

The Stanzas on the Cārvāka/Lokāyata in the *Skhalitapramathanayuktihetusiddhi*

Krishna Del Toso

Abstract: in Āryadevapāda's *Skhalitapramathanayuktihetusiddhi* we find a problematic passage in which some Cārvāka theories are expounded. The problem here lies in the fact that, according to Āryadevapāda, the Cārvākas – who did not admit rebirth – would have upheld that happiness in this life can be gained by worshipping gods and defeating demons. As the Cārvākas were materialists, the reference to gods and demons does not fit so much with their philosophical perspective. In this paper, by taking into account several passages from Pāli and Sanskrit Buddhist sources, I have tried to demonstrate that Āryadevapāda is here probably following the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*, where mention is made of some Lokāyatikas who are said to have been able to infatuate gods and demons. In both the Pāli Canon and the Mahāyāna *sūtras*, however, the term *lokāyata* does not refer to “materialism”. It rather conveys the meaning of “art of disputation”, and is generally used in the description of *brāhmaṇas* well versed in the Vedas, in the recitation of *mantras* and in dialectic methods in general. It is the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* that introduces the idea – corroborated also by a passage from the *Mahābhārata* – that these *brāhmaṇas*, skilled in *lokāyata*, would have indulged in some materialistic tenet. When the two terms, Cārvāka and Lokāyata, came both to mean “materialism”, around the IV century CE, it is highly probable that non-Cārvāka thinkers and commentators – as could be the case of Āryadevapāda – had in some occasion assimilated and integrated certain points of view, originally belonging to the ancient *lokāyata* perspective (for instance, the references to gods and demons), into what they believed Cārvāka philosophy had to be.

Keywords: Cārvāka/Lokāyata, *Skhalitapramathanayuktihetusiddhi*, Pāli sources, Mahāyāna *sūtras*, Interpretation, Āryadevapāda.

K. Del Toso

Facoltà di Scienze della Formazione, Università di Trieste, via Tigor 22,

Trieste, Italy

e-mail: krishna.deltoso@gmail.com

<p. 544>

The *Skhalitapramathanayuktihetusiddhi* (SPYHS) is traditionally attributed to Āryadeva. It is a didascalic work, extant in Tibetan only, in which several non-Mahāyāna points of view on liberation are expounded and criticized. The opening section deals with the Cārvāka/Lokāyata school; the argument is introduced by a standard formula *kha cig na re* (“some say”):

ma śi bar du bde bar 'tsho ||
śi nas de yi spyod yul med ||
lus kyañ thal ba bzin soñ nas ||
slar 'tsho bar lta ga la 'gyur ||

de phyir sña phyi yod ma yin ||
tshe 'di ñid la bde ba 'i phyir ||
lha mchod 'dre srin mnan byas na ||
btsan phyug mthu stobs 'grub par 'gyur ||¹

That is:

Let a man live happily as long as there is no death [because] from death nobody escapes; when also the body is burnt to ashes, from where, indeed, a future life will be?

Therefore, there is not an existence preceding or subsequent [the present one]; [so,] in order to be happy in this very life, revere the *devas* and subjugate the *piśācas* and the *rākṣasas*: thus you will attain nobleness, richness and authority.

It is highly probable that the first of these two stanzas – notwithstanding some differences that could be due, in any case, to metrical needs – represents the Tibetan translation of the following Sanskrit *śloka*:

yāvaj jīvaṃ sukhaṃ jīven nāsti mṛtyor agocaraḥ |
bhasmībhūtasya dehasya punarāgamaṇaṃ kutaḥ ||

