

# THE EASTERN BUDDHIST

## AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE LANKAVATARA SUTRA

1. The Chinese Translations—2. Comparison of the Contents of the Three Chinese Translations and One Sanskrit Text—3. Examples of the Textual Differences—4. A Further Examination of the Sutra as to its Inner Connections—5. The *Lankavatara* and Bodhidharma, the Father of Zen Buddhism in China—6. The Study of the Sutra after Bodhidharma in China and Japan—7. An English Translation of the Introductory Chapter from the Sanskrit Edition.

### I. THE CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

Altogether four Chinese translations of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* were made between about A.D. 420 and 704, of which we have at present three still in existence. The first, in four fasciculi, was by Dharmaraksha, whose title was, "Master of the Law, Teacher of the Tripitaka, of Central India." According to 開元錄,<sup>1</sup> this was done from the same text which was later used by Guṇabhadra, Bodhiruci, and Śikshānanda. But this statement is not quite exact. "The same text" here undoubtedly allows of a wide latitude of interpretation as we shall know below when a comparative study of the different translations is made. He came to China in 412 and settled in Ku-tsang (姑臧), the capital of the Northern Liang. He spent eight years in translating the *Mahāparinirvāna-Sūtra* in forty or thirty-six fasciculi, which he revised three times. Though it is not exactly known when the *Lankāvatāra* was translated by him, it is likely that the work was taken up after the *Parinirvāna-Sūtra*, that is, between 412-433. He was assassinated in 433 when he was forty-nine years old. Roughly speaking, the first Chinese translation of the *Lankāvatāra* was produced about fifteen hundred years ago.

<sup>1</sup> *Kai-yüan Lu*, Fas. IV, 38a (Kōkyō Shoin edition). This is a catalogue of the Buddhist Tripitaka compiled in the Kai-yüan era (713-741, A.D.), of the T'ang dynasty.

Unfortunately, this is lost. The title was simply, *The Lankā-Sūtra* (楞伽經).<sup>1</sup>

The second translation, also in four fasciculi, which appeared in 443 bears the title, *The Lankāvatāra-Treasure-Sūtra* (楞伽阿跋多羅寶經) and the translator is Guṇabhadra, "The Law-teacher of the Tripitaka, of Central India." He came to China by sea in 435. On his way the wind ceased, the ship could not sail on, the supply of fresh water was exhausted, and the sailors did not know what to do. The situation, however, was improved by the mystic rites performed by Guṇabhadra; for the wind began to blow more favourably and a pouring rain saved them from dying of thirst. Among his translations we may mention the *Śrīmāla*, *Aṅglimāla*, *Samyuktāgama*, etc. He died in 468 at the age of 75.<sup>2</sup>

*The Lankāvatāra Sūtra* which is recorded as having been handed by Bodhidharma to his disciple Hui-k'ê was probably this Guṇabhadra translation in four fasciculi. It is strange that the first translation became lost so early as 700 when the fourth translation was issued. At the time of Tao-hsüan's *Catalogue of Buddhist Literature in Great T'ang* (大唐內典錄), which was completed in 664, mention is made of the first one. In Fas. VIII of this *Catalogue* under the heading, "Those sutras which have been translated under the former dynasties and at present are kept among the Tripitaka collection" (歷代衆經見入藏錄), he refers to the "*Lankāvatāra Sūtra* in ten fasciculi, kept in one case," which is evidently that by Bodhiruci; and a little further down there is another entry: "*The Lankāvatāra* in four fasciculi, two sutras in one case." This must be the case for the first and the second translations, as they were both compiled in four fasciculi. In the *Kai-yüan Catalogue*,

<sup>1</sup> 大唐內典錄, (*Tai-t'ang Nei-tien Lu*, a Catalogue of the Buddhist Books Compiled in the T'ang Dynasty), Fas. III, 64a (the Kōkyō Shoin edition). This is an earlier compilation than the *Kai-yüan Lu*, as the preface is dated the first year of Lin-tê, 664.

<sup>2</sup> *The Kai-yüan Lu*, Fas. V, 45b et seq. (the Kōkyō Shoin edition).

however, which was finished in 730, Dharmaraksha's *Lankāvatāra* is mentioned as lost. The loss must have taken place even earlier as I stated before; for Fa-tsang (法藏) who had much to do with the fourth or T'ang translation (done in the years 700-708) makes no reference whatever to the first. This was only forty years after the compilation of Tao-hsüan's *Catalogue*. It is quite unfortunate that we now have no means of seeing how far the agreements go between the first and the second translations, as they are both in four fasciculi and it is likely that they were made from the same original. Fa-tsang<sup>1</sup> criticises the second (or Sung) translation as being not quite good as a translation, for it retains to some extent the original Sanskrit diction which puzzles even the intelligent Chinese reader adequately to understand the sense.

The third one (入楞伽經) in ten fasciculi is by Bo-

<sup>1</sup> He died in 712, one of the greatest scholars in China and a most eminent figure in the history of the Avatamsaka school of Buddhism. He was a contemporary of Hsüan-chuang (玄奘), I-tsing (義淨), Hui-nêng (慧能), Shên-hsiu (神秀), Śikshānanda, Divākara, Bodhiruci (all of the T'ang dynasty), etc. When Hsüan-chuang came back from India, Fa-tsang was one of the learned scholars chosen by Hsüan-chuang to be his assistants or co-workers in converting the Sanskrit texts into the Chinese language. Fa-tsang, however, disagreed with Hsüan-chuang in the interpretation of the texts and withdrew from the translation bureau. Later, he worked with Śikshānanda in the translation of the *Avatamsaka Sūtra* and the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*, and illuminating lectures were given by him on the teachings of the *Avatamsaka* for the edification of the Empress Tsê T'ien (則天), who was one of the great women-rulers of China. His 入楞伽心玄義 (*Ju lêng-chia hsin hsüan-i*) is a short expository treatise on the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* throwing much light on the understanding of the text and its philosophy, and in this he complains of the second translation being difficult even for men of superior intelligence to understand it thoroughly, not to say anything about the ignorant and unlearned who are apt to give wrong interpretations to the text. This being really the case, as was confirmed later by Su Tung-pei and Ch'iang Chih-ch'i, noted Chinese scholars of the Sung dynasty, the understanding of the *Lankāvatāra* must have caused a great deal of trouble among scholars. So far, however, in China and Japan the four fasciculi one has had a far wider circulation than the ten or the seven fasciculi one.

dhiruci, "the Law Teacher of the Tripitaka, of Northern India." It was finished in 513, about one hundred years after the Sung translation. Fa-tsang's remarks are: "Although this translation is fuller than the preceding one, the original meaning is not fully expressed and errors are more apt to creep in." This may be true to a certain extent but as we now have no original text of this third, or Wei translation, there is no way to verify this criticism of Fa-tsang. There are, however, some points in it which are in better agreement with the Nanjo edition than with the others. It may not be quite fair to say that Bodhiruci put in his own words to help the reading of the text; the fact may be perhaps, that his original was largely mixed with gloss and that he was not discriminating enough to reject it as such. This fact partly shows that the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*, being a difficult text to understand, not only textually but doctrinally as well, was already in bad condition from a literary point of view when it was brought into China by these early Indian missionaries.

The fourth Chinese translation, entitled *The Mahāyāna Lankāvatāra Sūtra* (大乘入楞伽經) in seven fasciculi, was produced in 700-704, and the chief translator was Śikshānanda. More details are known of this translation than of all preceding ones as regards the circumstances and persons concerned. The preface by the Empress Tsê-t'ien Wu-hou (則天武后) tells how it came to be translated once more by Śikshānanda and others; and, moreover, Fa-tsang, who was one of the Chinese scholars who were engaged in revising the translation by Śikshānanda, wrote a sort of commentary-introduction in which is given not only an analytical resumé of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*, but a full account of the work itself. The following is quoted from the book (入楞伽心玄義):

"With regard to the translation: the four fasciculi one was done by Guṇabhadra, Master of the Tripitaka, of India, at Chih-huan Ssū (祇桓寺), Tang Yang (丹陽), in the

Yüan-chia (玄嘉) period (424-453) of Sung; Pao-yün (寶雲) the monk took down the master's dictation and Hui-kuan (慧觀) put it into writing.<sup>1</sup> The ten fasciculi one was done toward the end of Wei by Bodhiruci, Master of the Tripitaka, of India, who was engaged in the work at Yung-nêng Ssü (永寧寺), Lo-yang (洛陽).<sup>2</sup>

"As to the present one, (that is, the seven fasciculi one), Śikshānanda, Master of the Tripitaka, of Yü-t'ien (于闐), is the translator, who, after finishing the translation

<sup>1</sup> 寶雲傳語慧觀筆受. *Chuan-yü* literally means "to transmit words," and *pi-shou* means "to receive with a writing brush." As Guṇabhadra who came from India probably could not speak Chinese well enough to make himself fully understood, Pao-yün acted as a kind of interpreter; or Guṇabhadra gave a literal translation of the original, which was done into literary Chinese by Pao-yün, and this in turn was put into writing by Hui-kuan. When the Indian translators were not complete masters of the Chinese language, there was always a "transmitter" who acted as a "go-between." In some cases there were other scholars engaged in the work, whose office it was to see if the original meaning was correctly understood, or to put the translation into better classical style, or to see that the translation fully expressed the original ideas. This more or less round-about way was inevitable, seeing that the translator did not have a complete command of the two languages, Sanskrit and Chinese. But it was in this way, too, that the Chinese translators so well produced the sense of the original, and it helped a great deal towards making Buddhism strike root firmly in the native soil. From the linguistic point of view, however, there might have been something missed in the Chinese versions which is retained in the Tibetan texts. So we read in the life of Hsüan-chuang as recorded in the *Kai-yüan Catalogue* (fas. VIII, 73a) that "in the former days the sutras were translated in this way: first, the original text was translated literally word by word, and this was turned round to adapt itself to the Chinese style of diction, and finally the words and sentences were rearranged and revised by those especially skilled in writing. Thus, while going through so many hands, the original writing suffered much alteration, sometimes something added, sometimes something taken away. But now in the case of Hsüan-chuang everything was managed single-handed; as words came out of his mouth they were at once written down and made a perfectly readable translation." Literary accuracy was thus gained, but the strange fact is that some of these older translations are still in far better circulation than the newer ones.

<sup>2</sup> According to the *Kai-yüan Catalogue* (fas. VIII, 56a), Sêng-lang (僧朗) and Tao-chan (道湛) put the translation into writing.

of the *Avatamsaka* at Fo Shou-chi Ssū (佛授記寺), of the Eastern City, in the first year of Chiu-shih (久視, A.D. 700) was ordered by the Empress Tsê-t'ien to take up once more the task of translating the *Lankāvātāra*. Before the work was completed, Śikshānanda returned to the Capital and was given residence at the Chin-ch'an Ssū (清禪寺). The translation was roughly finished here, but before he had time to revise it he was allowed to return to his native land, by Imperial order. In the second year of Chang-an (長安, 702) Mi-t'o-shan (彌陀山), [a Master of] the Tripitaka, came from Tu-huo-lo (吐火羅), who, before coming to China had spent twenty-five years in India, thoroughly mastering the Tripitaka, and he was especially learned in the *Lankāvātāra*. By Imperial order he was requested to revise Śikshānanda's translation, aided by such monk-translators as Fu-li (復禮), Fa-tsang (法藏), etc. Fu-li was engaged in giving final touch to the revised Chinese version, and an Imperial preface to the sutra was written, in which its merits were extolled.

“As to the four fasciculi translation, the rendering is not perfect, the wording is after the Western grammar (? 語順西音), which makes even men of superior intelligence confused, not knowing how to read it, while the ignorant and unlearned are apt to give wrong interpretations.

“The ten fasciculi one is somewhat fuller in paragraphs and chapters [than the preceding one], but the sacred sense is not adequately expressed. When words are added and sentences are mixed in, the meaning grows murky, frequently causing errors, and the result is that the truth, bright and clear, becomes obstructed in its course on account of the local dialect.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This is the translation of 方言, *fang-yen*, but what it really means is hard to decide; for the ten fasciculi version of the *Lankāvātāra* was not surely written in any other language than the Chinese just like the other translations. May it, however, mean that Bodhi-suci's original was well mixed up with gloss written in the local dialect of his native Northern India?

“The Empress regretting this inadequacy ordered another translation to be made. The present one was made by comparing in detail five Sanskrit copies, and after examining the two Chinese translations. What was in accordance with [the true sense] was adopted, while what was not properly done was corrected. Many years of labour have thus ended in producing this splendid work, in which it is expected that the [original] sense is accurately represented and scholars may thus be saved from committing further errors.”

The preface by the Empress Tsê-t'ien, which is usually found attached to the T'ang edition, generally agrees with the account given by Fa-tsang, but there is one point that is not quite clear and seems to disagree with Fa-tsang. Among other things we have the following in the preface which concerns the translation itself: “Originally this sutra was brought here from the Western country (西國), in the era of Yüan-chia. Guṇabhadra translated it, but it had not a wide circulation. Bodhiruci's version came out in the era of Yen-chang, but it misses the original meaning in many respects. Full of reverential thoughts about the transmission [of the Good Law], I earnestly wished for its prosperous condition. In the first year of Chiu-shih, which corresponds in the cyclical commutation to the year of *kêng-tsu*, and in the sixth month of the year, during the summer season, I went to Chi-fêng (箕峯) to escape the heat and enjoy the cool air by the river Ying-shui (潁水), when at the San Yang palace another translation was produced. The essentials of the three copies were inquired into, and the finished teaching was compiled into seven fasciculi. The Very Reverend Śikshānanda of Yü-t'ien who is a learned monk of the Tripitaka, and Fu-li, a priest of Tai-fu-hsien Ssü (大福先寺) and others [partook in the work]; they have all the reputation equal to that of Tao-an (道安) and Hui-yüan (慧遠), and virtues like those of Ma-t'eng (摩騰) and Fa-lan (法蘭); they are again all worthy to succeed

in the steps of Nāgārjuna, and have deeply delved into the secrets of Aśvaghosha; they are equally great in the fragrance of their moral conduct and in the flower of their enlightened minds; the jewel of their intelligence and the moon of their spiritual essence are both perfectly full: therefore, they are capable of thoroughly understanding the mystery [of Buddhism] and manifesting the deepest significance of it. The final copying [of the translation] was completed on the fifteenth day of the first month of the fourth year of Chang-an."

In this flowery composition by the Empress Tsê-t'ien, the phrase "討三本之要詮, to enquire into the essentials of (the) three books (or copies?)," is somewhat ambiguous. Does "*san pên*" refer to the three preceding translations, or to three Sanskrit copies which they utilised? As the first translation was already lost at that time, the "*san pên*" must mean three original Sanskrit copies which they then had at hand. If so, the number does not agree with that mentioned by Fa-tsang as already quoted, for he says distinctly five copies instead of three. Could the character "three" be an error of the scribes? Fa-tsang who was a great scholar and an actual participant in the production of the seven fasciculi Chinese *Lankāvātāra* translation, has a better claim for authority, if choice is to be made between the literary remains of the time concerning the original texts, etc.

However this might have been, it is clear that the seven fasciculi translation is apparently the best of all the Chinese translations of this important Mahāyāna sutra, seeing that it was produced by the joint labour of competent scholars both Indian and Chinese. But, strangely, almost all the commentaries written seem to be based on the four fasciculi one by Guṇabhadra, which is regarded as Bodhidharma's copy handed over to his disciple, Hui-k'ê.

To sum up: the first Chinese translation of the *Lankāvātāra Sūtra* was completed between A.D. 420 and 430, a



second one appeared ten or twenty years later and each was made into four fasciculi. It took over a hundred years for the third in ten fasciculi to appear, while over two hundred years elapsed before the fourth in seven fasciculi was published, which means that the latest one came out over three hundred years after the first.

## II. COMPARISON OF THE CONTENTS OF THE THREE CHINESE TRANSLATIONS AND ONE SANSKRIT TEXT

A detailed comparison of the three extant Chinese translations and the Sanskrit text of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* has not been attempted yet, except as to chapter-divisions and other general aspects. Before I present my own views concerning the result of such comparison, a tabular view of the contents as regards chapter-divisions of the four texts will be given below. (See page 10.)

This table shows at once (1) that the Guṇabhadra version<sup>1</sup> is very much simpler and shorter than all the others; (2) That Śikshānanda agrees with the Sanskrit as regards chapter divisions; (3) That Bodhiruci has more chapter headings, i.e., is cut into shorter sections; (4) That in Guṇabhadra, the first and the last two chapters are missing altogether; (5) That Guṇabhadra has practically no chapter-divisions whatever, and that while “Sarvabuddhapravacanaḥṛidaya” has the character “*pin*” (品) suffixed which is the usual Chinese term for the Sanskrit “*parivarta*” (division), this title is almost like a sub-title to the *Lankāvatāra* itself, as if it were another name for the sutra.

What do these plain facts indicate? The first logical

<sup>1</sup> Of the three existing Chinese translations, Guṇabhadra's is conveniently called the Sung version, Bodhiruci's the Wei, and Śikshānanda's the T'ang. Or, according to the number of fasciculi into which each version is divided, the Sung is often called simply the Four Fasciculi, the Wei the Ten Fasciculi, and the T'ang the Seven Fasciculi. In this chapter the translators' names will be used to designate the different versions.

