

MODERN GREEK STUDIES
(AUSTRALIA & NEW ZEALAND)

Volume 14, 2010

A Journal for Greek Letters

*Pages on the Crisis of Representation:
Nostalgia for Being Otherwise*

CONTENTS

SECTION ONE

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|----|
| Joy Damousi | Ethnicity and Emotions: Psychic Life in Greek Communities | 7 |
| Gail Holst-Warhaft | National Steps: Can You Be Greek If You Can't Dance a <i>Zebekiko</i> ? | 26 |
| Despina Michael | Μαύρη Γάτα: The Tragic Death and Long After-life of Anestis Delias | 44 |
| Shé M. Hawke | The Ship Goes Both Ways: Cross-cultural Writing by Joy Damousi, Antigone Kefala, Eleni Nickas and Beverley Farmer | 75 |
| Peter Morgan | The Wrong Side of History: Albania's Greco-Illyrian Heritage in Ismail Kadare's <i>Aeschylus or the Great Loser</i> | 92 |

SECTION TWO

| | | |
|----------------------------|--|-----|
| Anthony Dracopoulos | The Poetics of Analogy: On Polysemy in Cavafy's Early Poetry | 113 |
| Panayota Nazou | Weddings by Proxy: A Cross-cultural Study of the Proxy-Wedding Phenomenon in Three Films | 127 |
| Michael Tsianikas | Τρεμολογία/Tremology | 144 |

SECTION THREE

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|-----|
| Christos A. Terezis | Aspects of Proclus' Interpretation on the Theory of the Platonic Forms | 170 |
| Drasko Mitrikeski | Nāgārjuna's <i>Stutyatātastava</i> and <i>Catupstava</i> : Questions of Authenticity | 181 |

| | | |
|---|--|-----|
| Vassilis Adrahtas and Paraskevi Triantafyllopoulou | Religion and National/Ethnic Identity in Modern Greek Society: A Study of Syncretism | 195 |
| David Close | Divided Attitudes to Gypsies in Greece | 207 |
| Bronwyn Winter | Women and the ‘Turkish Paradox’: What The Headscarf is Covering Up | 216 |
| George Kanarakis | Immigration With a Difference: Greek Adventures in the South-Pacific Rim | 239 |
| Vrasidas Karalis | The Socialist Era in Greece (1981-1989) or the Irrational in Power | 254 |
| Steve Georgakis and Richard Light | Football and Culture in the Antipodes: The Rise and Consolidation of Greek Culture and Society | 271 |
| Ahmad Shboul | Greek destinies among Arabs: <i>Rumi</i> Muslims in Arab-Islamic civilization | 287 |
| Elizabeth Kefallinos | ‘Mothers From the Edge’: Generation, Identity and Gender in Cultural Memory | 305 |
| | BRIEF NOTE ON CONTRIBUTORS | 321 |

Drasko Mitrikeski
The University of Sydney

NĀGĀRJUNA'S *STUTYATĀTASTAVA* AND *CATUṢTAVA*:
QUESTIONS OF AUTHENTICITY

INTRODUCTION

It is a peculiar fact that the interest in the *Stutyatāstava* and other hymns traditionally attributed to Nāgārjuna but not included in the so-called '*Catupstava*' has all but dried up.¹ All scholarly inquiry has focussed on the question 'Which four hymns comprise the collection called '*Catupstava*' ('*Four Hymns*')?' The idea that the *Stutyatāstava* was one of the four initially brought it scholarly attention but when it was decided that the hymn was not part of the *Catupstava*, interest in it all but disappeared. Two aspects of this are strange: First, no one has offered any evidence that would dispute the authenticity of this hymn. Second, the question of which hymns comprise the *Catupstava* seems to be linked to further misconceptions: a) Nāgārjuna himself placed four of his hymns into the collection, b) if a hymn belongs to the collection it is necessary authentic, and, c) that these four are either totalling or, at least, quintessential of Nāgārjuna's hymns.

