

東洋大学学術情報リポジトリ Toyo University Repository for Academic Resources

Criticism of Heretics' Views of Nirvaṇa in the 70th Paragraph of the Laṅkāvatārasūtra: Sumiwake as Buddhist Wisdom for Multicultural Harmonious Co-existence

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 著者 | Horiuchi Toshio |
| journal or publication title | Journal of International Philosophy |
| number | 4 |
| page range | 331-340 |
| year | 2015-03-31 |
| URL | http://id.nii.ac.jp/1060/00008214/ |

Criticism of Heretics' Views of *Nirvāṇa* in the 70th Paragraph of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*: *Sumiwake* as Buddhist Wisdom for Multicultural Harmonious Co-existence

HORIUCHI Toshio

Introduction

The *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*'s 70th paragraph¹ lists and criticizes heretics' views of *nirvāṇa*. Nakamura [1950] and Takasaki [1985] have done partial research on this section, and Japanese translations of it have been published.² In this paper, I will uncover wisdom regarding multicultural harmonious co-existence that takes the form of *sumiwake* 棲み分け (habitat segregation/ lifestyle partitioning), which can be seen from as far back as early Buddhism in this paragraph.³ Furthermore, I will offer a Japanese translation of this paragraph (excluding repetitive verses) as reference material. The only critical edition of the sutra based on manuscripts and covering its entirety is Nanjo [1923] (below, Nj). Various issues regarding this text perhaps unavoidable due to the constraints of its time and it being the first attempt of its kind have been pointed out and scholars have asserted the need for a completely revised critical edition. Nj is a critical edition based on four manuscripts he was able to obtain. Subsequently many other manuscripts were discovered. Takasaki created a reliable revised critical edition of a certain chapter in the sutra based on 16 manuscripts (Takasaki [1981]). However, the problem with Nj is not that it is based on a limited number of manuscripts; rather, it lies in its inaccurate readings of them (again, understandable due to the constraints of his time). Incidentally, all but one of the sutra's manuscripts are on paper. The single other manuscript is written on palm leaves (T MS), and it sometimes presents better readings of the sutra than the others. Thus, one of my endeavors in this paper will be to present the readings of this palm leaf manuscript when translating some sections. This paper covers a section that occupies less than four pages in Nj. However, Nj fails to include footnotes on the variant readings found in the T MS in five places within this section. Among these sections, three readings will enable us to understand the sentences that were unclear in previous studies that were based on only Nj.

1) The 70th Paragraph of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*

This paragraph introduces 22 heretical views of *nirvāṇa* / *mokṣa* (liberation) which I will number from (1) to (22). (For details, please consult the attached reference material.) For example, it presents the theory that one reaches *nirvāṇa* by understanding that Time or an independent God is the creator of the world (11, 18). As Takasaki [2009: 427] accurately points out, this understanding connects to a theory of liberation because, "In terms of content these are theories of the formation of the world rather than *nirvāṇa* (liberation). (However, in that one is liberated by correctly seeing this, they are all theories of liberation.)" Here, in the background is the attitude that has existed since early Buddhism, namely, that wisdom that awakens oneself to the way things are as they are (*yathābhūta*) is enlightenment.

The sutra first presents the following view of *nirvāṇa* of "certain heretics":

(1) There occurs no bundle of mind and mind associates through seeing that [everything] differs from permanence (i.e., is impermanent), through the aversion to the objects, through the destruction of *skandha* ([five] aggregates), *dhātu* ([eighteen] cognitive elements), and *āyatana* ([twelve] sense fields).

In his commentary, Jñānaśrībhadrā states, “Śrāvaka and those called “*dge slong skye bo'i chos bsam pa can*” see the [five] aggregates as extinguishing. On the other hand, in the Mahāyāna, they are neither permanent nor nonexistent since the subject and object do not exist because objects of the external world do not exist.” Jñānagarbha also holds that this understanding of *nirvāṇa* is not one of heretics, but rather śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas. This understanding simply says that false discrimination (*vikalpa*) does not arise when its cause goes away (subsequently described as “material causes halting”). The sutra criticizes it on the grounds that false discrimination does not arise “by understanding that objects to be examined are empty.”

Below appears the understanding that one enters *nirvāṇa* by understanding *sva-lakṣaṇa* (own characteristics) and *sāmānya-lakṣaṇa* (general characteristics).

(6) Further, others (heretics) imagine *nirvāṇa* by the realization of its own, and the general characteristics of all things, by the [real] existence of things of the past, future, and present as un-destructive.