*Table Showing Chapter-divisions in the Different Texts of the Lankāvatāra.*

Gunabhadra (Sung), A.D. 443, in 4 fas.	Bodhiruci (Wei), A.D. 513, in 10 fas.	Śikshānanda (T'ang), A.D. 700-704, in 7 fas.	Sanskrit, ed. 1923
(wanting)	1. Rāvanādhye- shaṇā	1. Rāvanādhye- shaṇā	1. Rāvanādhye- shaṇā
Sarvabuddha- pravacana- hrīdaya	2. Praśna	2. Sarvadharmā- samuccaya	2. Shaṭṭriṃśat- sāhasra- sarvadharmā- samuccaya
	3. Sarvadharmā- samuccaya		
	4. Buddhacitta	3. Anityatā	3. Anityatā
	5. Lokāyatika		
	6. Nirvāṇa		
	7. Dharmakāya		
	8. Anityatā	4. Abhisamaya	4. Abhisamaya
	9. Abhisamaya		
	10. Tathāgata- nityānitya	5. Tathāgata- nityānitya	5. Tathāgata- nityānitya
	11. Buddhata	6. Kṣhaṇika	6. Kṣhaṇika
	12. Pañcadharma		
	13. Gaṅgānādi- vāluka		
	14. Kṣhaṇika		
	15. Nairmāṇika	7. Nairmāṇika	7. Nairmāṇika
16. Māmsabhā- kṣhaṇa	8. Māmsabhā- kṣhaṇa	8. Māmsabhā- kṣhaṇa	
(wanting)	17. Dhāraṇī	9. Dhāraṇī	9. Dhāraṇī
	18. "Sagāthakam"	10. "Sagāthakam"	"Sagāthakam"

inference is that Guṇabhadra being the oldest translation represents a more primitive *Lankāvatāra* than the others. Possibly the later texts had these three extra chapters added during the one hundred years that elapsed between Guṇabhadra and Bodhiruci. That they were mechanically added is shown by their having no organic connection with the older parts. As they have nothing new to propose, if they were not found in the text, we would not have missed them. The first chapter where Rāvaṇa, the Lord of Lankā, asks the Buddha to deliver a discourse on his inner perception of truth, may superficially appear to be a sort of introduction needed for the development of the sutra; but there is no doubt that it was added later to supply this need, though really there was no such need from the beginning. The Rāvaṇa chapter was prefixed when there was a need on the part of the later Mahayanists to get the sutra connected with the story of Rāvaṇa and Rāmacandra as told in the *Rāmāyaṇa* when the latter came to assume a definite form as an epic, which, according to scholars, took place probably in the third or the fourth century of the Christian era. As the Guṇabhadra text stands, the interpolation of the Rāvaṇa incident has no special help to offer in the understanding of the sutra. The chapter of Dhāraṇī is a very short one, occupying about three pages of the Nanjo edition. This was also added when Dhāraṇī began to enter into the body of Mahayana literature, which took place much later in the history of Mahayana Buddhism in India. That the "Sagāthakam" was also a later attachment is easily shown from the examination of its contents, but for this I will devote a special paragraph later. The Sanskrit text and Śikshānanda are in full agreement as to chapter-divisions, which undoubtedly points to one original; but a more detailed examination will reveal that the Sanskrit is more frequently in accord with Bodhiruci. A safe conclusion may be that the texts were all different; while Bodhiruci belongs to a later redaction and is to a great extent mixed with notes

and glosses, which fact makes it roughly 1.4 per cent. larger than Śikshānanda.

As I noted elsewhere<sup>1</sup> the whole *Lankāvatāra* is just a collection of notes unsystematically strung together, and, frankly speaking, it is a useless task to attempt to divide them into sections, or chapters (*parivarta*), under some specific titles. Some commentators have tried to create a system in the *Lankāvatāra* by making each paragraph somewhat connected in meaning with the preceding as well as the succeeding one, but one can at once detect that there is something quite constrained or far-fetched about the attempt. If this, however, is to be done successfully, the whole arrangement as it stands of the paragraphs must be radically altered; and this redaction is possible only by picking up and gathering together cognate passages which are found promiscuously scattered throughout the text, when for the first time a kind of system would be brought into the text. As the present form stands, passages of various connotations are juxtaposed, and a heading indicating one of the ideas contained in them is given to the whole section, thus artificially separating it from the rest. Guṇabhadra has done the wisest thing by simply designating the entire sutra as "The Gist of the Buddha's Teaching" (*buddhapravacanahrīdayam*).

The chapter-divisions in Bodhiruci are sometimes more or less rational, while we find four or five sub-divisions made into one chapter in Śikshānanda as well as in the Sanskrit. In this case, one Bodhiruci section expounds generally one main idea in one prose portion which is abridged at the end into one metric form. To be exact, the chapter entitled "Anityatā" (Impermanency), which makes up the third chapter both in Śikshānanda and in the Sanskrit text, is sub-divided in Bodhiruci into five sections or chapters. The first sub-divided chapter on "Buddhacitta" (Buddha-mind) treats of fifteen different subjects, none of which make any

<sup>1</sup> *Essays in Zen Buddhism*, Vol. I, p. 75.

direct reference to "Buddhacitta." This title, therefore, does not at all indicate the contents of the chapter except in a most comprehensive way. The fifteen subjects treated in this Bodhiruci chapter on "Buddhacitta" are as follows: (1) The Will-body (*manomayakāya*); (2) the five deadly sins; (3) Buddhatā; (4) the sameness of all the Buddhas; (5) that not a word was uttered for preaching by the Buddha during his long life; (6) being and non-being; (7) the experience-fact and preaching about it; (8) false discriminations; (9) language and meaning; (10) the three kinds of wisdom; (11) the nine changes taught by the philosophers; (12) the nine fetters and the true understanding; (13) the relation between false discriminations and existence; (14) that the world is a mere name; and (15) suchness and preaching about it.<sup>1</sup> Each subject treated here is expounded in prose as well as in verse. From this the reader can see how diversified are the topics treated and yet there is something more or less common running underneath them. Of the rest of the five sub-chapters in Bodhiruci the one on "Dharmakāya" can be further divided into two sections, each of which is composed of prose and verse. Except these two sub-chapters on "Buddhacitta" and "Dharmakāya," all the chapters in Bodhiruci consist regularly of prose and verse parts.

The sixth chapter in Śikshānanda and the Sanskrit on "Momentariness" (*kṣaṇika*), Nirvana, etc., is divided in Bodhiruci into four sub-chapters with the headings: "Buddhatā," "Pañcadharmā," "Gangānanda," and "Kṣaṇika." Each of these consists normally of one prose section and one verse, showing that one topic of thought occupies one sub-chapter. Taking all in all, the chapter-divisions of the *Lankāvatāra* in whatever version are, to say the least, arbitrary and of later elaboration.

A good practical way of reading the sutra without displacing the contents from their original setting will be to

<sup>1</sup> This is practically a repetition of (7).

isolate in most cases one prose part with its metric repetition from another such part; and this will naturally cut up the text into many short independent sections.<sup>1</sup> There are some prose paragraphs without any corresponding gāthā-section, for instance, in the earlier part of Guṇabhadra and in the second chapter of the other versions. Guṇabhadra, when thus treated, will yield a little over fifty separate, individual chapters. The impression one gets after perusing the sutra carefully is that such independent statements dealing with the principal ideas of Mahāyāna Buddhism at the time when the sutra was compiled, were notes taken down by the author without any intention of arranging them in order. As was the case with the Pali Nikāyas, each of these independent paragraphs was perhaps a complete sutra in itself. Later, perhaps when there was a need for editing them under a title, they came to be known as the *Lankāvatāra*, or the *Buddhapravacanahrīdaya*. So long as we do not know how the Mahāyāna sutras were produced, all that we can say about their compilation has the nature of conjecture.

Were the sutras compiled one after another in time succession? Did one presuppose the existence of another, so that we can definitely trace the development of ideas backed by such documents? Or did they develop in different localities each one without knowing another? Is it possible as a matter of historical fact to arrange the Mahāyāna sutras in time sequence? Does logical development always coincide with historical events? That is to say, are fact and syllogism one? Does the one always and by nature precede, or follow the other? Until these questions are historically solved there will be many problems unsolved in connection with the making up of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*.

That the first introductory chapter in which Rāvaṇa

<sup>1</sup> Kumārajīva divides his Chinese translation of the *Diamond Sutra* into thirty-two sections, each of which consists of an irregular number of lines, sometimes of two or three lines only. This is quite a rational way of reading the sutra. Perhaps Kokwan Shiren followed Kumārajīva in his treatment of the *Lankāvatāra*.

invites the Buddha to Lankā to discourse on the truth inwardly realised by him, is a later addition, is also shown in the relation between the prose part and the verse. In this chapter, there is no such relation whatever between the two portions as is to be found in other parts of the sūtra, that is, there is here no verse part that corresponds and repeats the sense of the prose: the whole chapter is one complete piece, there is nothing fragmentary about it, it is altogether different in tone and style from the other parts of the sūtra, the way the theme is developed and the style of the writing are quite distinct. In this respect, the chapter on meat-eating resembles this introductory one, although it has the verse part in correspondence with the prose. The meat-eating chapter may be a later addition, also, in spite of its being found in Guṇabhadra. It does not seem to fit in perfectly with the main part of the sūtra. Did the author of the *Lankāvatāra* just put it in at the end as a kind of appendix, not standing in any organic relationship with the sūtra proper, where highly metaphysical subjects are treated? And later did it accidentally get incorporated into the body of the sūtra as forming a part of it?

Now we come to consider the last chapter, entitled, "Sagāthakam," which occupies a special position in the structure of the *Lankāvatāra*. As the title indicates, it is composed entirely of gāthās. In the Sanskrit there are 884 couplets<sup>1</sup> taking up about one fourth of the whole text. Of these over 200 are found in the main text itself; therefore, about 680 gāthās are newly-added ones. In Śikshānanda these repetitions are systematically excluded from its gāthā chapter, while in Bodhiruci everything is thrown in and with something more. There are 890 quatrains in Bodhiruci and 656 in Śikshānanda, showing the relative amount of śloka in each, as four Chinese lines are generally equivalent to one Sanskrit śloka.

As for the contents and their arrangement there is utter

<sup>1</sup> The number includes occasional triplets.

chaos in the "Sagāthakam." No doubt they chiefly concern the same themes as treated in the main text, but there are some original theses, and it is often hard to see why and how they came to be thrown in here. To read the "Sagāthakam" properly, therefore, it must be cut up into so many small portions, sometimes taking just one solitary śloka as expressing a complete idea, i.e., as a sort of aphorism. When this cutting-up process is brought to an end, we see that the "Sagāthakam," which appears on the surface as one solid chain of gāthās, is nothing but a heap of rubbish and gems.

How did this conglomeration come to be affixed to the *Lankāvatāra*? Why do we find so many gāthās taken from the sutra proper and mixed up with the rest? And the way they are mixed is most strange, seeing that while some are taken in bodily just as they are found in the sutra itself, others are broken up and interspersed fantastically among the rest. Was this done intentionally? Or did it happen just so? Does the "Sagāthakam" suggest an earlier origin than the sutra, in which the gāthā part was later elaborated in the prose in the way of commentary? But there is some reason to suppose that the "Sagāthakam" as a whole and in detail is later than the sutra proper, partly because it contains some historical matter which has no place in it, but chiefly because the thought expressed here seems to be more definite and developed than that in the body of the sutra. Taking all in all, the relation between the "Sagāthakam" and the rest of the sutra is a mystery so long as we have as yet reached no sure ground in the historical study of Mahayana literature in India. This much we may say that the "Sagāthakam" can easily be made into an independent text expounding the principal truths of the Mahayana philosophy. It reminds one of a notebook in which a student of the Mahayana took down some of the more important ideas as he learned them orally from his master, and in which at the same time he also put some other matter for his own benefit, though not necessarily in close relation-



ship with the main contents of the notebook. In this respect the "Sagāthakam" shares the characteristics of the sutra as a whole. It may be noticed that Śikshānanda calls this part of the text the "Chapter of Gāthās" and Bodhiruci simply "General Chapter" (總品), while the Sanskrit edition is prefaced, "Listen to the jewel-made Gāthās preached in the Lankāvatāra-Sūtra, and free from the net of the [erroneous] views, [and containing] the wonderful Mahayana teaching," and concludes with this: "Thus is completed the Sagāthakam, the Mahayana-sutra called 'Lankāvatāra, the noble and orthodox Dharma.'"

Incidentally, reference may be made to certain lines in the "Sagāthakam," which are often quoted by followers of Shin Buddhism as teaching Amitābha's Land of Bliss. The lines are as follows:

"The matured (*vaiṣṭhika*) Buddhas, and manifested (*nairmāṇika*) Buddhas, and beings, and Bodhisattvas, and [their] lands—they are in the ten quarters (G. 140).

"The flowing (*nisyanda*) Buddhas, the reality (*dharma*) Buddhas, the transformed (*nirmāṇa*) Buddhas, and the manifested ones (*nairmāṇika*)—they all issue from Amitābha's Land of Happiness (G. 141)."

Further: "My vehicle of self-realisation is beyond the attainment of the philosophers.' [Asked Mahāmati,] 'Pray tell me, after the passing of the Teacher, who would keep this up?'

"After the time when Sugata is passed away and no more, O Mahāmati, know that there will be one who should hold up the eye [of the Dharma].

"In the southern part of this country called Vedali there would be a Bhikshu of great and excellent reputation known as Nāgāhvaya, who would destroy the onesided view of being and non-being.

"He would, while in the world, make manifest the unsurpassable Mahayana, and attaining the Stage of Joy, pass to the Land of Happiness.' " (G. 163-G. 166.)

In the Sanskrit text we have, instead of Nāgārjuna, Nāgāhvaya, and of course we do not know whether they are one person, or whether there is a mistake on the part of the scribe. From these passages alone it is difficult to infer anything historical concerning the age of the *Lankāvatāra* as a whole, and also its possible relation to the doctrine of Amitābha's Land of Bliss (*sukhāvati*).

In short, the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* may be divided as regards its textual construction into the following six specifically definable parts:

1. The Rāvana chapter;
2. The section devoted to the enumeration of the so-called 108 questions and 108 terms;
3. The prose section in which no verses are found;
4. The prose-and-verse section, which may be subdivided:
  - a. The part devoted to a discourse carried on principally in verse, for instance, paragraphs on the system of Vijñānas;
  - b. The part containing ideas fully developed both in prose and verse, for example, meat-eating chapter;
  - c. The part containing ideas fully discussed in prose and supposedly recapitulated in verse, as in the greater parts of the text;
5. The Dhāraṇi section;
6. The Sagāthakam.

### III. EXAMPLES OF THE TEXTUAL DIFFERENCES

This is not the place to dwell extensively on the textual differences between the various versions of the *Lankāvatāra*, for to do so would involve many questions which properly do not fall into an introductory part such as we intend this article on the sutra to be. No doubt a detailed comparison of the different translations with the Sanskrit text, as well

as with each other, will be instructive from the point of view of text-criticism and also from that of the history of Chinese Buddhist literature as translations. But as the writer wants to limit his attention chiefly to the inner significance of the sutra as an exposition of Zen Buddhism, and also as a most valuable text of the Mahayana, let us be content with the following extracts from the three Chinese translations and the Sanskrit text. A comparison of these extracts,<sup>1</sup> which may be considered as characteristic of each text, though they have been selected somewhat at random, will throw much light on the nature of the respective literatures. I have tried to give a literal English translation of the Chinese as far as it could be made readable.

<sup>1</sup> Sung—the Kōkyōshoin Edition of 1885, 黃六, 二十六丁 a; Wei—六十三丁 a; T'ang—百八丁 b; Sanskrit Nanjo edition, pp. 228-229.

SUNG	WEI
<p>1. Further, O Mahāmati, the five categories (<i>dharma</i>) are: Appearance, Name, Discrimination,<sup>1</sup> Suchness, and Right Knowledge.</p>	<p>1. Further, O Mahāmati, the five categories are: Appearance, Name, Discrimination, Suchness, and Right Knowledge.</p>
<p>2. O Mahāmati, Appearance is such as is manifested in places, forms, colours, figures, etc.—this is called Appearance.</p>	<p>2. O Mahāmati, what is Appearance? Appearance is what is seen in colours, forms, figures, which are distinctive and not alike,—this is called Appearance.</p>
<p>3. As when having such and such appearances, [things] are called a jar, etc., and by no other designation,—this is known as Name.</p>	<p>3. O Mahāmati, depending upon this appearing of things, there arises discrimination, saying that “this is a jar”, “this is a horse, a cow, a sheep, etc.,” that “this is such and such”, “this is no other thing”—this, O Mahāmati, is called Name.</p>
<p>4. Mind and what belongs to mind, whereby various names are set up and all kinds of appearances are brought out into view, such as a jar, etc.—this is called Discrimination.</p>	<p>4. O Mahāmati, depending upon these objects thus named, their characteristics are distinguished and made manifest, whereby such various names are set up as cow, sheep, horse, etc. This is called the Discriminating of mind and objects belonging to mind.</p>
<p>5. That Name, that Appearance—they are ultimately unattainable; [when] there is no intelligence from beginning to end, [when] there is no mutual conditioning in all things, and [when] Discrimination which is not real is put away,—this is known as Suchness.</p>	<p>5. O Mahāmati, when one surveys names and appearances even down to atoms, one never sees a single reality, all things are unreal; for they are due to the discriminations stirred up in one’s deceiving mind.</p>

<sup>1</sup> For *Vikalpa*, Sung has 妄想, and not 分別 as in Wei and T’ang.

