

Kazuo Kano

**Two Folios from Sthiramati's Triṃśikābhāṣya
in Sanskrit
Photographed by Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana:
Diplomatic and Critical Editions of
Göttingen Xc14/1e***

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Although many Sanskrit manuscripts were discovered over the last century in India and Nepal, for Buddhist texts Tibet was and remains an important source of old palm leaf manuscripts. Some have been published recently and more probably remain to be discovered in Tibetan (or Chinese) archives.¹ It is easy to forget the monumental discoveries made by Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana in Tibet some seventy years ago. In fact, many of the materials he photographed have still not been systematically treated by scholars.² In the present paper I would like to present editions of two folios from Sthiramati's Triṃśikābhāṣya on a plate kept in Göttingen.

During his third expedition to Tibet, September 19 through 21, 1936, at Ņor E-vaṃ-chos-ldan monastery in gTsañ province, Rāhula Sāṅ-

* I am grateful to Prof. Lambert Schmithausen for a number of text-critical suggestions, to Prof. Karin Preisendanz, Prof. David Jackson, Prof. Toru Funayama, Dr. Hartmut Buescher, Dr. Klaus-Dieter Mathes, and Mr. Yasuhiro Ueno for reading my draft and making many valuable remarks, to Dr. Diwakar Acharya and Dr. Kengo Harimoto for palaeographical suggestions, and to the Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen for permitting me to use the plates of Xc14/1. I also thank Dr. Piotr Balcerowicz and Mrs. Orna Almogi for correcting my English. In a previous article (Kano 2004), I discussed the identification of some unidentified Sanskrit manuscripts photographed by Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana (Göttingen shelf-marks Xc14/1 and Xc14/57). The present paper is part of a series of publications dealing with these manuscripts.

¹ For a discussion of Sanskrit manuscripts in Tibet before and after the Cultural Revolution of China, see Steinkellner 2004.

² As for the photographic materials regarding works of the Pramāṇa tradition, the contribution of Much (1988) is remarkable.

kr̥tyāyana photographed two folios of a palm leaf manuscript along with a number of other Sanskrit manuscripts.³ Later, positive prints were made from the original negative films, and they are preserved today at the Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen.⁴ The two folios at issue are included in the fifth plate⁵ of shelf-mark Xc14/1 of the Göttingen collection. The plate contains the images of eight folios in total. The first three folios are of the Ratnagotravibhāga (20r, 25r, 26r); the fourth, fifth, and sixth folios are from an unknown work quoting verses from the Pramāṇavārttika;⁶ and the remaining two are the folios in question, which are from Sthiramati's Triṃśikābhāṣya (see p. 118, below). The last text fragment is labeled by Bandurski "catalogue number 1(e)," which we call here Xc14/1e. Although Bandurski describes Xc14/1e as "unidentified,"⁷ Schmithausen had previously identified it as part of Sthiramati's Triṃśikābhāṣya⁸ and proposed an emendation to verse 19 based on variant readings retained in the folios. However, he did not go into further details.

Unfortunately the positive print that contains the images of the *verso* sides of these palm leaves is not preserved at Göttingen. However, Rāhula Sāṅkr̥tyāyana most likely photographed the reverse side, too, labeling it "Ñ Mahāyānot. 2B," since he labeled the front side as "Ñ Mahāyānot. 2A" (i.e., photographed at Ñor monastery; Ratnagotravibhāga-Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra; plate number 2A), placing a piece of paper with the siglum in Devanāgarī script below the palm leaves. The right side margins of the palm leaves of Xc14/1e are damaged resulting in the loss of two or three *akṣaras* per line. The Newari script is similar to that of a palm leaf manuscript of

³ For his research at Ñor monastery in 1936 and the list of Sanskrit manuscripts once preserved there, see Sāṅkr̥tyāyana 1937: 18-19, 55; dGe 'dun chos 'phel 1939-1940: 24.15-27.20 (ed. Zam gdoñ), 27.20-31.5 (ed. Hor khañ); Kano 2004: 51, n. 12.

⁴ Bandurski 1994: 13.

⁵ The contents of the fifth plate are exactly the same as of the sixth plate. Rāhula Sāṅkr̥tyāyana photographed the same sides of the same palm leaves twice.

⁶ See Appendix B, Xc14/1d.

⁷ Bandurski 1994: 33.

