constantly developed by the

190. Radhakrishnan, S. Indian Philosophy, p. 629ff.
compassionate (Krpatmaka) Buddhas with particular effort (Prayatnena). Then the author, as his usual style, is engaged to criticise the sectarians. It has been repeatedly mentioned in previous discussion that here his target of attack is Viññānavādin. According to him, when the self (ātman) which is conceived (Kalpita) by the sectarians (tīrthika) is analysed logically it cannot obtain a place inside any of the five aggregates. Being identical with the aggregates the self would not be permanent (nitya) but the self (ātman) has no such nature. A container content relationship (ādhārādheyaabhāva) is not possible between a permanent (self) and impermanent (aggregates). When there is no so-called self (ātman) how can the so-called creator (Kāraka) be permanent (nitya)? If there were a subject (dharmin) one may begin investigating its attributes (dharma) in the world (loke). Since a permanent (creator) cannot create things (arthakriya) whether it be gradually (Kramena) or all at once (yugapat), therefore there are no permanent things whether it be exterior (bāya) or interior (antah). Thus the solicitous (Hitaisinah or Buddhas) have spoken of the five aggregates to disciples (sāvaka) about form (rūpa), feeling (Vedanā), apprehension (sa’mjñā), Karma-formations (samskāra) and consciousness (Vijnāna). But


193. The srāvakas only endorse pudgaśānairātmya but by quoting a celebrated passage from Samyuttanikāya, III, p. 142, Nagārjuna shows that even here we find evidence of the Buddha’s preaching of dharmanirātmya;

phenapiḍopamaṁ rūpaṁ vedanā budbudopamaṁ/
maṛciṣadṛśaṁ samjñā samśkarāṁ kadaliśanibhāṁ/
māyopamaṁ ca viññānan utkam ādityabandhunā/
evam dharman viññāmano bhikṣuṁ arabdhvīryavanā/
dīva vā yadi vā ratrau samprajñānam pratismṛtah/
pratividhyeth padam sāntam samśkaropasaṁ saṁvāṁ/

the bodhisattvas have been always taught by Buddha this doctrine about the aggregates: form is like a mass of foam (pñapinda), feeling is like bubbles (budbuda), apprehension (sañjñā) is like a mirage (marici), karmaformations (samskāra) are like plantain (kadalī) and consciousness (Vijnana) is like an illusion (māyā). If you analyse by spatial division (digbheda) even the atom (paramāṇu) is seen to possess parts (bheda). That which is analysed into parts (aṇīṣa), how can that logically be an atom (paramāṇu)? Concerning one single exterior object (bāhyārtha) divergent judgements may prevail. That form (rūpa) which is pleasant (manohara) to one person, precisely that may appear different to others. In respect to the same female body, an ascetic, a lover and a dog entertain three different notions. 'A Corpse', 'A mistress', 'A titbit', This particular appearance of consciousness appears under the aspect of form (rūpakāra).

Just as people due to mental delusions (cittamohana) see illusions, mirages, cities of Gandharvas etc. (māyāmariccigandharvanagārādi), the manifestation of form (rūpadarsana) is just like that.

Now, Nāgārjuna returns to the main theme. Idealists (Vijñānavādins) say this manifold world is established to be more consciousness. According to Nāgārjuna, 'The entire world is mere mind' is infact declare by Buddha to remove the fear of fools. It is not a doctrine concerning reality. The imagined (parikalpita) the dependent (paratantra) and the absolute (parinīspanna) have only one nature of their own: emptiness. They are imaginations (kalpanā) of mind (Citta).
Next, the idealists' claim that mind purified by shifting position (āśrayaparivṛtti) becomes the object of its own specific knowledge (svapratyātmagati, gota) is also objected to by Nāgārjuna in the following way: that mind which is past (aftta) does not exist, that which is future (anāgata) is not discovered (aprāpta). How can finally the present mind shift over from place to place? The consciousness (vijñāna), essentially, lacks substance or self nature (nairātmyarūpa). Hence consciousness has no other basis. Just as iron (ayaḥ) moves swiftly around when approached by a load-stone (ayaskānta) though it possesses no mind (Citta) but appears as if it possessed mind (cittavād iva drṣyate). 194 Thus the store-consciousness (ālayavijñāna) appears to be real though it is false and when it moves to and fro it seems to retain the three existences (bhavatraya). Just as the ocean and tress are moved though they have no mind (citta) likewise the store-consciousness (ālayavijñāna) is only active dependent upon a body (Kayasritya). So considering the fact that without a body there is no consciousness, you must also state that kind of specific knowledge of itself (svapratyatmagati) this consciousness possesses. In order to convince oneself as well as others clever people should always proceed without error. 195