Jñānaśrībhadrā attributes this view to the Śaiva school, *gtogs 'dod pa*, and Brahmvādins. On the other hand, according to Jñānagarbha, this also referred to the Buddhist *Vaibhāṣikas. He probably interpreted this passage this way based on the fact that it states, “existences of the past, future, and present existing.” It also appears to be valid after looking at the sutra’s 31st paragraph.

For śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas, *nirvāṇa* is discrimination not functioning due to them seeing objects without cognitive distortion by distancing themselves [from the world]⁴ based on awakening to one’s own characteristics and to general characteristics. Based on this, they have the perception that *nirvāṇa* is there.⁵

In other words, here a Buddhist view of *nirvāṇa* is being criticized as heretical.

From the perspective of this sutra, the correct teaching is that *nirvāṇa* arises due to a turn (*vyāvṛtti*)⁶ of the mind, thought, and consciousness[es] ... that is based on *svacittadrśyamātra*, or an understanding that everything is nothing but what is seen (or is a manifestation) of the mind. A similar teaching can be found in paragraphs 31 and 74.

I and all Buddhas say, “*Nirvāṇa* is revolution (*parāvṛtti*) of the habituated tendencies of the mind and consciousness.”⁷

I say, “*Nirvāṇa* is the understanding based on the Tathāgata’s own individual nobleperson wisdom that takes as its basis a revolution (*parāvṛtti*) in the assemblages of the bundle of mind and mind associates that are discrimination.”⁸

2) Wisdom for Multicultural Harmonious Co-existence in Paragraph 70

Above, I took up several understandings of *nirvāṇa* that appear in paragraph 70. Next, I will consider the kind of attitude found in the sutra regarding these heretical teachings. First, let me focus on the fact that śrāvaka and pratyekabuddhas’ (i.e., non-Mahāyāna Buddhists) views of *nirvāṇa* are criticised as heretical, at least based on the understanding of the commentaries. This criticism suggests that the goal of the sutra here is not eliminating different teachings, but rather situating the Mahāyāna’s correct view of *nirvāṇa* amidst various other ones including those of non-Mahāyāna Buddhists. When doing so, the sutra says that wise people are to “throw out” (*parivarjitāni*) and

“should avoid” (*vyāvartanīyā*) heretical teachings.

Furthermore, in another passage on the heretical Lokāyatika teachings, it says that they “should not be served, not be respected, and not be venerated.”⁹ In another section, the following phrase is found: “In order to throw out heretical views...”¹⁰

In the above, an attitude towards heretical teachings can be found that is neither the elimination of, compromise with, nor friendly relations with different theories. Rather, it is one of *sumiwake* (habitat segregation/ lifestyle partitioning).

Incidentally, a similar attitude towards other heretical teachings can also be found in early Buddhism, namely in the *Suttanipāta*’s recommendation to transcend disputes:

“There is only one truth. There is no second.

Those who know it will not quarrel.” (884ab).¹¹

“I teach that there are only two results of quarrels (i.e., praise and censure).

Seeing this reason, you all should see that the state of non-disputes is peaceful, and must not engage in quarrels.” (896bcd)¹²

Furthermore, in the sutras and in Vinayas there is a period in which individuals who used to follow heretical teachings were under observance for a four-month period to enter the Buddhist sangha.¹³

The Japanese Buddhist Hōnen similarly said, “Various delusions arise where there are quarrels. Wise people should leave them 100 yojanas far behind” (諍論之處ニハ諸ノ煩惱起ル、智者ハ之ヲ遠離スルコト百由旬也).¹⁴ While this obviously is a statement that arose in the context of avoiding *nenbutsu* oppression, it should also be taken note of as universal wisdom that can be seen in the aforementioned *Suttanipāta*.

Incidentally, in Vasubandhu’s (India, ca. 400) *Vyākhyāyukti* there is an intense debate surrounding whether the Mahāyāna is the teaching of the Buddha. Vasubandhu’s answer to the Śrāvakayāna criticism that Mahāyāna is not the Buddha’s words can be found in chapter 4. It is succinctly and accurately summarized in Matsuda [1985]: “Arguing against the theory that Mahāyāna Buddhist scriptures are not the Buddha’s words, it gives these scriptures value as the Buddha’s teachings by sharply distinguishing between explicit and implicit teachings.¹⁵ Following the text itself more closely, the following could also be said (from Horiuchi [2009: 61-62]):

a. 【Śrāvakas’ Criticism 1】 (The symbol “↔” indicates a contradiction)

Āgamas (four Āgamas and five Nikāyas) ↔ Mahāyāna (Here, “Mahāyāna” refers to the
“teaching that all dharmas are essenceless.”)

