The process of the development of tetralemma in the Śālistamba-sūtra

Morinobu Asano

The Śālistamba-sūtra, a small volume which refers to 'pratītya-samutpāda', has been esteemed especially by the Mādhyamika school, as is shown by the fact that this sūtra was quoted in many Mādhyamika śāstras such as PP, SS, BP and so on. Many scholars naturally have paid special attention to this sūtra from the early times.

In 1913, Poussin made the samskṛt-restoration mainly from Tibetan Bkaḥ-ḥgyur, comparing it with the quotations of above-mentioned śāstras and similar expressions in other sūtras. In 1950, N.A. Śastri also made the samskṛt-restoration in the same way as Poussin.

After these, although several studies about the Śālistamba-sūtra were published, there are few studies on the differences of the versions, because the problem had been thought to be solved in LP, especially in its footnotes. But in LP, also in Śastri’s study, the examinations of the texts are confined to the quotations of above-mentioned śāstras. So there seems to be no reference to the five Chinese translations which include the oldest one and whose dates of translations are comparatively clear. As regards the samskṛt version, in 1961, a samskṛt manuscript named Madhyamaka-Śālistambasūtra («MS») was published.

Gathering these Chinese versions, the above-mentioned śāstras and texts only found in Tibet, we can gain so many texts of the Śālistamba-sūtra. And comparing these texts, we can find several variant readings. I would like to trace the process of the development of one of them, as much as possible, by means of a comparative study.

The Śālistamba-sūtra explains the pratītya-samutpāda by dividing it into two kinds, the outside and the inside. Of these, the inside pratītya-samutpāda is regarded as the twelve chains of the causations. And the outside
The process of the development of tetralemma in the Śālistamba-sūtra pratitya-samutpāda is regarded as the process of the growth of the rice plant from the seed to the grain. Explaining the latter, this sūtra says that the spout puts forth when the seed ceases to exist under the condition that these causes exist. After these, it says (in the case of MS which has the most developed form) that this spout is not made by itself (A), not made by others (B), not made by both (C), not transformed by the lord (D), not changed by the time (E), not born from the primary substance (F), not depending on no-cause (G), not born from no-cause (H). These passages are quite different from the texts to the texts, and hence I shall indicate the diagram below. And the same expression is repeated thereafter by changing 'this spout' into 'the spout of name and form'. I shall call the former (1), and the latter (2).

**MS**: Madhyamaka-śālistambasūtram, by Dr. Gokhale, Buddhist Sanskrit Texts — No. 17, Mithila Institute 1961/ (1)p. 111, 1. 11~13 (2)p. 112, 1. 22~23.

**BP**: Bodhicaryāvatārāpanjika, Prajñākaramati’s commentary to the Bodhicaryāvatāra of Śāntideva, by L. Poussin, 1914/ (1)p. 578, 1. 17~19 (G is omitted in T), (2)p. 481, 1. 1~9 (F is added in T).

**PP**: Mūlamadhyamakakārikās de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā commentaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>周 (1)</th>
<th>隋 (2)</th>
<th>唐 (1)</th>
<th>宋 (2)</th>
<th>蘇 (1)</th>
<th>敦煌 (2)</th>
<th>TM (1)</th>
<th>TK (1)</th>
<th>K (1)</th>
<th>SS (2)</th>
<th>PP (1)</th>
<th>BP (1)</th>
<th>MS (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5~6, (2)p. 567, 1. 2~3.

S S : Śāntideva : Śīkṣāsamuccaya, by C. Bendall, B.B. I, 1902/ (2)p. 225, 1. 1~2
(F is added in T).


T K : LP : (1)p. 95 1. 19~22, (2)p. 103 1. 4~7.

T M : A Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts collected by Sir A. Stein, Toyo
Bunko, No. 188 (sa lu igan pa rten ciṅ ḥbyun ḥahi mdo r bstan pa)

敦煌 :『仏説大乗勝鬘経』敦煌出土訳 大正蔵16巻/ (1)p. 824b3~4, (2)p. 825b18~20.

宋 :『大乘無著論摩訶経』宋施護訳 大正蔵16巻/ (1)p. 822a22~24, (2)p. 822c27~29.

唐 :『慈氏菩薩所説大乗緣生縁起論経』唐不空訳 大正蔵16巻/ (1)p. 819c5~7,
(2)p. 820b29~820c2.

東晉 :『仏説勝鬘経』東晉失訳 大正蔵16巻/ (1)p. 817b13~15, (2)p. 818a29~818b3.

呉 :『了本生死経』呉支謙訳 大正蔵16巻/ (1)p. 815b24, (2)p. 816b29~816c1.

First 舆(1) has a quite simple form, which has only three phrases, A (非
自作), B (非彼作), H (亦不無因生). But 舆(2) adds C (非両作). These
four phrases, not made by itself(A), not made by others(B), not made by
both(C), not born from no-cause(H) are the same as ‘四句分別’ by which
they meant the deny of the production of existence from the time of early
Buddhism. It is quite possible that the first form of this passage was ‘四句
分別’, considering that it was succeeded by the Māla-madhyaṃkakārīka
which is thought to be written at the same time as the Śālistamba-sūtra
and the Abhidharmakośa and so on. So we should think that C (非両作)
was mistakenly dropped in 舆(1). Assuming so, the development into 東晉
is evident. 東晉 adds three phrases D, E, F between the third phrase and
the fourth. After that, G was added. All versions from 唐 to MS have
these eight phrases, although F or G is maybe dropped in either (1) or (2),
except PP(1) which has a unique form. As regards G, it differs from
the other seven phrases, in that it can be divided into the three types shown
the above diagram:

① MS means ‘not depending on no-cause’. This is similar to TM.
② BP, PP(2). SS mean ‘not depending on one cause’. This seems to be
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the same as K, 宋.