195. Dhamapada, Ch. - XII, 2,

Attānameva patham patirupe nīvesaye/
atha' māmanusāseyya na kilisseyya pāndito //
(Vedya) and subject (Vedaka) do not exist? Thus he concludes mind is but a name (nāmamātra) and consciousness must be regarded as but a name. The name too has no own-being (īsvabhāva). The Jinas have never found mind (Citta) to exist either inside, outside or between both. Therefore mind has an illusory nature (māyāsvabhāva). The Tathāgatas do not regard mind under the form of cognisable (bodhya) and cognisant (bodhaka). Where cognisant and cognisable prevail there is no enlightenment. Space (ākāśa). bodhicitta and enlightenment (bodhi) are without marks, without generation. They have no structure and beyond the limitation of words. Their mark so to speak is nonduality (advaya). Those who do not know emptiness will have no share in liberation. Beings are subject to two kinds of maturation (vipāka): that of Buddhas and bodhisattvas and that of good and bad rebirth (sugatidurgati). Perhaps the disciples (Srāvakas) obtain an inferior enlightenment (hīna-bodhi) owing to indifference (vairāgya) but the bodhi of the Perfect Buddhas (Sambuddhas) is obtained by not abandoning living being (sattva). The bodhisattvas are active in developing enlightenment (bodhi) which has compassion as its solid roots and which grows from sprout of bodhicitta and has the sole fruit of altruism (parārtha). Wishing to protect the living being (sattva) they are even born in the

196. Cf. Śūnyatā-saptati - Verse - 51
Na rūpe nāpi madhye hi caṅsurbuddhirna caṅsushoh /
Caṅsuh pratītya rūpaṁ ca viparyāso vikalpatāma/

197. The Pratisamkhyaśānti of the Srāvakas is inferior to the Ānuttara samyaksambodhi of the Buddhas. Chaudhuri, Dr. S. Analytical Study of the Abhidharmakosa, pp. - 71ff.
mud of existence (bhāvapāṅka). Unsoiled (alipta) by its events they are like a lotus in mire. And under the influence of compassion they display (their) descent (from Tuṣita), birth, merriments, renunciation, penances, great enlightenment, victory over the hosts of Māra, turning of the Dharmacakra, as well as Nirvāṇa. Finally, it is said that in Mahāyāna this bodhicitta is said to be the highest. Simply by generating the bodhicitta a mass of merit (pūryārāsi) is collected. If a person, only for a moment, developed bodhicitta, the mass of his merit not even the Jinas could calculate.

12. SUHRLLEKHA:

Suhrllekha\textsuperscript{199} belongs to that class of literature having the characteristics of lekha (Letter). It is also known as Nagarjuna - Bodhisattva - Suhrllekha.


\textsuperscript{199} Not a single Sanskrit fragment seems to have survived of the 123 Āryā meter in which Suhrllekha was originally composed. It is, however, available in no less than three Chinese translations - i) Taisho, XXXII, Nos. 1672-1674, ii) Tibetan (TP, No. 5409, Cf. No. 5682 which is a duplicate with a few important variants) and very good commentary (TP, No. 5690) corresponding to its name Vyaktapada Suhrllekha by a certain Mahāmati (Chr. Lindtner, Nagarjuniana, p. 218); Apart from several partial versions three complete English ones are known, LS Kawamura, Golden Zephyr: Instructions from a spiritual Friend, Emeryville 1975, and Ven. Lozan Jampal et. al., Nāgārjuna's Letter to king Gautamīputra, Delhi, 1978, Chr. Lindtner's Nagarjuniana, 1982, First Indian Edition, 1987 Delhi, pp. 218-224, where he attempts to point out some parallels in Nāgārjuna's other works and identifies some of the canonical sources upon which Suhrllekha proves to be dependent. The pioneer version of this was 'Nāgārjuna's Friendly Episle', English translation from Tibetan by Dr. H. Wanzel, JPTS. 1886, pp. 1-32.
Here, author addresses to his old patron (dānapati) Shiyehteh-kia-whose regal title was Sha-to-pohana, there are traced many precepts common to both the Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna. The Suhrlekha enjoyed such popularity in India is evident from the account of the Chinese pilgrim l-Tsing who visited India in the 7th Century, for he writes, "The India students learn this epistles in verse early in the course of instruction, but the most devout make it their special object of study throughout their lives". While summarising the contents of the letter l-Tsling observes: 'It may be regarded as an elegant composition, the object of which is to encourage and exhort to earnest diligence, and to point out the true middle path of right behaviour in relationship with friends and kindred. The leading thoughts are; faith in the three honourable ones (Buddha, Dharma and the Saṅgha). They are to nourish and cherish father and mother, to hold by the moral precepts, and to avoid the society of those who practise evil and are immersed in the pleasures of life, to free himself from the bonds of family complications, to meditate rightly on impermanence, to search into the character of the future life, whether that life be under the form of a wandering spirit (preta), or in the higher grades, as a man or deva or in the lowest condition, as born in