T'ANG	SANSKRIT
1. Further, O Mahāmati, the five categories ( <i>dharma</i> ) are: Appearance, Name, Discrimination, Suchness, and Right Knowledge.	1. Further, O Mahāmati, the five categories ( <i>dharma</i> ) are: Appearance ( <i>nimitta</i> ), Name ( <i>nāma</i> ), Discrimination ( <i>vikalpa</i> ), Suchness ( <i>tathatā</i> ), and Right Knowledge ( <i>samyagjñāna</i> ).
2. Of these, by Appearance is meant that which we see,—each differs in colour, form, figure, etc. This is known as Appearance.	2. Then, O Mahāmati, by Appearance is meant that which is known as form, shape, distinctive figure, image, mark, etc. They are seen as Appearance.
3. Depending on these Appearances, names such as jars, etc., are set up, saying, “this is such and such”, “this is no other”,—this is known as Name.	3. From this Appearance, ideas are formed such as a jar, etc., saying, ‘This is it’, ‘This is no other’,—this is Name.
4. By mind and what belongs to mind, various names are set up, all kinds of appearances are brought out into view,—this is known as Discrimination.	4. O Mahāmati, what is known as mind or as belonging to mind, whereby a name is pronounced as indicating appearance, or objects of like nature [are recognised]—that is Discrimination.
5. That Name, that Appearance [—they are all] ultimately non-existent: they are only due to the discrimination by a perturbed mind of [things] mutually [related]. When one thus surveys the world until the disappearance of intelligence takes place, one has what is known as Suchness.	5. That Name and Appearance are ultimately unattainable [as realities] when intelligence <sup>1</sup> is put away, and that these things are not recognised and discriminated in their aspect of mutuality,—this is Suchness.

<sup>1</sup> *Buddhi* in this case is to be understood as “*vikalpa-lakṣhaṇa-grāhābhiveśa-pratisthāpikā*” as is distinguished on p. 122.

SUNG (continued)	WEI (continued)
6. Reality, exactness, ultimate end, self-nature, the unattainable,—these are the characteristics of Suchness.	6. O Mahāmati, what is known as Suchness is non-emptiness, exactness, ultimate end, self-nature, self-substance, right seeing,—these are the characteristics of Suchness.
7. This is what I and other Buddhas have conformed to and entered into; we universally, for the sake of sentient beings, preach this according to the truth; [by us] this is set up and brought out into their view.	7. By myself and the Bodhisattvas and [other] Buddhas who are Tathagatas, Arhats, and All-knowing Ones, it is said that though names differ the sense is one.
8. When one conformably enters into right realisation which is neither discontinued nor permanent, no Discrimination arises, and one is in conformity with the noble path of self-realisation, which is not the state attained by all the philosophers, Śrāvakas, and Pratyekabuddhas,—this is known as Right Knowledge.	8. O Mahāmati, these are in conformity with Right Knowledge, neither discontinuing nor permanent and without discrimination; and where discrimination does not prevail one is conformed to the superior wisdom that is realised within one's inmost self. This is different from the false views entertained by all philosophers, Śrāvakas, Pratyekabuddhas, and from the incorrect views held by the partisans.
9. O Mahāmati, these are called the five Dharmas (categories); the threefold Svabhāva, eight Vijñānas, twofold Nairātmya, and all the Buddha-teachings are included therein.	9. O Mahāmati, in the five Dharmas (categories), the three Dharmalakṣaṇas, the eight Vijñānas, the two Nairātmyas, all the Buddha-teachings are included in the five Dharmas. <sup>1</sup>
10. Therefore, O Mahāmati, you should discipline yourself in your own way and also teach others, but do not follow others.	10. Mahāmati, you and other Bodhisattvamahāsattvas should discipline yourselves in order to seek this excellent knowledge. O Mahāmati, you know the five Dharmas when you

<sup>1</sup> Strangely, this is repeated.

T'ANG (continued)	SANSKRIT (continued)
6. O Mahāmati, reality, exactness, ultimate end, source, self-nature, the [un-]attainable,—these are the characteristics of Suchness.	6. Suchness may be characterised as truth, reality, exact knowledge, limit, source, self-substance, the unattainable.
7. This has been conformed to and realised by myself and all [other] Buddhas and is disclosed as it really is and preached by us.	7. This has been realised by myself and other Tathagatas, truthfully pointed out, recognised, made public and widely shown.
8. If one in conformity with this has an insight [into the nature of it] as neither discontinuous nor permanent, no discrimination is stirred, and one enters upon a state of self-realisation which goes beyond the realm obtained by the philosophers and the two yānas. This is known as Right Knowledge.	8. When one, realising this, rightfully understands it, neither as discontinuous nor permanent, he becomes free from discrimination, conforming himself to the superior wisdom in his inmost consciousness, which is a state other than that attained by the philosophers and is not the attainment of the Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas. This is Right Knowledge.
9. O Mahāmati, in these five Dharmas (categories), the three Svabhāvas, the eight Vijñānas, and the two Nairātmyas, all the Buddha-teachings are wholly included.	9. O Mahāmati, these are the five Dharmas (categories), and in these are included the three Svabhāvas, the eight Vijñānas, the two Nairātmyas, and all the Buddha-teachings.
10. O Mahāmati, with these categories you should by your own wisdom be skilfully conversant and also make others conversant therewith. Becoming conversant therewith, the mind is confirmed and is not led away by another.	10. Then, O Mahāmati, reflect well in this by yourself and let others do [the same], and do not allow yourself to be led by another.

SUNG (continued)	WEI (continued)
<p>11. Then, wishing to reiterate this sense the World-honoured One preached the following gāthā: The five Dharmas, the three Svabhāvas, And the eight Vijñānas, The twofold Nairātmya,— They include all the Mahayana. Name, Appearance, Discrimination,— [These belong to] the twofold aspect of Svabhāva; Right Knowledge and Suchness,— They constitute the Perfection aspect.</p>	<p>are not led by other teachings. 11. Then the Blessed One repeated this in the gāthā:  The five Dharmas, the Svabhāvas. And the eight Vijñānas, The twofold Nairātmya:— They include all the Mahayana. Name, Appearance, and Discrimination— These three Dharmas are aspects of the Svabhāva; Right Knowledge and Suchness— These are aspects of the First Principle.</p>
<p>SUNG TEXT IN THE ORIGINAL CHINESE</p>	<p>WEI TEXT IN THE ORIGINAL CHINESE</p>
<p>1. 復次大慧 五法者 相 名 妄想 如 如 正智。</p>	<p>1. 復次大慧 五法 相 名 分別 眞如 正智。</p>
<p>2. 大慧 相者 若處所 形相 色像等 現 是名爲相。</p>	<p>2. 大慧 何者名爲相 相者 色 形相 狀貌 勝不如 是名爲相。</p>
<p>3. 若彼有如是相 名爲瓶等 即此非 餘 是說爲名。</p>	<p>3. 大慧 依彼法相 起分別相 此是瓶 此是牛 馬 羊等 此法如是 如是不異 大慧是名爲名。</p>
<p>4. 施設衆名 顯示諸相 瓶等心心法 是名妄想。</p>	<p>4. 大慧 依於彼法立名 了別示現彼相 是故立彼 種種名字 牛羊馬等 是名分別心心數法。</p>
<p>5. 彼名彼相 畢竟不可得 始終無覺 於諸法無展轉 雖不實妄想 是名 如如。</p>	<p>5. 大慧 觀察名相乃至微塵 常不見 一法相 諸法不實 以虛妄心生分別故。</p>



T'ANG (continued)	SANSKRIT (continued)
<p>11. Then the Blessed One repeated this in the gāthā:</p> <p>The five Dharmas, the three Svabhāvas, And the eight Vijñānas, The twofold Nairātmya,— [They] wholly include the Mahayana. Name, Appearance, and Discrimination, Are included in the two Svabhāvas; Right Knowledge and Suchness,— They are Perfect Knowledge (<i>pariṣiṣṭhpannatākṣaṇa</i>).</p>	<p>11. So this is said:</p> <p>The five Dharmas and the Svabhāvas, And the eight Vijñānas, The two Nairātmyas,— They comprise the whole Mahayana. Name, Appearance, Discrimination:— These are two aspects of Svabhāva; Right Knowledge and Suchness:— These are aspects of Perfect Knowledge (<i>pariṣiṣṭhpanna</i>).</p>
<p>T'ANG TEXT IN THE ORIGINAL CHINESE</p>	<p>THE ORIGINAL TEXT IN SANSKRIT</p>
<p>1. 復次 大慧 五法者 所謂相名分別 如如 正智。</p> <p>2. 此中相者 所謂見色等形狀各別 是名為相。</p> <p>3. 依彼諸相立瓶等名 此如是 此不異 是名為名。</p> <p>4. 施設衆名 顯示諸相 心心所法 是名分別。</p> <p>5. 彼名彼相畢竟無有 但是妄心展轉分別 如是觀察乃至覺滅 是名如如。</p>	<p>1. punaraparaṃ mahāmate pañcadharmo nimittaṃ nāma vikalpas tathatā samyagjñānaṃ ca.</p> <p>2. tatra mahāmate nimittaṃ yat samsthānākṛiti - viśeṣākāra - rūpādi-lakṣhaṇaṃ dṛiṣyate tan nimittam.</p> <p>3. yat tasmīn nimitte ghaṭādi saṃjñākrītakam evam idaṃ nānyatheti tan nāma.</p> <p>4. yena tan nāma samudīrayati nimittābhivyāñjakaṃ samadharmeti vā sa mahāmate citta-caitta-saṃśabdito vikalpaḥ.</p> <p>5. yan nāma-nimittayor-ātantaṇupalabdhitā buddhi-pralayaḥ anyonyānanubhūtaparikalpitaḥ eṣāṃ dharmānāṃ tathateti.</p>

SUNG (continued)	WEI (continued)
6. 眞實 決定 究竟 自性 不可得 彼是如相。	6. 大慧 言眞如者 名爲不虛 決定畢竟盡 自性 自體 正見 眞如相。
7. 我及諸佛 隨順入處 普爲衆生 如實演說 施設顯示於彼。	7. 我 及諸菩薩 及諸佛如來 應正遍知 說名異義一。
8. 隨入正覺 不斷不常 妄想不起 隨順自覺聖趣 一切外道 聲聞 緣覺 所不得相 是名正智。	8. 大慧 如是等隨順 正智 不斷不常 無分別 分別不行處 隨順自身內 證聖智 離諸一切外道 聲聞 辟支佛等惡見 明黨不正智中。
9. 大慧是名五法 三種自性 八識 二種無我 一切佛法悉入其中。	9. 大慧 於五法 三法相 八種識 二種無我 一切佛法皆入五法中。
10. 是故大慧 當自方便學 亦教他人 勿隨於他。	10. 大慧 汝及諸菩薩 摩訶薩 爲求勝智 應當修學 大慧 汝知五法 不隨他教故。
11. 爾時世尊欲重宣此義 而說偈而言 五法三自性。 及與八種識。 二種無有我。 悉攝摩訶衍。  名相虛妄想。 自性二種相。 正智及如如。 是則爲成相。	11. 爾時世尊重說偈言 五法自體相。 及與八種識。 二種無我法。 攝取諸大乘。  名相及分別。 三法自體相。 正智及眞如。 是第一義相。

T' ANG (continued)	SANSKRIT (continued)
6. 大慧 眞實 決定 究竟 根本 自性 (不)可得 是如如相。	6. tattvaṃ bhūtaṃ niścayo nishṭhā prakṛtiḥ svabhāvo 'nupalabdhiḥ tat tathālak- śhaṇam.
7. 我及諸佛 隨順證入 如其實相開 示演說。	7. mayānyaisca tathāgatair anu- gamyā yathāvad deśitam prañāptaṃ vivṛitam uttāni- kritam.
8. 若能於此隨順悟解 離斷離常 不 生分別 入自證處 出於外道二乘 境界 是名正智。	8. yatrānugamya samyagavabo- dhanucchedāśāsvatato vikal- pasyāpravṛittiḥ svapratyāt- māryajñānānukūlaṃ tīrtha- kara-paksha-parapaksha-śrā- vaka-pratyekabuddhāgilak- ṣhaṇaṃ tat samyagjñānam.
9. 大慧 此五種法 三性 八識 及二 無我 一切佛法普皆攝盡。	9. ete ca mahāmate pañcadhar- māḥ, eteshveva trayāḥ sva- bhāvā aṣṭau ca vijñānāni dve ca nairātmye sarvabuddha- dharmāś cāntargataḥ.
10. 大慧 於此法中 汝應以自智善巧 通達 亦勸他人令其通達 通達此 已 心則決定 不隨他轉。	10. atra te mahāmate svamati- kausalam karāṇiyam anyaiś ca kārayitavyaṃ na para- praṇeyena bhavitavyam.
11. 爾時世尊重說頌言 五法三自法。 及與八種識。 二種無我法。 普攝於大乘。  名相及分別。 二種自性攝。 正智與如如。 名則圓成相。	11. tatredam ucyate: pañcadharmāḥ svabhāvaśca vijñānānyashta eva ca, dve nairātmye bhavet kṛtsno mahāyāna-parigrahaḥ. nāma-nimitta-saṅkalpāḥ svabhāva-dvaya-lakṣhaṇam, samyagjñānaṃ tathātvaṃ ca parivishnanna-lakṣhaṇam.

A comparison of these four texts will give us some insight into the nature of each version; the variations are not necessarily due to the translators' individualism; they must have existed already in the original texts. Let me give another parallelism, this time one in verse. The extracts are from Chapter II, the opening gāthās of Mahāmati. The comparison will be only between the T'ang and the Sanskrit, as the Wei more or less agrees with the Sanskrit, while the Sung agrees with the T'ang, though the Sung as well as the Wei lack two verses corresponding to (4) and (5) of the Sanskrit. The most significant disagreement between T'ang and Sanskrit concerns "the awakening of a great compassionate heart." According to the Mahayanists, a heart is to be awakened in one that is above all forms of attachment and yet that feels suffering in the world as its own. In Sung and T'ang this idea is emphatically presented, whereas in Wei and Sanskrit it is missing. From this, can we not infer that there were at least two quite different texts of the *Lankāvatāra* from the early days of its existence as far as these gāthās are concerned? I do not know how the present Sanskrit text could be made to read like Sung and T'ang. The philosophy of the *Lankāvatāra* asserts the emptiness or the not-being-born of existence, and it is quite right to say that the world is like a dream or transcends birth-and-death, but we must remember that this position is not one of absolute nihilism, because the sutra teaches the reality of Prajñā itself or the truth of mind-only (*cittamātra*). So far the Sanskrit gāthās here reproduced accord well with the principal ideas of the *Lankāvatāra*, but there is another element in the Mahayana, which is love or compassion, and when the world is surveyed from this viewpoint, it is filled with sufferings, sorrows, and undesirable events. These are also in a way dreamy happenings, but compassion sees them in another light and strives to eradicate them by all sorts of "skilful means." For this reason, Sung and T'ang are preferable here to Wei and Sanskrit.

T'ANG <sup>1</sup>	SANSKRIT <sup>2</sup>
1. The world transcends birth and death, it is like the flower in the air; [transcendental] knowledge cannot be qualified as being or non-being, and yet a great compassionate heart is awakened.	1. When thou reviewest the world with thy wisdom and compassion, it is to thee like the ethereal flower, and of which we cannot say whether it is created or vanishing, as [the categories of] being and non-being are inapplicable to it.
2. All things are like the mirage, they are beyond the reach of mind and understanding; [transcendental] knowledge cannot be qualified as being and non-being, and yet a great compassionate heart is awakened.	2. When thou reviewest all things with thy wisdom and compassion, they are like visions, they are beyond the reach of mind and consciousness, as [the categories of] being and non-being are inapplicable to them.
3. The world is always like a dream. It is beyond nihilism and eternalism. [Transcendental] knowledge cannot be qualified as being or non-being, and yet a great compassionate heart is awakened.	3. When thou reviewest the world with thy wisdom and compassion, it is eternally like a dream, of which we cannot say whether it is permanent or it is subject to destruction, as [the categories of] being and non-being are inapplicable to it.
4. The wise know that there is no self-substance in a person, nor in an object, and that both passions and their objectives are always pure [in their nature] and have no individual marks; and yet a great compassionate heart is awakened in them.	4. The Dharmakāya whose self-nature is a vision and a dream, what is there to praise? Real existence is where rises no thought of nature and no-nature.
5. The Buddha does not abide in Nirvana, nor does Nirvana in the Buddha; it goes beyond	5. He whose appearance is beyond the senses and sense-objects and is not to be seen

<sup>1</sup> This partly appeared in my previous article on "The *Lankavatāra* as a text of Zen Buddhism", *The Eastern Buddhist*, Vol. IV. Nos. 3-4 (1928), p. 288. The translation was made from the Sung, but it mostly agrees with the T'ang as is observable here.

<sup>2</sup> The verses are quoted in my *Essays in Zen Buddhism*, pp. 76-77.