《The Mahāyāna contradicts the Āgamas and is therefore not the Buddha’s word》

b. 【Vasubandhu’s Refutation 1’】

【Śrāvakas’ Answer 1’】

Āgamas

Āgamas

Teaching a ↔ Teaching b

⇒ Explicit Teaching ≡ Implicit Teaching

《If one says Mahāyāna is not the Buddha’s teachings because it contradicts the Āgamas, the Āgamas are not either because they have internal contradictions.》

《In the case of contradiction, one is implicit teaching and the other is explicit teaching. Therefore, there is no contradiction.》

c. 【Śrāvakas' Criticism 2】

【Vasubandhu's Answer 2'】

Mahāyāna

⇒

Mahāyāna

All dharmas are essenceless ↔ Cultivation of the path

All dharmas are essenceless (Implicit teachings) ≡
Samdhinirmocana-sūtra, *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*
[Corresponding verses] (Explicit teachings)

《The Mahāyāna has contradictory teachings, and there are no explicit teachings that remove these contradictions》

《The teaching that all dharmas are essenceless is an implicit teaching, and the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, etc. are explicit teachings. In other words, Mahāyāna has both implicit and explicit teachings. Therefore, there is no contradiction.》

d. 【Vasubandhu's Conclusion】

《It does not hold that “Mahāyāna is not the Buddha's word because it contradicts.” In other words, Mahāyāna does not contradict and is therefore the Buddha's word.》

In summary, Mahāyāna is as it is the Buddha's word, and Śrāvakayāna is as it is the Buddha's word. Vasubandhu does not hold that the Śrāvakayāna is not the Buddha's word, nor does he try to dissolve the contradictions between the Śrāvakayāna teachings and the Mahāyāna. In other words, even in the case of teachings that appear at first glance to be contradictory, since in the Mahāyāna contradictions are dissolved because it contains explicit and implicit teachings, “it is not valid to say that the Mahāyāna is not the Buddha's teachings because it contradicts” the Āgamas.

Conclusion

In the above texts, we find wisdom for multicultural and multi-religious harmonious co-existence in the form of “a habitat segregation of ideas” that constitutes an ideological version of *sumiwake*, which Imanishi Kinji 今西錦司 explains using the example of the upstream / midstream habitat segregation of fish.¹⁶ Rather than oppression, conquest, or compromise, it is co-existence in which each party maintains their own position while not interfering with one another. It emphasizes not the golden rule (doing to others as you would like them to do to you) but the silver rule (not doing to others what you would not like to be done to you).

Abbreviations

D: Sde dge edition of Tibetan Tripitaka.

Jg: Jñānagarbha: *Āryalaṅkāvatāra-nāma-mahāyānasūtravṛtti tathāgatahṛdayālaṅkāra-nāma*, P, No. 5520, D, No. 4019.

Jś: Jñānaśrībhadrā: *Ārya-Laṅkāvatāravṛtti*, P, No. 5519, D, No. 4018.

LAS(t): *'Phags pa Lang kar gshegs pa chen po'i mdo*. Peking (P) No. 775, Derge (D) No. 107.

Nj: Nanjio, Bunyiu. ed., *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*. Bibliotheca Otaniensis 1, Kyoto, Japan, 1923.

P: Peking edition of Tibetan Tripitaka.

Shinron: Kokan Shiren 虎関師鍊. “Butsugo Shinron” 『仏語心論』 (Nihon Daizōkyō 日本大藏經 Hōdōbu Shōso 方等部章疏 3).

Song: Guṇabhadra tr., *Ryōga-abatsutarahōkyō*, Taishō (T) No. 670 (Vol.16.480a-514b).

T MS: Tōdai Manuscript, Originally collected by J. Takakusu, kept in Tokyo University, Matsunami Catalogue No. 333. T in Nj.