As is well-known, this is a Cārvāka *śloka*, referred to in several works.² It must be noted that also the first *pāda* of the second stanza appears to be conceptually in line with the fundamental tenets of the Cārvāka thought, as is demonstrated by, for instance, the following two Cārvāka *sūtras*: *paralokāsiddhau pramāṇābhāvāt* (“Because there is no means of right knowledge for establishing the other world”) and *paralokino ’bhāvāt paralokābhāvaḥ* (“Because there is not someone who dwells in the other world, the other world is non-existent”).³ The second *pada* of the same stanza refers to nothing but a logical consequence involved in the *pada* a, that is: if only the present life is admitted, then “no happiness is to be expected in any future life. Hence happiness can be obtained in this life alone, and nowhere else”.⁴ With the third *pāda*, however, problems arise. Indeed, the materialist philosophy of the Cārvākas could not allow them to accept the existence of gods or of

¹ sDe-dge bsTan-’gyur, dBu-ma, vol. 199: TSHa, foll. 19b5-6.

² For a list of occurrences of this *śloka* in Sanskrit texts see Bhattacharya (2009: 84); a discussion of its principal readings can be found in Bhattacharya (2009: 201-205).

³ Bhattacharya (2009: 80).

⁴ Bhattacharya (2009: 124).

<p. 545>

other supernatural creatures, like *piśācas* or *rākṣasas*. Moreover, we cannot even suppose that this – and also the subsequent – *pāda* of the second stanza deals with another, non-Cārvāka, point of view, because *kha cig na re* clearly refers to a single group of thinkers, and because *de phyir* (Skr. *tasmāt*) indicates that the discourse here proceeds from the first stanza. So, why does the author of the SPYHS speak of the worship of gods and the subjugation of demons exactly in this context? I think that the answer to this problem can be found in the *sūtras* of the Mahāyāna, particularly in the *Lankāvatārasūtra*, which seems to have been one of his primary sources of inspiration.⁵ It will, nonetheless, be useful here to begin by taking into consideration the Pāli Canon, from which the Mahāyāna *sūtras* appear to have drawn inspiration on account of this particular matter.

In several passages of the *Suttapiṭaka* we meet with the word *lokāyata* which, in this context, as Ramkrishna Bhattacharya has acutely pointed out,⁶ refers not to materialism, rather to the art of disputation. It seems that those who cultivated themselves in casuistry and disputation were also interested, at least in part, in socio-political affairs, as the recurring compound *lokāyatamahāpurisalakkhaṇesu anavayo* (“Perfectly acquainted with the [knowledge in the art of] disputation and with the [knowledge of the] signs of a great person”)⁷ makes clear: indeed, for instance, in *Majjhimanikāya* 2.133-134 we read about the *brāhmaṇa* Brahmāyu – who is said to be conversant with *lokāyata* – speaking of, and skilled in, the thirty-two characteristics which identify a person who can become either a great king (if he decides to accept the state of householder) or a future liberated one (if he decides to leave his house for an ascetic life). In every passage in which mention is made of someone well versed in the art of *lokāyata*, the Pāli Canon specifies that this person, among other characteristics, is also *padako* (“a knower of words”), *veyyākaraṇo* (“a grammarian”) and *tiṇṇaṃ vedānaṃ pāragū* (“a perfect knower of the three Vedas”), the standard formula being: *tiṇṇaṃ vedānaṃ pāragū sanighaṇḍukeṭubhānaṃ sākkharappabhedānaṃ itihāsapañcamānaṃ padako veyyākaraṇo lokāyatamahāpurisalakkhaṇesu anavayo* (“He is well versed in the three Vedas, together with lexicons and [books concerning] rituals and with [writings] containing distinctions on [account of the phonology of] letters, and [the correct interpretation of] legends as fifth, he is a knower of words, a grammarian, one perfectly acquainted with the art of disputation and the [knowledge of the] signs of a great person”). Moreover, it appears that the traditional way of instruction adopted among these *brāhmaṇas* were founded on *mantras* (Pāli *mantas*), as we can infer both from the fact that sometimes the abovementioned list is preceded by the words *ajjhāyako mantadharo* (“engaged in study and knowing *mantras* by heart”), and from the following description of the *brāhmaṇa* Sela who, by virtue of his expertise in Vedas and *lokāyata* (*Suttanipāta* 105): *tīṇi ca māṇavakasatāni mante vāceti* (“He