This paper will review the evidence regarding the *Catupstava* and argue that the question of its make up does not involve Nāgārjuna but only his later commentators. Furthermore, the paper will demonstrate that the answer to that question does not help in deciding the authenticity of those hymns or any others. The paper will also discuss the authenticity of the *Stutyatāstava* and argue that its acceptance as genuine hymn of Nāgārjuna is warranted.

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE QUESTION:
WHICH HYMNS COMPOSE THE *CATUṢTAVA*?

From early in the twentieth century, scholars have been aware of several traditional commentators quoting verses from individual hymns attributed to Nāgārjuna and

referring to a collection called ‘*Catupstava*.’ Of the earliest references, Candrakārti, in his *Prassanapadā* and *Madhyamakāvātāra* ascribes *Nirauṇḍamyastava* and *Lokātātastava* to the master Nāgārjuna. Prajñākaramati does the same in his *Pañjikā* but also ascribes *Acintyastava*. Early twentieth century scholars of Madhyamaka accepted *Nirauṇḍamyā* and *Lokātāta* but debated about the remaining two. So, Louis de La Vallée Poussin (1913) included *Cittavajra* and *Paramārtha* – an opinion accepted by Giuseppe Tucci (1932:311). Prabhūbai Patel (1932), however, accepted *Stutyatāta* and *Acintya*. In 1956, Tucci published a Sanskrit edition of a manuscript containing the *Mahāyānaviṣṭikā*, a work which in the colophon is said to be the *Catupstavāsamāsārtha*, a commentary to the four hymns attributed to the great ācārya Nāgārjuna. The manuscript was incomplete; the commentary on the first *stava* was missing. It did have an almost complete commentary² of the remaining three hymns which were: *Nirauṇḍamyastava*, *Acintyastava* and *Paramārthastava*. The manuscript contained no reference to the name of the first hymn but, since both Candrakārti and Prajñākaramati included *Lokātātastava*, Tucci accepted that hymn as the first in the set. With that, for the first time, the set of four was determined: *Lokātātastava*, *Nirauṇḍamyastava*, *Acintyastava* and *Paramārthastava*. Etienne Lamotte, who objected the conclusion, opted for La Vallée Poussin’s version. The matter remained open for debate until 1982 when Christian Lindtner provided convincing reasons for accepting Tucci’s determination. Lindtner found four manuscripts containing the same four individual hymns which coincides with the testimony given by the *Catupstavāsamāsārtha*. He also claimed that precisely those four hymns were quoted by Bhāvaviveka, Candrakārti and òntarakūita, and also by several less-known Indian authors (Lindtner, 1982:121-122). Since then, there has been no discussion on the issue and scholars have never returned to studying the *Stutyatātastava*. Other hymns attributed to Nāgārjuna were also ignored.

ON THE FACE OF THE EVIDENCE

We do not disagree with Lindtner about the composition of a collection called the ‘*Catupstava*’ but feel that his evidence can only prove that, from a certain point in time, in some circles there was a collection of these four hymns attributed to Nāgārjuna. However, that does not mean that Nāgārjuna composed only four hymns or that he personally included the above-listed four in one group called ‘*Catupstava*.’ There seems to be several reasons to the contrary.

Candrakārti, in the *Madhyamaka-āstrastuti*,³ stanza 10, in the list of treatises ascribed to the master Nāgārjuna, includes one entitled *SaĪstuti* (*bstod pa* in Tibetan translation). As Tola and Dragonetti (1985:1) explain, this is a generic term to designate the hymns (*stava*, *stotra*). However, Candrakārti gives no reference to four hymns.

The Tibetan canon preserves eighteen hymns attributed to Nāgārjuna, collectively known as the hymnic corpus (*bstod chogs*, as opposed to the *rigs chogs* or scholastic corpus). But, the Tibetan canon makes no reference to *Catupstava*. It is not very likely that, if Nāgārjuna really grouped four hymns, the Tibetan translators would not have known of it or would have broken it up.

In 1932 Tucci published editions of two of the four hymns – *Nirauṣṭyastava* and *Paramārthastava* – which he found independently and found no reference to the other two or to *Catupstava*.