Bibliography

Kubota Chikara 久保田力. 1991. “Mana shiki to “Ryōgakyō” ” マナ識と『楞伽經』 [*Manas* and the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*], IBK,

- Hadano et al., co-eds. 1993. “Sei Nyūryōgakyō chū: Tibtetto butten kenkyū sōsho (dai yon shū)” 聖入楞伽經註 チベット仏典研究叢書 (第4輯) (*Jñānaśrībhadra Ārya-laṅkāvatāravṛtti Tohoku University Catalogue No. 4018 by Hakuyu Hadano, Professor Emeritus of Tohoku University with Hirofumi Isoda, Keinosuke Mitsuhara, Koichi Furusaka, The Institute of Tibetan Buddhist Textual Studies*) Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館.
- Horiuchi Toshio 堀内俊郎. 2009. Seshin no Daijō bussetsu ron—“Shakukiron” daiyonshō o chūshin ni 世親の大乗仏説論—『釈軌論』第四章を中心に (Vasubandhu’s Proof of the Authenticity of the Mahāyāna as Found in the Fourth Chapter of His Vyākhyāyukti). Bibliotheca Indologica et Buddhologica 13. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林.
- Matsuda Kazunobu 松田和信. 1985. ““Vyākhyāyukti” no nitaisetsu—Vasubandhu kenkyū nōto (2)” *Vyākhyāyukti*の二諦説—Vasubandhu研究ノート(2)— [Two truth theory in the *Vyākhyāyukti* : A note on Vasubandhu (2)]. IBK, 33-2, (114)-(120).
- Miyamoto Keiichi 宮元啓一. 1998. *Buddha: Dentōteki Shakazō no Kyōkō to Shinjitsu* ブツダ 伝統的釈迦像の虚構と真実 [*Buddha: A fabrication and truth of traditional image of Shaka*] (in Japanese). Tokyo: Kōbunsha 光文社.
- Nakamura Hajime 中村元. 1950. *Shoki no Vedānta Tetsugaku* 『初期のヴェーダーンタ哲学』 (*A History of Early Vedānta Philosophy*) Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店.
- Nakamura Hajime 中村元. 1984. *Buddha no kotoba* 『ブツダのことば』 [*Buddha's words*], Tokyo: Iwanami Bunko 岩波文庫.
- Sasaki Shizuka 佐々木閑. 1999. *Shukke toha nanika* 出家とは何か [*What is the renunciation*]. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan 大蔵出版.
- Suganuma Akira 菅沼晃. 1981. “入楞伽經無常性品・現觀品・如来常無常品・變化品訳註 (The *Anityatāparivarta*, the *Abhisamayaparivarta*, the *Tathāgatānityānityaprasaṅgaparivarta* and the *Nairmāṇikaparivarta* of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*, their translations and commentaries). 東洋学論叢 (*Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters, Toyo University*). 34, 1-134.
- Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙. 1932. *The Laṅkāvatārasūtra A Mahāyāna Text*, Delhi, rep. in 1999.
- Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道. 1980. *Ryōgakyō 楞伽經 [Laṅkāvatārasūtra]* (Butten Kōza 仏典講座17), Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan 大蔵出版.
- Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道. 1981. *A Revised Edition of the Laṅkāvatārasūtra Kṣanika-Parivarta*, Tokyo, Japan, 1981.
- Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道. 1985. 『楞伽經』の外教説—提婆造『外道小乘涅槃論』との関連 (Descriptions of the Doctrines of Heretics in the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*: With Reference to the *Treatise on Nirvāṇa of Heretics and Hīnayāna* by Āryadeva). Repr. in id., *Collected Works of Takasaki Jikidō*, Vol.8. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社. 2009.
- Tokiwa Gishin 常盤義伸. 2003. [*A Study of the Four-Fascicle Laṅkāvatāra Ratna Sūtram*] Osaka: private issue, 4 Vols.
- Yasui Kōsai 安井広済. 1976. Bonbun wayaku: “Nyūryōgakyō” 『梵文和訳 入楞伽經』 [A Japanese Translation of the Sanskrit *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*], Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館.