⁵ The SPYHS is indeed very similar, in content, to the *Dīpō púsà shì léngjiājīng zhōng wàidào xiǎoshèng nièpán lùn* 「提婆菩薩釋楞伽經中外道小乘涅槃論」 (Taishō 1640) – a text extant only in the Chinese Canon and attributed to Āryadeva – which is, as the title itself suggests, a sort of partial commentary on the *Lankāvatārasūtra* 「楞伽經」. This work has been translated by Tucci (1936). We note, parenthetically, that here no reference is made to Cārvākas or Lokāyatas.

⁶ Bhattacharya (2009: 187-200).

⁷ *Majjhimanikāya* 2.133; 2.147; *Ānguttaranikāya* 1.163; etc.

<p. 546>

instructed three hundred young [*brāhmaṇas*] in *mantras*”). In any case, at least a section or collection of these *mantras*, we know from the Pāli Canon, was undoubtedly about the characteristics of a great man (*Majjhimanikāya* 2.134 and *Dīghanikāya* 1.88: *amhākaṃ mantesu dvattiṃsamahāpurisalakkhaṇāni*; “In our *mantras* the thirty-two signs of a great person [are dealt with]”).

If, now, we turn to the Mahāyāna *sūtras*, it can be easily noticed that this literary tradition resorts to the same definitions of *lokāyata* already furnished by the Pāli sources. For instance, in the *Divyāvadāna* 33.1.12.1 (*Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna*) we read: *sa [...] pūrvajanmādhītān vedān samanūsmarati sma sāṅgopāṅgān sarahasyān sanighaṇṭakaitabhān sākṣaraprabhedān itihāsapañcamān anyāni ca śāstrāṇi padako vaiyākaraṇo lokāyate yajñamantre mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇe niṣṇāto* (“He remembered [to have been], in his previous life, one expert in the Vedas, together with the major and minor supplementary texts, with the secret doctrines [i.e., the Upaniṣads], with lexicons and [books concerning] rituals and with [writings] containing distinctions on [account of the phonology of] letters, [the correct inter-

pretation of] legends as fifth, and other treatises, a knower of words, a grammarian, deeply versed in the art of disputation, in [reciting] *mantras* for worship and in the signs of a great person”),⁸ and in 33.1.13.2 we find: *mantradharas trayāṇām vedānām pāragah sāṅgopāṅgānām sarahasyānām sanighaṅtakauṭabhānām sākṣaraprabhedānām itihāsapāñcamānām padako*⁹ *vaiyākaraṇaḥ | lokāyatayajñamantramahāpuruṣalakṣaṇeṣu pāragah* (“[He is] one who knows *mantras* by heart, well versed in the three Vedas, together with the major and minor supplementary texts, with the secret doctrines, with lexicons and [books concerning] rituals and with [writings] containing distinctions on [account of the phonology of] letters, and [the correct interpretation of] legends as fifth, a knower of words, a grammarian, one well versed in the art of disputation, in [reciting] *mantras* for worship and in the signs of a great person”).¹⁰ The presence of the compound *yajñamantra*, together with other compounds such as *aṅga-upaṅga* etc., suggests to us that the term *mantra*, in this case, does not refer to charming incantations or something similar, rather to the ritual formulae used in the Vedic sacrifices (*yajña*). Moreover *Divyāvadāna* 33.1.12.1 helps us to interpret the compound *lokāyatayajñamantra* in 33.1.13.2 as a *dvandva* and not as a *tatpuruṣa* or a *karmadhāraya*.

In other Mahāyāna *sūtras* – probably (wrongly?) assuming the idea, adumbrated by the abovementioned *Majjhimanikāya* 2.134 and *Dīghanikāya* 1.88, that *lokāyatamantras* are *mantras* describing *only* or *primarily* the signs of the great man¹¹ – the

⁸ Vaidya (1959: 318).