200. Rev. S. Beal. 'Some remarks on the Suhrlekha or friendly communication of Nāgārjuna Bodhisattva to king Shatopohanna" in the Indian Antiquary, June, 1887, pp. 169ff, where he mentioned "The Choice Law-verses of Nāgārjuna-Bodhisattva, written for the sakes of Jantakarāja - translated by the Docor of the Law, Guṇavarman, of the Sung dynasty, A.D. 431." - S. Beal has translated 100 lines from Guṇavarman's translation comprising 442 lines with seven symbols in each line.

hell; and thus to seek deliverance (from such conditions) with all the heart. He then exhorts to the practice of the three species of wisdom (the Trividya) and illustrates the character of the eight branches of the holy way of Buddha (the eight fold path). He urges the king to learn the four true methods of salvation and to aim at the perfect condition of love and purity, like that of Avalokitesvara and Amitabha. The principal points of the text are noted in this context. There is reference to the six Memorable things - anusmṛtyas (Dharma 54). Worldly wealth has been declared to be unstable and unsubstantial (asara) and they should be utilised for the good of the Bhikkhus. Brāhmaṇas and the poor (V.6.) The six pāramitās are referred to (V.8). The eight śīlas (V. 10-11) have been duly stressed. Verse 13 directly states what is noted in the very first verse of Appamādaavagga of Dhamma-pāda. Again verse 16 is substantially the same as what we get in the Dhamma-pāda (Cf. Udana, XIV, 9f). Using a good simile it has been stated that people are like mango fruits some even ripe looking like green, and so on, (V.20). We come across ideas like the unstable nature of the body (V.56). Amongst all the blisses the bliss in the form of cessation of desire is the highest (V.85). The king has been instructed to exert himself with energy so that there may not by any means be as much as an atom of the seed of the sin-fruit produced by evil action, speech or thought. There is eulogy for Nirvāṇa.

202. From H. Wanzel, JPTS 1886, pp 6-32. Translation of some of the verses as taken from I-Tseng's Chinese translations are also recorded by Max Muller, in his 'The late Kenjiu Kasawara' in the JPTS, 1883, pp. 69-75. Translation of S. Beal under the heading 'Some remarks' ... 'Shatopohanna' Indian Antiquary, May-June, 1887, pp. 1671-172.
wisdom (prajñā), the eightfold path (V.114) and the four truths (V.115). Towards the end of the letter Nāgārjuna observes: 'To satisfy all these counsels (I have) given to thee in these words (i.e. in this letter) would be difficult even for a Bhiksu (who has given up domestic life; how much more for a layman, grhaṣṭha, com.); therefore keep to the virtue thou art able to fulfill, make (the best) use of your lifetime.' In the concluding portion of the text i.e. the colophon is like this:

'The friendly spistle, sent by the Master (acarya), the Noble Nāgārjuna (Klu-Sgrup) to his friend king Udayaṇa (Bde-spyod) is finished', Translated, corrected and put in order by the Indian Pandita (mKhyan-Po) Sarvajnadeva, and the great translator Bande Dpalrtsegs.203

Suhrilekha is written in a straightforward and pleasing style and in arya meter. There is a unity of thought; all human endeavours are summed up under one heading, viz. the desire for release from the round of rebirth (V.104). This, as we have seen in Ratriavair, is achieved by fulfilling pūnya-ñānasamāṃbha. And, to put it briefly, Suhrilekha is concerned with the pūnya-ñānasamāṃbha of a grhaṇa according to the teachings of the ancient āgamas. As it was written principally for laymen, Ven. L. Jamspal204 observes "Though scholars and academicians seeking clarification of abstruse points of the doctrine of the Mādhyaṃikas may find little to satisfy them in the Suhrilekha, those who desire

204. Ibid. introduction. p. XVI.
a concise and comprehensive manual of instruction in the doctrine and practice of Buddhist philosophy and religion will surely not be disappointed." Today, also, the Suhrilkekha enjoys widespread popularity among Tibetans who use it with regularity as a basic manual for teaching Buddhist Dharma.205 Prof. Chr. Lindtner observes - 'There can be no doubt that the author is a devotee of Mahāyāna, he speaks of Sugatapratima (2), the six pāramitā(8) Avolokiteśvara (120) and Amitābha (121). On the other hand the theory of Śūnyatā is hardly mentioned (but see 40, 49), and the dialects of prajñā known from MK etc. do not occur. But this is only what we would expect from an author who adheres to the Mahāyāna idea of Upayakauslya (See BS, 6, 17 etc.; BV, 98-99). Thus it shows great similarity to BS, SS and certain parts of RA, without, however, actually repeating the dharmadesanā given in those texts.206

