

On the Sanskrit Version of *Dharmadhātustava*

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Liu Zhen
National Institute for Advanced Humanistic Studies
Fudan University
Shanghai, PR C

Abstract

The *Dharmadhātustava* (DDhS), ascribed to Nāgārjuna, has become an important Buddhist *sūtra* since the 10th century. Great significance has been attached to the DDhS in the Indo-Tibetan Tantric tradition. Bhāviveka, Nāropa, Atiśa, etc., as well as a large number of Tibetan authors cite stanzas from the DDhS and clearly ascribe authority to it. Upon its introduction into Tibet, numerous commentaries were written on it by the local Tibetan masters, of which most were Sakyapa or non-Gelugpa. Since the 30ers in the last century the Japanese scholars started to research this text, while the westerners after 40 years. Recently its Sanskrit manuscript has been found in TAR. Up to now there are five source materials: three Chinese translations (two in Tang Dynasty and one in Song Dynasty), a Tibetan translation and that Sanskrit manuscript. In this paper it will be discoursed about the content and construction of this text, the paleography, language, metre and dating of the Sanskrit manuscript, and the difference among the five materials.

1. General remarks

Although the *Dharmadhātustava* (DDhS) has been ascribed to Nāgārjuna,¹ this attribution has been questioned by TSUKINOWA (1934) and SEYFORD RUEGG (1971: 453–54) and rejected by LINDTNER (1982: 10).² Judging from its content, which shows significant influence from the tathāgatagarbha-tradition, the author of the DDhS cannot be the same as that of the *Madhyamakakārikā*. Another possible indication for the non-authenticity of this work is the fact that we do not find any Indian commentaries on it.³

Nevertheless, great significance has been attached to the DDhS in the Indo-Tibetan Tantric tradition. Bhāviveka,⁴ Nāropā,⁵ Ratnākaraśānti, Dharmendra, Atiśa, etc., as well as a large number of Tibetan authors cite stanzas from the DDhS and clearly ascribe authority to it. Upon its introduction into Tibet, numerous commentaries were written on it by the local Tibetan masters, of which most were Sakyapa or non-Gelugpa.⁶

2. Source materials

¹ It has been brought to our attention that Lobsang Dorjee (Sarnath) and Drasko Mitrikeski (Sydney) are also working on the Sanskrit text of the *Dharmadhātustava*.

² In addition to SEYFORD RUEGG 1971, other works investigating the DDhS include: TSUKINOWA 1933, 1934, HAYASHIMA 1987, BRUNNHÖLZL 2007 and MOCHIZUKI 2008. However, since the Skt. text was regarded as lost, it was not taken into account in any of the studies published to date.

³ Cf. BRUNNHÖLZL 2007: 130.

⁴ A quotation is found in the *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa*; cf. BRUNNHÖLZL 2007: 130. According to SEYFORD RUEGG 1990 (59-71) and KRASSER 2011(231, n. 100), the author of this work is the second Bhāviveka, who lived after the sixth-century author of the *Madhyamakahrdayakārikā* and the *Prajñāpradīpamūlamadhyamakavṛtti*. According to ECKEL 2008 (23-27), the *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa*, which can be dated to the later decades of the eighth century or even thereafter, e.g., the eleventh century, is attributed to Bhāviveka.

⁵ In his *Sekoddeśaṭīkā* (*Paramārthasaṃgraha*, SUṬ), six stanzas (18–23) of the DDhS are cited, which provide the only other Sanskrit evidence for the work; the other known quotations are in Tibetan. With the exception of one word in 18d and various scribal slips in the *Sekoddeśaṭīkā* Mss' citations, the Skt. quotations match up almost perfectly with the corresponding verses of the DDhS. Cf. the edition of SUṬ in CARELLI 1941: 66 and SFERRA & MERZAGORA 2006: 188, and the quotation in SEYFORD RUEGG 1971: 466, n. 82.

⁶ Cf. BRUNNHÖLZL 2007: 130-152.

The source materials for this edition are: a Sanskrit Ms found in Tibet, the Tibetan translation by Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita and Nag tsho lo tsā ba Tshul khriṃs rgyal ba⁷ dated to the middle of the eleventh century, and two Chinese translations, one undertaken by 不空金剛 (Amoghavajra) in about A.D. 765⁸ and the other by 施護 (*Dānapāla or *Dānarakṣita) between A.D. 1015 and 1019.⁹

2.1. The Sanskrit manuscript

2.1.1. Description

The present work is based on two pages of black-and-white photocopies of a Ms whose original is kept in the Potala. They show, respectively, the *recto* and *verso* of eight folios as well as a numbering label. This label bears the following information in Chinese and Tibetan: “*’zwa lu*, number 53, number of folios: 8.” This indicates that the Ms came from Żalu, TAR. By means of the label, these eight folios can be identified with a Ms listed in Luo Zhao’s catalogue,¹⁰ namely, the sixth text listed under the Ms “Potala, Tanjur, item no. 8.” Luo Zhao notes: “The Sūtras, *Pañcarakṣāhṛdayabījamañtraḥ* (*sic!*), etc., are in one bundle with a label, ‘Żalu, No. 53, eight folios’. Three folios deal with the *Pañcarakṣāhṛdayabījamañtra*, measuring 30.5 by 4.3 cm, black ink, Dhārikā script, 4–5 lines. The other five folios concern some kind of *stava*, without title, with its beginning and end, measuring 30.5 by 4.4 cm, black ink, Dhārikā script, 5 lines.” This collective Ms is now kept in the CTCRC’s library, Box Nr. 185, item 6.