T'ANG (continued)	SANSKRIT (continued)
enlightenment and the enlightened, also being and non-being.	by them or in them; how could praise or blame be predicated of him, O Muni?
6. The Dharmakāya is like a vision, like a dream, and how could it be praised? When one realises that it has no substance, it is birth-less, this is called praising the Buddha.	6. With thy wisdom and compassion, thou comprehendest the egoless nature of things and persons and art eternally clean of the evil passions and of the hindrance of knowledge because they both are without signs [of individuality].
7. The Buddha has no marks belonging to the senses and sense-objects. Not to see is to see the Buddha. How could there be praising and blaming in the Muni?	7. Thou dost not vanish in Nirvana, nor does Nirvana abide in thee; for it transcends the dualism of the enlightened and enlightenment as well as the alternatives of being and non-being.
8. When one sees the Muni so tranquil and detached from birth [-and-death], this one not only in this life but after is free from attachments, has nothing to grasp.	8. Those who see the Muni so serene and beyond birth, are detached from cravings and remain stainless in this life and after.
1. 世間離生滅 譬如虛空華 智不得有無 而興大悲心	1. utpāda-bhaṅga-rahito lokaḥ khapushpa-saṁnibhaḥ, sad- asan-nopalabdhas te prajñayā kṛipayā ca te.
2. 一切法如幻 遠離於心識 智不得有無 而興大悲心	2. māyopamāḥ sarvadharmāḥ cittavijñāna-varjitāḥ, sad- asan-nopalabdhas te prajñayā kṛipayā ca te.
3. 世間恒如夢 遠離於斷常 智不得有無 而興大悲心	3. śāśvatocheda-varjataś ca lo- kaḥ svapno-pamaḥ sadā, sad- asan-nopalabdhas te prajñayā kṛipayā ca te.
4. 知人法無我 煩惱及爾焰 常清淨無相 而興大悲心	4. māyā - svapna - svabhāvasya dharmakāyasya kaḥ stavaḥ, bhāvanām niḥsvabhāvanām yo 'nutpādaḥ sa sambhavaḥ.
5. 佛不住涅槃 涅槃不住佛 遠離覺所覺 若有若非有	5. indriyārtha-visamyuktam ad- riṣyam yasya darśanam, pra- śamsā yadi vā nindā tasyo-

T'ANG (continued)	SANSKRIT (continued)
6. 法身如幻夢 云何可稱讚 知無性無生 乃名稱讚佛	cyeta katham mune. 6. dharma-pudgala-nairātmyam kleśa-jñeyam ca te sadā, viśuddhamānimittena prajñā- yā kṛipayā ca te.
7. 佛無根境相 不見名見佛 云何於牟尼 而能有毀讚	7. na nirvāsi nirvāṇe na nirvā- nam tvaṃ saṃsthitam, bud- dha-boddhavya-rahitaṃ sad- asat-paksha-varjitam.
8. 若見於牟尼 寂靜遠離生 是人今後世 離著無所取	8. ye paśyanti munim śāntam evam utpatti-varjitam, te bhonti nirupādānā ihāmutra nirañjanāḥ. <sup>1</sup>

#### IV. A FURTHER EXAMINATION OF THE SUTRA AS TO ITS INNER CONNECTIONS

Having finished what I wished to remark, though sketchily, about those chapters which are wanting in Guṇabhadra, and which, therefore, can logically be judged as later additions, I proceed to make some general statements about the sutra as to its form and contents and their inner connections.

The text takes throughout a form of dialogue between the Buddha and the Bodhisattva Mahāmati. No other Bodhisattvas or Arhats appear on the scene, though the dialogue is supposed to take place in an assembly of the Bhikshus and Bodhisattvas as in other sutras. Guṇabhadra fixes the scene of the sutra at the summit of Mt. Lankā in the Southern Sea, but in it there is no mention whatever of Rāvaṇa, who,

<sup>1</sup> This series of gāthās reappears in the "Sagāthakam," gg. 1-6, except the gāthās 4 and 5 which are missing in the "Sagāthakam"; and the order in the latter runs thus: 1, 3, 2, 6, 7, 8. The variations are: "viśuddham-animittena...." for "viśuddhamānimittena...." (6); "na nirvāsi nirvāṇe na nirvāṇam...." for "na nirvāsi nirvāṇena nirvāṇam...." (7); "te bhavantyanupādānā...." for "te bhonti nirupādānā...." (8).

in Bodhiruci and Śikshānanda, plays an important rôle, though in the first chapter only, as the initiator of the discourses that follow.

Mahāmāti opens the dialogue by praising the virtues of the Buddha, whose wisdom sees that the world is a shadow but whose love embraces all suffering beings; Mahāmāti then proceeds to ask the World-honoured One about one hundred and eight subjects (*ashṭottaram praśnaśatam*). The Buddha answers: "Let sons<sup>1</sup> of the Victorious One ask me, and, O Mahāmāti, you too ask, and I will talk to you about my inner realisation (*pratyātmagatigocara*)".

Now we ask, "What is the relation between the Buddha's inner realisation and Mahāmāti's 108 questions, about which he wishes to be enlightened? Are all these subjects concerned with the realisation itself?" There must be some connection between the Buddha's replies and Mahāmāti's questions. If not, they are certainly talking about things of no concern to each other.

Let us see, however, what questions issue from the lips of Mahāmāti now and what are the subjects he is interested in. The questions are set forth in gāthās 12-59 inclusive, in Chapter II of the Sanskrit text. But what a conglomeration! Some of them are, indeed, quite to the point as they refer, for instance, to the origin of intellection (*tarka*) and mental confusion (*bhrānti*), and to their purification, emancipation, Dhyāna, Ālaya-vijñāna, Manovijñāna, Cittamātra, Non-ego, relative truth, phenomenality of existence, truth of suchness, the supreme wisdom (*āryajñāna*), Buddha of Transformation, Buddha of Recompense, absolute Buddhahood, enlightenment, etc. But at the same time there are questions concerning medicine, certain mythical gardens, mountains, woods, the capturing of elephants, horses, deer, the gathering of clouds in the sky, rules of prosody, the six seasons of the year, racial origins, etc. These do not seem to be properly asked of the Buddha, who is not a college

<sup>1</sup> *Jinaputra*, that is, Bodhisattva.



professor, or rather a primary school teacher, but the master of spiritual enlightenment. Why are the contents of the 108 questions of such a mixed character?

What is more astounding are the answers—that is, answers that are supposed to enlighten the questioner—given by the Buddha. The gāthās 61–96 (inclusive) are the words of the Buddha, who is the wisest man in the world and who is willing to disclose all the secrets of the Mahayana teaching that have been taught by all the Buddhas. He states in the beginning:

“Birth, no-birth, Nirvana, emptiness-aspect, transformation,—[all these are] without self-nature (*asvabhāvatva*); the Buddhas born of Pāramitā;

“Śrāvakas, sons of the Victorious One, philosophers, formless deeds (*arūpyacārīṇa*); Mt. Sumeru, the great ocean, mountains, isles, lands, earths;

“Stars, the sun, the moon; philosophers, deities, and also Asura; emancipation, Self-control, the Psychic Faculties, the Powers, Dhyānas, Samādhis,

“Nirodha and the miracles, the Bodhyaṅgas, and even the Paths; Dhyānas and Apramānas, Skandhas, and going and coming;

“Samāpatti and Nirodhas,—for they are mind-made, only words. The mind, will, intelligence, non-ego, the five Dharmas—[so are they too].”<sup>1</sup>

So far, the answer, whatever be its exact purport, is more or less cogent to the main ideas of the *Lankāvatāra*; but what follows is strange not only from the doctrinal point of view but from literary construction. They are often not answers but questions, some of which are mere repetitions of the questions themselves. For instance, the Buddha is made to answer the 108 questions in this way:

<sup>1</sup> How far this is a correct rendering of the gāthās (62–66, pp. 29–30) is rather difficult to say; for the original merely enumerates all these items, sometimes repeating, and the grammatical relation between them is not to be definitely settled.

“How are the elephant, horse, and deer caught? You tell me. How is the conclusion (*siddhānta*) drawn from the combination of cause (*hetu*) and illustration (*dṛishṭānta*)? (g. 69.)

“What is meant by doing and being done? by various forms of mental confusion and the truth? They are both of mind-only and are not visible, that is, not objective (*dṛiṣya*). There is no gradation of the stages (70).

“What is the turning of the imageless?<sup>1</sup> Tell me, what about books, the medical sciences, artistic skill, the arts?” (71).

A glance is sufficient to see what kind of an answer this is. Questions and answers are curiously mixed up, and trifles and grave matters, too. The gāthās go on more or less like this until the Buddha concludes thus:

“O Son, thou askest me suchlike and many other questions. Each is in agreement with the [right] form, having nothing to do with erroneous views. I will tell thee right here the perfect doctrine. Listen to me! According to the teaching of the Buddhas I will make a declaration in complete sentences of 108 clauses (*paḍam*). O Son, listen thou to me.” (gāthās 97–98.)

With what [right] form are the questions proposed by Mahāmati supposed to be in conformation? From what erroneous views are they to be regarded as free? Whatever we may say about them, one thing is sure that all these questions and answers are incoherently strung together, and we fail to find any logical interpretation to the whole body of the gāthās making up the first part of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*.

Is some historical background needed to get a clue to the solution? Another source of confusion is discovered when we go on with Buddha's so-called 108 clauses, which

<sup>1</sup> Here is inserted the word “one hundred (*śatam*)” in all the texts except Sikshānanda. The insertion makes the confusion worse confounded.

are enumerated soon after. Evidently these clauses have nothing to do with the questions, although the number, which seems to be a favorite one, at least with the Buddhists, is substantially the same. The 108 clauses preached by the Buddhas of the past are a string of negations, negating any notion that happened to come into the mind at the moment, apparently with no system, with no special philosophy in them. These negations are another example of the irrationality of the *Lankāvatāra*.

“At that time Mahāmāti, the Bodhisattva-Mahāsattva, said to Buddha, ‘O thou Blessed One, what are these one hundred and eight clauses?’

“The Buddha said: ‘What is termed as birth, is not birth; what is termed as eternal, is not eternal; what is termed as form, is not form; what is termed as abiding, is not abiding. . . . .’”

The negations go on like this concerning varieties of things not only religious and philosophical but of common experience. They comprise such terms as self-nature, mind, emptiness, cause and condition, passions, purity, master and disciple, racial distinctions, being and non-being, inner realisation, contentment with existence, water, number, clouds, wind, earth, Nirvana, dreams, mirage, heaven, food and drink, the Pāramitās, the heavenly bodies, medical science, industrial arts, Dhyānas, hermits, royalty, sex, taste, doing, measuring, seasons of the year, plants and vines, letters, etc. The number of terms, according to our calculation, seems to be a trifle less than 108, but this does not matter very much. What does matter is the subject-matter and the ultimate significance of the negations. Are all these negations from the point of view of absolute Śūnyatā philosophy? Why are the denials merely enumerated and no explanations given? Is it meant that these subjects are what engaged the attention of all the Buddhas of the past? But for what? Are they all important notions for the emancipation of sentient beings? Are they the subjects to

be treated in the body of the *Lankāvatāra*? If so, how is it that the eight Vijñānas, which occupy a position of chief interest in the sutra, are not at all mentioned here? In short, the presence of these so-called 108 questions (*praśna*) forming the first section of the *Lankāvatāra* proper, can safely be cut off as not essentially belonging to the teachings.

A similar problem must have been in the mind of Fa-tsang (法藏), one of the helpers in the translation of Śik-shānanda and a commentator of great importance, when he wrote the following in his 玄義 (*hsüan-i*):

“According to what I understand, the *Lankāvatāra* exists in three forms: the largest contains 100,00 ślokas, which, as is mentioned in the *Kaihuang Catalogue of the Tripitaka*, is preserved in the mountains of Nan-chê-chü-p’an (南遮俱槃國), of Yü-t’ien (于闐), not only of the *Lankāvatāra* but of ten other sutras, the largest of which consists of 100,000 ślokas each. The second large edition of the *Lankāvatāra* has 36,000 ślokas: of this mention is made in all the Sanskrit texts whose translations we have here. In this edition a chapter is devoted to answering in detail all the 108 questions: and Mi-t’o-shan (彌陀山), Master of the Tripitaka from T’u-luo-lo (吐火羅), is said to have personally studied the text while in India. It is also said that in the Western countries there is at present a commentary written by the Bodhisattva Nāgārjuna on this 36,000 śloka text of the *Lankāvatāra*. The smallest, the third text, contains only a little over 1,000 ślokas, and is known as the *Lankāhṛīḍya*, which translated means, ‘the substance of the Lankā’. The present text is that. Formerly, it was designated as 乾栗太心 (*ch’ien-li-t’ai* or *hṛīḍaya-hsin*). The *Lankā* in four fasciculi is the one in which further abridgement was effected.”

The existence of the three kinds of the *Lankāvatāra* text may be mythical as is the case with other sutras, of which a tradition of similar nature is stated; but it is probable that the *Lankāvatāra* which we have at present in the three Chinese translations and in the Nanjo Sanskrit

edition is an abridgement of a larger and fuller text, that is, selections made from it by a Mahayana scholar who took them down in his notebook for his own use; and that in the larger text not only the 108 questions (*praśna*) but the 108 clauses (*pada*) are systematically answered and explained. In any event, something more than the present text of the *Lankāvatāra* is needed to understand it thoroughly and harmoniously.

The *Lankāvatāra* proper may be said to begin after the these "Questions" and "Clauses", each 108 in number; what follows here concerns the system of Vijñānas and their functions. But this paragraph does not last long, and after making some sketchy and not quite intelligible statements about the Vijñāna, it slides off into other subjects, such as seven kinds of self-nature or category (*bhāvasvabhāva*), seven kinds of truth (*paramārtha*), manifestations of self-mind, the problem of becoming, the world-conception and the religious life of certain Śramaṇas, who are evidently Buddhists, etc. When these subjects have received barely an outline treatment, the text returns to the Vijñāna, and after that a variety of subjects is discussed as is to be seen later when an index of the contents of the whole sutra is given, but always in reference to the attainment of the inner realisation. Though the sutra makes frequent detours away from the main subject, which is inevitable from the nature of the textual construction, it revolves around the truth that the whole system of Mahayana philosophy is based on such notions as Śūnyatā (emptiness), Anutpāda (being unborn), Anābhoga (effortless), Cittamātra (mind-only), etc., and that all these notions cannot be grasped and taken into one's life in their true perspective unless a spiritual insight is gained, when there issues transcendental knowledge and supreme enlightenment.

We can thus almost say that there are as many subjects treated in the *Lankāvatāra* as it can be cut up into so many separate paragraphs, each paragraph consisting sometimes

of a prose part and its corresponding verse, but sometimes in long or short prose part only, not accompanied by verse. The same subjects are sometimes repeated more or less fully. The Japanese commentator Kokwan Shiren (虎關師鍊),<sup>1</sup> who is also the author of a history of Japanese Buddhism known as the *Genko Shakusho* in thirty fasciculi (元亨釋書三十卷), divides the Guṇabhadra version of four fasciculi into eighty-six sections including the last chapter on "meat eating." This is the most rational way of reading the sutra, as in each of his sections only one subject is treated.

There is another thing which we must not let escape attention here. It is the refutation of the philosophies of other schools which were flourishing then in India. The Lokayata, Sāṅkhya, Vaiśeṣhika, and other schools are cursorily reviewed as not in agreement with the Buddhist teaching, or as not to be confused with it.

#### V. THE LANKAVATARA AND BODHIDHARMA, THE FATHER OF ZEN BUDDHISM IN CHINA

That the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* is closely connected with Zen Buddhism in China has already been noted in the first volume of *Essays in Zen Buddhism* and also in my previous article on the sutra; I wish to present here a more detailed historical account of this relationship. According to Tao-hsüan's *Biographies of the High Priests* (道宣, 唐高僧傳), Bodhidharma (菩提達摩) handed his copy of the *Lankāvatāra* in four fasciculi to his first disciple, "Hui-k'ê (慧可), saying, "As I observe, there are no other sutras in China but this, you take it for your guidance, and you will naturally save the world." By the non-existence of "other

<sup>1</sup> The commentary called the *Butsugoshin Ron* (佛語心論) in eighteen fasciculi was completed in 1325. He was a most learned Zen scholar and died in 1346 when he was sixty-nine years old.

sutras," Bodhidharma evidently meant that there were at that time no sutras other than the *Lankāvatāra* in China, which would serve as a guide-book for the followers of Zen Buddhism. This idea will grow clearer as we come to Tao-yüan's *Records of the Transmission of the Lamp* (道原傳燈錄) in which the author states:

"The Master further said, 'I have the *Lankāvatāra* in four fasciculi, which is handed over to you, and in this is disclosed the essential teachings of the Tathagata concerning his mental ground. It will lead all sentient beings to spiritual opening and enlightenment. Since I came to this country, I was poisoned about five times and each time I took out this sutra and tried its miraculous power by putting it on a stone, which was split into pieces. I have come from Southern India to this Eastern land and have observed that in this country of China the people are predisposed to Mahayana Buddhism. That I have travelled far over seas and deserts is due to my desire to find proper persons to whom my doctrine may be transmitted. While there was as yet no good opportunity for this, I remained silent as if I were one who could not speak. Now that I have you, [this sutra] is given to you, and my wish is at last fulfilled.'"

