

Jam-yang-shay-ba would find support in the last two lines of this quote for his position that Buddhapalita is the founder of the Prasangika system, but those who say that ChandrakTrti is the founder would also find support from the statement just above it that ChandrakTrti 'opened the chariot way' for Prasangika through clearly differentiating this system from others. I find Jam-yang-shay-ba's position to be insupportable in the face of (1) his own statement that even though Saraha preceded Nagarjuna in holding the Madhyamika view and even though Vimuktisena preceded Shantarakshita in holding the Yogachara-Svatantrika view (*GT*, ca 10a.5-1 la.4), those two are not posited as the founders of, respectively, the Madhyamika system and the Yogachara-Madhyamika system because they did not clearly set off those schools in contradistinction to other systems and (2) his admission that Buddhapalita did not do that for Prasangika (*GT*, ca 9a.5-10a.1) whereas ChandrakTrti did (see p.584). Jang-gya (288.last line) goes so far as to say that Jam-yang-shay-ba actually did not hold that Buddhapalita founded Prasangika for the above reasons. However, the monastic college that uses Jam-yang-shay-ba's texts, Go-mang, currently holds that Buddhapalita was the founder and that this is Jam-yang-shay-ba's view.

- 495 The four types of Superiors (*Aryan*) are Hearer, Solitary Realizer, Bodhisattva, and Buddha Superiors. *Aryan* (*Phagspa*) is translated as 'Superiors' because, according to Kensur Lekden, these are beings who have risen above the level of common beings (*prthagjana*, *so sor skye bo*) through cognizing emptiness directly on the path of seeing.

Shravaka (*Nyan thos*) is translated as 'Hearers' because (*GM*, 16a.3-5) they *hear* (*nyan*) the doctrine, practice it, and then *cause others to hear* (*thos par byed pa*) that they have actualized their goal (see Hopkins' *Compassion in Tibetan Buddhism* [London: Hutchinson, 1980], pp.102-3). This etymology is built around active and causative uses of the verbal root for hearing, *shru*; one hears and then causes others to hear, in this case not what one has heard but what one has achieved after putting into practice the doctrines one has heard by announcing that 'I have done what was to be done; I will not know another life,' etc. The translation of the term as 'disciples' loses this etymological meaning which appears to be important in the

tradition as is evidenced by Chandrakīrti's citing it in his *Supplement* (Tibetan Publishing House edition, 3.11) and Dzong-ka-ba's including and expanding on Chandrakīrti in his commentary (*Compassion*, P. 102).

Chandrakīrti (*Comm*, 3.14, cited by Dzong-ka-ba in *Compassion*, p. 103) gives a second etymology of *Shravaka* as Hearer-Proclaimer (*GM*, 16a.5fl) based on the *White Lotus of Excellent Doctrine Sutra* (*Saddharmapundarīka*, IV.53 [P781, Vol. 30 23.3.2; *Buddhist Sanskrit Texts*, No. 6, p.82] which says:

O Protector, today we have become hearer-proclaimers
(shravakabhūta).
 We will thoroughly proclaim the excellent enlightenment
 And will set forth the terms of enlightenment.
 Thus we [will be] like formidable Hearer-Proclaimers
(Shravaka).

Jam-yang-shay-ba (*GM*, 16a.6), expanding on Dzong-ka-ba's explanation (*Compassion*, p. 103), interprets this as meaning that *Shravakas* are so called because upon *hearing* (*thos nas*) about the supreme fruit of Buddhahood or about its path from a Buddha they *proclaim* (*sgrogspa*) it to others without practicing it themselves. He says (*GM*, 17b.4) that at this point in the *Lotus Sutra* Bodhisattvas are saying that they are fit to be derided because, like Hearers, they are proclaiming the fruit of the Mahayana or the profound path proceeding to that state without practicing it themselves. The context of the sutra, however, appears to be slightly different as can be seen in Leon Hurvitz's very readable translation in the *Scripture of the Lotus Blossom of the Fine Dharma* (New York: Columbia, 1976, p.98). The Buddha has told the story of the 'prodigal son' (see Whalen Lai's fine article 'The Buddhist "Prodigal Son": A Story of Misperceptions', *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp.91-8), and the former Hearer, Mahakāshyapa, is re-telling the story, relating it to how he and other Hearers formerly proclaimed the Bodhisattva path but did not practice it:

The Buddha's sons,
 Hearing the Dharma from us
 And day and night taking thought,
 Engaged in cultivated practice; (p.95)