The five folios of an unnamed *stava*, which are represented as the first five folios on each photocopy, contain nothing other than the DDhS. Contrary to Luo Zhao’s assessment, the last folio of the work is missing.¹¹ His comment, however, that the *Pañcarakṣāhṛdayabījamañtra*, whose *rectos* and *versos* are also found on our copies, is contained in three folios is correct, although he does not mention the additional material contained in them.¹²

It should be noted that the other three folios which have been included with the Ms of the DDhS have been copied by another scribe.¹³ However, the two Mss are almost in the same style, and can both be dated to the same period, namely the beginning of the eleventh century.¹⁴

If we count the six *pādas* missing in the Ms (but found in all translations) from the end of f. 4a and the beginning of f. 4b, the Ms ends at the beginning of *pāda* 86c. As we know that T has a total of 101 verses and approximately eight stanzas occupy one side of the folios of our Sanskrit Ms, the last 15 verses and a possible colophon would have filled one more complete folio.

⁷ Cf. the colophon of T and SEYFORTH RUEGG 1971: 463 and n. 68.

⁸ TSUKINOWA 1934: 425.

⁹ He and two Indian monks led a project to translate 大教王經 (**Sarvatathāgatattvasamgrahasūtra*), during which this later Chinese version of the DDhS must have been made. Cf. TSUKINOWA 1934: 419. It is worth remarking that all these translators of the three translations had a tantric background.

¹⁰ For Luo Zhao’s catalogue, cf. STEINKELLNER 2007: xii, n. 5.

¹¹ It is possible that the seventh Ms listed under the same heading in Luo Zhao’s catalogue is the missing end of the DDhS, but in another form (different size, script, etc.). He states: “Some kind of *stava*, one folio, with a label ‘Żalu, No. 51, one folio’, palm leaf, measuring 26.1 by 4.6 cm, black ink, Gupta script, 6 lines.” If this folio indeed contains the end of the DDhS, it could be a remnant of an earlier copy, of which the preceding five-sixths of the text would have been replaced by the five folios listed as Żalu, No. 53.

¹² Actually, in addition to the *Pañcarakṣāhṛdayabījamañtra*, the three folios bear a colophon, other mantras and a series of verses used in everyday ritual; cf. the diplomatic and critical edition in Appendix 3. The preserved colophon indicates that these three folios were written during Kings Lakṣmīkāmadeva and Rudradeva’s shared reign of Nepal. According to PETECH (1958: 35-39), this must have occurred between A.D. 1008 and 1018.

¹³ Characteristics of this scribe that distinguish him from the one who copied the DDhS: a thicker end of the downward curve in *ru*, *tha* and *dha* sometimes written with closed tops (however less frequently than open tops), *na* and *ra* in a slightly more hooked style, etc.

¹⁴ On the basis of the paleographic analysis and the fact that the eight folios were bundled together, it cannot entirely be ruled out that the colophon (see n. 12) found on the first of these three final folios was intended to belong to both the *Pañcarakṣāhṛdayabījamañtra* and the DDhS.

The metre of the text is *anuṣṭubh* with some *vipulās*.

If some (not strictly speaking) rhyming was intended, it resulted in an awkward imitation of an *alamkāra*, i.e., *yamaka*, for example:

ya eva dhātuḥ saṃsāre śuddhaḥ sa eva nirvāṇe	śodhyamānaḥ sa eva tu dharmakāyaḥ sa eva hi <2> ¹⁵
yathā hi kṣīrasammīśraṃ tathā hi kleśasammīśraṃ	sarpimaṇḍaṃ na dṛśyate dharmadhātuḥ na dṛśyate <3>
yathā viśodhitaṃ kṣīraṃ tathā viśodhitāḥ kleśā	ghṛtadravyaṃ sunirmalam dharmadhātuḥ sunirmalaḥ <4> etc.

2.1.2. Remarks on the text

As usual, there is more correspondence between the words, phrases and sentences of the Skt. and T than the Skt. and Ch. Nevertheless, there are quite a few cases in which one does find a correspondence between the Skt. and Ch that is not evident in T (normally in Ch1, see § 2.3.). In some places there are words or phrases in Skt. which have no correspondence in the parallel texts.