According to this, it might seem that it was Bodhidharma himself who brought the *Lankāvatāra* to China; but Tao-hsüan and other records contradict it, and thus we have the following note right under the above statement in the *Transmission of the Lamp*, though the writer of the note is not known. "The following is taken from the report of *Pao-lin Chuan* (寶林傳): "Hsüan, the Vinaya Master, who is the author of the *Biographies of the High Priests*, says under the 'Life of K'ê, the Great Teacher', that in the beginning Bodhidharma took out the *Lankāvatāra* and handing it to K'ê said, 'As I observe that there are no other sutras in China but this, you take it for your guidance, and you will naturally save the world.' If this statement is correct, it

means that it was before the second Patriarch attained to the realisation of the truth that Bodhidharma handed the *Lankāvatāra* to him, telling him to go over it. But according to the *Transmission of the Lamp*, the sutra was evidently given to K'ê after the Law was entrusted to the hands of Hui-k'ê, together with the robe, Bodhidharma's further remark that he had the *Lankāvatāra* in four fasciculi which he would now give to Hui-k'ê, is probably quite correct. However, the remark that he had the sutra with him, sounds as if there never had been any *Lankāvatāra* before his coming to China. [This may not be quite exact.] The remark made later by Ma-tsu (馬祖) is to be regarded as more likely, for we read [in one of his sermons] to this effect, that [Bodhidharma] further quoted from the *Lankāvatāra* with which the mental ground of all sentient beings was given the [authoritative] seal, this does not conflict with the fact of the case."

It is immaterial, as far as the historical relation between the *Lankāvatāra* and the father of Zen Buddhism in China is concerned, whether the sutra was handed by Bodhidharma to his disciple Hui-k'ê after his realisation of the truth of Zen or before, and again, whether it was Bodhidharma himself or somebody else who first brought the sutra over to China; what we want to establish here is the mere fact of the relationship that historically exists between Bodhidharma and this sutra. Now as to this, we have ascertained it to be really so.

The reference to Ma-tsu (died 788) is important when the position of the *Lankāvatāra* in the history of Zen Buddhism after Hui-nêng is to be considered, though I do not wish to enter into its discussion here. I just quote the passage in question. Ma-tsu figures most prominently in Chinese Zen after Hui-nêng, for it was practically due to him and his contemporaries that Zen came to strike root most firmly in Chinese soil and grow up as a native product of Chinese genius. The passage reads thus: "O monks,



when you each believe that you yourself is the Buddha, your mind is no other than the Buddha-mind. The object of Bodhidharma who came from Southern India to this Middle Kingdom was to personally transmit and propagate the supreme law of One Mind by which we are all to be awakened to the truth." He further quotes from the *Lankāvatāra*, saying, "The mental ground of all sentient beings was given the seal [authority], because he was afraid of your being too confused in mind to believe that you yourself are the Buddha."

In Ma-tsu's discourse, he does not expressly say that the *Lankāvatāra* was given to Hui-k'ê by his master, Bodhidharma, but simply that the existence of the Buddha-mind in each of us is certified by the teaching of the *Lankāvatāra*. The idea of the commentator who alluded to this passage in Ma-tsu was to strengthen the fact that the *Lankāvatāra* and Zen Buddhism were mutually related, not only historically but doctrinally. However this may be, Bodhidharma undoubtedly attempted to authorise the truth of his teaching by the *Lankāvatāra*, in which his unique method and the fact of spiritual enlightenment are expounded as from the Buddha's own "golden mouth." But the narrative in the *Transmission of the Lamp* goes farther than that when it refers to the miraculous virtue of the *Lankāvatāra*. The belief in the magical power of an object considered to be holy is universal. It may be superstition, but if so it is of a wonderfully lasting character, as we find it throughout the world, civilised or uncivilised. May we not regard Bodhidharma's belief in the magical *Lankāvatāra* to destroy the effect of a poison, as indicating the fact that his Zen teaching was very much opposed in his day by enemies, as not being quite in agreement with the experience of Buddhist life that they went through? If this were the case—and it is proved by other facts—the uniqueness of Zen Buddhism must have been quite a disturbing element in the Buddhist world of those days.

There was one noted Zen master of the Sung dynasty who denied the historical relation between the *Lankāvatāra* and Bodhidharma. His name is Ta-kuan T'an-ying (達觀曇穎, 985-1061). His standpoint is that of an absolute transcendentalist, ready to ignore anything relative and historical. According to 人天眼目 (*jên-t'ien yen-mu*, "The Eye for the Gods and Men"), a monk once asked, "Tradition says that Bodhidharma, the Great Master, brought along with him the four fasciculi of the *Lankāvatāra*: is this really so?" T'an-ying replied, "No, that is a mere invention of a busybody. Dharma simply transmitted the mind-seal which is above all letters; directly pointing to the mind itself he led people to see their real nature and attain Buddhahood. This being so, how could the *Lankāvatāra* have anything to do with Dharma?" The monk protested, "But this is the story told in the *Pao-lin-chuan*." The master said, "The writer had not time enough to enquire penetratingly. I will give my viewpoint. There are three translations of the *Lankāvatāra*: the first, in four fasciculi, was done by Guṇabhadra of Sung, who was a Tripitaka-master from India. The next one in ten fasciculi was by Bodhiruci in the Yüan-wei dynasty. The translator was a contemporary of Bodhidharma and it was he who poisoned Dharma. The last one was by Śikṣhānanda, who as a Tripitaka-master of Yü-t'ien came to China while the Heavenly Empress was ruling in T'ang. When these facts are put together, one can readily understand what is true from what is untrue. Yang-shan Chi (仰山寂), a great Zen master, too, had this once fully discussed and made the matter clear."

Ta-kuan's idea seems to be this: The *Lankāvatāra* was brought over to China and translated into Chinese by somebody else than Bodhidharma, who thus had nothing to concern himself with the sutra, and, therefore, it is evident that he never handed this to his disciple Hui-k'ê. Though there is no express reference to Hui-k'ê, we can infer the above from the way he writes about the translation of the

sutra. From the very beginning he had no thought of connecting the father of Zen Buddhism with the *Lankāvatāra*. The writing of Yang-shan on the subject is now apparently lost.

In one respect Ta-kuan's view is even historically justified. During the Sung dynasty the relation between the Zen and the T'ien-tai school of Buddhism was quite tense, and each did its best to denounce the other as not being in harmony with the spirit of Buddhism. This was due, on the one hand, to T'ien-tai emphasising the intellectual study of the sutras as steps leading to spiritual development, whereas Zen, on the other hand, ignored all such literary and philosophical handbooks as altogether irrelevant to one's religious insight which is all in all in the realisation of the inner truth. The latter did not stop at this, its followers positively rejected all the literary authorities and treated the sutras and other sacred documents as if they were a mere heap of rubbish. This enraged the disciples of Chih-chê Tai-shih, one of whom writes disparagingly in his *History of the Orthodox Buddhism*, fas. III, (釋門正統, *Shih-mên Chêng-tung*): "The school calling itself Ch'an [that is, Zen] generally makes an all-sweeping negation its main business. All that is expounded in the sutras and śāstras, all that is philosophically reasoned out, all that is regarded as morality—all such is put aside by followers of the Ch'an as having no value except on paper. When they are criticised for their extreme view, they declare, 'No disciplining, no realisation—this is the principle of our school.' Why don't they get cured of their diseases by studying our T'ien-tai philosophy of the six identities?" In another place (fas. VI), the author says, "The Zen followers declare their principle to be something directly transmitted from the Buddha outside his explicit teaching; but where can one find his teaching outside the sutras bequeathed to us and to them?" "It is really a pitiable sight to see a Zen master in the pulpit, who, not knowing what is what, scandalises

the ancient worthies, abuses the sutras and their teachings, and confounds the minds of the ignorant and the genteel." (Fas. VII.) The quotations show well how the Zen school was evaluated by its intellectualist opponents during the Sung.

The fact is, there are so many things in common with Zen and T'ien-tai, and just because of this common ground, one side when it goes to one extreme is sure to be denounced by the other side. The writer of the *Jên-t'ien Yen-mu* prefaces Ta-kuan's apology in the following manner: "At the time followers of the philosophical school [of Buddhism, as distinguished from the intuitionists] rose up strongly against the latter and concocting various arguments and reports scandalised the ancient worthies to the disparagement of the Zen school." Probably Ta-kuan was one of these extremely impassioned apologists who tried hard to silence his T'ien-tai opponents, but who at the same time only succeeded in stirring up their blood all the more. When Zen insisted on its being above all fetters of discursive reasoning, the T'ien-tai pointed out the fact that there is the historical fact of Bodhidharma handing the *Lankāvatāra* to his pupil Hui-k'ê, and further argued that if this be the case, how could the Zen followers justify their absolutism which cannot be separated from a sutra. In point of fact, the teaching of Zen is not derived from the *Lankāvatāra*, but is only confirmed by it. Zen stands on its own footing, on its own facts, but as all religious experience requires its intellectual interpretation, Zen, too, must have its philosophical background, which is found in the *Lankāvatāra*. For the sutra teaches, as was shown in the preceding article and elsewhere, that the final goal of the Buddhist life is to gain an inner insight into the truth underlying the relativity of all existence. The reason for this particular sutra's having been brought by Bodhidharma to bear upon his teachings can thus be easily understood. Ta-kuan went too far in his assertion, but his spirit is not altogether against Zen.

At the same time, the T'ien-tai philosophers were not quite right to think that Zen grew out of the letters of the *Lankāvatāra*. The transcendental intuitionism of Zen and the teaching of Pratyātmagatigocara in the *Lankāvatāra* were what connected the two so closely.

#### VI. THE STUDY OF THE SUTRA AFTER BODHIDHARMA IN CHINA AND JAPAN

After Bodhidharma the study of the *Lankāvatāra* went on steadily as is shown in the history of Zen Buddhism. According to Tao-hsüan, the author of the *T'ang Kao Sêng Chuan* (唐高僧傳), we have under "The Life of Hui-k'ê" the following: "Therefore, Na (那), Man (滿), and other masters always took along with them the *Lankāvatāra* as the book in which spiritual essence is propounded. Their discourses and disciplines were everywhere based upon it in accordance with the instructions left [by the Master]." Na and Man were disciples of Hui-k'ê. Further down in Tao-hsüan's *Biographies* we come to the life of Fa-ch'ung (法冲), who was a contemporary of Tao-hsüan and flourished in the early middle of the T'ang, and who was an especial student of the *Lankāvatāra*. Here we have a concise history of the study of this sutra after Hui-k'ê.

"Fa-ch'ung, deploring very much that the deep signification of the *Lankāvatāra* had been neglected for so long, went around everywhere regardless of the difficulties of travelling in the faraway mountains and over the lonely wastes. He finally came upon the descendants of Hui-k'ê among whom this sutra was being studied a great deal. He put himself under the tutorship of a master and had frequent occasions of spiritual realisation. The master then let him leave the company of his fellow-students and follow his own way in lecturing on the *Lankāvatāra*. He lectured over thirty times in succession. Later he met a monk who had been instructed personally by Hui-k'ê in the teaching of the

*Lankāvatāra* according to the interpretations of the Ekayāna (one-vehicle) school of Southern India. Chung again lectured on it over a hundred times.

“The sutra was originally translated by Guṇabhadra of Sung and written down by Hui-kuan; therefore, wording and sense are in good concord, practice and substance mutually correlated. The entire emphasis of its teaching is placed on Prajñā (highest intuitive knowledge) which transcends literary expression. Later, Bodhidharma, the Zen master, propagated this doctrine in the South as well as the North, the gist of which teaching consists in attaining the unattainable, which is to have a right insight into the truth itself by forgetting word and thought. Later, it grew and flourished in the middle part of the country. Hui-k’ê was the first who attained to the essential understanding of it. Those addicted to the literary teaching of Buddhism in Wei were averse to becoming associated with these spiritual seers. Among the latter there were some who had their minds truly enlightened by penetrating into the very heart of the teaching. As time passed on the younger generations failed to come to the real understanding of their predecessors.”

Now we will trace the line of transmission from the beginning, from master to disciple, and show that the *Lankāvatāra* has its part in the history of Zen. Tao-hsian continues: “After Bodhidharma there were his two disciples, Hui-k’ê and Hui-yü; the Master Yü, after attaining the truth, was absorbed in his inner life and did not take the trouble to talk about it. K’ê the Ch’an-shih (Zen Master) was followed by San (絜禪師), Hui (惠禪師), Shêng (盛禪師), Na-kuang (那光師), Tuan (端禪師), Chang (長藏師), Chên (眞法師), Yü (玉法師). They all orally discoursed on the deep meaning of the sutra, and did not leave any literature.

“After the Master K’ê, Shan (善師) produced a commentary in four fasciculi; Fêng (豐禪師), one in five fas.;

Ming (明禪師), one in five fas.; and Hu-ming (胡明師), one in five fas.

“Indirectly following the Master K'ê there were the Master Tai-t'sung (大聰師) who wrote commentary in five fas.; Tao-yin (道蔭師), who wrote one in four fas.; Ch'ung (冲法師), who wrote one in five fas.; An (岸法師), who wrote one in five fas.; Chung (寵法師), who wrote one in eight fas.; and Tai-ming (大明師) who wrote one in ten fas.

“There was another line, independent of the Master K'ê but depending upon [Asanga's] *Mahāyāna-saṅgraha*; Chien (遷禪師) wrote a commentary in four fas.; and Shan-tê the Vinaya Master (尚德律師), one in ten fas. After Nakuang (那光師), there were Shih the Zen Master (實禪師), Hui (惠禪師), K'uang (曠禪師), and Hung-chih (弘智師) who is said to have been living at Hsi-ming (西明) in the capital; after his death the line was broken. Ming the Zen Master (明禪師) was succeeded by Chia (伽法師), Pao-yü (寶瑜師), Pao-ying (寶迎師), and Pao-ying (寶瑩師), whose line is still flourishing at present.

“Ch'ung, since he began to study the sutras, made the *Lankāvatāra* the chief object of his especial study and altogether gave over two hundred lectures on it. He has not, however, so far written anything about it. He went about with his lecturing as circumstances directed him, and he had no premeditated plans for his missionary activities. When one gets into the spirit of the teaching one realises the oneness of things; but when the letters are adhered to, the truth appears varied. The followers of Ch'ung, however, insisted on having him put the essence into a kind of writing. Said the Master, ‘The essence is the ultimate reality of existence; when it is expressed by means of language its finesse is lost; much more is this the case when it is committed to writing.’ He however could not resist the persistent requests of his disciples. The result appeared as a commentary in five fasciculi, entitled *Szū Chi* 私記 [private notes], which is widely circulated at present.”

This detailed story relative to the *Lankāvatāra* after Hui-k'ê is illuminating in many ways; it not only gives an insight into the historical relation between Zen and the sutra, but it gives the reason why the relationship exists between them. When the author refers to the specific features of the *Lankāvatāra* as consisting in attaining the unattainable, which is beyond the ken of reasoning, he at the same time describes the peculiarities of Zen teaching brought over to China by Bodhidharma. That the school of Dharma was not favourably received by students of Buddhist philosophy, that Hui-yü (慧育) who is better known as Tao-yü (道育), kept his mouth closed, knowing that the truth realised in his innermost mind was something beyond the phraseology of ordinary mentalities, that Fa-ch'ung (法冲) refused to commit his thoughts to writing because by doing so the exquisite colouring of his lively experience vanishes;—all these statements made by Tao-hsüan (道宣) who was not yet acquainted with the later growth of Zen Buddhism, so exactly delineates the characteristic point of Zen. The study of the *Lankāvatāra*, as especially related to Zen, was kept up to the time of Fa-ch'ung and Tao-hsüan, who were contemporaries, and this was about the time of Hung-jên (弘忍), the fifth patriarch of Chinese Zen Buddhism. Judging from these historical facts we know that the intellectual study and the practical discipline went on side by side, and that there were as yet none of the clear distinctions which later developed distinguishing the Zen after Hui-nêng (慧能), the sixth patriarch, from what preceded. So far none of all these numerous commentaries on the *Lankāvatāra* have been recovered.

There is one thing in the foregoing account given by Tao-hsüan of the history of the *Lankāvatāra* that requires notice: that there was another school in the study of the sutra than the one transmitted by Dharma and Hui-k'ê. This was the school of Yogācāra idealism. The line of Hui-k'ê belonged to the Ekayāna school (一乘教) of



Southern India which was also the one resorted to by Dharma himself when he wanted to discourse on the philosophy of Zen Buddhism. To this Ekayāna school belong the *Avatamsaka* and the *Śraddhotpanna* as well as the *Lankāvatāra* properly interpreted. But as the latter makes mention of the system of the eight Vijnānas whose central principle is designated as Ālayavijñāna, it has been used by the Yogācāra followers as one of their important authorities. Ch'ien the Zen Master (遷禪師) and other teachers were those among whom the *Lankāvatāra* received an interpretation different from that given by Fa-ch'ung and his party. Though Fa-ch'ung is not recorded in any historical work on Zen in our possession at present, he was probably one of the earlier Zen followers. That he was not an ordinary scholar of the *Lankāvatāra* is proved by the following incident recorded by Tao-hsüan. When Hsüan-chuang (玄奘) came back from his long sojourn in India his influence in the Buddhist world of the day must have been immense. He was perhaps a little too self-confident and somewhat too presumptive when he declared that all the Chinese translations of the Buddhist sutras and śāstras prior to him were not exact and reliable, and no discourses or lectures ought to be given on the older texts. When Fa-ch'ung heard of this, he retorted sharply, saying, "You are a Buddhist priest ordained according to the older texts; if you do not allow any further propagation of them, you should first take off the priestly robe and be reordained according to the newer texts. It is only when you listen to this advice of mine that you can go so far as to prohibit the spread of the older translations." This protest from one wandering monk-student of the *Lankāvatāra* in four fasciculi against the most powerful authority of the new translation school, whose reputation and influence must have been almost overwhelming, shows what kind of a man Fa-ch'ung really was. Everything recorded of him reminds one strongly of his Zen training and understanding.