In their article on the four hymns, Tola and Dragonetti (1985:2) refer to the personal letter by Lindtner from 1984 who kindly informs them that none of the manuscripts in his possession containing the four hymns speaks of *Catupstava* as a whole.

According to Lindtner, the collection of four hymns is referred to by name *Catupstava* for the first time by Vairocanarakūita in his *Bodhisattvacaryāvatārapaṣjika*. He further notes that Prajṣākaramati in his *Bodhicaryāvatārapaṣjika* also refers to *Catupstava* (Lindtner, 1982:121, n.144). Lindtner places Prajṣākaramati in the eleventh century CE which is slightly later than Ruegg who has Prajṣākaramati flourishing c. 950-1000 and Vairocanakūita in the eleventh century (Ruegg, 1981:116). Be that as it may, the first datable reference to *Catupstava* is from the tenth or eleventh century. Furthermore, a work titled *Catupstavasamāsārtha* is attributed to certain Amṣṭākara⁴ of whom nothing is known but who, according to de Jong (1972:12), lived much later than Candrakārti (seventh century CE). It could well be that Amṣṭākara lived before Prajṣākaramati but at the moment we cannot prove such a hypothesis since the manuscript found by Tucci is of more recent date. Hence, the earliest references to *Catupstava* cannot be dated earlier than the tenth century.

Lindtner claims that the four hymns composing *Catupstava* are precisely those quoted by early commentators such as Bhāvaviveka, Candrakārti and øāntarakūita. Two points must be made here. To begin with, the *Paramārthastava* has not been quoted by early commentators such as Buddhapālita, Bhāvaviveka or Candrakārti.⁵ The *Acintyastava* has been only quoted in the *Madhyamakaratnapradāpa*, a work

attributed to Bhāvaviveka, which is for Paul Williams another indication of the later date of composition of this hymn.⁶

Other hymns have also been quoted by early commentators and attributed to Nāgārjuna. To take just one example, the *Dharmadhātustava* (which doctrinally does not go any further than *Nirauṣamyastava*, verses 21-23) has been quoted by Bhāvaviveka (Lindtner, 1982:17, n.46). Hence, it is not evident that all hymns of the *Catupstava* have been quoted by early commentators of Nāgārjuna. Thus, it is not proven that they are all of early origin, much less that they are authentic. Even if they have been quoted, that does not prove that there were no other hymns also quoted and attributed to the master.

Amṣṭākara's *Catupstavasamāsārtha*, the only existing commentary on *Catupstava*, places the four hymns in the context of the path of the Bodhisattva through ten grounds (*bhūmi*) of perfection where the *Lokātātastava* corresponds to achieving the seventh ground, the *Nirauṣamyastava* to the eight, the *Acintyastava* to the ninth and the *Paramārthastava* to the tenth ground. Obviously, Amṣṭākara has the *Daiṅab-hūmikasūtra* as a model and he frequently quotes it. There are many objections one could address to Amṣṭākara's approach but for the purposes of the present discussion it is sufficient to limit ourselves to few observations about the style. If the hymns make an organic unit with one underlying message, they would have been written within the short period of time (while the author carried the unifying idea) and they would have close similarities in style. However, the four hymns have significant differences in style. For example, 17.8% of the lines in *Lokātātastava* and 14.7% in *Nirauṣamyastava* contain some kind of *vipulā*. The number matches closely to that in *Mūlamadhyamakārikā* (18%) and in *Ratnāvalā* (14.9%).⁷ However, in *Acintyastava*, out of 118 lines we find only 3 where there is any kind of *vipulā*. This is approximately 2.5%, while *Paramārthastava* is perfect *stotra kāvya* with no *vipulā* at all. This difference alone is not strong enough to question the authenticity of the hymns but it does raise significant doubts that *Acintyastava* and *Paramārthastava* have been written at the same time as *Lokātātastava* and *Nirauṣamyastava*. If Nāgārjuna had a collection in mind, it is unlikely that he would have offered the public the first two hymns separately. And, even if we accept that after he wrote *Lokātātastava* and *Nirauṣamyastava* his competence in poetic expression improved dramatically, it is only to be expected that he would have polished the metre in the first two and made the whole set uniform. The fact that there are these significant differences in style, along with the different specific doctrinal features in each of the hymns,⁸ seem sufficient reason to conclude that they are not an organic unit.