Although within each stanza nearly every word has a parallel in T and Ch, the construction of the sentences in the translations sometimes takes on a new form, with, e.g., shifts in case or number. This can be seen in the following examples:

ya eva dhātuḥ ¹⁶ saṃsāre śuddhaḥ sa eva nirvāṇe	śodhyamānaḥ sa eva tu dharmakāyaḥ sa eva hi <2> ¹⁷
---	---

gañ zig 'khor ba'i rgyur gyur pa | de ñid sbyañ ba byas pa las |
dag pa de ñid mya ñan 'das | chos kyi sku yañ de ñid do || [2]¹⁸

其性即生死 淨時亦復然
清淨是涅槃 亦即是法身 {2}¹⁹

and

buddho hi pariṇirvāti śucir nityaśubhālayaḥ |
kalpayanti dvayaṃ bālā advayaṃ yogināṃ padaṃ || <55>²⁰

gañ phyir sañs rgyas mya ñan 'das | gtsañ ba rtag pa dge ba'i gzi |
gañ phyir gñis ni byis pas brtags | de yi gñis med rnal 'byor gnas | [65]²¹

¹⁵ The stanza numbering of the Skt. text is placed in angled brackets < >, that of T in square brackets [], of Ch1 in braces { } and of Ch2 in round brackets ().

¹⁶ Except for this word, which has no correspondence in either T or Ch1; cf. § 2.3.

¹⁷ “That very element which is in *saṃsāra*, however, is being purified. Purified, it is in *nirvāṇa*, for it is nothing but the Dharmakāya.”

¹⁸ “When that which is the cause of *saṃsāra* has been purified, just that, pure, is *nirvāṇa*, and nothing but the Dharmakāya.” For *dhātu* explained as *hetu*, cf. the passage from the *Ratnagoṭravibhāṅgavyākhyā* cited in ZIMMERMANN 2002: 58ff.

¹⁹ “Its nature is *saṃsāra*, even though it is purified (*sic!*). When it is pure, it is *nirvāṇa*, and also the Dharmakāya indeed.”

²⁰ “For the Buddha enters *pariṇirvāṇa*, pure, with a fundamental basis that is permanent and good. The spiritually immature conceive duality. For *yogins*, there is (only) the non-dual abode.”

²¹ “Since the Buddha enters *pariṇirvāṇa*, (he) is pure, and (his) fundamental basis is permanent and good. Since the spiritually immature conceive duality, the *yogin* has his non-dual abode.”

是佛般涅槃 常恒淨無垢
愚夫二分別 無二瑜伽句 {54}²²

and

daśabhiś ca balair bālas tiṣṭhate bālacandravat |
kleśair malinasattvānām na paśyati tathāgatam | <84>²³

stobs bcu'i stobs kyis byis pa rnam | byin brlabs zla ba tshes pa bzin |
ñon moñs can gyi sems can gyis | de bzin gśegs pa mi mthoñ ño | [51]²⁴

彼彼人現化²⁵ 安住如水月
煩惱攪擾心 不見於如來 {113}²⁶

etc.

If we make an overview of the entire Skt. text, using T as a basis for its missing conclusion, the contents can be divided into several units. These are, briefly:

- 1) the relationship between gnosis (*jñāna*) and defilement (*kleśa*), <1–23>
- 2) emptiness, <24–37>
- 3) the true nature of the six senses and their objects, <38–45>
- 4) the need to relinquish the conception of
 - a. self and <46–50>
 - b. objects, <51–55>[61–65]
- 5) the path <56–63>[66–73]
- 6) a. introduction of the *bhūmis* of the bodhisattva, <64–67>[74–77]
b. the ten *bhūmis* of the bodhisattva, <68–77>[78–87]
- 7) the Dharmakāya, <78–80>[88–90]
- 8) the Nirmāṇakāya for
 - a. the bodhisattvas who have arrived at the *bhūmis* (Buddhaputras), <81–83>[91–93]
 - b. the normal living beings, and the Rūpakāya, <84–86c, *86d–88>[51–55]
- 9) the Sambhogakāya, <*89–93>[56–60]
- 10) the Buddha. <*94–101>[94–101]

This breakdown reveals the logical, thematic structure of the DDhS and its organic development (some verses, however, may be insertions). The author commences by introducing the Dharmadhātu and elucidating how it is obscured by the defilements (*kleśas*); he then proceeds to explain selflessness (*anātman*) – of the Self, sense-objects, indeed of all things –, demonstrating that conceptuality prevents and is not involved in awakening (*bodhi*). Subsequent to this, he expounds the components of the path to liberation, presents the *bhūmis* and finally describes Buddhahood and the Buddha.

²² “This *parinirvāna* of the Buddha is constantly pure and without stain. (For) the spiritually immature, (it is) the conceiving of duality, (but) the non-dual is the verse of the *yogin*.”

²³ “A spiritually immature man remains like the new moon by means of the ten powers. He does not see the *tathāgata* due to the defilements of impure beings.”

²⁴ “The spiritually immature are empowered by the ten powers, like the new moon. The being with defilements does not see the *tathāgata*.”

²⁵ This *pāda* has no correspondence in the other texts. However it is clear that the object of this sentence, which is equivalent to the subject in Skt. and T, is plural as in T, against the singular in Skt.

²⁶ “One after the other, (he) appears before their eyes and tranquilly abides like the moon reflecting on the water. (Since) defilements disturb the heart, (they) don’t see the *tathāgata*.”