⁹ In both this and the previous recurrences of *padako*, Vaidya refers to a variant *padaśo*; *padako* is nonetheless corroborated by the Pāli Canon.

¹⁰ Vaidya (1959: 319).

¹¹ Of course we do not know if this is true. Personally, I am persuaded of the fact that *mantra* in this context means “hymn” in general, thus both a formula for sacrifices and a mnemonic verse for other purposes. Thus, the case of *Divyāvadāna*’s *yajñamantra* – which is a *unicum* in Mahāyāna *sūtras*, at least as far as my knowledge can go – has the aspect of a sort of specification apparently inserted by the author(s) of the text for a better understanding of the actual significance of *mantra* in this particular context. This would nonetheless confirm the idea that *mantra* as “charming incantation” is not, here, an acceptable meaning.

<p. 547>

reference to *mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇas* is omitted and only the art of disputation (*lokāyata*) and the skill in remembering and reciting *mantras* (without, however, the specification *yajña*-) are listed.

In the *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra* 39 (*Sarvanagararakṣāsambhavatejāśrī*) we can, indeed, read: *lokāyatamantrābhiratānām* (“Of those content with disputation and *mantras*”).¹²

In the *Kāśyapaparivartasūtra* § 5 we meet with the expression *lokāyatamantraparyeṣṭyā* (“By searching for disputation and *mantras*”),¹³ and in § 111 we have the variant *lokāyatamantraparyeṣṭitā* (“The searching for disputation and *mantras*”).¹⁴ This same text specifies that (§ 13) *lokāyatiko vicitramantrapratibhānaḥ* (“The dialectician has the eloquence of several *mantras*”),¹⁵ shifting in this way the usual *lokāyata* into *lokāyatika*, that is, ‘one who is devoted to, or skilled in, disputation’.

The distinction between the substantive *lokāyata* and the nominal adjective *lokāyatika* can be observed also in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* 13, where we find both *lokāyatamantrapāragān* and *lokāyatikān*, that is “those conversant with disputation and *mantras*” and “dialecticians”.¹⁶

The *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* repeats the same formula of the *Kāśyapaparivartasūtra* – i.e., *lokāyatiko vicitramantrapratibhānaḥ* – as a quite standard refrain,¹⁷ which is explained as

follows: *vicitramantrapratibhāno* [...] *lokāyatiko vicitrair hetupadavyaṅjanair bālān vyāmohayati* (“The dialectician, who has the eloquence of several *mantras*, infatuates the ignorant ones by means of various reasons, words and expressions”). Furthermore, a description very similar to that just cited above occurs also in another interesting passage of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*:

*lokāyatikavicitraheturṣṭāntopanibaddhaṃ yena tiryāṅcam apy adhītya
devāsuralokaṃ vicitrapadavyaṅjanair vyāmohayati |
āvyavyadrṣṭābhiniveśenābhiniveśayati kim aṅga punar mānuṣān |*

The dialectician, by whom [every argumentation] is discussed with several reasons and examples, having gone over even the [mind of the] animals, infatuates the gods and the demons by means of various words and expressions; by a strong determination in [accepting only] what is observed to come into being and to pass away, he causes [even the gods and the demons] to devote themselves to [his very doctrines], how much more the human beings?¹⁸

¹² Vaidya (1960: 236).

¹³ Virobyova-Desyatovskaya (2002: 6).

¹⁴ Virobyova-Desyatovskaya (2002: 39).

¹⁵ Virobyova-Desyatovskaya (2002: 11).

¹⁶ Vaidya (1960: 166). Vaidya refers also to a different reading for the first compound: *lokāyatamantradhāra-kān*. Nonetheless, on the basis of the abovementioned *Divyāvadāna* 33.1.13.2 where we have *pāragah*, which follows in its turn the Pāli *pāragū*, it seems to me quite clear that °*pāragān* is to be accepted here as correct. Ramkrishna Bhattacharya (unpublished article) suggests a possible emendation of this compound in *lokāyataya-jñamantra*°.