After examining the evidence we are left with the following alternatives: either Nāgārjuna composed a work titled '*Catupstava*' containing our four hymns but part of the tradition lost the count; or, at some time before Prajñākaramati and/or Amṣṭākara (that is, before the tenth century) our four hymns were arranged together and became known as '*Catupstava*.'⁹ If the second is correct, the evidence outlined above suggests that it is, then the question 'Which four hymns compose the *Catupstava*?' is not a question directly concerning Nāgārjuna. In that sense, Lindtner's evidence that there was a collection of four hymns including *Lokātāstava*, *Nirupamyastava*, *Acintyastava* and *Paramārthastava*, existent at the time of Amṣṭākara/Prajñākaramati (and probably only in their circles) is convincing, but it does not and cannot prove that there were no other hymns composed by Nāgārjuna circulating independently, and it does not and cannot prove that Nāgārjuna grouped four of his hymns in a collection now known as *Catupstava*.

In light of the above it now seems that there is no obvious advantage of studying the four hymns composing the *Catupstava* for a better understanding of Nāgārjuna through the study of his hymns. Also, if one of the hymns belonging to the collection is proven to be authentic, that does not prove the authenticity of the others. The authenticity of each one would have to be established individually through analysis of the style, structure, content, doctrinal specifics and then through comparison of all those features with other works reliably attributed to Nāgārjuna. It is an unfortunate fact that excessive focus on the question of the make up of the *Catupstava* has hindered proper consideration of other hymns attributed to Nāgārjuna.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE *STUTYATĀTASTAVA*

The *Stutyatātastava* (*bsTan-gjur*, 2020, folio 87a–88a)¹⁰ is one of the 18 hymns attributed to Nāgārjuna by the Tibetan canon.¹¹ That fact alone does not provide decisive evidence of authenticity, considering that many of the hymns listed there are dubious or decisively spurious.¹² We do not know of any case where verses of this hymn have been quoted by the commentators. Due to the non-existence of a Sanskrit manuscript we cannot conduct analysis of the style and compare it with other works reliably attributed to Nāgārjuna. However, we can point to obvious and significant similarities in the doctrinal and other content between the *Stutyatātastava* and the other authentic works of the master.

In terms of the doctrinal content, the hymn is concerned with the teaching of emptiness and explains it through various arguments practically all of which are typical

for Nāgārjuna's style of Madhyamaka and can be found implicitly or explicitly in his analytical works. Some of the statements closely resemble the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*: dharmas have no *svabhāva* and are, ultimately, beyond the domain of words (verse 3); conventionally the Buddha spoke of 5 aggregates, 18 constituents and 12 sense spheres but, in order to reach the ultimate, grasping of those must be abandoned (4); in order to get liberated one must break with all conceptual proliferations (5); ultimately, things are like reflections (8); the Buddha declared things as 'empty' for pragmatic reasons in order to facilitate the abandoning of all views (9); both 'empty' and 'non-empty' must be abandoned (10); all views enter inner contradictions (11-15).

There is no presence of problematic doctrines that are either incompatible or requiring composition later than Nāgārjuna's philosophy as presented in the works reliably attributed to him (as in the case of *Acintyastava* 4513 or *Kāyatrayastotrānāma*¹⁴). In short, the hymn is doctrinally fully in accord with Nāgārjuna's analytical works.

Furthermore, there are great similarities between this hymn and the four hymns of the *Catupstava*. Starting from the title. The *Stutyatātastava* means 'Hymn to the One Beyond Praise.' That suggests that the Buddha is seen as transcendent, utterly incomparable with anything worldly, beyond the reach of words. The same understanding is present in the content and reflected in the titles of the hymns of the *Catupstava*: 'Hymn to the Incomparable One' (*Nirauṇamastava*), 'Hymn to the One Beyond the World' (*Lokātātastava*), 'Hymn to the Unthinkable One' (*Acintyastava*), and 'Hymn to the Ultimate One' (*Paramārthastava*).