Notes

- 1 Based on the paragraph divisions in Kokan Shiren's 虎関師錬 *Butsugo Shinron* 仏語心論.
- 2 Yasui [1976: 165-168], Suganuma [1981: 64-73], Tokiwa [2003: 207-211].
- 3 Below are the papers I have published on “The Basis of Thought for a Society of a Multicultural Harmonious Co-existence”: “*Upekṣā* as a Potential Basis for *Kyōsei* in Buddhism,” *Journal of International Philosophy* (JIP), No. 1, 2012 (in Japanese and English); “An Annotated Translation of Sūtra Passages 62 & 63 in Chapter 2 of the *Vyākhyāyukti*: ‘Speaking and Listening’ as Means towards the Construction of a Basis for Multicultural Coexistence,” JIP, No. 2, 2013 (in Japanese and English); “Coexistence in the Early Buddhist Scriptures: From *Suttanipāta* and *Dhammapada*” (in Japanese), JIP, No. 3, 2014. In Horiuchi [2012] I focused on *upekṣā* (equanimity or impartial mind), one of the four *catvāri-apramāṇāṇi*, or (immeasurable states of mind; the others being *maitrī* [friendship], *karuṇā* [compassion], and *muditā* [empathetic joy]). However, subsequently, I found out that Miyamoto Keiichi had written the following: “Without any qualifications, *maitrī*, *karuṇā*, and *muditā* become clingy, and are no different from the mind of attachment. Thus, *upekṣā* is necessary. At least in early Buddhism, the objective of religious training was nihilism toward life, and thus during religious training one must cultivate it. Of course, for Gotama Buddha *upekṣā* was complete; *maitrī*, *karuṇā*, and *muditā* all were magic for living as if a world without meaning has meaning—in other words, expedient means” (Miyamoto [1998: 151-152]). My focus on *upekṣā* and *sumiwake* when searching for the basis of ideas for multicultural harmonious co-existence is essentially rooted in the same perspective. However, while Miyamoto writes that *upekṣā* is “fundamentally adopting an attitude of indifference towards self and other” (Miyamoto [1998: 151]), I use it to mean the mind of equanimity towards self and other that leaves behind the lenses of interest calculation and self-consciousness, or a transcendental interest. Regardless, further investigation into the topic is necessary.
- 4 A term that means “to leave behind the noise of the mundane world”. It is used when discussing the religious training and

enlightenment of pratyekabuddhas. See the 16th paragraph, etc. (Takasaki [1980: 239]).

- 5 Nj. 99.14-16: *śrāvakapratyekabuddhānāṃ nirvāṇaṃ svasāmānyalakṣaṇāvbodhād asaṃsargato viṣayāvīparyāśadarśanād vikalpo na pravartate/ tatas teṣāṃ tatra nirvāṇabuddhir bhavati/*
- 6 I revised my original translation of *vyāvṛtti* as “eliminate” based on the guidance of Professor Kubota Chikara 久保田力 after my presentation at the Japanese Association for Religious Studies' conference held at Doshisha University. Based on the below two examples, *vyāvṛtti* can be understood to mean “turn.” Regarding the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*'s own view of *nirvāṇa*, also see Kubota [1991].
- 7 Paragraph 31 (Nj. 98): ... *-manomanovijñānadṛṣṭivāsanāparāvṛttir nirvāṇam ity ucyate sarvabuddhair mayā ca*
- 8 Paragraph 74 (Nj. 200): *vikalpacittacaittakalāpasya parāvṛttipūrvakaṃ tathāgatasvapratyātmāryajñānādhigamaṃ nirvāṇam iti vadāmi*
- 9 Paragraph 67 (Nj. 173.3-5): *lokāyatiko ... na sevītavyo na bhaktavyo na paryupāsītavyo*
- 10 Paragraph 24 (Nj. 79.8): *tīrthakaradrṣṭivivṛttyartham*
- 11 *ekaṃ hi saccaṃ na dutṭyaṃ atthi, yasmim pajā no vivade pajānaṃ*. This translation follows the Japanese translation in Nakamura [1984]. In PTS, the phrase “*ekaṃ hi saccaṃ na dutṭyaṃ atthi, yasmim pajāno vivade pajānaṃ*” can be found. Regarding this passage, Nakamura says to cut it and read as, “*yasmim (=sacce) pajā no vivade pajānaṃ (=pajānanto)*.” The above translation follows this suggestion.
- 12 *duve vivādassa phalāni brūmi, etam pi disvā na vivādiyetha khemābhipassaṃ avivādashūmiṃ*.
- 13 Sasaki [1999: 82-83].
- 14 *Shichi kajō kishō mon* 七箇條起請文 [Seven-point Statement] in *Shōwa shinshū Hōnen shōnin zenshū* 昭和新修 法然上人全集 [In-Shōwa-New-Revised Complete Works of Hōnen], Ishii Kyōdō 石井教道, ed., Heiraku-ji Shoten, 1955, 787. Cf. *Tannishō* 歎異抄 [Lamentations of Divergences] Ch. 12 (*Tannishō shinchū* 歎異抄新註 [New Commentary on the *Tannishō*], Taya Raishun 多屋頼俊, Hozōkan, 1939).
- 15 Explicit teachings are those that can be understood literally. Implicit teachings are those that cannot be understood literally.
- 16 Here, I am just borrowing and modifying a fundamental concept in a search to explore the basis of thought for multicultural co-existence. The following criticism of the “*sumiwake* theory” exists from the field of biology:
<http://ja.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E4%BB%8A%E8%A5%BF%E9%8C%A6%E5%8F%B8> (Wikipedia, accessed 10/25/2014.)