The study of the *Lankāvatāra* after Fa-ch'ung seems to have declined, especially in connection with Zen Buddhism, and its place was taken by the *Vajracchedikā*, a sutra belonging to the Prajñāpāramitā group. It is quite interesting to enquire into the circumstances that brought about this change. For one thing the *Lankāvatāra* is a very difficult specimen of literature, and it requires a great deal of scholarship to read and understand it intelligently. Though Tao-hsüan remarks that its diction and sense are well in harmony (文理克諧), Su Tung-pei's (蘇東坡) criticism, which appears in his preface to the Chin-shan edition (金山板) of the Sung dynasty (1085), is more to the point: "The *Lankāvatāra* is deep and unfathomable in meaning, and in style so terse and antique, that the reader finds it quite difficult to punctuate the sentences properly, not to say anything about his adequately understanding their ultimate spirit and meaning which goes beyond the letters. This was the reason why the sutra grew scarce and it became almost impossible to get hold of a copy." The real difficulty of properly punctuating the Chinese text of the *Lankāvatāra* in four fasciculi lies not necessarily, as Su Tung-pei judges, in the classical terseness of style, but rather in its adoption of the Sanskrit style of arranging words as is remarked by Fa-tsang. It was no easy task even for a most competent scholar to find exact Chinese expressions for the original phrases, and frequently he was obliged to follow the Sanskrit grammar. The Chinese translations, therefore, had occasionally to be read, not after their native laws of syntax, but after the Sanskrit. This is what Su Tung-pei really means by "terseness of style", and also the reason for Chiang Chih-chi's (蔣之奇) complaint that "I was much distressed with the difficulty of reading this sutra." When even scholars of the first grade find the *Lankāvatāra* so hard to read, the natural result was to leave it alone on the shelf for the worms to feed on it. Hence its decline as a help to the mastery of Zen. After Fa-ch'ung, who was con-

temporary with Hung-jên, the fifth patriarch of Zen Buddhism in China, the *Lankāvatāra* came gradually to be replaced by the *Vajracchedikā*. This does not mean that the former went altogether out of usage, but that the latter came to be thought more of in connection with Zen, especially as Zen grew to be more and more popular and appreciated by the general public outside the cloister. It must, therefore, be said that the fifth patriarch was far-sighted enough in this respect. The decline of the *Lankāvatāra* was, in fact, inevitable. The statement made by Chiang Chih-chi in his preface to the Chin-shan edition of the *Lankāvatāra* sheds light on the history of the sutra and also on the state of affairs in the Buddhist thought-world of his day (1085), and we give the following extract in which the two tendencies of Buddhism are referred to:

“The sutras preached by the Buddha are classified altogether into twelve divisions, which now make up as many as 5,000 fasciculi. While the Right Law was still in prevalence, the number of converts was beyond reckoning, who fathomed the bottom of the Law by merely listening to a half stanza, or even to one phrase of the Buddha’s teaching. But as we come to the age of similitude and to these latter days of Buddhism, we are indeed far away from the Sage; people at last find themselves being drowned in the letters; the difficulty is like counting the sands on the bottom of the ocean, and they do not know how to get at the one substance which alone is true. This was what caused the appearance of the Fathers, who, directly pointing at the human mind, told us to see here the ultimate ground of all things and thereby to attain Buddhahood. This is known as a special transmission outside the scriptural teaching. If one is endowed by superior talents and an unusual sharpness of mind, a gesture or an utterance will suffice to make one have an immediate knowledge of the truth. Therefore, Ummon (雲門) treated the Buddha with the highest degree of irreverence, while Yakusan (藥山) forbade his

followers to even study the sutras, since they were advocates of 'special transmission.'

"Zen is the name given to this branch of Buddhism, which keeps itself away from the Buddha. It is also called the mystical branch, because it does not adhere to the literal meaning of the sutras. It is for this reason that those who blindly follow the steps of Buddha are sure to deride Zen, while those who have no liking for letters are naturally inclined toward the mystical. The followers of the two schools know how to shake the head at each other, but fail to appreciate the fact that they are after all complementary. Is not Zen one of the six virtues of perfection? If so, how can it conflict with the teaching of the Buddha? In my view, Zen is the outcome of the Buddha's teaching and the mystical issues from the letters. There is no reason why one should shun Zen because of the Buddha's teaching, nor do we have to disregard the letters on account of the mystical teaching. When we realise this, we come nearer to the truth. Jan-ch'iu (冉求) asked, 'Should I put everything I learn into practice?' Replied Confucius, 'Yes, do so conduct yourself.' When Tzū-lu (子路) asked the same question of the Master, the latter cautioned him, saying, 'As long as your parents are still alive, how can you put everything into practice as soon as you learn it?' Ch'iu was backward, so the Master urged him to go ahead, while Lu was too pushing, so he was told to be more circumspect. There is nothing cut and dried in Zen teaching, it is always directed at the oneness of human character. The fault of studying [scriptural] Buddhism lies in the danger of becoming sticklers for the scriptures, the meaning of which they fail to rightfully understand. Ultimate reality is never grasped by such, for them Zen would be salvation. Whereas those who study Zen are too apt to run into the habit of making empty talks and practising sophistry. They fail to understand the significance of letters. To save such the study of Buddhist literature [or philosophy] is to be re-

commended. It is only when these onesided views are mutually corrected that there is a perfect appreciation of Buddhist teaching.

“Of old when Bodhidharma was here from the West, he handed the mind-seal over to the second patriarch, Hui-k'ê, and afterwards said: ‘I have here the *Lankāvātāra* in four fasciculi which I now pass to you. It contains the essential teaching concerning the mind-ground of the Tathagata, by means of which you lead all sentient beings to open their eye to the truth of Buddhism.’ According to this we know that Bodhidharma was not onesided, both the Buddhist sutra and Zen were handed over to his disciple, both the mystical and the letters were transmitted. At the time of the fifth patriarch, the *Lankāvātāra* was replaced by the *Vajracchedikā* which was given to the sixth patriarch. When the latter [while peddling the kindling wood] heard his customer recite the *Vajracchedikā*, he asked him whence he got the text. He answered, ‘I come from Mt. Wu-tsu (五祖山) east of Wang-mai (黃梅) in the province of Chin (蘄州) where Hung-jên the Great Master (弘忍大師), advises both monks and laymen to study the *Vajracchedikā*, which will by itself lead them to an insight into the nature of being and thus to the attainment of Buddhahood.’ Thus the holding of the *Vajracchedikā* started with the fifth patriarch, and this is how the sutra came into vogue and cut short the transmission of the *Lankāvātāra*....”

This long passage is quoted from Chiang Chih-chi's preface to the Chin-shan edition of the *Lankāvātāra*, as it is enlightening in more ways than one. First, we can infer from it that there was a strong antipathy between the philosophers of Buddhism and the Zen followers, each trying to get the upper hand; second, that the history of Zen Buddhism has been closely connected from the very beginning with the study of the *Lankāvātāra*; third, that the spread of the *Vajracchedikā* was coincident with the rise of Zen under the mastership of Hung-jên; and fourth, that

the *Lankāvatāra* ceased to be studied as much as before, being replaced by the *Vajracchedikā*, but at the same time showing that the *Lankāvatāra* and Zen were most intimately related in spite of the Zen followers' general attitude of aloofness from all the sutras of Buddhist teaching.

There is, however, one point in Chiang Chih-chi's account which requires revision. He says that the *Lankāvatāra* lost its transmission after the adoption by Zen followers of the *Vajracchedikā*, but this is not entirely correct, for not only are allusions to the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* found in Ma-tsu (馬祖) but the line of Shên-hsiu (神秀) seems to have been more partial to the *Lankāvatāra* than to the *Vajracchedikā*, as we see in Chang Shuo's stele-inscription (張說碑銘) for Shên-hsiu.<sup>1</sup>

As I remarked before, the chief defect in the *Lankāvatāra* which prevented its becoming popular, was its peculiar style and diction, which is not altogether native Chinese, and which made it difficult even for scholars to understand. On the other hand, the *Vajracchedikā*, like other sutras of the Prajñāpāramitā group, is easy to understand so far as its diction and phraseology go; and besides it is short in spite of its repetitious style. This advantage over the *Lankāvatāra* is sufficient to explain why the *Vajracchedikā* superseded it as a guide book to the mastery of Zen teaching. While the *Lankāvatāra*, according to my judgment, as regards pointing the way to the realisation of the inner truth, is nearer the mark, this advantage is easily upset by its unapproachability; and this advantage of the *Vajracchedikā* is in many ways decisive if Zen is to be studied and practised by a wider circle than scholars and specialists. That the *Lankāvatāra*, in spite of its literary shortcomings.

<sup>1</sup> Shen-shiu is not regarded as the sixth patriarch by the followers of Hui-nêng, who have been the transmitters of Zen teaching down to the present day. The line led by Shên-hsiu was broken off not long after his death, and records regarding him and his descendants are very scarce. But Chang-shuo's inscription states that Shên-hsiu was the sixth patriarch.

kept up its tradition throughout the development and wide propagation of Zen is proved by the existence still of a number of commentaries written in the T'ang, Sung, Ming, and Ch'ing, as well as in Japan. What, therefore, we can say of the *Lankāvātāra* after the fifth patriarch, is that it did not cease to be studied, but was not so much in vogue as before, as for instance at the time of Fa-ch'ung and prior to him.

The supersession of the *Lankāvātāra* by the *Vajracchedikā* has another reason in the nature of Zen about which I wish to have a word here. Zen has no aversion to book-learning necessarily, but in point of fact Zen can be grasped more readily perhaps by the simple-minded and those who are not stuffed with intellectual accomplishments, as is proved, for instance, in the case of Hui-nêng, who to all appearance was not so erudite as his rival Shên-hsiu. This practical tendency has produced another tendency to disregard, sometimes to disregard, sometimes to even positively slight, the study of the sutras. Hence the above remarks of Chiang Chih-chi. But here is the lurking-place for the two divergent schools of Zen to start out without being fully conscious of each other's characteristic standpoint. The one clings to the view that Zen is not controlled by the intellect, while the other upholds the fact that Zen is not by nature shy of erudition. The latter tends to be patronised by those whose natural bent is for learning and intellection; while the former is likely to be favoured by the more practical-minded. Hui-nêng belonged to the practical school both by disposition and by education, while Shên-hsiu was a scholar; for this reason Shen-hsiu held fast to the *Lankāvātāra*, and Hui-nêng to the *Vajracchedikā*, while both were being tutored by Hung-jên; for it is not true that Hung-jên was partial to the *Vajracchedikā*; indeed, for him the one was of as much importance as the other. Seeing that Hung-jên was about to paint the outside wall of his Meditation Hall with pictures illustrative of the *Lankāva-*

*tāra*, Hui-nêng inscribed his famous poem upon it.<sup>1</sup> What was a unity in the mind of the master, divided itself in the minds of his disciples, each of whom, according to his individuality, asserted one side more forcibly than the other, although not necessarily consciously. When a tendency is thus in the beginning given a strong impetus, it gains momentum, opening up its own course of movement. The *Vajracchedikā* school of Hui-nêng proved to be more in accord with the Chinese genius and consequently prospered more than the *Lankāvatāra* school of Shên-hsiu, though the latter was not entirely replaced by the former.

Hui-nêng was not such an illiterate peddler as is made out by his followers, only he was not so learned and scholarly as Shên-hsiu. But it was more politic for them to contrast their leader in this respect with his rival, who, was, indeed, the head of all the monks under Hung-jên not only in learning but in the disciplinary side of Zen as well. By emphasising this contrast Hui-nêng came out to be the greater Zen master, and the absolute aspect of Zen by which it transcends all the intricacies of learning and intellection received more emphasis than it actually needed. The *Lankāvatāra* thus finally ceased to be legitimately appreciated by the Zen followers of the present day. Some scholars of Buddhism, chiefly modern Japanese, ignorant of the real nature of Zen, yet knowing enough of the historical relation between Hui-nêng and the *Vajracchedikā*, which was once edited by him with a preface, try to prove that Zen is the outcome of practical training of the mind to gain an insight into its real working. But its absurdity is patent to all serious students of Zen, for the Prajñāpāramitā is the result of the intellectual elaboration on the Zen experience which alone was the object of Hui-nêng's teaching in

<sup>1</sup> *Essays in Zen Buddhism*, Series I, p. 192:

“The Bodhi is not like the tree,  
The mirror bright is nowhere shining;  
As there is nothing from the first,  
Where can the dust collect itself?”



connection with all the literary endeavours of scholars. He never took a dislike especially to the *Lankāvatāra*, his "ignorance" was altogether of a different order.

There are no records after Fa-ch'ung and after Hui-nēng as to the study by Zen followers of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*, except the commentaries that had been written on it by scholars and that we are still in possession of. The fact that during the Sung the sutra was much neglected has already been made clear by the preface of Chiang Chih-chi and Su Tung-pei to the Chin-shan edition of the sutra. But four commentaries of the Sung dynasty are still extant against two of the T'ang. One of the T'ang commentaries was written by Fa-tsang, as was stated previously, and this is a sort of general introduction to the study of the *Lankāvatāra* and is the most valuable literature ever written in connection with the sutra; for not only does it give the author's summarised interpretation of the *Lankāvatāra* as a whole and of its position in the system of Buddhism, but in it the reader can find Fa-tsang's view as a Buddhist philosopher. Quite a few commentaries have been written on this work of Fa-tsang's by Japanese scholars.

During the Ming dynasty the *Lankāvatāra* seems to have been studied much, for we have seven commentaries written on it during this period that are still in existence. The Ch'ing dynasty has produced two, also extant. There are altogether fifteen expository writings on the *Lankāvatāra* from Chinese scholars, which are still in current circulation, as they are all included in the supplementary part of the Tripitaka compiled by Mr. Tatsuye Nakano, Kyoto, 1905-1912, and one is found in the main body of the Chinese Tripitaka itself.

In Japan during the Nara era in the eighth century the *Lankāvatāra* with other sutras and śāstras was copied by pious Buddhists as a deed of merit and also to have extra copies of them, but how earnestly it was studied is not

known. We have many interesting and at the same time illuminating documents of this period, that is, of the first half of the eighth century, in which detailed entries are kept as to the various Buddhist writings that were copied by the official scribes as well as the business side of this pious undertaking which was constantly carried on during those days. Among these old valuable papers are references to the *Lankāvatāra* and its commentaries, and the most remarkable thing is that two of the commentaries mentioned are ascribed to Bodhidharma himself. How did such a tradition come over to Japan? As far as we know there are no records in China as to Bodhidharma's authorship of any such writings. If these were still in existence, they would shed much light on the history of Zen Buddhism in China.

The first serious study of the sutra was undertaken by a Zen monk called Kokwan Shiren (1278-1346) who was also a learned scholar being the author of a history of Buddhism known as *The Genko Shakusho* (元亨釋書三十卷) in thirty fasciculi, as was mentioned before. His commentary on the *Lankāvatāra* is called the *Butsugoshinron* (佛語心論十八卷), "Treatise on the Essence (or heart) of the Buddha-teaching," and consists of eighteen fasciculi. His dividing the sutra into eighty-six sections proves the keenness of his intellectual and analytical acumen. Tokugan Yōson (徳嚴養存) who published another commentary in 1687 followed Kokwan in the division of the sutra. His commentary is quite an improvement on his predecessor's. He mentions, among the *Lankāvatāra* commentaries he consulted with, two which are not included in the Supplementary Tripitaka of Kyoto. I wonder if they are accessible now?

A third Japanese work on the sutra is mentioned by Seigai Ōmura and Gisho Nakano who are the authors of the *Explanatory Notes* to the Nihon Daizokyo (日本大藏經解題) completed in 1921; the title of this Japanese book is *Ryōgakyō Kōyoku* (楞伽經講翼), by Kōken (光謙). Unfortunately the author of this article has not yet been able to see it

himself. In the same *Notes* seven works are mentioned written by Japanese scholars as commentaries on Fa-tsung's *Introduction to the Lankāvatāra*.

Most recent Japanese works relative to the *Lankāvatāra* are Sōgen Yamakami's Japanese rendering of the *Lankāvatāra* by Śikshānanda; Shōshi Mitsui's concise exposition of the *Lankāvatāra* teaching; and Hōkei Idzumi's Japanese translation of the Nanjo edition of the Sanskrit original. Each in its way is helpful to the understanding of this neglected Mahayana literature.

#### VII. INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER OF THE LANKAVATARA SUTRA

*In which Rāvana, King of the Rakshasas, requests the  
Buddha to discourse on the realisation of the  
inmost truth*

This introductory chapter which appears in all the *Lankāvatāra* texts except Gunabhadra, the earliest Chinese version now extant, is, as I have remarked before, no doubt a later addition, and does not properly belong to the main text; but as it pretty well gives a summary, if any such thing is possible, of the *Lankāvatāra*, I have decided to incorporate its translation in this article. The translation is chiefly based upon the Nanjo edition of the Sanskrit text, and wherever it differs very much from the Chinese versions as regards the sense, the differences are quoted in footnotes.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The following translation is far from being satisfactory, and very likely it is laden with errors. Nobody can deny that the original text is corrupt to a great extent and requires for its complete revision greater learning and more critical intellect than the present translator can afford. But his over-zeal to have this important Mahayana sutra more widely known not only among those who are interested in Buddhism but among students of comparative religion will, he hopes, condone his audacity in sending this partial and imperfect translation of the *Lankāvatāra* to the public at large. He will be more than pleased if critics will be kind enough to get him acquainted with whatever suggestions and corrections they may find in it.