Like all four hymns of the *Catupstava*, the *Stutyatātastava* starts with a verse of salutation and ends with the verse of dedication of merit accumulated by the performed praise of the Buddha.

Like *Nirauṇamastava* 23 and *Paramārthastava* 2, the *Stutyatātastava* 1 describes the act of reverence towards the Buddha as devotion (*bhakti*, *gus pa*) and is not shy of spelling out the appropriateness of devotion (despite the sober tone in *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* which is devoid of any forms of worship).

Verse 2 of the *Stutyatātastava* is in its logic similar to the verse 2 of the *Lokātātastava*: all dharmas being empty, persons do not exist ultimately. Yet, even though the Buddha understands this, his compassion for them does not reverse.

Almost all verses can find their doctrinal and logical parallels in the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. The only significant difference is in the form: in the

Mūlamadhyamakakārikā the logic and the arguments are delivered as products of Nāgārjuna's philosophical analysis but in the *Stutyatātastava* all are given as being spoken by the Buddha with Nāgārjuna only repeating them faithfully and thus praising the master through evocation of his teaching.¹⁵ Each one of the four hymns of *Catupstava* follows the same practice; an overwhelming majority of the verses are recollections of the word of the Buddha, many of them directly addressing the Buddha as if he were personally present.¹⁶

Without going any deeper into the analysis of the form and content, the evidence presented seems to warrant the conclusion that the *Stutyatātastava* was written by an author with very similar understanding of the purpose of the stotra genre as the author of the hymns of *Catupstava*. Furthermore, we find the following: full doctrinal compatibility with the key elements of Nāgārjuna's doctrine; no close similarities in form or doctrine to the hymns by A÷vaghòa, Mātçceña, Rāhulabhadra or any other known *stotra-kavi*; and, that there is nothing in the content to suggest a different time or place of composition than that of Nāgārjuna. In summary, we find no reason to dispute the authenticity of the hymn.

Stutyatāta stava

bstod pa las 'das par bstod pa

Hymn to the One Beyond Praise

'jam dpal gzhon nur gyur pa la phyag 'tshal lo
Homage to the Youthful Maṛju÷ri!

Verse 1:

bla med lam las gshegs pa yi
de bzhin gshegs pa bstod 'das kyang
gus shing spro ba'i sems kyi ni
bdag gis bstod 'das bstod par bgyi

Although the Tathāgata, who has gone by the unsurpassed path,
is beyond praise,
I, with the mind inspired by devotion,
praise the one beyond praise.

Verse 2:

bdag dang gzhan dang gnyis ka las
rnam par dben pa'i dngos gzigs kyang

khyod kyi thugs rje sems can las
ma log pa ni ngo mtshar lags

Even though you see the reality
devoid of self, other and both,
it is marvellous that your compassion does not turn away
from sentient beings.

Verse 3:

ngo bo nyid kyis ma skyes shing
tshig las 'das pa'i spyod yul gyi
chos rnams khyod kyis gang bstan pa
de ni khyod kyi ngo mtshar lags

What you have taught –
that *dharmas* are un-arisen by way of *svabhāva*
and are beyond the domain of words –
that is your marvellous [teaching].

Verse 4:

phung po khams dang skye mched rnams
khyod kyis bsgrags (87b)¹⁷ par mdzad lags kyang
de dag yongs su 'dzin pa ni
slad kyis kyang ni bzlog par mdzad

Although you declared
aggregates, constituents, and sense spheres,
later you turned aside
grasping of these.

Verse 5:

gang zhig rkyen las de ma mchis
dngos rnams rkyen las ji ltar skye
de skad mkhas pa khyod gsungs pas
spros pa rnams ni bcaad pa lags

If one thing exists without a cause,
how can anything arise through a cause?
By speaking these wise words, o Protector,
you broke up conceptual proliferations.