Reference Materials:

An English translation of the 70th Paragraph of the LAS (except the verse portion)¹

[70]

Then, Mahāmati the Bodhisattva-Mahāsattva further said this to the Blessed One (*Bhagavat*): Blessed one! *Nirvāṇa*, *nirvāṇa* is said [by you]. Of what is this a designation, vis., the word *nirvāṇa* as imagined by all heretics?

The Blessed One said: Then, Mahāmati, listen well and reflect well. I will tell you. Heretics imagine the *nirvāṇa*.

However, there is no *nirvāṇa* that suits their imagination (*vikalpa*, false discrimination).

Mahāmati, the Bodhisattva-Mahāsattva gave ear to the Blessed One, saying: Sure, Blessed One.

The Blessed One said this to him:

(1) Mahāmati, some heretics explain: there occurs no bundle of mind and mind associates through seeing that [everything] differs from permanence (i.e., is impermanent)², through the aversion to the objects, through the destruction of *skandha*, *dhātu*, and *āyatana*. Just like there is a [cessation of] the flame of a lamp, seeds, and fire by the cessation of the substratum, there is a cessation of imagination through non-recollection of the object of the past, future, and present. For them, therefore, there is a comprehension that there exists *nirvāṇa*. However, O Mahāmati, one does not enter *nirvāṇa* by the view of destruction.

(2) Further, the others (heretics) explain that there is liberation (*mokṣa*)³ by going to another point of place⁴. Just as in cases of the cessation of imagination to the object, [just like] the wind [ceases].

(3) Further, others explain that there is liberation through destruction of the perception of the comprehended and the act of comprehension⁵.

(4) Others imagine that there is liberation {through non-occurrence of imagination}⁶ through seeing permanence and impermanence⁷.

1 Text: T MS, 50a3-51a4., Nj.182.7-185.16, Hadano etc. 1993.420-435; Commentaries: Jg, D 213b1-217b2, Jś, D 210a5-218a1; Translations: Suzuki [1932(1999): 157-160], Yasui [1976: 165-168], Suganuma [1981: 64-73].

2 Nj has *-vaidharmā-* and footnotes that Tib has *-vaidharmya-*. However, since the latter reading is also attested by the T MS, I will take this reading.

3 This whole paragraph criticizes the heretical view of *nirvāṇa*. But (2) to (4) refer to *mokṣa* (liberation) instead of *nirvāṇa*.

4 Jś comments that this is the assumption, such as going to liberation at the middle of the sun.

5 *buddhiboddhavya*: This refers to subject and object according to Jś. Its destruction seems to accord with the proper Mahāyāna view of *nirvāṇa*. However, he further says: they (i.e., heretics) maintain that the permanent *ātman* is liberated because such manifestations (i.e., those of the subject and object) do not exist. Commentators mostly detect the view of *ātman* on the basis of the heretical view of *nirvāṇa* as enumerated here. However, it is only in (7) that the sutra itself clarifies this point. See Nakamura [1950: 227ff.].

6 *vikalpasya apravṛtter*: Suganuma rightly points out that since the Song translation. omits these words in {}, this is “assumed not to have existed originally.”

7 Jś writes, “by attributing the consciousness that abides in the stream of continuity of personality as *ātman*...” This is also denied because it admits *ātman*. Jg says that it is to see that some things such as *ātman* are permanent, while others such as matter (*rūpa*) are impermanent. He identifies this view as that of Vedānta.

(5) Further, others⁸, thinking that⁹ “the imagination of various signs¹⁰ brings¹¹ the arousal of sufferings”- not being skillful in [the fact] that [everything is] nothing but what is seen by the mind (*svacittadrśyamātra*), being afraid of the fearing of signs - comprehends *nirvāṇa* by seeing the no-signs¹², with the sign of¹³ being eager for happiness.

(6) Further, others imagine *nirvāṇa* by the realization of its own, and the general characteristics of all things, by the [real] existence of things of the past, future, and present as un-destructive.

(7) Further, others imagine *nirvāṇa* by the non-destruction of the *ātman*, being, soul, personality, man, person¹⁴, and all things.

(8) Further, O Mahāmati, other heretics who have foolish understandings imagine *nirvāṇa* through seeing the discrimination of *prakṛti* (i.e., material principle) and *puruṣa* (i.e., mental principle), and by the fact that *guṇa*¹⁵ is a creator of transformation.

(9) Others [imagine *nirvāṇa*] by the complete extinction of merit and demerit.