(1)<sup>1</sup> Thus I have heard. The Blessed One once stayed in the Castle of Lankā which is situated at the peak of Mount Malaya on the great ocean, and which is adorned with flowers made of jewels of various kinds.<sup>2</sup> He was with a large assembly of Bhikshus and with a great multitude of Bodhisattvas, who had come together from various Buddha-lands. The Bodhisattvas-Mahasattvas, headed by the Bodhisattva Mahāmāti, were all perfect masters<sup>3</sup> of the various Samādhis, the [tenfold] Self-mastery, the [ten] Powers, and the [six] Psychic Faculties; they were anointed by all the Buddhas with their own hands; they all well understood the significance of the objective world as the manifestation of their own mind; (2) they knew how to maintain [various] forms, teachings, and disciplinary measures, according to the various mentalities and behaviours of beings;<sup>4</sup> they were thoroughly versed in the five Dharmas, the [three] Svabhāvas, the [eight] Vijñānas, and the twofold Non-ātman.

At that time, the Blessed One who had been preaching at the palace of the King of the Sea-serpents came out at the expiration of seven days and was greeted by an innumerable host of Śakra, Brahmans, and Nāgākanyās, and looking at Lankā on Mount Malaya smiled and said, “By the Tathagatas of the past, who were Arhats and Fully-enlightened Ones, this truth (*dharma*) was made the subject of their discourse, at that castle of Lankā on the mountain-peak of

<sup>1</sup> These numerals in parentheses refer to the pages of the Sanskrit edition.

<sup>2</sup> Much more fully described in Bodhiruci (Wei).

<sup>3</sup> Literally, “sporting” (*avivṛṭita*).

<sup>4</sup> T’ang: According to the minds of beings, they manifest a variety of form and discipline them with [various] means.

Wei: [There are] various beings and various minds and forms; in accordance with these various minds and various changing thoughts, [the Bodhisattvas], by innumerable means of salvation, save [beings] everywhere, make themselves visible everywhere, so that their manifestations are universal.

Sung: [There are] various beings and various minds and forms; by innumerable means of salvation, [the Bodhisattvas] become variously visible to all classes [of beings].

Malaya,—the truth realisable by the supreme wisdom in one's inmost self, and not visible to the reasoning philosophers, nor conceivable by the consciousness of the Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas.<sup>1</sup> I, too, would here for the sake of Rāvana, Overlord of the Yakshas, discourse on this truth."

[Inspired] by the spiritual power of the Tathagata. Rāvana, Lord of the Rakshasas, heard [his voice and thought], "Certainly, the Blessed One is coming out of the palace of the King of Sea-serpents, surrounded and accompanied by an innumerable host of Śakra, Brahmans, Nāgākanyās; looking at the waves of the ocean and contemplating the mental agitations going on in those assembled, [he thinks of] the ocean of the Ālayaviññāna where the Vijñānas revolve [like the waves] stirred by the wind of objectivity." Then standing there, Rāvana uttered an utterance: "I will go and request of the Blessed One to enter into Lankā, which for this long night would probably profit, do good, and gladden (3) the gods as well as human beings."

Thereupon, Rāvana, Lord of the Rakshasas, with his attendants, riding in his floral celestial chariot, came up to where the Blessed One was, and having arrived there he and his attendants came out of the chariot. Walking around the Blessed One three times from left to right, they played on a musical instrument, beating it with a stick of blue Indra (sapphire), and hanging the lute at one side. which was inlaid with the choicest lapis lazuli and supported by [a band of] priceless cloth, yellowish-white like *priyaṅgu*. they sang with various notes such as Saharshya, Rishabha. Gāndhāra, Dhaivata, Nishāda, Madhyama, and Kaiśika,<sup>2</sup> which were melodiously modulated in Grāma, Mūrchana. etc.; the voice in accompaniment with the flute beautifully blended in the measure of the Gāthā.

<sup>1</sup> The Sanskrit text is here certainly at fault; there ought to be a negative particle somewhere in this passage, which is the case with the Chinese translations.

<sup>2</sup> Neither Bodhiruci nor Śikshānanda refers so specifically to these various notes.

1. "The truth-treasure whose principle is the self-nature of Mind, has no selfhood, stands away from reasoning, and is free from impurities; it points to the knowledge attained in one's inmost self; O Lord, show me here the way leading to the truth.

2. "The Sugata is the body in whom are stored immaculate virtues; in him are manifested [bodies] transforming and transformed; he enjoys the truth realised in his inmost self: may he enter into Lankā. Now is the time, O Muni!

3. (4) This Lankā was inhabited by the Buddhas of the past, and [they were] accompanied by their sons who were owners of many forms. O Lord, show me now the highest truth, and the Yakshas who are endowed with many forms will listen."

Thereupon, Rāvana, the Lord of Lankā, further adapting the Toṭaka rhythm sang this in the measure of the Gāthā.

4. After seven nights, the Blessed One, leaving the ocean which is the abode of the Makara, the palace of the Sea-king, now stands on the shore.

5. Just as the Buddha rises, Rāvana, accompanied by the Rakshasas and Yakshas numerous, by Śuka, Sārana,<sup>1</sup> and learned men,

6. Miraculously goes over to the place where the Lord is standing. Alighting from the floral vehicle, he greets the Tathagata reverentially, makes him offerings, tells him who he is, and stands by the Lord.

7. "I who have come here, am called Rāvana, the ten-headed king of the Rakshasas: mayest thou graciously receive me with Lankā and all its residents.

8. "In this city, the inmost state of consciousness realised, indeed, by the Enlightened Ones of the past (5) was disclosed on this peak studded with precious stones.

9. "Let the Blessed One, too, surrounded by sons of

<sup>1</sup> Said to be the ministers' names.

the Victorious One, now disclose the truth immaculate on this peak embellished with precious stones; we, together with the residents of Lankā, desire to listen.

10. "The *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* which is praised by the Buddhas of the past [discloses] the inmost state of consciousness realised by them, as it is not founded on any system of doctrine.

11. "I recollect the Buddhas of the past surrounded by sons of the Victorious One recite this sutra; the Blessed One, too, will speak.

12. "In the time to come, there will be Buddhas and Buddha-Sons pitying the Yakshas; the Leaders will discourse on this magnificent doctrine at the peak adorned with precious stones.

13. "This magnificent city of Lankā is adorned with varieties of precious stones, [surrounded] by peaks, refreshing and beautiful and canopied by a net of jewels.

14. "O Blessed One, here are the Yakshas who are free from faults of greed, reflecting on [the truth] realised in one's inmost self and making offerings to the Buddhas of the past; they are believers in the teaching of the Mahayana and intent on disciplining one another.

15. "There are younger Yakshas, girls and boys, desiring to know the Mahayana. Come, O Blessed One, who art our Teacher, come to Lankā on Mount Malaya.

16. (6) "The Rakshasas, with Kumbhakarna at their head, who are residing in the city, wish, as they are devoted to the Mahayana, to hear about this inmost realisation.

17. "They have made offerings assiduously to the Buddhas [in the past] and are to-day going to do the same. Come, for compassion's sake, to Lankā, together with [thy] sons.

18. "O great Muni, accept my mansion, the company of the Apsaras, necklaces of various sorts, and the delightful Aśoka garden.

19. "I give myself up to serve the Buddhas and their

sons; there is nothing in me that I do not give up [for their sake]; O great Muni, have compassion on me!"

20. Hearing him speak thus, the Lord of the Triple World said, "O King of Yakshas, this mountain of precious stones was visited by the Leaders of the past.

21. "And, taking pity on you, they discoursed on the truth revealed in their inmost. [The Buddhas of] the future time will proclaim [the same] on this jewel-adorned mountain.

22. "This [inmost truth] is the abode of those practisers who stand in the presence of the truth. O King of the Yakshas, you have the compassion of the Sugatas and myself."

23. The Blessed One granting the request [of the King] remained silent and undisturbed; he now mounted the floral chariot offered by Rāvana.

24. Thus Rāvana and others, wise sons of the Victorious One, (7) honoured by the Apsaras singing and dancing, reached the city.

25. Arriving in the delightful city, [the Buddha was] again the recipient of honours; he was honoured by the group of Yakshas including Rāvana and by the Yaksha women.

26. A net of jewels was offered to the Buddha by the younger Yakshas, girls and boys, and necklaces beautifully ornamented with jewels were placed by Rāvana about the necks of the Buddha and of the sons of the Buddha.

27. The Buddha, together with the sons of the Buddha and the wise men, accepting the offerings, discoursed on the truth which is the state of consciousness realised in the inmost self.

28. Honouring Mahāmāti as the best speaker, Rāvana and the company of the Yakshas honoured and requested of him again and again,<sup>1</sup> [saying],

<sup>1</sup> Gāthās 20-28, inclusive, are in prose in T'ang.



29. "Thou art the asker of the Buddhas concerning the state of consciousness realised in their inmost self, of which we here, Yakshas as well as sons of the Buddha, are desirous of hearing. I, together with the Yakshas, sons of the Buddha, and the wise men, request this of thee.

30. "Thou art the most eloquent of speakers, and the most strenuous of practisers (yogins); with faith I beg of thee. Ask [the Buddha] about the doctrine, O thou the proficient one!

31. "Free from the faults of the philosophers and Pratyekabuddhas and Śrāvakas is (8) the truth of the inmost consciousness, immaculate, and culminating in the stage of Buddhahood."

32.<sup>1</sup> Thereupon the Blessed One created jewel-adorned mountains and other objects magnificently embellished with jewels in an immense number.

33. On the summit of each mountain the Buddha himself was visible, and Rāvana, the Yaksha, also was found standing there.

34. Thus the entire assembly was seen on each mountain-peak and all the countries were there, and in each there was a Leader.

35. Here also was the King of the Rakshasas and the residents of Lankā, and the Lankā created by the Buddha rivalling [the real one].

36. Other things were there, too,—the Aśoka with its shining woods, and on each mountaint-peak Mahāmati was making a request of the Buddha

37. Who discoursed for the sake of the Yakshas on the truth leading to the inmost realisation; on the mountain-peak he was delivering a complete sutra with exquisite voices varied in hundreds of thousands of ways.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> From this point T'ang is in prose again.

<sup>2</sup> Thus according to Bodhiruci and Śīskhānanda. The Sanskrit text has: "hundreds of thousands of perfect sutras".

38. [After this] the teacher and the sons of the Buddhas vanished away in the air, leaving Rāvana the Yaksha himself standing in his mansion.

39. Thought he, "How is this? What means this? and by whom was it heard? What was it that was seen? and by whom was it seen? Where is the city? and where is the Buddha?"

40. "Where are those places, those jewel-shining Buddhas, those Sugatas? (9) Is it a dream then? or a vision? or is it a castle conjured up by the Gandharvas?"

41. "Or is it dust in the eye, or a fata morgana, or the dream-child of a barren woman, or the smoke of a fire-wheel, that which I saw here?"

42. Then [Rāvana reflected], "This is the nature as it is (*dharmatā*) of all things objectified in and by the mind, and it is not comprehended by the ignorant as they are confused by every form of discrimination.

43. "There is neither the seer nor the seen, neither the speaker nor the spoken; the form and usage of the Buddhist works—they are nothing but discrimination.

44. "Those who see things such as were seen before, do not see the Buddha; when discrimination is not aroused, then one indeed sees<sup>1</sup> the Buddha; the Buddha is a Fully-Enlightened One; when one sees him, it is in a world unmanifested."<sup>2</sup>

The Lord of Lankā was then immediately awakened, feeling a turning (*parāvṛitti*) in his mind and realising that the world was nothing but his own mind: he got settled in the realm of non-discrimination; was inspired by a stock of his past good deeds; acquired the cleverness of under-

<sup>1</sup> The Nanjo edition has here *na*, but I have followed the T'ang.

<sup>2</sup> T'ang has: "He who sees in the way as was seen before, cannot see the Buddha; when no discrimination is aroused, this, indeed, is the seeing." According to Wei: "If he sees things and takes them for realities, he does not see the Buddha. Even when he is not abiding in a discriminating mind, he cannot see the Buddha." Wei evidently reads somewhat like the Sanskrit.

standing all the texts; obtained the faculty of seeing [into things] as they were; was no more dependent upon others; observed things excellently with his own wisdom; gained the insight that was not of discursive reasoning; was no more dependent upon others;<sup>1</sup> became himself a great practiser of discipline; was able to manifest himself in all excellent forms; got thoroughly acquainted with all skilful means; had the knowledge of the characteristic aspects of every stage whereby to surmount it skilfully; was delighted to look into<sup>2</sup> the self-nature of Citta, Manas, Manovijñāna; got a view whereby he could cut himself loose from the triple continuation; had the knowledge of disposing of every argument of (10) the philosophers; thoroughly understood the Tathāgata-garbha, the stage of Buddhahood, the inmost self; found himself abiding in the Buddha-knowledge; [when suddenly] a voice was heard from the sky, saying, "It is to be known by oneself."

"Well done, well done, O Lord of Lankā! Well done, indeed, O Lord of Lankā, for once more! The practiser is to discipline himself as thou doest. The Tathagatas and all things are to be viewed as they are viewed by thee; otherwise viewed, it is nihilism. All things are to be comprehended by transcending the Citta, Manas, and Vijñāna as is done by thee. Thou shouldst look inwardly and not get attached to the letters and a superficial view of things; thou shouldst not fall into the attainments, conceptions, experiences, views, and Samādhis of the Śrāvakas, Pratyek-abuddhas, and philosophers; thou shouldst not have any liking for small talk and witticism; thou shouldst not cherish the notion of self-substance.<sup>3</sup> nor have any thought for the vainglory of rulership, nor dwell on such Dhyānas as belong to the six Dhyānas, etc.

"O Lord of Lankā, this is what is realised by the great

<sup>1</sup> This does not appear in T'ang, nor in Wei.

<sup>2</sup> T'ang: to go beyond.

<sup>3</sup> Wei and T'ang: Do not hold the views maintained in the Vedas.

practisers who can thus destroy the discourses advanced by others, crush mischievous views into pieces, properly keep themselves away from ego-centered notions, cause a turning in the depths of the mind fittingly by means of an exquisite knowledge; they are Buddha-sons who walk in the way of the Mahayana; and in order to enter upon the Tathagata-stage of self-realisation, the discipline is to be pursued by thee.

“O Lord of Lankā, conducting thyself in this way, let thee be further purified in the way thou hast attained; (11) by disciplining thyself well in Samādhi and Samāpatti, follow not the state realised and enjoyed by the Śrāvakas, Pratyekabuddhas, and philosophers, as it is due to the imagination of those who discipline themselves according to the practices of the puerile philosophers. They cling to the visible forms created by their egotistical ideas; they maintain such notions as element, quality, and substance; they cling tenaciously to views originating from ignorance; they get confused by cherishing the idea of birth where prevails emptiness; they cling to discrimination [as real]; they fall into the way of thinking where obtains the dualism of qualifying and qualified.

“O Lord of Lankā, this is what leads to various excellent attainments, this is what makes one grow aware of the inmost attainment, this is the Mahayana realisation. One will accomplish and acquire a superior state of existence.

“O Lord of Lankā, by entering upon the Mahayana discipline the veils [of ignorance] are destroyed and one turns away from the manifold waves of mentation and falls not into the refuge and practice of the philosophers.

“O Lord of Lankā, the philosophers’ practice starts from their own egotistic attachments. Their ugly practice arises from their adhering to the dualistic views concerning the self-nature of the Vijnāna.

“Well done, O Lord of Lankā! reflect on the significance of this as you did when seeing the Tathagata before; for this, indeed, is seeing the Tathagata.”

At that time it occurred to Rāvāna: "I wish to see the Blessed One again, who has all the disciplinary practices at his command, who has turned away from the practices of the philosophers, who is born of the state of realisation in the inmost consciousness, and who is beyond [the dualism of] the transformed and the transforming. He is the knowledge (12) realised by the practisers, he is the realisation attained by those who are enjoying the perfect bliss of the Samādhi when there takes place an intuitive understanding which comes through meditation. Therefore, he is known as great adept in the mental discipline.<sup>1</sup> May I see thus [again] the Compassionate One by means of his miraculous powers in whom the fuel of passion and discrimination are destroyed, who is surrounded by sons of the Buddha, who has penetrated into the minds and thoughts of all beings, who moves about everywhere, who knows everything, who keeps himself away from works (*kriyā*) and forms (*lakṣhaṇa*); seeing him may I attain what I have not yet attained, [retain] what I have already gained, may I conduct myself with non-discrimination, abide in the joy of Samādhi (meditation) and Samāpatti (concordance), and attain to the ground where the Tathagatas walk, and in these make progress.

At that moment, the Blessed One recognising that the Lord of Lankā is to attain the Anutpattikadharmakshānti<sup>2</sup> showed his glorious compassion for the ten-headed one by making himself visible once more on the mountain-peak studded with many jewels and enveloped in a net-work of jewels. The ten-headed King of Lankā saw the splendour again as seen before on the mountain peak, [he saw] the Tathagata, who was the Arhat and the Fully-enlightened One, with the thirty-two marks of excellence beautifully adorning his person, and also saw himself on each mountain-

<sup>1</sup> The original text here as it stands does not seem quite intelligible to me. Hence I have followed the T'ang which generally gives the best reading.

