

7. NANJIO'S 1185—BHĀVAVIVEKA.

DEAR PROFESSOR RHYS DAVIDS,—Bunyii Nanjio's 1185, *Pān-zo-taṅ-lun* (*Prajñādīpa Śāstra*,¹ *Prajñāpradīpaśāstra-kārikā*, or *vyākhyā*?²), is said by the editor to have been "composed by the Bodhisattvas Nāgārjuna and Nirdeśaprabha (? 'distinct - brightness,' or Piṅgalanetra), the latter explaining 500 verses of the former." That is clear enough. *Nirdeśaprabha* may be a wrong translation of 分別明 (*Fan-pieh-miñ*); but *humanum est errare*. The origin of *Piṅgalanetra* alone is perplexing.

But if we glance at the table of Additions (p. xxxv), or the first Appendix (s. nom. *Deva*), we are definitely puzzled: "for *Nirdeśaprabha* (? distinct - brightness, or Piṅgalanetra) read *Nīlanetra* (or Āryadeva)." And again: "*Ārya Deva*, also called *Nīlanetra*, on account of his having two spots, as large as the eyes, on his cheeks. His real name was *Candrakīrti*."

To make things more obscure, observe that Nanjio's 1179, the *Kuñ-lun* or *Madhyamakaçāstra*, gives us a *Mūla- or Capital-Text* by Nāgārjuna, and a *ṭikā* by Nilacakṣus (? 'blue eye,' or Piṅgalanetra). This Nilacakṣus must again be *Candrakīrti*.

The observations of Dr. Takakusu (in *J.R.A.S.*, 1903, p. 181) do not throw much light on the matter.

The *Madhyamakaçāstra*, or *Mūlamadhyamaka*, is undoubtedly the collection of the *Mādhyamika* aphorisms,³ attributed by Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese tradition to Nāgārjuna.³

There is in Nepalese literature and in the Tibetan a *Madhyamakavṛtti* (*Prasannapādā nāma*) by *Candrakīrti*,

¹ Read *Prajñāpradīpa*. *Prajñā* is of course correct. But I wonder why Nanjio writes *ad 1179 Prānyamūlasāstra*; the Tibetan has: *Pradžñā nāma mūlamadhyamākakārikā* = . . . ces-rab ces-bya-ba.

² Incorrect. *Prajñā* is the name of the Nāgārjuna's śāstra (Treatise) of the Nāgārjuna's kārikās (Aphorisms or sūtras). *Prajñāpradīpa* is the name of the *vyākhyā* (Commentary).

³ According to the colophon of the Tibetan translation of this book, there are 449 aphorisms or ślokas.

which I am now editing for the Bibliotheca Buddhica. It bears no intimate relation either to Nanjio's 1179 or to his 1185.

But there is in the Tanjur, Mdo, xviii, a commentary on the Madhyamakaçāstra, by Bhāvaviveka¹ (*Legs-ldan-hbyed*), entitled *Prajñāpradīpa Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti*. This is exactly the title of the Nanjio's 1185; and novice as I am in Chinese lexicography, it appeared to me that Fan-pieh-min could be well translated, not *distinct-brightness*, but *bright-distinctness* (compare the Tibetan *legs-ldan-hbyed* = 'good distinction'); that *viveka* was a better translation of *distinct* than *nirdeśa*; lastly, that Nanjio himself (or his sources?) had translated (Appendix i, No. 14) Tshin-pien = 'clear discussion' = Bhāvaviveka.²

At my request, my brother Henry de la Vallée Poussin sent me a translation of the beginning of 1185 (being the major part of the introduction); and I received a few days afterwards (by the kindness of my friend Mr. F. W. Thomas) a copy of the commencement of the Tibetan xylograph. The accord was more admirable than I could have ever hoped. All the Mādhyamika treatises have the same phraseology, and all the commentators are given to explaining the subject, the purpose, and the so-called 'relation' of the treatise; but the Chinese (my brother's translation from the Chinese) and the Tibetan *do* agree in details, and the coincidence is complete. I am unable to understand the introductory stanza; but we do not always understand Sanskrit stanzas. The Tibetan lotsavas were more clever than we are; but the Chinese translators were also puzzled by the stylistic and grammatical complications.

Therefore the notice on Nanjio's 1185 must be written as follows: "Text by Nāgārjuna; commentary by Bhāvaviveka

¹ Such is the spelling of Schiefner, Kern, etc. *Bhava*^o is not impossible.

² We find in the Mahāvvyutpatti a third translation of Bhāvaviveka. See Julien's MS. (Bibl. Nationale), § 172, No. 3,310 (= Minaev's edition, § 177. 22). Bhavya = skal-ldan (bhagavant, bhavya; skal-ba-med-pa = abhavya, see Śikṣāsamuccaya, 209. 12) = 有清分 = yew-tsing-fan = being-clear-distinction = clear distinction of the being. (H. V. P.)

(= Tandjour, Mdo, xviii, foll. 44–299),” and the statement “Deest in Tibetan” must be erased.

As concerns Nilacakṣus = Āryadeva = Piṅgalanetra, I have nothing to say, except that the commentary in Nanjio 1179 is identical neither with Nāgārjuna’s, nor with Buddhapālita’s, nor with Candrakīrti’s commentaries on the same book. “A chaque jour suffit sa peine.”—Yours faithfully,

L. DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN.

8. THE BRAHMAJĀLA SUTTANTA IN CHINESE.

DEAR PROFESSOR RHYS DAVIDS,—Referring to my note “Pāli and Sanskrit” (J.R.A.S., 1903, p. 359), Dr. K. Watanebe writes as follows:—“No. 1087 in Nanjio’s Cat. is entirely different from No. 554. The former, as you mentioned, belongs to the Mahāyāna class; while the latter is classified as Small Vehicle Sūtra (see Nanjio), and it corresponds with slight differences to the Pāli Brahma-jālasutta. There is another Chinese version of this sutta contained in the Chinese Dīghanikāya (Nanjio, 545).”—Yours faithfully,

L. DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN.

9. KAUSĀMBĪ, KĀŚĀPURA, VAISĀLĪ.

Jaunpur.

May 7th, 1903.

DEAR PROFESSOR RHYS DAVIDS,—I have good reasons, which I intend to publish in due course, for believing that the city of Kauśāmbī visited by Yuan Chwang should be identified with Gūrgi (Arch. Surv. Rep., xix, pl. xx; xxi, pl. xxxvi); that Kāśapura, visited by the same pilgrim, is now known as Jhūsī (Mon. Antiq. N.W.P., 138); and that Vaiśālī city was situated in the Chaparā District of Bengal, and is represented by the extensive remains of the undescribed walled city at Mānjhī, on the left bank of the Ghāgharā (Gogrā) river, opposite to the confluence of this river with the old bed of the Ganges.—Yours truly,

W. VOST.