(10) Others [imagine *nirvāṇa*] through the extinction of defilement and through gnosis.¹⁶

(11) Others imagine *nirvāṇa* through seeing the Supreme God as the independent creator of the world.

(12) Others [think] that the arising of this world is due to the mutual dependence, not to the cause. However, it is nothing but an adherence to the cause¹⁷. But because of their foolishness, they do not realize it. By this they imagine *nirvāṇa*.

Others say that the birth of this world occurs from interaction, not from a cause. However, this is (*sa ca*) nothing

8 This refers to the *vidyādhārāntavādins* according to Jś.

9 Although Nj has only *iti* without the footnote of variant readings, the T MS has *iti kṛtvā*. I will amend Nj according to the T MS.

10 This refers to the representation (**saṃjñā*) according to Jś.

11 Although Nj has *-vāhaka* without the footnote of variant readings, the T MS has *-āvāhaka*, which appears again in Nj. 197.2 (Tib: *’thob par byed pa*). I will amend Nj according to the T MS (Cf. BHSD, 108a).

12 Nj has *nimitta-* and this is also supported by Tib. However, all the Chinese translations have 無相, which supports **animitta-*. Even if we take the reading of Nj, since the previous word is *nimittabhayabhīṭā*, if we connect these directly and assume *nimittabhayabhīṭānimitta-*, this corresponds to the Chinese translations. However, according to Hadano, etc., manuscripts have *nimittabhayabhīṭāḥ*, namely, have *ḥ* at the end of the word. But since in the previous sentence it reads “being afraid of the fear of signs,” the phrase “to see the no-sign (*animitta*)” is expected from a contextual point of view, too. In addition, Jś comments that “the sign” refers to “the sign of representation” and says: “by thinking that representation is a swelling, representation is a pain, one becomes the non-possessor of such representations.”

13 Nj has *-nimitta* and footnotes that Tib has *-nimitte*. However, since the latter reading is also supported by the T MS, I will amend Nj. Suganuma and Takasaki also understand the way according to the Tib. As a whole, the meaning seems to be: seeing the no-sign being afraid of the sign itself *has the sign* of being eager for happiness. Jś comments, “where there is an aspiration for happiness, there is a basis of *samsara*. How can [it] be *nirvāṇa*? (*gang na bde ba’i kun tu tshor ba yod pa de na skye ba gzhan gyi gnas tel ji ltar mya ngan las ’das pa yin*).”

14 These are synonyms for *ātman* (self).

15 This refers to the three *guṇas*: *sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*.

16 This also seems to be the proper view of *nirvāṇa*, as that of the Buddhist, or at least that of the śravakas. However, Jś comments that it is not liberation, because they lack investigation by wisdom, and because even if defilements such as lust are gone, they still adhere to *ātman*.

17 Nj has *anye anyonyapravṛtto ’yaṃ sambhavo jagata iti na kāraṇataḥ sa ca kāraṇābhīniveśa eva na cāvabudhyante mohāt tadanavabodhān nirvāṇaṃ kalpayanti*. However, according to T MS and Tib (<<>> means that it is a supplement from the Tib), *anye anyonyapravṛtto <’>yaṃ sambhavo jagata | na kāraṇataḥ <<iti>> sa ca kāraṇābhīniveśa eva na cāvabudhyante mohāt tadanavabodhān nirvāṇaṃ kalpayanti*. Namely, according to the T MS, *iti* does not exist after *jagata*. Moreover, according to the Tib, *iti* exists after *kāraṇataḥ*. Although previous translations followed Nj and understood that this whole sentence (two sentences in English) describes a heretical view of *nirvāṇa*, if we follow the T MS and Tib, we can understand that the phrase after *sa ca* is a criticism of the heretical view of *nirvāṇa* by the Buddha.

but adherence to a cause. Without understanding this because of their ignorance, they imagine *nirvāṇa*.

(13) Further, O Mahāmati, other heretics¹⁸ imagine *nirvāṇa* by understanding the truth and the way (the way of truth)¹⁹.

(14) Others have the comprehension of *nirvāṇa* through the realization²⁰ of the *guṇa* (quality) and *guṇin* (possessor of the quality)²¹, which is caused by seeing that [these are] one, other, both, and non-both.

(15) Others imagine *nirvāṇa* by seeing what arose from the nature, namely, the nature of things that is like the variety of the [feather of the] peacock, various mines of jewels, and sharp spine.

(16) Others, O Mahāmati, through the realization of the twenty-five truths.