<sup>2</sup> This is explained in my previous article on the *Lankavatara* in *The Eastern Buddhist*, Vol. IV, Nos. 3-4, p. 222 et seq.

peak, together with Mahāmati, in front of the Tathagata, the Fully-enlightened One, putting forward his discourse on the realisation experienced by the Tathagata in his inmost self, and, surrounded by the Yakshas, conversing on the literary teaching, recitation, and story [of Buddhism?]. Those (13) [Buddha]-lands were seen with the Leaders.<sup>1</sup>

Then the Blessed One beholding again this great assembly with his wisdom-eye, which is not the human eye, laughed loudly and most vigorously like the lion-king. Emitting rays of light from the tuft of hair between the eyebrows, from the ribs, from the loins, from the Śrivatsa<sup>2</sup> on the breast, and from every pore of the skin,—emitting rays of light which shone flaming like the fire taking place at the end of a kalpa, like a luminous rainbow, like the rising

<sup>1</sup> There is surely a discrepancy here in the text. T'ang reads: "In all the Buddha-lands in the ten quarters were also seen such events going on, and there was no difference whatever." Wei is quite different and has the following: "Besides, he saw all the Buddha-lands and all the kings thinking of the transitoriness of the body. As they are covetously attached to their thrones, wives, children, and relatives, they find themselves bound by the five passions and have no time for emancipation. Seeing this, they abandon their dominions, palaces, wives, concubines, elephants, horses, and precious treasures, giving them all up to the Buddha and his Brotherhood. They now retreat into the mountain-woods, leaving the home and wishing to study the doctrine. He [Ravana] then sees the Bodhisattvas in the mountain woods strenuously applying themselves to the mastery of the truth, even to the extent of throwing themselves to the hungry tiger, lion, and Rakshasas. He thus sees the Bodhisattvas reading and reciting the sutras under a tree in the woods and discoursing on them for others, seeking thereby the truth of the Buddha. He then sees the Bodhisattvas seated under the Bodhi-tree in the Bodhi-maṇḍala thinking of the suffering beings and meditating on the truth of the Buddha. He then sees the venerable Mahāmati the Bodhisattva before each Buddha preaching about the spiritual discipline of one's inner life, and also sees [the Bodhisattva] surrounded by all the Yakshas and families and talking about names, words, phrases, and paragraphs." This last sentence is evidently the translation of the Sanskrit *deśanāpāṭhakatāhām*, which is contrasted in the *Lankāvatāra* throughout with *pratyātmarīyajñānagocara* (the spiritual realm realised by the supreme wisdom in one's inmost consciousness).

<sup>2</sup> Swastika.

sun, blazing brilliantly, gloriously—which were observed from the sky by Śakra, Brahmans, and the guardians of the world, the one who sat on the peak [of Lankā] vying with Mount Sumeru laughed a loudest laugh. At that time the assembly of the Bodhisattvas together with Śakra and Brahmans, each thought within himself:

“For what reason, I wonder, from what cause does the Blessed One who is the master of all the world (*sarva-dharma-vaśuvartin*), after smiling first,<sup>1</sup> laugh the loudest laugh? Why does he emit rays of light from his own body? Why, emitting [rays of light], does he remain silent, with the realisation [of the truth] in his inmost self, and absorbed deeply and showing no surprise in the bliss of Samādhi, and reviewing the [ten] quarters, looking around like the lion-king, and thinking only of the discipline, attainment, and performance of Rāvana?”

At that time, Mahāmati the Bodhisattva-mahāsattva who was previously requested by Rāvana [to ask the Buddha concerning his self-realisation], feeling pity on him, (14) and knowing the minds and thoughts of the assembly of the Bodhisattvas, and observing that beings to be born in the future would be confused in their minds because of their delight in the wordy teaching (*deśanāpāṭha*), because of their clinging to the letter as [fully in accordance with] the spirit (*artha*), because of their clinging to the disciplinary powers of the Śrāvakas, Pratyekabuddhas, and philosophers, —which might lead them to think how it were that the Tathagatas, the Blessed Ones, even in their transcendental state of consciousness should burst out into loudest laughter —Mahāmati, the Bodhisattva, asked the Buddha in order to put a stop to their inquisitiveness the following question: “For what reason, for what cause did this laughter take place?”

Said the Blessed One: “Well done, well done, O Mahāmati! Well done, indeed, for once more, O Mahāmati!

<sup>1</sup> This is wanting in the Chinese translations.

Viewing the world as it is in itself and wishing to enlighten the people in the world who are fallen into a wrong view of things in the three periods of time, thou undertakest to ask me the question. Thus should it be with the wise men who want to ask questions for both themselves and others. Rāvāna, Lord of Lankā, O Mahāmati, asked a twofold question of the Tathagatas of the past who are Arhats and perfect Buddhas; and he wishes now to ask me too a twofold question in order to have its distinction, attainment, and scope ascertained—this is what is never tasted by those who practise the meditations of the Śrāvakas, Pratyekabuddhas, and philosophers; and the same will be asked by the question-loving ten-headed one of the Buddhas to come.”

Knowing that, the Blessed One said to the Lord of Lankā, thus: “Ask, O thou, Lord of Lankā; the Tathagata has given thee permission [to ask], delay not, whatever questions thou desirest to have answered, I will answer each of them (15) with judgment to the satisfaction of thy heart. Keeping thy seat of thought free from [false] discrimination, observe well what is to be subdued at each stage; ponder things with wisdom; [seeing into] the nature of the inner principle in thyself, abide in the bliss of Samādhi; embraced by the Buddhas in Samādhi, abide in the bliss of tranquillisation; going behind the Samādhi and understanding attained by the Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas, abide in [the attainment of the Bodhisattvas] in the stages of Acalā, Sādhumatī, and Dharmameghā; grasp well the egolessness of all things in its true significance; be anointed by the Buddhas [with the water] of Samādhi at the great palace of lotus-jewels. <sup>1</sup>Surrounded by the Bodhi-

<sup>1</sup> The following sentence is done by the aid of T'ang, as the Sanskrit does not seem to give any sense. Literally translated it reads: “There by the becoming lotuses, by those lotuses that are blessed variously by the benediction of his own person. . . .” Wei has: “O King of Lankā, thou wilt before long see thy person, too, thus sitting on the lotus-throne and continuing to abide there in a most natural manner. There are innumerable families of lotus-kings and



sattvas who are sitting on lotuses of various sorts each supported by the gracious power of the Buddhas, thou wilt find thyself sitting on a lotus and each one of the Bodhisattvas looking at thee face to face. This is a realm beyond the imagination. Thou shouldst plan out an adequate plan and establish thyself at a stage of discipline by planning out such a plan as would include [all kinds of] skilful means, so that thou comest to realise that realm which is beyond imagination; and then thou wilt attain the stage of Tathagatahood in which one is able to manifest oneself in various forms, and which is something never seen before by the Śrāvakas, Pratyekabuddhas, philosophers, Brahmans, Indra, Upendra, and others."

At that moment the Lord of Lankā being permitted by the Blessed One, rose from his seat on the peak of the jewel-mountain which shone like the jewel-lotus immaculate and glowing in splendour; he was surrounded by a company of celestial maidens of all kinds; garlands, flowers, perfumes, incense, unguents, umbrellas, banners, flags, neck-laces, half-necklaces, diadems, tiaras,—all in every possible variety, (16) and other ornaments too whose splendour and excellence were never heard of or seen before, were created; music was played surpassing anything that could be had by the gods, Nāgas, Yakshas, Rakshasas, Gandharvas, Kinnaras, Mahoragas, and human beings; musical instruments were created equal to anything that could be had in all the World of Desire and also such superior musical instruments were created as were to be seen in the Buddha-lands; the Blessed One and the Bodhisattvas were enveloped in a net of jewels; a variety of dresses and high banners were raised high up in the air, as high as seven tālānga trees, to greet [the Buddha]; showering great clouds of offerings, playing music

innumerable families of Bodhisattvas there, each one of whom is sitting on a lotus-throne, and surrounded by those thou wilt find thyself and looking face to face at one another, and each one of them will before long come to abide in a realm beyond the understanding."

which resounded [all around], and then descending from the air, [the Lord of Lankā] sat down on the peak of the jewel-mountain ornamented with magnificent jewel-lotus whose splendour was second only to the sun and lightning. Sitting he made courtesy, smiling first to the Blessed One for his permission, and proposed him a twofold question: "It was asked of the Tathagatas of the past, who were Arhats, Fully-enlightened Ones, and it was solved by them. O Blessed One, now I ask of thee; [the request] will certainly be complied with by thee as it was by the Buddhas [of the past] in wordy teaching.<sup>1</sup> O Blessed One, duality was discoursed upon by the Transformed Tathagatas and Tathagatas of Transformation, but not by the Tathagatas of Silence.<sup>2</sup> The Tathagatas of Silence are absorbed in the blissful state of Samādhi, they do not discriminate concerning this state, nor do they discourse on it. O Blessed One, thou assuredly will discourse on this subject of duality. Thou art thyself a master of all things, an Arhat, a Tathagata. The sons of the Buddha and myself are anxious to listen to it."

The Blessed One said, "O Lord of Lankā, tell me what you mean by duality?"

The Lord of the Rakshasas, (17) who was renewed in his ornaments, full of splendour and beauty, with a diadem, bracelet, and necklace strung with vajra thread, said, "It is said that even dharmas are to be abandoned, and how much more adharmas (no-dharmas)! O Blessed One, why does this dualism exist that we are called to abandon? What are adharmas? and what are dharmas? How can there be a duality of things to abandon? Does not duality arise from falling into discrimination, from discriminating self-substance where there is none, from [the idea of] things

<sup>1</sup> That is, as far as the teaching could be conveyed in words. *Deśanāpāṭha* stands in contrast with *siddhānta* or *pratyātmagati* in the *Lankāvatāra*.

<sup>2</sup> In T'ang and Wei: "Original Tathagatas."

created and uncreated, because the non-differentiating nature of the Ālayavijñāna is not recognised? Like the seeing of a hair-circle as really existing in the air, [the notion of dualism] belongs to the realm of intellection not exhaustively purgated. This being the case as it should be, how could there be any abandonment [of dharmas and adharmas]?"

Said the Blessed One, "O Lord of Lankā, seest thou not that the differentiation of things, such as is perceived in jars and other breakable objects whose nature it is to perish in time, takes place in a realm of discrimination [cherished by] the ignorant? This being so, is it not to be so understood? It is due to discrimination [cherished by] the ignorant that there exists the differentiation of dharma and adharma. Supreme wisdom (*āryajñāna*), however, is not to be realised by seeing [things this way]. O Lord of Lankā, let it be so with the ignorant who follow the particularised aspect of existence that there are such objects as jars, etc., but it is not so with the wise. One flame of uniform nature rises up depending on houses, mansions, parks, and terraces, and burns them down; while a difference in the flames is seen according to the power of each burning material which varies in length, magnitude, etc. This being so, why (18) is it not to be so understood? The duality of dharma and adharma thus comes into existence. Not only is there seen a fire-flame spreading out in one continuity and yet showing a variety of flames, but from one seed, O Lord of Lankā, are produced, also in one continuity, stems, shoots, knots, leaves, petals, flowers, fruit, branches, all individualised. As it is with every external object from which grows [a variety of] objects, so also with internal objects. From Ignorance there develop the Skandhas, Dhātus, Āyatanas, with all kinds of objects accompanying, which grow out in the triple world where we have, as we see, happiness, form, speech, and behaviour, each differentiating [infinitely]. The oneness of the Vij-

nāna is grasped variously according to the evolution of an objective world; thus there are things seen inferior, superior, or middling, things defiled or free from defilement, things good or bad. Not only, O Lord of Lankā, is there such a difference of conditions in things generally, there is also seen a variety of realisations attained innerly by each religious practiser as he treads the path of discipline which constitutes his practice. How much more difference in dharma and adharma do we not see in a world of particulars which is evolved by discrimination? Indeed, we do.

“O Lord of Lankā, the differentiation of dharma and adharma comes from discrimination. O Lord of Lankā, what are dharmas? That is, they are discriminated by the discriminations cherished by the philosophers, Śrāvakas, Pratyekabuddhas, and ignorant people. They think that the dharmas headed by Guṇa and Dravya are produced by causes—[these are the notions] to be abandoned. Such are not to be regarded [as real] because they are appearances. It comes from one’s clinging [to appearances] that the manifestations of his own mind are regarded as reality (*dharmatā*). (19) Such things as jars, etc., are products of discrimination conceived by the ignorant, they exist not; their substances are not attainable. The viewing of things from this viewpoint is known as their abandonment.

“What, then, are adharmas? O Lord of Lankā, what we call dharmas are not attainable, they are not appearances born of discrimination, they are above causality; there is in them no such [dualistic] happening as is seen as reality and non-reality. This is known as the abandoning of dharmas. What again is meant by the unattainability of dharmas? That is, it is like horns of a hare, or ass, or camel, or horse, or a child conceived by a barren woman. They are dharmas the nature of which is unattainable; they are not to be thought [as real] because they are appearances. They are only talked about in popular parlance if they have any sense at all; they are not to be adhered to as

in the case of jars, etc. As these [unrealities] are to be abandoned as not comprehensible by the mind (*viññāna*), so are things (*bhāva*) of discrimination also to be abandoned. This is called the abandoning of dharmas and adharms. O Lord of Lankā, your questioning as to the how of abandoning dharmas and adharms is hereby answered.

“O Lord of Lankā, thou sayest again that thou hast asked [this question] of the Tathagatas of the past who were Arhats and Fully-enlightened Ones and that it was solved by them. O Lord of Lankā, that which is spoken of as the past belongs to discrimination; as the past is thus a discriminated [idea], even so are the [ideas] of the future and the present. Because of reality (*dharmatā*) the Tathagatas do not discriminate, they go beyond discrimination and futile reasoning, they do not follow (20) the individuation-aspect of forms, except when [reality] is disclosed for the edification of the unknowing and for the sake of their happiness.<sup>1</sup> It is by Prajñā that the Tathagata performs deeds transcending forms; therefore, what constitutes the Tathagatas in essence as well as in body is

<sup>1</sup> This is one of the most important sections in this first introductory chapter, but singularly all the three texts, perhaps excepting T'ang, present some difficulties for clear understanding. Wei: “O Lord of Lankā, what you speak of as past is a form of discrimination, and so are the future and the present also of discrimination. O Lord of Lankā, when I speak of the real nature of suchness as being real, it also belongs to discrimination; it is like discriminating forms as the ultimate limit. If one wishes to realise the bliss of real wisdom, let him discipline himself in the knowledge that transcends forms; therefore, do not discriminate the Tathagatas as having knowledge-body or wisdom-essence. Do not cherish any discrimination in [thy] mind. Do not cling in [thy] will to such notions as ego, personality, soul, etc. How not to discriminate? It is in the Manovijñāna that various conditions are cherished such as forms, figures, [etc.]; do not cherish such [discriminations]. Do not discriminate nor be discriminated. Further, O Lord of Lankā, it is like various forms painted on the wall, all sentient beings are such. O Lord of Lankā, all sentient beings are like grasses and trees, with them there are no acts, no deeds, O Lord of Lankā, all dharmas and adharms, of them nothing is heard, nothing talked. O Lord of Lankā, all things in the world are like māyā . . . .”

wisdom (*jñāna*). They do not discriminate, nor are they discriminated. Wherefore do they not discriminate in the Manas? Because discrimination is of the self, of soul, of personality. How do they not discriminate in the Manovijñāna? [The Manovijñāna] is meant for the objective world where causality prevails as referred to forms, appearances, conditions, and figures. Therefore, discrimination and non-discrimination must be transcended.

“O Lord of Lankā, and that which comes out in manifestation is [like] a figure inlaid in a wall, it has no sensibility [or consciousness]. O Lord of Lankā, all that is in the world is devoid of work and action because all things have no reality, and there is nothing heard, nothing hearing. O Lord of Lankā, all that is in the world is [like] an image magically transformed. This is not comprehended by the philosophers and the ignorant. O Lord of Lankā, he who thus sees things, is the one who sees truthfully. Those who see things otherwise walk in discrimination; as they depend on discrimination, they cling to dualism. It is like seeing one’s own image reflected in a mirror, or one’s own shadow in the water, or in the moon-

T’ang: “O Lord of Lankā, what you speak of as past is no more than discrimination, so is the future; I too am like him. [Is this to be read, “the present, too, is like it”?] O Lord of Lankā, the teaching of all the Buddhas is outside discrimination; as it goes beyond all discriminations and futile reasonings, it is not a form of particularisation, it is realised only by wisdom. That [this absolute] teaching is at all discoursed about is for the sake of giving bliss to all sentient beings. The discoursing is done by the wisdom transcending forms. It is called the Tathagata; therefore, the Tathagata has his essence, his body in this wisdom. He thus does not discriminate, nor is he to be discriminated. Do not discriminate him after the notions of ego, personality, or being. Why this impossibility of discrimination? Because the Manovijñāna is aroused on account of an objective world wherein it attaches itself to forms and figures. Therefore, [the Tathagata] is outside the discriminating [view] as well as the discriminated [idea]. O Lord of Lankā, it is like beings painted in colours on a wall, they have no sensibility [or intelligence]. Sentient beings in the world are also like them; no acts, no rewards [are with them]. So are all the teachings, no hearing, no preaching.”

light, or seeing one's shadow in the house, or hearing an echo in the valley. People grasping their own shadows of discrimination (21) uphold the discrimination of dharma and adharma, and, failing to carry out the abandonment of the dualism, they go on discriminating and never attain tranquillity. By tranquillity is meant oneness, and oneness gives birth to the highest Samādhi, which is gained by entering into the womb of Tathagatahood, which is the realm of supreme wisdom realised in one's inmost self."

DAISETZ TEITARO SUZUKI