¹⁷ Nanjiō (1923: 173-174).

¹⁸ Nanjiō (1923: 174).

<p. 548>

In this excerpt we find the (exaggerated and obviously ironic) idea that a *lokāyatika* has the capacity of infatuating other men as well as gods and demons. This reminds us of the abovementioned problematic *pāda* in the SPYHS, where the *pūrvapakṣin* is, indeed, said to be able in propitiating gods and subjugating demons. It is interesting to notice, here, that in the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* we find also a passage, from which the conceptual explanation, proposed by this text, of the compound *āvyavyaya* (“coming into being and passing away”) in the *lokāyatika* perspective can be guessed:

*tatra āmiṣaṃ mahāmate katamad yaduta āmiṣaṃ āmr̥śam ākarṣaṇaṃ
nirmr̥śaṃ parāmr̥ṣṭiḥ svādo bāhyaviṣayābhiniveśo [...] eṣa mahāmate
āmiṣasaṃgraho na dharmasaṃgraho yaṃ lokāyatikaṃ sevamāno labhate lo-
kāyatam |*

Therefore, O Mahāmati, what is an object of enjoyment? An object of enjoyment is that which is touched, drawn by, pulled away, sized, [that which] has a taste, [that which causes] strong adherence to external objects [...]; this, O Mahāmati, is the grasping of an object of enjoyment, not the grasping of the *dharma*, [and] the one who obeys to a dialectician succeeds in such a [way of] disputation.¹⁹

This passage apparently refers to a sort of materialistic or worldly view to which the *lokāyatikas* would have indulged in. The *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*, moreover, asserts also that the *lokāyatikas*, by strongly recouring to dialectical tricks, are able to expound thoughts and ideas in which they themselves do not necessarily believe: *lokāyatam eva vicitraitḥ padavyaṅjanair dṛṣṭāntopasaṃhārair deśayanti na svanayaṃ svakāraṅābhiniveśābhiniṣṭā* (“They teach just [how to make a] disputation by means of several words and expressions, examples and conclusions, which are not [necessarily] their own idea, persevering with tenacity in [making use of] their own [dialectical] means”).²⁰

It can be noted, at this point, that in the *Mahābhārata* references are made to groups of *brāhmaṇas* who, although well-versed in the Vedas, are said not to understand correctly the real meaning of the Scriptures (*Śāntiparva* 19.17):

vedavādān atikramya śāstrāṅy āraṅyakāni ca |
vipāṭya kadalīskandhaṃ sāraṃ dadṛśire na te ||

Having mastered the Vedic doctrines, the *Āraṅyikas* and the [other] treatises, they do not see the real meaning [of these Scriptures] as [one does not find solid wood after] having split the banana trunk in two.²¹

It appears that some of them were well accomplished in the art of disputation, travelled from village to village for delivering lectures and holding debates,

¹⁹ Nanjīō (1923: 180).

²⁰ Nanjīō (1923: 175).

²¹ This stanza plays on the double significance of the term *sāra*, both “real meaning”, “main point”, and “solid”, “strong”.

<p. 549>

postulated the non-existence of the *ātman* and, moreover, adhered tenaciously to their methods (*Śāntiparva* 19.23-24):

bhavanti sudurāvartā hetumanto 'pi paṇḍitāḥ |
dṛḍhapūrvaśrutā mūḍhā naitad astīti vādināḥ ||

amṛtasyāvamantāro vaktāro janasaṃsadi |
caranti vasudhāṃ kṛtsnāṃ vāvadūkā bahuśrutāḥ ||

There are [some] learned men, very hard to be dissuaded [from their behaviour] and endowed with the science of logic, who have a strong ancient tradition, who are confused, who declare: “there is not this [*ātman*]”.

They are wise but disrespectful towards final emancipation, they roam about in assemblies all over the world, they are eloquent and well versed in the Vedas.