It is interesting to note that in all versions, the contents of the first half of the hymn, stanzas 1–50, apart from some omissions, form a fixed and integral text.²⁷ However, from stanza 51 on the order of the stanzas differ in Skt. and T, despite there being a word-for-word correspondence in the individual stanzas' translations. Here, the order found in Ch1 and Ch2 is closer to the Skt., if one disregards some omissions. Stanzas <51–83> of the Skt. correspond to stanzas [61–93] of T. Stanzas <50–51> in the critical edition read as follows:

uktaṃ ca sūtravargeṣu viharety ātmacintakaḥ |
prajñādīpavihāreṇa paramāṃ śāntim āgataḥ || <50>

na bodher dūraṃ saṃjñī syān na sāsannaṃ ca saṃjñīnaḥ |
ṣaṇṇāṃ hi viṣayābhāso yathābhūtaṃ parijñayā || <51>²⁸

These correspond to T [50 and 61], Ch1 {49–50}, Ch2 (49–50):

śes rab mar me la gnas nas | mchog tu źi bar gyur pa yis |
bdag la brtags pas gnas bya źes | mdo sde 'i tshogs las gsuṅs pa lags | [50]

byañ chub riñ bar mi bsam źiñ | ñe bar yañ ni bsam mi bya |
yul drug snañ ba med par ni | yañ dag ji bźin rig gyur pa'o | [61]

說於眾契經 住於自思惟
照以智慧燈 即得最勝寂 {49}

菩提不遠想 亦無隣近想
是六境影像 皆由如是知 {50}

煩惱籠迷執 世尊經所宣
智生感染滅 妄執勿相纏 (49)

去來執最勝 體空猶可思
菩提非妄執 正證亦知非 (50)

From Skt. stanza <84>, once again the stanza order is no longer the same in the four texts under consideration. Stanzas <83–84> read as follows:

anekaratnapattrābhaṃ lakṣaṇaṃ jvalakalpikam |
anekaiḥ padmakotībhiḥ samantāt parivāritaḥ || <83>²⁹

²⁷ However, Atiśa's *Dharmadhātudarśanaḡī* quotes ca. 20 stanzas from the first 32 stanzas of the DDhS in a different order, which is difficult to explain. Cf. SEYFORTH RUEGG 1971: p. 471 and n. 119.

²⁸ “And, it has been said in the group of Sūtras: ‘He remains focused on himself. Through abiding in the lamp of wisdom, he reaches the supreme peace.’ One who is aware is not far from (the state of) awakening; nor is that (awakening) close to the one who is aware. For with the knowledge that is in accord with reality there is (only) a false appearance of the six (sense) objects.”

²⁹ “It is characterized by the light of its many jewel petals, which has flame as the proper thing. It is surrounded by many millions of lotuses on all sides.” I don't understand what *jvalakalpika* means.

op.cit. <84>

These correspond to T [93, 51], Ch1 {82, 113} and Ch2 (75, 83).³⁰

'dab ma rin chen du ma'i 'od | 'dod par bya ba'i ze'u 'bru can |
pad ma bye ba du ma yis | rnam pa kun tu yoñs su bskor | [93]

無量寶葉光 寶光明為臺
無量億蓮花 普遍為眷屬 {82}

大寶花王座 俱胝眾妙成
莊嚴皆普遍 功德實難思 (75)

曉了塵沙界 根隨染久無
二空殊勝智 妙用化童愚 (83)³¹

On the basis of this comparison of the stanzas, it might be possible to conclude that these units, if in fact they were even recognized as units, were freely selected and combined with one another at the will of the compilers. Since the order and number of stanzas in the various texts is not identical, the meaning of the text varies correspondingly in the different versions.

Indisputably, since there are many variations between the different texts of the DDhS due to their different transmission backgrounds,³² a comparison of sentences and contexts would be less fruitful than one confined to words and short phrases. Thus the critical apparatus operates solely with deviations from the Skt. of words and short phrases, viz., small units of words.

2.2. Tibetan translation

The following Tibetan translations of the DDhS have been used in the critical edition. The location in each canonical version is as follows:

Co ne (C): ka, fol. 72a7–76b4
sDe dge (D): ka, fol. 63b5–67b3
dGa' ldan (Golden Ms Edition, G): ka, fol. 90b1–96a1
sNar thang (N): ka, fol. 70a3–74b3
Peking (Qianlong, P): ka, fol. 73a7–77a8

As mentioned above, Skt. and T correspond more than Skt. and Ch, although this is not consistently the case. There are also instances where the Skt. only corresponds to the Ch (see § 3.2.), T corresponds only to Ch (see § 2.1.2.), or T does not correspond to any other text (see § 2.1.2.).

Seyfort Ruegg (1971: notes on pp. 464–471) points out many variant readings in D against the other editions.³³ When compared with the Skt. text, these distinctive readings in D often

³⁰ [51] and {113}, *op.cit.*

³¹ It is doubtful whether this stanza really corresponds to stanza 84 in the Skt. text.

³² For examples of various Skt. Mss. and T, cf. MACDONALD 2005: xxxiii–xxxvi and STEINKELLNER 2007: xxxvii–xliv.

³³ Neither the Skt. Ms nor G was available to him.

seem more reliable, i.e., are closer to the Skt., than the reading shared by the remaining four editions.

