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 Zebekeiko?  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 Aeschylus or the Great Loser  92

SECTION TWO

Anthony Dracopoulos  The Poetics of Analogy: On Polysemy in Cavafy’s Early Poetry  113
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 Stutyatātāstava and Catuṣṭāstava: Questions of Authenticity  181
CONTENTS

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:
Rumi 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 CATUPṬSTAVA: QUESTIONS OF AUTHENTICITY

INTRODUCTION

It is a peculiar fact that the interest in the Stutyatātastava and other hymns traditionally attributed to Nāgārjuna but not included in the so-called ‘Catupṭstava’ has all but dried up. All scholarly inquiry has focussed on the question ‘Which four hymns comprise the collection called ‘Catupṭstava’ (‘Four Hymns’)?’ The idea that the Stutyatātastava was one of the four initially brought it scholarly attention but when it was decided that the hymn was not part of the Catupṭstava, 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 Catupṭstava 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 Catupṭstava 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 Stutyatātastava and argue that its acceptance as genuine hymn of Nāgārjuna is warranted.

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE QUESTION: WHICH HYMNS COMPOSE THE CATUPṬSTAVA?

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 ‘Catuṣṭava.’ Of the earliest references, Candrakārti, in his Prasanaṇapada and Madhyamakāvratāra ascribes Niraupamyaṣṭava and Lokātātastava to the master Nāgārjuna. Prajñākāramati does the same in his Pārijīka but also ascribes Acintyastava. Early twentieth century scholars of Madhyamaka accepted Niraupamya and Lokātāta but debated about the remaining two. So, Louis de La Vallette Poussin (1913) included Cittavajra and Paramārtha – an opinion accepted by Giuseppe Tucci (1932:311). Prabhupāi Patel (1932), however, accepted Stutyatāta and Acintya. In 1956, Tucci published a Sanskrit edition of a manuscript containing the Mahāyānaviśikā, a work in which the colophon is said to be the Catuṣṭavasamāśārtha, a commentary to the four hymns attributed to the great acārya Nāgārjuna. The manuscript was incomplete; the commentary on the first stava was missing. It did have an almost complete commentary of the remaining three hymns which were: Niraupamyaṣṭava, Acintyastava and Paramārthastava. The manuscript contained no reference to the name of the first hymn but, since both Candrakārti and Prajñākāramati 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, Niraupamyaṣṭava, Acintyastava and Paramārthastava. Etienne Lamotte, who objected the conclusion, opted for La Vallee 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 Catuṣṭavasamāśārtha. He also claimed that precisely those four hymns were quoted by Bhāvaviveka, Candrakārti and Śaṅkrakaūta, 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 ‘Catuṣṭava’ 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 ‘Catuṣṭava.’ There seems to be several reasons to the contrary.
Candrakârti, in the Madhyamakâvajrastruti,\(^3\) stanza 10, in the list of treatises ascribed to the master Nâgârjuna, includes one entitled SaÎstuti ( bstod pa in Tibetan translation). As Tola and Dragonetti (1985:1) explain, this is a generic term to designate the hymns ( stava, stotra). However, Candrakârti gives no reference to four hymns.

The Tibetan canon preserves eighteen hymns attributed to Nâgârjuna, 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 Catuþstava. It is not very likely that, if Nâgârjuna 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 – Niraupamyastava and Paramàrthastava – which he found independently and found no reference to the other two or to Catuþstava.

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 Catuþstava as a whole.

According to Lindtner, the collection of four hymns is referred to by name Catuþstava for the first time by Vairocanarakûita in his Bodhisattvacaryâvatârapa¤jikâ. He further notes that Prajñâkaramatî in his Bodhicaryâvatârapa¤jikâ also refers to Catuþstava (Lindtner, 1982:121, n.144). Lindtner places Prajñâkaramatî in the eleventh century CE which is slightly later than Ruegg who has Prajñâkaramatî flourishing c. 950-1000 and Vairocanakûita in the eleventh century (Ruegg, 1981:116). Be that as it may, the first datable reference to Catuþstava is from the tenth or eleventh century. Furthermore, a work titled Catuþstavasamàsàrtha is attributed to certain Amçtàkara⁴ of whom nothing is known but who, according to de Jong (1972:12), lived much later than Candrakârti (seventh century CE). It could well be that Amçtàkara lived before Prajñâkaramatî 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 Catuþstava cannot be dated earlier than the tenth century.