Verse 6:

gang dag tshogs las rab grub na
 tshogs pa rgyu las 'byung mthong ba
 de dag mtha' gnyis brten par ni
 khyod kyis shin tu gzigs pa lags

Those who see that, if a totality is established,
 then the totality arises from a cause,
 they rely on two extremes.
 This has been thoroughly realized by you.

Verse 7:

dngos po rkyen la brten grub par
 khyod ni shin tu bzhed pa lags
 de ltar byas pa'i skyon lags par
 'di ltar ston pa khyod kyis gzigs

Things are established in dependence on conditions,
 that is your worthy proclamation,
 and thus, what is produced is faulty.
 In this way, o Protector, you have realized the [ultimate] teaching.

Verse 8:

gang nas kyang ni mchi ma lags
 gang du yang ni mchis ma lags
 dngos po thams cad gzugs brnyan dang
 mtshungs par khyod ni bzhed pa lags

It does not exist through anything,
 it does not exist anywhere;
 all things are similar to a reflection,
 you asserted, indeed.

Verse 9:

lta ba thams cad spang ba'i phyir
 mgon po khyod kyis stong pa gsungs
 de yang yongs su btags pa ste
 dngos su mgon po khyod mi bzhed

For the sake of abandoning all views, o Protector,
 the empty has been declared by you.

Furthermore, that being imputed,
you did not declare it to be substantial, o protector.

Verse 10:

stong dang mi stong bzhed ma lags
gnyis kar khyod dgyes ma lags te
de la brtsod pa ma mchis par
khyod kyi gsung chen spyod pa lags

You are not pleased by asserting
empty, non-empty [and] both,
there can be no argument about that –
this is the action of your great utterance.

Verse 11:

gzhan min dngos po yod min zhing
gzhan min gnyis min zhes kyang gsungs
gcig dang gzhan nyid spangs pas na
ji lta bur yang dngos ma mchis

Without other, a thing does not exist;
without other, 'two' does not exist.
Abandoning singularity and difference,
a thing cannot exist in any way.

Verse 12:

gal te skye sogs gsum mchis na
'dus byas mtshan nyid mchis par 'gyur
de dag gi yang skye la sogs
gsum pa tha dad 'gyur pa lags

If we have the three: arising, etc.,
Then there would be the characteristics of compounded phenomena.
Moreover, of their [characteristics of] 'being born,' etc.,
it is proper that the three are different.

Verse 13:

skye sogs gsum pos so so ni
'dus byas las la nus ma lags
gcig la gcig tu 'dus pa rnam
phrad par yang ni mchis ma lags

If the three: arising, etc., are separate,
 they have no capacity to function as compounded phenomenon.
 If they all include each other,
 there will be no meeting.

Verse 14:

de ltar mtshan gzhi mtshan ma mchis
 de ltar grub pa ma lags pas
 'dus byas grub pa ma lags na
 'dus ma byas lta ga la grub

It is not established that
 the characterisation and the characteristic exist.
 If the conditioned is not established,
 how can the unconditioned be established?

Verse 15:

smra ba'i seng ges de skad du
 khyod nyid gsungs na seng ge yis
 'bigs byed glang chen smra rnam kyi
 rgyags pa bsal bar gyur pa bzhin

When you, the lion among speakers, speak thus,
 it is like the lion
 removing the arrogance
 of the words of the Vindhya-mountain elephant.

Verse 16:

(88a) lam zhugs gnod pa sna tshogs dang
 lta ba'i lam ngan mi bsten ltar
 khyod la brten nas yod pa dang
 med pa nyid la'ang brten ma lags

One who has entered the path does not resort to
 various ways of causing harm and on the bad path of views.
 Likewise, having relied on you,
 there is no reliance on existence and non-existence.

Verse 17:

khyod kyis dgongs nas gsungs pa dang
 gang dag gis ni de ltar rtogs

de dag khyod kyis dgongs gsungs pa
phyir zhing rtogs par bgyi mi 'tshal

Those who have understood in this way
what was said by you with [hidden] intention,
they have no need of further understanding
of your intended words.

Verse 18:

dngos kun mya ngan 'das mtshungs par
de ltar gang gis rnam shes pa
de tshe de la ji ltar bur
ngar 'dzin kun tu 'byung bar 'gyur

For him who realises that
all things are like nirvāḍa
how can the conception of 'I'
arise at that time?