As compared to the Skt. text, the second *pāda* of stanza [33] is missing in T. In CGNP, a *pāda* has been added between stanzas [91] and [92], perhaps in order to bring the total number of *pādas* into balance. This added *pāda* is merely a repetition of the third *pāda* of [92]. In D, this odd *pāda* is absent, although it also lacks the *pāda* of [33].³⁴

More noteworthy is the shift of a block of ten stanzas in T. As has been described above, the stanzas <51–83> of the Skt. text correspond to [61–93] of T, although from the beginning to stanza [50], T parallels the Skt. text stanza for stanza. The stanzas [51–60] correspond to <84–86c> (and presumably the following stanzas) of the Skt.³⁵

To explain this variation, there are three hypotheses:

1. The Tibetan translators revised the text during translation, finding their order more suitable with regard to the context than the original one. The stanzas [51–60] (which would correspond to <84–*93> in the Skt. text) are related to three *kāyas* of the Buddha. The first *kāya*, namely Dharmakāya, the Nirmāṇakāya for the Bodhisattvas, and the Buddha, which are involved with Buddhahood, are then consecutively described in [88–93] and [94–101], without the interruption as found in the Skt. While the insertion of the topic of the three *kāyas* of the Buddha between 3) “the nature of the six senses” and 4) “the practice” is not particularly reasonable, it seems logical to want to connect the two parts concerning the Dharmakāya etc.

2. The translators jumped when reading their Skt. exemplar, overlooking ten stanzas, namely <84–*93>. Like the first *pāda* in <84>, *daśabhiḥ ca balair bālas*,³⁶ the Sanskrit for the first *pāda* in [94], *stobs bcu po yis yoṅs su gaṅ*, quite possibly also began with *daśabhiḥ* and was followed closely by *balaiḥ*, which may have led to the eye-skip. When discovered, the forgotten stanzas were inserted into the text at an earlier point, namely following stanza [50].

3. The Skt. exemplar used by the Tibetan translators presented the verse order as now found in T. However, since both Chinese translations confirm the stanza order of our Skt. text, their Skt. text may have had an error, i.e., the Tibetan translators had a Skt. Ms that already had the verses either inserted in the wrong place or written around the margins or on an extra folio. This would mean that a Skt. scribe committed the eye-skip, as described in the second hypothesis, and that the translators had to deal with his ten added stanzas.

There are nevertheless sufficient reasons to use D as the basic text for the critical edition of the Tibetan translation.³⁷ However, if a reading in the other version(s) has been found to be closer to the Skt. than that in D, and thus is more reliable, this is then the reading that has been chosen.³⁸ In stanzas [56–60] as well as the preface and colophon, for which there is no Skt. or Ch parallel text available, the T edition follows D if there is no clear contradiction with regard to context or grammar; otherwise the common mode of textual criticism is followed, e.g., *'phags pa 'jam dpal g'zon nur gyur pa* D instead of *'jam dpal g'zon nur gyur pa* CGNP in the preface, but *'phags pa klu sgrub* CGNP instead of *chen po klu sgrub* D in the colophon. In the critical apparatus of T, variations in punctuation or abbreviated forms, like *ñido*, *yoṅsu*, etc., which mostly occur in G and N, have not been taken into account.

2.3. Chinese translations

³⁴ This has been noted in SEYFORTH RUEGG (1971: 471 and n. 117) and HAYASHIMA (1987: 44); Seyforth Ruegg, however, considers the proper position of the additional *pāda* to be stanza [99].

³⁵ Due to the missing final folio of the Skt. text, it is not certain whether the Skt. would have corresponded to all ten stanzas of T.

³⁶ *stobs bcu'i stobs kyis byis pa rnam* (T).

³⁷ As shown above, it can be seen that D is the closest to the Skt. original.

³⁸ Where no Skt. correspondence is found, a comparison with Ch has been made, e.g. *des* CGNP instead of *te* D [96c] for 以 {85a}.

The earlier Chinese translation (henceforth: Ch1) is found in Taishō 413, and the later (henceforth: Ch2) in Taishō 1675.³⁹ The title of Ch1 reads 百千頌大集經地藏菩薩請問法身讚 (**Śatasahasragāthāmahāsaṃnipātasūtrakṣitigarbhaparipṛcchādharmakāyastava*), “Praise of the Dharmakāya, which is asked by Kṣitigarbha Bodhisattva, from the Sūtra of *Mahāsaṃnipāta* in the hundred-thousand Hymns”. Here, neither a relationship with the topic of the Dharmadhātu, nor the author Nāgārjuna is indicated. In the eighth century, this text was regarded as an appendix to the *Samnipātasūtra* and was attributed to Kṣitigarbha.