Some of the points in this description suggest to us that these wise but confused dialecticians were *brāhmaṇas* who upheld some materialistic tenets. Now if, on the one hand, these *brāhmaṇas* were surely not *Cārvākas*, because we know that *Cārvākas* were not inter-

ested at all in Vedas and in making sacrifices,²² on the other hand, we can here easily find several similarities with the *lokāyatikas* of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*. To conclude, with all probability the author of the SPYHS could have assumed, wrongly, from the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* the idea that the *lokāyatikas* described there, who were well versed in the Vedas and skilled in using *mantras*, which gave to them power over the gods and the demons, were Cārvākas. It can be suggested, as final consideration, that he has incorporated this form of *lokāyata* in the section on Cārvāka probably because, by this time, both the terms were being used to refer to the same philosophical school.

Addendum

Our last consideration can be corroborated also from a comparison with the *Jñānasārasamuccaya*, if we admit that the author of this text is the same author of the SPYHS. Such an admission appears to be underlined by stylistic comparisons (both are didascalical works very similar in style and contents) and historical evidences. Now, in *kārikā* 14 of the *Jñānasārasamuccaya*, mention is made of *gzuṅ ṅan rgyaṅ 'phen pa* (Skr. **daurjanyalokayātika*), “the evil *lokāyatika(s)*”, whose fundamental doctrines are said to be the negation of *karman*, *las med* (Skr. **akarman*), and of final emancipation, *thar pa med* (Skr. **nirmokṣa*), which are in fact two peculiarities of the Cārvāka philosophy.²³ Ramkrishna Bhattacharya has pointed out that, “no much earlier than the fourth century CE, *lokāyata* came to mean materialism [...]. What was common to the older Lokāyata-s and the new Cārvāka materialists was perhaps disputatiousness”.²⁴ We have thus to conclude

²² Bhattacharya (2009: 80) lists two Cārvāka *sūtras* against the religious acts: *dharmo na kāryaḥ* and *tad upadeśeṣu na prayetavyam*, that is (Bhattacharya 2009: 87): “Religious act is not to be performed” and “Its [religion’s] instructions are not to be relied upon”.

²³ sDe-dge bsTan-'gyur, dBu-ma, vol. 199: TSHa fol. 27a3. As I unfortunately did not have the occasion to check the Sanskrit MS of SPYHS preserved in the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Peking – see Mimaki (2008: 236) –, the Sanskrit **daurjanyalokayātika*, **akarman* and **nirmokṣa*, proposed here, are to be considered nothing but a tentative restoration.

²⁴ Bhattacharya (2009: 195).

<p. 550>

that the SPYHS (as the *Jñānasārasamuccaya*) cannot have been written by Āryadeva, the disciple of Nāgārjuna and author of the *Catuḥśataka*, who lived at most in the III century CE. Moreover, the SPYHS is quoted in the *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa*,²⁵ whose author is a Bhavya/Bhāviveka who flourished probably around the VII-VIII centuries.²⁶ Seyfort Ruegg has pointed out that in the *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* mention is made of a stanza from Saraha’s *Dohākośa* and that Saraha is there referred to as *bla ma'i bla ma* (Skr. *guruguru*), that is “teacher’s teacher”.²⁷ According to Seyfort Ruegg: “this Saraha may be identical with Rāhulabhadra, the master of Ārya-Nāgārjuna, i.e. of a deuterio Nāgārjuna who would seem to have lived in the seventh century”.²⁸ Consequently, the deuterio Nāgārjuna – known also by the name of Nāgārjunapāda – had this Bhavya/Bhāviveka among his pupils.