(17) Others imagine *nirvāṇa* by understanding the teaching of the six subdivisions [of actions] by the protector of creatures (i.e., the king).

(18) Others see that time is the creator and that the arising of the world depends on time. By this realization, they imagine *nirvāṇa*.

(19) Others by existence.

(20) Others by non-existence²².

(21) Others by the comprehension of existence and non-existence.

(22) Others imagine *nirvāṇa* by seeing the non-discrimination between existence (i.e., *saṃsāra*) and *nirvāṇa*.

Further²³, O Mahāmati, others who roar the lion's roar imagine *nirvāṇa* as follows: by the realization that [everything is] nothing but what is seen by the mind, by non-adherence to the existence and non-existence of the outer [objects], by seeing the real state that is void of what relates to the four alternatives (*cātuṣkoṭika*), by the non-falling of the imagination, which is seen by the mind in two extremes [i.e., of existence and non-existence], by the non-apprehension of object and subject, by seeing that all measures do not work to the truth²⁴ – by being foolish, there exists the non-apprehension of truth – by which [i.e., of foolishness] elimination, by the realization of the holy dharma that [should be understood] personally, by the recognition of two forms of selflessness, by the cessation of two defilements, by the reversion of mind, mentation, and mental consciousness, [which occurs] when [one enters] the concentration (*samādhi*), which has an image such as that of illusion²⁵, going higher and higher through the stages [of the bodhisattvas] until reaching the stage of Tathāgatahood.

18 This refers to the Naiyāikas according to Jś.

19 *satyamārga*: Jg expounds a twofold interpretation of this compound. The first is “the truth and the way,” which refers to the four truths and the way[s] for them. Thus, this refers to the Buddhist view. The second is “the way of truth,” which refers to the sixteen *padārthas* (categories) by Naiyāikas.

20 Nj and Chinese translations have *abhisambaddhād* (by connection) unanimously. However, Tib suggests *abhisambuddhād* (by realization). According to Jś, if one radically destroys the nine qualities (*buddhi*, *sukha*, *duḥkha*, *icchā*, *dveṣa*, *prayatna*, *dharma*, *adharma*, and *saṃskāra*) of the *ātman*, it is the *ātman* that has qualities liberates. The liberation for *Vaiśeṣikas* is that the *ātman* is independent by being void of qualities. Therefore, here, I would like to follow Tib, realizing [the difference of] qualities and what possesses qualities.

21 This refers to the *Vaiśeṣika* according to the commentaries. It establishes the nine factors as *dravya* (substance, that which has quality), and twenty-four factors as *guṇa* (quality).

22 By ablution and burnt offering (**homa*) according to Jś.

23 The order of this and the next paragraph differs in the Song translation. As Takasaki points out, the order of the Song translation has contextual consistency. Suzuki also translates according to the order of the Song translation.

24 *sarvaprāmāṇāgrahaṇāpravṛttidarśanāt tattvasya*: As Suganuma points out, the reading of this phrase differs among translations. Here, since the Song translation has 一切度量不見所, namely, it omits *agrahaṇa*, I would like to delete the word, as it did not originally exist but was incorporated by mistake, since it appears immediately after.

25 Although Nj has *māyādiviśvasamādhi* without the footnote of variant readings, according to Hadano etc., some manuscripts have *māyādibimbasamādhi*, which is supported by Tib. I would like to accept the latter reading here. Jś says, “the

Thus, what is wrongly told by the argumentative heretics is connected with improperness and should be avoided by the wise. O Mahāmati, all these imagine *nirvāṇa* by the personal continuity that falls into the two extremes [of existence and non-existence]. However, nothing arises nor ceases here. O Mahāmati, *nirvāṇa* for each heretic, which is examined through their own texts, thought, and understanding, deviates [from the truth]. It is not established as being imagined by them²⁶. There is no *nirvāṇa* for any [heretics] through the coming and going of mentation.

O Mahāmati, by you and other Bodhisattva-Mahāsattvas, this should be learned and the view of *nirvāṇa* by all heretics should be rejected.

concentration (**samādhi*) has a pure and mundane appearance, such as illusion and reflection (*rgyu ma dang gzugs brnyan la sogs pa bzhin du dag pa jig rten pa'i snang ba dang bcas pa'i ting nge 'dzin*).” *Māyopamasamādhi* is often emphasized in this sutra (Cf. paragraphs 3, 7 etc. of the LAS).

26 Nj has *tathā na tiṣṭhate* without the footnote of variant readings, and T MS has *na tathāvatīṣṭhate*, which should be taken up.