Ch1 is a direct translation of the DDhS and in its entirety contains 125 four-*pāda* stanzas. While in the first 124 stanzas each *pāda* has five syllables, which is normally regarded as an apt reflection of the Skt. metre *anuṣṭubh*,⁴⁰ each *pāda* in the final stanza has seven syllables, which might correspond to the Skt. metre *triṣṭubh*. Verses {1–82} match stanzas <1–83> of the Skt. text very well, except that stanza <20> in the latter finds no equivalent in Ch1. Naturally there are here, too, a handful of variations in the wording.⁴¹ It seems that stanzas {83–90} of Ch1 would be equivalent to 94–101 of the Skt. text. Surprisingly, some of the same portion of the text that does not correspond in position to the Skt. and T (i.e., [51–60]) is again not in the expected position in Ch1. However, contrary to T, these stanzas (in this case five: {113–115 and 120, 122}) have been placed at the end, i.e., {113–115} correspond to <51–53>; {120} corresponds to T [54], and {122} to T [55]. Stanzas {91–121, 123–124}⁴² deal with the *Nirmāṇakāya*, which also here can be divided into two parts. The first twelve stanzas {91–112} describe the *Nirmāṇakāya* from the side of the Buddhas; the latter eleven {113–121, 123–124} describe the *Nirmāṇakāya* in the eyes of ordinary beings. In addition, 22 stanzas, {91–112}, reveal Tantric characteristics and find no parallel among other three texts.⁴³ The last stanza {125} describes the spreading of this doctrine.

Ch2 bears the title 贊法界頌 (**Dharmadhātustava* or *Dharmadhātustotra*). It is a less satisfactory translation,⁴⁴ and contains only 87 four-*pāda* stanzas. It is clear that many stanzas of the Skt. text are missing, while at least six stanzas⁴⁵ find no correspondence in any other version and the correspondence of more than ten stanzas is unclear. In any case, stanzas (1–75) can be recognized as a translation of stanzas <1–83> of the Skt. text, in the same order. Thus, Ch2 corresponds until verse (75) to both Ch1 and the Skt. text. The next four stanzas, (76–79), may have corresponded to *94–101 of the Skt. text. Then follow the stanzas (80–86) on the *Nirmāṇakāya* and *Sambhogakāya*, which correspond to stanzas <85–86c> and possibly *86d–92 of the Skt. text. The concluding stanza deals with the spreading of the work.

There is some vocabulary in the Skt. text that corresponds only to words found in Ch1.

In addition to these two Chinese translations, there exists another translation, whose authority is however doubtful.⁴⁶ It is the second 品 (*varga*) called 地藏菩薩讚歎法身觀行品 (**Kṣitigarbhadharmakāyastavasamṣkāraparīkṣāvarga*), “The Chapter of Investigation on Predispositions, in which Kṣitigarbha Bodhisattva praises Dharmakāya”, in a Sūtra called 示所

³⁹ Ch2 has long been recognized as a Chinese translation of the DDhS; see, e.g., SEYFORTH RUEGG 1971: 463. In 1933, Tsukinowa discovered that Ch1 was an earlier Chinese translation, but not all scholars took note; it has been mentioned in HAYASHIMA (1987) and BRUNNHÖLZL (2007: 113). Like TSUKINOWA (1933), HAYASHIMA (1987) also provides a detailed comparison of T, Ch1 and Ch2; however, Hayashima does not take advantage of this comparison or of the critical apparatus in the Taishō edition to improve certain readings in the main text of Ch1.

⁴⁰ For the term 五言四句, see Taishō 2059, 415b.

⁴¹ Cf. the notes in the translation below.

⁴² Stanza {122} deals with the *Rūpakāya*, cf. the breakdown in §2.1.2.

⁴³ Cf. TSUKINOWA 1933: 540ff. Tsukinowa believed, therefore, that this part must have been added even after the establishment of the common content of DDhS, and that Ch1’s entire text would stand after that of T and Ch2 in the transmission line, cf. *ibid.*, p. 425ff.

⁴⁴ On the quality of translations during the Song Dynasty, see SEN 2002: 27–80.

⁴⁵ Stanzas (14, 28, 33, 37, 80, 86).

⁴⁶ It is identified by TSUKINOWA (1934: 46ff.).

犯者瑜伽法鏡經, “Sūtra of Yogadharma Mirror, showing those who offended (Discipline)”, in Taishō 2896. Recorded in a Buddhist canon register from A.D. 730, it has already been acknowledged as an Apocrypha,⁴⁷ and was therefore probably regarded as lost. This Sūtra is only preserved in the form of a fragment found in Dunhuang,⁴⁸ in which its first *varga* and most of the second *varga* is no longer available. According to its colophon, this Sūtra was translated into Chinese by 室利末多 (*Śrīmadda) in A.D. 707. If we can rely on this dating, then it seems possible that this *varga* may be neither an invention nor a re-composition based on Ch1, a Chinese translation which was finished more than 50 years later than this text, but indeed the earliest translation of the DDhS.⁴⁹

This second *varga* (henceforth: ChX) contains only 31 four-*pāda* stanzas, in which each *pāda* has seven syllables, and a final paragraph in prose, but no indication regarding the original total number of stanzas⁵⁰ has come down to us. Most of these stanzas approximately correspond to {90-125} of Ch1 in wording and order, while stanzas x+22-24 correspond to <84-86> in Skt. and [51-53] in T, and x+1 and x+29 to [101] and [54] in T too. Nevertheless eight stanzas, {98-102} and {122-124}, have no correspondence in ChX, whereas three stanzas, x+2, 8, 14, do not find a match in any other texts.⁵¹ When we compare the stanzas with those of other texts, especially x+22-24 with {113-115} and <84-86> as follows, we can see that ChX is a more paraphrastic and literary translation than Ch1.⁵²