Verse 19:

de ltar yang dag rig pa'i mchog
de nyid rig pa khyod bstod pa'i
bdag gi bsod nams gang yin des
'jig rten yang dag rig mchog shog

By means of whatever merit I, who praise you,
the knower of reality, supreme among
those who know correctly [have accumulated] in this way
may the world have superior correct knowledge.

REFERENCES

- de Jong, Jan, William. (1962) La Madhyamaka-àstrastuti de Candrakārti. *Oriens Extremus* IX, 1, 47-56.
— (1972) Emptiness. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 2, 7-15.
Lamotte, Etienne. (1970) *Le Traite de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse*. Tome III (Universite de Louvain: Institut Orientaliste).
La Vallée Poussin, Louis, de. (1913) Les Quatre Odes de Nàgàrjuna. *Le Muséon*, 1913, 1-18.
Lévi, Sylvain. (1929) Autour d'A÷vaghòà. *Journal Asiatique*, 255-285.
Lindtner, Christian. (1982) *Nagarjuniana* (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag).

- Mitrikeski, Drasko. (2007) Nāgārjuna and the Tathāgatagarbha: Closer Look at Some Peculiar Features in the Nirupamyastava. *Journal of Religious History* (forthcoming).
- Patel, Prabhupai. (1932) Catustava. *Indian Historical Quarterly* 8, 316-31, 689-705; 10 (1934), 82-89.
- Ruegg, David, Seyfort. (1981) *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz).
- Tucci, Giuseppe. (1932) Two Hymns of the *Catup-ṣṭava* of Nāgārjuna. *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 309-325.
- . (1978, first ed. 1956) Catuṣṭavasamāsārtha of Amṣṭākara. (In G. Tucci, *Minor Buddhist Texts*, Part I & II (pp.235-246) Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co., Ltd.).
- Tola, Fernand & Dragonetti, Carmen. (1985). Nāgārjuna's Catustava. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 13,1-54.
- Williams, Paul. (1984) Review Article [on Lindtner's *Nagarjuniana*]. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 12, 73-104.

ENDNOTES

- 1 I'd like to extend my deepest gratitude to Dr Peter Oldmeadow for his numerous corrections and valuable suggestions on earlier drafts of this paper.
- 2 Except for the first two-three sentences, according to Tucci
- 3 A poem of 14 stanzas. Sanskrit original edited by de Jong, published together with Tibetan and French translation (1962).
- 4 Sanskrit edition of the text is published by Giuseppe Tucci (1978).
- 5 See Lindtner's *Conspectus testium* (1982:126-127).
- 6 Lindtner's *Conspectus testium* (1982:126), and Paul Williams (1984:93).
- 7 More details on the comparison in style in my article, 'Nagarjuna and the Tathagatagarbha: a closer look at some peculiar verses in the Nirupamyastava', *Journal of Religious History* (2009), 33/2, pp. 149-164.
- 8 For example, *Nirupamyastava* 21 uses the word *dharmadhātu* and the following verse, 22, offers a description of the reality in positive ontological terms. This two points led David Seyfort Ruegg to remark that the hymn is 'not far removed from the theory of the absolute expounded in the doctrine of the *tathāgatagarbha*' (Ruegg:1981, p. 116). The *Acintyastava* 45 contains the phrase '*paratantras tu vidyate*' ('dependent on another, however, is found'). The Mādhyamikas held that the *paratantrasvabhāva* only exists *saṃvṛtitaḥ* and not *paramārthataḥ*, but Yogācārins, as *Laikavātara* sūtra states, held that *paratantra* exists. The quoted *pāda* of *Acintyastava* seems to make a claim in line with the latter.
- 9 Tola and Dragonetti (1985) prefer the second option.
- 10 The Tibetan version has been edited and the Sanskrit version reconstructed by Prabhupai Patel (1932:701-705) but the hymn has not been translated in any Western language.
- 11 chos yi dhyins su bstod pa (*Dharmadhātustotra*), Tangjur (*bsTan-'gjur*), 2010, folio 70a-74b.
dpe med par bstod pa (*Nirupamyastava*), Tangjur, 2011, folio 74b-75b.
hjiḡ rten las hdas par bstod pa (*Lokātātastava*), Tangjur, 2012, folio 76a-77a
sems kyi rdo rje'i bstod pa (*Cittavajrastava*), Tangjur, 2013, folio 77a-77b.
don dam par bstod pa (*Paramārthastava*), Tangjur, 2014, folio 77b-78a.
sku gsum la bstod pa (*Kāyatrayastotranāma*), Tangjur, 2015, folio 78a-78b.