13. BODHISAMBHĀRA(KA):

Bodhisambhāraka is only extant in a Chinese version. Christian Lindtner draws our attention about this authentic writing of Nāgārjuna with a detailed review the evidence for ascribing this text to the founder and author of Mādhyamika philosophy. This available Chinese translation was made by Dharmagupta between 605-616 A.D. Among various causes which compell Lindtner for assenting to Nāgārjuna's authorship the following reasons are most

205. Ibid, introduction, p. XVI
significant: "The external evidence is provided by two quotations from Nāgārjuna’s ..., Bhodhisambhāra (44) in Candrakīrti’s Catub-establisha. I have also come across a quotation ... in Aśvabhāva’s Mahāyāna-samgrahaprabandhana. Moreover an early date of Bodhisambhāra is ensured by the fact that it is quoted in the Daśabhūmikavibhāṣa of which a Chinese version from Ca. 408 still exists, where an earlier one (by Dharmarakṣa) from Ca. 265 it lost. In both cases Nāgārjuna was held to be the author. It was found accompanied with a commentary composed by Īśvarabhikṣu. This commentary was also translated by Dharmagupta with the text. According to Lindtner, Bodhisambharaka was known to Bu-Ston..., it is probable that a Tibetan version may have existed - and perhaps still does. There is a Japanese translation of Bodhisambharaka. In the Western countries, it has virtually remained unnoticed before Lindtner. However, according to Lindtner translation, it contains 165 verses. The text is addressed to bodhisattvas, i.e. to pravrajitas and upāsakas devoted to Mahāyāna (verse-65). It is to be noted that Bodhisambhāra never refers to any other works of the author. The majority of verses are devoted to exposition of

208. Lindtner translates the Chinese term Bi qiuzi zai as Bhikṣu śvara Or more likely, śvara bhikṣu,’ Ibid.
209. Christian Lindtner has made an English translation of the Chinese version without detailing upon the difficulties and uncertainties inherent in such a task in general. Nakamamura has mentioned about its Japanese translation, Ibid. note 186.
the five पारमितास and a bodhisattva's fundamental attitude towards all other living beings (sattva). There is no end to the multifarious forms of bodhisattvacaryā. The main topics treated here are - samgrahavastu,210 daśabhumi,211 bodhicittotpādavidhi,212 mahāpurusālakṣaṇa,213 sattvaparipācana,214 puja215 dharmadesanā216, srāvakapratyekabhūmiprahāna,217 etc.

The Bodhisambharaka i.e. The Collections for Enlightenment is really beyond reach. Lindtner conveniently placed it under two main headings - puṇya and jñānasambhāra respectively resulting in the attainment of a rūpa and a dharmakāya i.e. in a buddhakāya. Though Prajñā is most important, but puṇyasambhāra is described here with much emphasis. Besides these major expositions, we also meet such simple admonitions like four kinds of good friends (Kalyāṇamitra) as well as bad companions (Kumitra). etc.

14. MAHĀYĀNAVIMŚIKĀ:

Mahāyānavimśikā has always enjoyed considerable popularity among the

211. Sixth Abhimukha and eighth Acalā are clearly referred in verse - 32.
212. Verses: 77-89; 99-133.
Mahāyānists. It is quoted in Jñānasīdhi. There is one Chinese and two Tibetan translation. Concensus of opinion among scholars is that this work is by another Nāgārjuna who lived about the first half of the 7th Century A.D. Christian Lindtner observes that 'its style and doctrine show considerable similarity to some of Nāgārjuna's authentic works.

Mahāyānavimsīkā or Mahāyānavimsaka is brief verse-summary comprising twenty verses. It teaches non-existence of Samsāra as well as Nirvāṇa and of everything being as unreal as dream. First, homage is paid to Buddha for, out of compassion, having preached the dharma that is, strictly speaking, beyong words. In reality, i.e., from the absolute point of view all living beings, all the creation orginated by action, in other words, the entire world including the Buddhas, is unoriginated and empty like an illusion. Nevertheless, due to sheer ignorance commoners imagine that the samsara exists. Hence they experience suffering, happiness etc. The manifold world is creation of their own mind and they can be compared to a painter who becomes afraid of a monster

220. Murti, T.R.V. Ibid. n.3.
222. Verse 1-3.
painted by himself. We would all have been utterly lost but for the Buddhas' Compassion. Those Buddhas guide living beings out of their illusions, and finally, when mankind has accumulated sufficient merit and insight, it too becomes enlightened and realises that everything was mere creation of ignorance.

There is only rebirth as long as there is ignorance. Only by means of Mahāyāna can one ever hope to cross the terrible ocean of samsāra or the more of repeated existence.

223 Verses 4-11.