19 *Meditation on Emptiness*

Also:

So we, though we preached
The jewel cache of the Buddhadharmā,
Had no hope for it
In the same way. (p.96)

Also:

Although we, for the sake of
The Buddha's sons,
Preached the Bodhisattvadharmā,
Wherewith the Buddha Path was to be sought,
Yet, with respect to this Dharmā,
We never had any hopes, (p.97)

Mahakāshyapa then explains that due to having heard that they have the lot of the Mahāyāna and thereupon attained the Mahāyāna path they, like the son in the parable who was gradually led to recognize that he is the son of a wealthy king, have gained something extraordinary which they always had in the sense that they had been preaching it but had no hope to practice it. As Hurvitz translates the stanza in question:

We now
Are truly voice-hearers,
Taking the voice of the Buddha Path
And causing all to hear it.

Thus, Jam-yang-shay-ba is certainly right in saying that the *Lotus Sutra* is indicating a dual etymology of *Shravaka* as those who *hear* about the highest enlightenment of the Mahāyāna and then *cause others to hear* about it (causative in Sanskrit, *sgrogs* in Tibetan) without practicing it themselves. However, it seems that the specific context here in this stanza is that the now Bodhisattva Mahakāshyapa is saying that he and others are now formidable hearer-proclaimers in that unlike their earlier state as Hearer-Proclaimers who heard and proclaimed the Mahāyāna teaching without practicing it, they have put it to practice, have attained its fruit, and will proclaim it to others. Thus, at this particular point Mahakāshyapa does not seem to be saying that 'we Bodhisattvas are fit to be derided' as Jam-yang-shay-ba says. This is confirmed in the commentary on the *Lotus Sutra*

by Prthivibandhu (*Sa'i rtsa lags*), in which in reference to this stanza he says (*The Nyingma Edition of the sDe-dge bKa'-gyur and bsTan'-gyur*, Dharma Publishing, 1981, Text 4017, Vol. 76 663.6), 'This indicates that, having attained the great fruit, they are fit to help others who are set as Hearer Superiors.' Mahakashyapa is rejoicing in their new situation.

How the context is interpreted affects the translation of the last line of IV.53, *steno vayam shravaka bhishmakalpah, de bas bdag cag nyan thos mi zad 'dra* (GM, 16b.2) or *de bas bdag cag sgogspa mi bzad 'dra* (P781, Vol. 30 23.3.2), 'Thus we [will be] like formidable Hearer-Proclaimers.' The term 'formidable' (*ibhishma, mi zad* or *mi bzad*) is missing in Hurvitz's translation from the Chinese. Louis de la Vallee Poussin (*Museon*, ns V. 11, 1910 [Vol. 29], p.253) renders the line, 'aussi serons-nous comme d'irresistibles (Jravakas.' In *Compassion in Tibetan Buddhism* (p. 103), I translated it as, 'Thus we are like intractable Hearers,' assuming that Jam-yang-shay-ba was taking the term in a negative way. 'Irresistible', like 'formidable', suggests the *might and power* (*bhishma*) of their proclamation now that they are proclaiming the Mahayana doctrine on the basis of actual attainment, whereas 'intractable' is a reference to the *awful* or *frightful* (*bhishma*) state that they were in when they just caused others to hear about the Mahayana but did not practice it themselves. In either case, there is a play on the contrast with their former state. The translation as 'formidable', however, seems to fit the context better.

Based on this etymology of *shravaka* as hearing of the highest enlightenment and proclaiming it without practicing it, Hurvitz (p. 116) explains that '...by *auditor* is *meant* (italics his) one who lacks knowledge of Emptiness.' However, as Dzong-ka-ba (*Compassion*, pp. 150-60) shows, this is not the position of Chandraklrti and other Prasafigikas; according to him, in Prasartgika the subtlest emptiness must be cognized even to be liberated from cyclic existence and thus Hearers and Solitary Realizers do so. In Dzong-ka-ba's interpretation of Prasangika, the path that Hearers hear about and proclaim without practicing would be great compassion, the altruistic intention to become enlightened, and meditation on emptiness using a myriad of reasonings rather than just a few. However, with regard to Chittamatra, Dzong-ka-ba and his followers hold that

Hearers and Solitary Realizers do not cognize the subtlest emptiness (see Sopa and Hopkins' *Practice and Theory of Tibetan Buddhism*, pp. 117-18), in which case what Hearers hear about and proclaim without practicing is the emptiness of a difference of entity between subject and object, as well as the paths of great compassion and so forth. The Chittamatrin interpretation, therefore, accords with Hurvitz's presentation.