3) As regards TK, 唐, 敦煌, We can take the original word, for example: 'na kārakādhīna'.

Now we have a question as to which is the original type of the three. First the type ① seems to be the same as the phrase H. The type ③ has possibility to be interpreted as contradictory to the phrase H. As regards the type ②, as PP is the oldest one except PP, we can suppose that this type was the original form and that the type ① and the type ③ were developed from this type. At any rate, the shapes of the letters of the manuscripts seem to be quite the same, although the meanings are different.

Now considering the dates of the completion and translations, I will retrace the development of this passage of the Śālistambasūtra. First when this sūtra was made, maybe the 2nd Century A.D., the original form of this passage was '四句分別'. Until the 4th Century A.D., three phrase D, E, F were added. Although some parts of them were dropped, the phrase 'naikāranādhīno' for example, was added after then. They changed subtly, and became independent types such as ①, ②, ③.

As regards PP(1), we can assume that the original form was the '四句分別' (=呉), and that the phrase I, 'born neither from the lord nor the time nor the atom nor the primary substance nor the self-nature' was added after the fourth phrase. But considering that this passage is quoted as a commentary on the Mūla-madhyamaka-kārikā 1.1., and that the quotation is limited only to this passage, we can guess that Candrakīrti quoted the said sentence by transforming it into the form similar to '四句分別', which fits to the Mūla-madhyamaka-kārikā 1.1.. This can be shown in a diagram as below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A, B, C, H</th>
<th>① MS, TM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>呉 → 東晉 → α</td>
<td>② PP(2), SS, K, BP, 宋</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+D, E, F +G</td>
<td>③ TK, 唐, 敦煌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP(1) + I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As regards the '四句分別'. Dr. A. Hirakawa said 'if these four passages were shown, all cases of the existences were exhausted in the world of
The process of the development of tetralemma in the Šalistamba-sūtra (12) thought at the age of Buddha'. So we can assume that these phrases were added gradually in order to deny all the causes of the occurrences which were put into question after the completion of the Šalistamba-sūtra.

1) L. de la Vallée Poussin; Bodddhisme, études et matériaux Théorie des douze causes, Gand 1913. (=LP)
2) N.A. Šastri: ĀRYĀ ŠALISTAMBA-SUTRA, prättyasamutpādavibhaṅga nirdeśasūtra and prättyasamutpādagāthā sūtra, 1950, ADYAR LIBRARY.
3) N.A. Šastri said that he referred to the Chinese translations. But there is no reference to them in its footnotes.
4) Buddhist Sanskrit Texts-No. 17 Mahāyāna-sūtra-samgraha part 1, Edited by Dr. L. Vaidya, The MITHILA INSTITUTE, 1961 p. 107~116. This manuscript was copied by Hutuktu Rimpoche Lobzang Jigme Gyaltsen, the Abbot of the Kundeling monastery of Lhasa, during his tenure there (1948~50). Dr. Gokhale guessed that this was imported from Bengal in the 16th century A.D.. This Ms. begins with Nāgārjuna's salutation, and follows a fragment of the Šalistamba-Sūtra (beginning with LP's p. 73, it continues only to p. 89), after follows a somewhat unsystematic and partly obscure commentary on the first Kālikā of Nāgārjuna's Mūla-madyamakā-sāstra (1. 1), and includes the quotations from the Daśabhūmika-sūtra and the Candrapradipa-sūtra. From the above, we can see that this Ms. is not a perfect Sanskrit version of the Šalistamba-sūtra, and ‘Madhyamaka-Šalistamba-sūtra’ is a provisional title named by Dr. Gokhale.
5) In addition to Tibetan Tripitaka Bka-hgyur, it is repored that there are some Tibetan Mss. of the Šalistamba-Sūtra found in the Touen-houang. For example, two manuscripts of the Šalistamba-sūtra were collected by Sir A. Stein, in the Indian Office Library. I use one of them in this study.
6) For example, Saṃyukta-Nikāya vol. II, pp. 19~21.
7) na svato nāpi parato na dvābhyaṃ nāpy ahetutaḥ/ utpānna jātu vidyante bhāvāśtv kvacacana kecana// (1, 1)
8) TM: byed pa la rag las ma yin, 敦煌: 非假作者，宋: 不繫屬作者，不繫屬因 L. de la Vallée Poussin revised this phrase as ‘byed pa [gcig] la rag las ma yin’ and said ‘je crois gcig nécessaire’, LP p. 103.
9) 平川彰著作集 vol. 1, p. 357, 1988 春秋社, Tokyo.
10) Kamalaśīla commented these phrases as follows: ‘not made by the lord’ means to omit the opinion of the lord-disputant, ... ‘not born from the primary substance’ which was wrongly discriminated by Sāṃkhya (P. BSTAN-ḤGYUR Mdo-tshogs Ḥgreal-pa Ji 187 a 3~6).
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