Turning now to the *Jñānasārasamuccaya*, its colophon refers to us that the author’s name was 'PHags pa lha'i žal śna nas, that is, Āryadevapāda.²⁹ This Āryadevapāda was probably the same person who wrote two tantric works, the *Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇa* and the *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa*, and was, he himself, a disciple of Nāgārjunapāda.³⁰ It can thus be inferred that our Āryadevapāda must have lived between the VII and the VIII centuries CE. This appears to be partially confirmed also by the fact that the *kārikā* 31 of the *Jñāna-*

sārasamuccaya has been quoted by Kamalaśīla (740-795 CE) in his *Tattvasaṃgrahapañjikā*.³¹ We are thus led to conclude not only that the authors of the *Jñānasārasamuccaya* and of the SPYHS flourished in the same period, but also that there is no reason for denying that they were the same person, i.e, a pupil of Nāgārjunapāda who was with all probability elder than Bhavya/Bhāviveka, the author of the *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa*.

²⁵ sDe-dge bsTan-'gyur, dBu-ma, vol. 199: TSHa, fol. 263b4-6.

²⁶ Seyfort Ruegg (1990: 62-63).

²⁷ Seyfort Ruegg (1990: 62).

²⁸ Seyfort Ruegg (1990: 62).

²⁹ The Tibetan *zal sna nas* (Skr. *pāda*) does not in itself indicate a part of a name, being mostly added to a name and used as a honorific title meaning something like 'venerable', etc. In any case, this does not provide sufficient reasons for disproving the present argumentation.

³⁰ See, for instance, Roerich (1995: 359-360).

³¹ I say "partially confirmed" because this point is not completely clear. If, indeed, it is true that Kamalaśīla, in the introductory section of his *Pañjikā*, quotes the *kārikā* 31 from the *Jñānasārasamuccaya*, it is likewise true that this *kārikā* is identical with Śāntarakṣita's *Tattvasaṃgraha* 3587. *Jñānasārasamuccaya* 31 (D, dBu-ma, vol. 199: TSHa fol. 27b5): *bsregs bcaḍ bdar ba'i gser bzin du || dge sloṅ dag gam mkhas rnams kyis || yoṅs su brtags la ṅa yi bka' || blaṅ bar bya ba yi gus phyir min ||*; *Tattvasaṃgraha* 3587: *tāpāchedācca nikaṣāt suvarṇamīva paṇḍitaiḥ | parīkṣya bhikṣavo grāhyaṃ madvaco na tu gauravāt ||*. Jha (1986: 1558, stanza 3588) translates: "O *bhikṣus*, my words should be accepted by the wise, not out of regard for me, but after due investigation, just as gold is accepted as true only after heating, cutting and rubbing". But if we assume that Śāntarakṣita (VIII century CE) himself has taken the *kārikā* from the *Jñānasārasamuccaya* (and I do not see why refuting a similar assumption), the period in which the author of the SPYHS flourished is confirmed to be the VII, and perhaps also the very beginning of the VIII century CE.

<p. 551>

Acknowledgments: I want to express all my gratitude to Ramkrishna Bhattacharya for having read and discussed with me this paper, step by step, from the first draft to its final version, and for having kindly put at my disposal some of his still unpublished articles. I would like, moreover, to thank also Francesco Sferra, for his valuable suggestions, and Luca Manassero for having checked my English.

Bibliography

a) Primary sources

Aṅguttaranikāya:

– Morris, R., Warder, A.K. (ed. by), *The Aṅguttara-Nikāya* vol. I, Pali Text Society, Oxford 1999 rep.

Āryadevapāda, *Jñānasārasamuccaya*:

– *Ye śes sñin po kun las btus pa zes bya ba*, in *The Nyingma Edition of the sDe-dge bKa'-'gyur and bsTan-'gyur*, Dharma Mudranālaya, Oakland (California) 1981, dBu-ma, vol. 199: TSHa, foll. 26b2-28a3.

Āryadevapāda, *Skhalitapramathanayuktihetusiddhi*:

– *'KHrul pa bzlog pa'i rigs pa gtan tshigs grub pa*, in *The Nyingma Edition of the sDe-dge bKa'-'gyur and bsTan-'gyur*, Dharma Mudranālaya, Oakland (California) 1981, dBu-ma, vol. 199: TSHa, foll. 19b1-22b1.