Though this second etymology of hearing and proclaiming without practicing is pejorative, the former is not, as it is frequently reported in sutra itself that upon achieving their goal Hearers report to others the fact that they have completed their path with statements such as, 'I have done what was to be done; I will not know another birth' (*Compassion*, p. 102). Thus, given the importance that Chandrakīrti, Dzong-ka-ba, and so forth give to the term itself, this non-pejorative etymology can serve as a basis for a literal translation as 'Hearers'.

Jam-yang-shay-ba (GM, 16b.2) views the two etymologies as built from different roots, but in both cases the Sanskrit seems merely to be a play between the active and the causative uses of *shru*. In the case of the *Lotus Sutra* the causative *samshravayishyamatha* (future causative first person plural) was translated into Tibetan as *sgrogs* rather than as *thos par byed pa* leading to the tradition that there are two etymologies of *shravaka*, one as *nyan thos* and another as *thos sgrogs*, whereas it seems that the two are variations of the one play on the active and the causative. In the first etymology the Hearers proclaim or cause others to hear that they have actualized their goal whereas in the second they proclaim or cause others to hear the doctrine that they have heard. Jam-yang-shay-ba (GM, 16b.2) says that the *Lotus Sutra* etymology is built from the verbal root for 'proclaiming the heard' (*thos pa sgrogs pa 'i hying*), but he does not cite the actual Sanskrit. However, in accordance with his etymology of the *ka* of *madhyamaka* as from the verbal root for proclaiming, *kai* (meaning 'to sound' according to Apte) following an explanation by Bhāvaviveka (GM, 4b.3), we can surmise that he is taking the *ka* of *shravaka* as built from the verbal root for proclaiming and 'the heard' as *shruta* from *shru*. However, though there are two etymologies of *shravaka*, they are built not around different verbal roots but around the single root *shru* treated in active and passive modes with different interpretations both of what is heard (the Hīnayāna or

Mahayana doctrine) and what is proclaimed (one's own attainment of the Hfnayana enlightenment or the Mahayana doctrine one has heard but not practiced).

Pratyekabuddha is translated as 'Solitary Realizer' because of the explanation (*Compassion*, pp. 103-4) that *pratyekabuddhas* are not Buddhas but are called *buddha* because of having *realization* of suchness. 'Solitary' indicates that in their last lifetime they practice alone without depending on a teacher in that lifetime.

The terms *Bodhisattva* and *Buddha* are left untranslated as they are sufficiently familiar in English.

496 P5260, Vol. 98 4.5.3, commenting on 1.1. The Sanskrit is Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, Vol. 10, 5.24; Poussin, 16.2, The brackets are from *GM*, 232b.6.

Prasannapada is translated as *Clear Words* though it would be just as suitable as *The Lucidly Worded*, or *The Clear Worded* as Stcherbatsky does in his *The Conception of Buddhist Nirvana* (rpt Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1978), or *Lucid Exposition of the Middle Way* as Mervyn Sprung does in his condensation of the text (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979). It strikes me that Chandrakrti gave his commentary on Nagarjuna's *Treatise on the Middle Way (Madhyamakashastra)* this title in contrast to Bhavaviveka's commentary, *Lamp for (Nagarjuna 'sj 'Wisdom' (PrajnapradTpa)* which, due to its brevity and lack of elaboration, is often difficult to fathom and thus unclear. As an example of such difficulty, see Bhavaviveka's refutation of Buddhapalita's interpretation of the refutation of production from self on p.461. Also, in the *Clear Words* ChandrakTrti gives a very clear picture of the movement of the refutations by citing the qualm that each step answers, such as in his brilliant commentary on chapter two.

Stcherbatsky, in his *The Conception of Buddhist Nirvana*, however, indicates that at least for him ChandrakTrti's text is not clear and that the title seems ironic (p.75 n.1): 'CandrakTrti has given to his commentary the title of 'The Clearworded' (prasanna-pada) probably not without some dose of irony, since, as Prof. WassiliefTattests, its extreme dialectical subtlety, especially in the first chapter, is equalled by no other work in the whole domain of Northern Buddhist literature.' In the same vein, Mervyn Sprung (p.xii) says about the first chapter, in defense of his abridgements of the text, '... [the abridgements]