隨諸眾生示神變 猶如明月水中現
邪智生盲惡眾生 佛對面前而不現 x+22

譬如餓鬼臨大海 盡見海水皆枯竭
如是薄德惡眾生 口常說言無有佛 x+23

此等薄德有情類 諸佛如來不能救
譬如生盲無目人 明珠對前而不見 x+24⁵³

op.cit. {113}

如餓鬼於海 普遍見枯竭
如是少福者 無佛作分別 {114}

有情少福者 如來云何作

⁴⁷ In 開元釋教錄, “Register of the Buddhist [Canon] in the Kaiyuan Era”, cf. Taishō 2154, 627b29-c12. However, it is not definitively stated there that the second *varga* itself is either a rewriting of an old Sūtra or an apocryphal one at all, cf. TSUKINOWA 1934: 49.

⁴⁸ For its preservation, cf. YABUKI 1927: 23(232).

⁴⁹ Its content also appears to support this assumption, cf. below.

⁵⁰ For the numbering of these stanzas “x+1”, “x+2” and so forth are used by the text edition in Appendix II.

⁵¹ To explain these variations further research is required.

⁵² Seven Chinese syllables for one *pāda* seems to be too many if we assume that the hymn part in the Skt. exemplar of ChX was also written in *anuṣṭubh* metre; cf. n. 40.

⁵³ “He demonstrates his supernatural power according to (the merit of) each being (respectively), like the moon reflected on the water (surface). For those evil beings who have deviant intelligence and are born blind, the Buddha will not appear (even) in front of them. Like the ghosts in front of ocean only see that it becomes dry everywhere, such evil beings, whose merit is inferior, often say ‘the Buddha doesn’t exist’. All the *tathāgata* Buddhas can not rescue such sentient beings, whose virtue is meager, like a man who is born blind without eyes and cannot see the bright pearl in front of him.”

如於生盲手

安以最勝寶 {115}⁵⁴

op.cit. <84>

yadā pretāḥ samantāt tu
tathaivājñānadagdhānām

śuṣkaṃ paśyanti sāgaram |
buddho nāstīti kalpanā || <85>

sattvānām alpapunyānām
jātya xx --x

bhagavān kiṃ kariṣyati |
xxxx - x || <86>⁵⁵

We are therefore convinced that ChX represents an independent translation from a Skt. manuscript in the DDhS transmission lineage. Finally, according to ChX's prose part, the whole hymn is placed in the mouth of Kṣitigarbha, whose name appears in the title of ChX and Ch1. Hence it is obvious that before the middle of the eighth century it was not thought that Nāgārjuna authored the text.

3. Conclusion

Thus, we see that through the long textual transmission of the *Dharmadhātustava*, the major textual constituent has been stanzas 1–83, with the insertion of the Nirmāṇa- and Sambhogakāya descriptions of T [51–60] an anomaly. The presumed positioning of these, <84–86c> and *86d–93, in the Skt. text, between the two parts of the Dharmakāya description, is a special case too, since in the other three versions, [94–101], {83–90}, (76–79), the description of the Dharmakāya is found as an integral section.

The core of this text already existed in the eighth century, albeit with another title. It spread widely, as the Sūtra was affiliated with Tantrism together with texts traditionally associated with Nāgārjuna. Only after the end of the eighth century or even in the eleventh century was the hymn ascribed to Nāgārjuna and given the title *Dharmadhātustava*. At this time it appears to have been shortened. Revisions occurred during its translation and transmission in the respective importing lands. The order in Ch2 is 1–6, 9 and 7–8, viz., the most ideal transmission in spite of its translation. The order in the second part of the Skt. text is not reasonable and has no echo in other versions. The order in T is 1–3, 7–8, 4–6 and 9. It might have been the same as in Ch2 if the translators/redactors had not misread the text.

Abbreviations

AAS	Austrian Academy of Sciences
C	Co ne bsTan 'gyur: Electronic Edition from Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center (TBRC)
cf.	confer
Ch	Chinese or Chinese text
Ch1	first Chinese translation of DDhS, Taishō 413
Ch2	second Chinese translation of DDhS, Taishō 1675

⁵⁴ Like the ghosts on the shore, who see that it becomes dry everywhere, such ones, whose merit is inferior, have the idea 'the Buddha doesn't exist'. For the sentient beings, whose merit is inferior, what will the *tathāgata* do? In the same way one puts the supreme of jewels in the hand of a man who is born blind."

⁵⁵ "Just in the same way as when the pretas see the ocean as dry all around, do those burned by ignorance have the idea 'the Buddha doesn't exist'. What will the Blessed One do for beings with little merit? It is as if one puts the best of jewels in the hand of a man who is born blind." The translation for *pāda* c and d in <86> has been done based on T.