Bhāviveka/Bhavya, *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa*:

– *dBu ma rin po che'i sgron ma*, in *The Nyingma Edition of the sDe-dge bKa'-'gyur and bsTan-'gyur*, Dharma Mudranālaya, Oakland (California) 1981, dBu-ma, vol. 199: TSHa, foll. 259b-289a.

Dīghanikāya:

– Rhys Davids, T.W., Carpenter, J.E. (ed. by), *The Dīgha Nikāya* vol. I, Pali Text Society, Oxford 1992-1995 rep.

Divyāvadānasūtra:

- Vaidya, P.L. (ed. by), *Divyāvadāna*, Mithila Institute, Darbhanga 1959.
- Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra*:
 – Vaidya, P.L. (ed. by), *Gaṇḍavyūha Sūtram*, Mithila Institute, Darbhanga 1960.
- ’Gos lo ts’a ba, *Deb ther sñon po*:
 – Roerich, G.N. (Engl. trans.), *The Blue Annals (Parts I & II Bound in One)*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1995 rep.
- Kamalaśīla, *Tattvasaṃgrahaṇīkā*:
 – Dwārikādās Śāstrī (ed. by), *The Tattvasaṃgraha of Ācārya Śāntaraḥṣita with the “Pañjikā” Commentary of Ācārya Kamalaśīla* (2 vols.), Bauddha Bharati, Varanasi 1968.
 – Jha, G. (Engl. trans.), *The Tattvasaṅgraha of Shāntaraḥṣita with the Commentary of Kamalashīla* (2 vols.), Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1986 rep.
- Kāśyapaparivartasūtra*:
 – von Staël-Holstein, A. (ed. by), *Kāśyapaparivartasūtra, a Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class*, Commercial-Press, Shanghai 1926.
 – Virobyova-Desyatovskaya, M.I. (ed. by), *The Kāśyapaparivarta. Romanized Text and Facsimiles*, The International Research Institute for advanced Buddhology, Soka University, Tokyo 2002.
- Laṅkāvatārasūtra*:
 – Nanjiō, B. (ed. by), *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, The Otani University Press, Kyōto 1923.
 – Suzuki, D.T. (Engl. trans.), *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra: A Mahāyāna Text*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1999.
- Mahābhārata*:
 – Sukhtankar, V.S., et al. (ed. by), *The Mahābhārata for the First Time Critically Edited*, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona 1919-1966.
- Majjhimanikāya*:
 – Trenckner, V. (ed. by), *The Majjhima-Nikāya* vol. II, Pali Text Society, Oxford 1993 rep.

<p. 552>

- Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*:
 – Vaidya, P.L. (ed. by), *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtram*, Mithila Institute, Darbhanga 1960.
- Suttanipāta*:
 – Andersen, D., Smith, H. (ed. by), *The Suttanipāta*, Pali Text Society, Oxford 1990 rep.

b) Secondary sources

- Bhattacharya, Ramkrishna, *Studies on the Cārvāka/Lokāyata*, Società Editrice Fiorentina, Firenze 2009.
- Bhattacharya, Ramkrishna, *lokāyata and Its Derivatives in the Sad-dharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra*, unpublished paper (permission to quote secured).
- Seyfort Ruegg, Davis, “On the Authorship of Some Works Ascribed to Bhāvaviveka/Bhavya”, in: *Panels of the VIIth World Sanskrit Conference* (Vol. II), *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka*, D. Seyfort Ruegg, L. Schmithausen (ed. by), Brill, Leiden 1990, pp. 59-71.
- Mimaki, Katsumi, “*Jñānasārasamuccaya* kk° 20-28. *Mise au point* with a Sanskrit Manuscript”, in: *Buddhist Studies: The Legacy of Gadjin M. Nagao*, J.A. Silk (ed. by), Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 2008, pp. 233-244.
- Tucci, Giuseppe, *Un traité d’Āryadeva sur le “nirvāṇa” des hérétiques*, «T’oung Pao» 24 (1936), pp. 16-31.