Lindtner claims that the four hymns composing Catuþstava are precisely those quoted by early commentators such as Bhàvaviveka, Candrakârti and øàntarakûita. Two points must be made here. To begin with, the Paramàrthastava has not been quoted by early commentators such as Buddhapanîla, Bhàvaviveka or Candrakârti.⁵ The Acintyastava has been only quoted in the Madhyamakaratapradâpa, 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 Nirupamyastava, verses 21-23) has been quoted by Bhāvaviveka (Lindtner, 1982:17, n.46). Hence, it is not evident that all hymns of the Catuṣṭava 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.

Amçtàkara’s Catuṣṭavasamāśārtha, the only existing commentary on Catuṣṭava, places the four hymns in the context of the path of the Bodhisatta through ten grounds (bhūmi) of perfection where the Lokātātastava corresponds to achieving the seventh ground, the Nirupamyastava to the eight, the Acintyastava to the ninth and the Paramārthastava to the tenth ground. Obviously, Amçtàkara has the Daśabhūmikasūtra as a model and he frequently quotes it. There are many objections one could address to Amçtàkara’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 Nirupamyastava contain some kind of vipulā. The number matches closely to that in Mūlamadhyamakakārikā (18%) and in Ratnāvalī (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 Nirupamyastava. 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 Nirupamyastava 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 ‘Catuṣṭava’ containing our four hymns but part of the tradition lost the count; or, at some time before Prajñākaramati and/or Amṛṭākara (that is, before the tenth century) our four hymns were arranged together and became known as ‘Catuṣṭava.’ If the second is correct, the evidence outlined above suggests that it is, then the question ‘Which four hymns compose the Catuṣṭava?’ is not a question directly concerning Nāgārjuna. In that sense, Lindtner’s evidence that there was a collection of four hymns including Lokātātastava, Nirupamyastava, Acintyastava and Paramārthastava, existent at the time of Amṛṭākara/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 Catuṣṭava.

In light of the above it now seems that there is no obvious advantage of studying the four hymns composing the Catuṣṭava 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 Catuṣṭava has hindered proper consideration of other hymns attributed to Nāgārjuna.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE STUTYATĀTASTAVA

The Stutyatātastava (bsTan-'gjur, 2020, folio 87a–88a) is one of the 18 hymns attributed to Nāgārjuna by the Tibetan canon. That fact alone does not provide decisive evidence of authenticity, considering that many of the hymns listed there are dubious or decisively spurious. 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 Kāyatrayasto-tranāma19). 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 Catupśṭava. Starting from the title. The Stutyatītastava 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 Catupśṭava: ‘Hymn to the Incomparable One’ (Niraupamyastava), ‘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 Catupśṭava, the Stutyatītastava starts with a verse of salutation and ends with the verse of dedication of merit accumulated by the performed praise of the Buddha.

Like Niraupamyastava 23 and Paramārthastava 2, the Stutyatītastava 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 Stutyatītastava 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 Mūlamadhyamakārikā. 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 *Catuṣṭava* 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 *Catuṣṭava*. 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 Aṅgavaghoṣa, 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.

*Stutyatātastava*

*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 Maṅjughoṣa!

Verse 1:

bla med lam las gshegs pa yi
de bzhin gshegs pa bstod ’das kyang
gus shing spro ba’i sems kyis 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 gzhana dang gnyis ka la
rnam par dben pa’i dngos gzigs kyang
khyod kyi thugs rje sms can las
ma log pa ni ngo mtshar lags

Even though you see the reality
deoild 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 dhammas are un-arisen by way of svabhava
and are beyond the domain of words –
that is your marvellous [teaching].