- sem chen mgu bar bya'i bstod pa (*Sattvārāḍhanastava*), Tangjur, 2017, folio 82b–83b.
shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin ma'i bstod pa (*Prajāpāramitāstotra*), Tangjur, 2018, folio 83b–84b.
bsam gyis mi khyab par bstod pa (*Acintyastava*), Tangjur, 2019, folio 84b–87a.
bstod pa las hdas par bstod pa (*Stutyatāstava*), Tangjur, 2020, folio 87a–88a.
bla na med pa'i bstod pa (*Niruttarastava*), Tangjur, 2021, folio 88a–88b.
hphag pa rje btsun hjam dpal gyi don dam pahi bstod pa
(*āryabhāṅṅāarakamaṅju-rāparamārthastutināma*), Tangjur, 2022, folio 88b–89a.
rje btsun hphags pa hjam dpal gyi snin rje la bstod pa (*āryamaṅju-rābhāṅṅāarakakaruōastotra*),
Tangjur, 2023, folio 89a–90a.
gnas chen po brgyad kyi mchod rten la bstod pa (*Aiṅṅamabāsthānacaityastotra*), Tangjur, 2024, folio
90a–90b.
gnas chen po brgyad kyi mchod rten la bstod pa (*Aiṅṅamabāsthānacaityastotra*), Tangjur, 2025, folio
90b–91a.
mdsad pa beu gnis kyi tshul la bstod pa (*Dvādaṅakārāōayastotra*), Tangjur, 2026, folio 91a–92a.
phyag htsal ba'i bstod pa she bya ba (*Vandanāstotranāma*), Tangjur, 2027, folio 92a–92b.
dmial ba las ndon pa shes bya ba (*Narakoddbharastava*), Tangjur 2028, folio 92b–93a.
- 12 A few examples should be sufficient here: the *Prajāpāramitāstotra* is most likely authored by Rāhulabhadra (for evidence see Etienne Lamotte 1970:1060). The *Sattvārāḍhanastava*, most of which exists in Sanskrit, has been edited by Sylvain Lévi under Aṅvaghōūa's name (S. Lévi, 1929:264–266). According to Lindtner (1982:15–16), this hymn resembles in style Mātṅceṅa more than anyone else. The *Kāyatrayastotranāma* is spurious because of the presence of the *trikāya* doctrine. From all other works reliably attributed to Nāgārjuna we can conclude that he only knew of the two-body doctrine.
- 13 See note 8 above.
- 14 See note 12 above.
- 15 Most of the verses are references to the word of the Buddha – verses 2–10, 16–17 directly address the Buddha evoking his marvellous teaching, words spoken by him, doctrines thoroughly realized by him, etc. Verses 11–14 seem to be different, since they do not mention the Buddha, but verse 15 summarises the whole group by explaining that all those were words spoken by the Lion of speech.
- 16 In *Niraupamyastava*, out of 25 verses, the first being salutation and the last dedication of merit, 22 address the Buddha directly. In *Lokātāstava*, at least 18 out of 28 verses – two thirds – refer to the statements made by the Buddha. If we take out the first verse of salutation, the last verse of dedication and the two verses (15 and 16) not present in the Tibetan translation, the percentage is even higher. In *Acintyastava* 31 out of 58 verses are direct references to the Buddha. In *Paramārthastava* 11 out of 11 verses are direct references to the Buddha.
- 17 The number of the page in the Tibetan canon.