CTRC	China Tibetology Research Center
D	sDe dge bsTan 'gyur: Electronic edition from the TBRC
DDhS	<i>Dharmadhātustava</i>
G	dGa' ldan bsTan 'gyur, Golden Mss Edition: Electronic edition from the TBRC
N	sNar thang bsTan 'gyur: Electronic edition from the TBRC
<i>op.cit.</i>	<i>opere citato</i>
P	(Qianlong) Peking bsTan 'gyur: <i>The Tibetan Tripitaka. Peking Edition</i> , Otani University, Kyoto, ed. by Suzuki Daisetz T., Kyoto 1955–61.
Skt.	Sanskrit or Sanskrit text
SSTAR	Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region
SUṬ	<i>Sekoddeśaṭīkā</i> of Nāropā
T	Tibetan or Tibetan text
TBRC	Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center Library <www.tbrc.org>
Taishō	<i>Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō</i> , 100 vols., Tokyo, 1924–
TAR	Tibetan Autonomous Region

Bibliography

BRUNNHÖLZL 2007,

KARL BRUNNHÖLZL, *In Praise of Dharmadhātu. Nāgārjuna and the Third Karmapa, Rangjung Dorje*. Ithaca: Snow Lion Publication 2007.

CARELLI 1941

MARIO E. CARELLI, *Sekoddeśaṭīkā of Naḍapāda (Nāropā), Being a commentary of the Sekkoddeśa Section of the Kālacakra Tantra, The Sanskrit Text edited for the first time with an introduction in English*. B. Bhattacharyya et al. (eds), Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. XC. Baroda: Oriental Institute 1941.

CHOU 1945

CHOU YILIANG, Tantrism in China. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, vol. 8, March, 1945, Numbers 3 and 4.

ECKEL 2008

MALCOLM DAVID ECKEL, *Bhāviveka and his Opponents*. Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 70. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press 2008.

HAYASHIMA 1987

OSAMU HAYASHIMA, Sanhokkaijuko. *Nagasakidaigaku Kyōikugakubu Shakaikagakuronsō*, Nr. 36, 1987, 41-90.

KRASSER 2011

HELMUT KRASSER, Bhāviveka, Dharmakīrti and Kumārila. In: , 193–241.

LINDTNER 1982,

CHRISTIAN LINDTNER, *Nagarjuniana. Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nāgārjuna*. Indiske Studier IV. Copenhagen.

MACDONALD 2005

ANNE MACDONALD, Manuscript Description. In: *Jinendrabuddhi's Viśālāmalavatī Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā*, Chapter 1. Part II, ix–xxxvi.

MOCHIZUKI 1931-37

SHINKŌ MOCHIZUKI, *Bukkyō daijiten (望月佛教大辭典)*, 6 vols., Tokyo 1931-37.

MOCHIZUKI 2008

KAIGYOKU MOCHIZUKI, Dol po pa wa Dharmadhātustava o. *The Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, 85–91.

PETECH 1958

- LUCIANO PETECH, *Mediaeval History of Nepal (c. 750-1480)*. Serie Orientale Roma X. Materials for the Study of Nepalese History and Culture 3. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente 1958.
- SEN 2002,
TANSEN SEN, the Revival and Failure of Buddhist Translations during the Song Dynasty. *T'oung Pao*, Second Series, vol. 88, Fasc. 1/3. Leiden, 27–80.
- SEYFORTH RUEGG
DAVID SEYFORTH RUEGG, *Le Dharmadhātustava de Nāgārjuna. Etudes Tibétaines. Dédiées à la Mémoire de Marcelle Lalou*. Paris: 1971, 448-471.
- SEYFORTH RUEGG 1990
DAVID SEYFORTH RUEGG, On the authorship of some works ascribed to Bhāvaviveka/Bhavya. In: D. Seyforth Ruegg & L. Schmithausen (eds), *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka*. J. Bronkhorst (ed), *Panels of the VIIth World Sanskrit Conference, Kern Institute, Leiden: August 23-29, 1987, vol. II, Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka*. Leiden: Brill 1990, 59-71.
- SFERRA & MERZAGORA 2006
FRANCESCO SFERRA & STEFANIA MERZAGORA, *The Sekoddeśaṭīkā by Nāropā (Paramārthasaṃgraha)*. Serie Orientale Roma XCIX. Roma: Istituto Italiano per l’Africa e l’Oriente 2006.
- STEINKELLNER 2007
ERNST STEINKELLNER, *Dharmakīrti’s Pramānaviniścaya, Chapter 1 and 2: Critically edited by Ernst Steinkellner*. (STTAR 2) Beijing-Vienna: CTCRC-AAS 2007.
- TSUKINOWA 1933
KENYO TSUKINOWA, 竜樹菩薩の讚法界頌と百千頌大集經地藏菩薩請問法身贊と，西藏文の“Dharmadhātustotra”とに就て，竜谷学報 Nos. 306, 419-444, Nos. 307: 516-543.
- TSUKINOWA 1934
KENYO TSUKINOWA, 法界讚内容考，竜谷学報 Nos. 308, 29-51.
- YABUKI 1927
KEIKI YABUKI, *Sangaikyō no kenkyū* (三階教之研究), Tokyo: 岩波书店 1927.
- ZIMMERNANN 2002
MICHAEL ZIMMERMANN, *A Buddha Within: The Tathāgatagarbhasūtra. The Earliest Exposition of the Buddha-Nature Teaching in India*. Hiroshi Kanno (ed), *Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica*, vol. VI. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University 2002.