Verse 4:
phung po kham 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 bcad 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:  
\[\text{stong dang mi stong bzhed ma lags} \]  
\[\text{gnyis kar khyod dgyes ma lags te} \]  
\[\text{de la brtsod pa ma mchis par} \]  
\[\text{khyod kyi gsung chen spyod pa lags} \]

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:  
\[\text{gzhan min dngos po yod min zhing} \]  
\[\text{gzhan min gnyis min zhes kyang gsungs} \]  
\[\text{gcig dang gzhan nyid spangs pas na} \]  
\[\text{ji lta bur yang dngos ma mchis} \]

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:  
\[\text{gal te skye sogs gsum mchis na} \]  
\[\text{’dus byas mtshan nyid mchis par ’gyur} \]  
\[\text{de dag gi yang skye la sogs} \]  
\[\text{gsum pa tha dad ’gyur pa lags} \]

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:  
\[\text{sky sogs gsum pos so so ni} \]  
\[\text{’dus byas las la mus ma lags} \]  
\[\text{gcig la gcig tu ’dus pa mams} \]  
\[\text{phrad par yang ni mchis ma lags} \]
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 mams 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
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 pam 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 nirvāṇa 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

NĀGĀRJUNA’S STUDYATĀTASTAVA AND CATUŚSTAVA


Patel, Prabhupai. (1932) Catustava. Indian Historical Quarterly 8, 316–31, 689-705; 10 (1934), 82-89.


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


7 More details on the comparison in style in my article, ‘Nagarjuna and the Tathagatagarbha: a closer look at some peculiar verses in the Niraupamyastava’, Journal of Religious History (2009), 33/2, pp. 149-164.

8 For example, Niraupamyastava 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 Madhyamikas held that the paratantrasvabhāva only exists saÎvâtita and not paramārthata, 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 Prabhpui 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 (Niraupamyastava), Tangjur, 2011, folio 74b–75b.

hjig rten las hdas par bstod pa (Lokātãtastava), 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 (Sattvārādhanastava), Tangjur, 2017, folio 82b–83b.
shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin ma'i bstod pa (Prajñāparamitāstotra), 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 (Śutratātastava), Tangjur, 2020, folio 87a–88a.
bla na med par bstod pa (Niruttarastava), Tangjur, 2021, folio 88a–88b.
hphag pa rje btsun hjam dpal gyi don dam pahi bstod pa (āryabhāññarakamārja+ārparamārthastutināmā), Tangjur, 2022, folio 88b–89a.
rje btsun hphags pa hjam dpal gyi snin rje la bstod pa (āryamañjula+ābhāññhārakakorobāstotra), Tangjur, 2023, folio 89a–90a.
gnas chen po brgyad kyi mchod rten la bstod pa (Avatamābhāsthānacaityaastotra), Tangjur, 2024, folio 90a–90b.
gnas chen po brgyad kyi mchod rten la bstod pa (Avatamābhāsthānacaityaastotra), Tangjur, 2025, folio 90b–91a.
mdsd pa beu gnis kyi tshul la bstod pa (Dvādaśakāratastotra), Tangjur, 2026, folio 91a–92a.
phyag htsal ba'i bstod pa she bya ba (Vandānastotranāma), Tangjur, 2027, folio 92a–92b.
dmyal ba las ndon pa shes bya ba (Narakodharastava), Tangjur 2028, folio 92b–93a.

12 A few examples should be sufficient here: the Prajñāparamitāstotra is most likely authored by Rāhulabhadra (for evidence see Etienne Lamotte 1970:1060). The Sat.bbārādhanastava, most of which exists in Sanskrit, has been edited by Sylvain Lévi under Āvaghoṣa's name (S. Lévi, 1929:264-266). According to Lindner (1982:15-16), this hymn resembles in style Mātṣeṇa 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 Niravamāṣṭotra, out of 25 verses, the first being salutation and the last dedication of merit, 22 address the Buddha directly. In Lokātātastava, 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.