⁸ "A leaf from a TrBh ms., hidden between the photos of the Ratnagotravibhāga manuscripts kept in Patna" (Schmithausen 1987: 337, n. 419).

the Triṃśikākārikā.⁹ The text on each palm leaf in Xc14/1e is divided into three blocks separated by two string holes. The first folio has seven lines and the second six.

It is very hard to date our manuscript for the lack of any positive evidence: neither is the colophon available nor is any striking external evidence found.¹⁰ We can just approximately date them to some time between the twelfth and thirteenth century for palaeographic reasons.

Aside from our two folios, Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana photographed some more folios of the Triṃśikābhāṣya (Lévi 24.4-25.10 and 27.29-29.17), some time between July 31 and August 16, 1938, again at Ānor monastery.¹¹ Gokhale (1968) reported on them in detail using the original films at Patna and improved Lévi's text on the basis of the readings in the manuscript. Their positive prints are preserved at Göttingen, with the shelf-mark Xc14/57.¹² Since the texts contained in Xc14/1e and Xc14/57 belong to the same work and were photographed at the same monastery, one might think that these palm leaves might have originated from the same bundle. However, their scripts and formats such as string holes and number of lines obviously differ, and hence they probably belong to different bundles.

Of the two folios of Xc14/1e the first folio begins with the last part of a gloss on verse 15, which is followed by verses 16 and 17 with

⁹ For this manuscript (J), see Mimaki et al. 1989: xi and Wang 1985: no. 120.

¹⁰ Although Kaḥ thog Si tu does refer to Sanskrit manuscripts preserved at Ānor monastery in his pilgrims' guide, the description is too vague. See Kaḥ thog 1920: 433.2-3 (ed. Khams sprul) and 314.11-12 (ed. bSod nams tshen brtan). On the other hand, it is remarkable that manuscripts preserved at Ānor monastery were mostly copied before its foundation in 1429. According to Sāṅkrtyāyana's list, the oldest datable manuscript found at Ānor was written in 1069 (the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā) and the latest in 1305 (the Kriyāsamuccaya, Xc14/40a). See Sāṅkrtyāyana 1935: 33, 35; Petech 1984: 46-47. This fact indicates that the manuscripts had been previously preserved elsewhere (according to Sāṅkrtyāyana 1935: 22 "the Mss., which are found in the monasteries of Žva lu and Ānor, originally belong to Sa skya") and brought into Ānor later. Thus, the year of the foundation of Ānor is not relevant for the dating of our manuscript.

¹¹ Sāṅkrtyāyana 1938: 140; Kano 2004: 52-53, n. 20.

¹² The text fragments of the Triṃśikābhāṣya are contained in Xc14/57, plate 1, leaves 1-2 (r); plate 2, leaf 1 (v).

their commentaries (Lévi 34.9-35.17). Verse 16 discusses five situations in which *manovijñāna* does not arise. Verse 17 states that the Self and all phenomena are conceptualized/superimposed by the threefold *vijñānapariṇāma* or *vikalpa* (*ālayavijñāna*, *kliṣṭamanas*, and *pravṛttivijñāna*). The second folio begins with a gloss on verse 19 (which deals with *ālayavijñāna* at the moment of rebirth) and ends with the proof of the existence of *ālayavijñāna* (Lévi 36.25-37.23).

INTRODUCTION TO THE EDITION

In this article, I provide a diplomatic transcription of the text fragments of the *Triṃśikābhāṣya* contained in Xc14/1e, their critical edition, and notes on selected readings. I also give two appendices: Appendix A is a table of corrections and alternative readings to Lévi (34.9-35.17 and 36.25-37.23) and Appendix B is a register of identification of texts that were not identified by Bandurski (1994).

In my critical edition, the primary witnesses are the two Sanskrit manuscripts: Xc14/1e (abbr. Xc) and a Nepalese palm leaf manuscript used by Lévi (abbr. C/D).¹³ C and D, though they are labeled with different manuscript sigla, belong to one and the same bundle.¹⁴ Two palm leaf manuscripts of the verse text of the *Triṃśikākārikā* (abbr. A and J), a Tibetan translation of the *Triṃśikābhāṣya* (abbr. Tib),¹⁵ Vinītadeva's subcommentary (the *Triṃśikāṭīkā*, abbr. Vin),

¹³ C/D, as well as Xc, seems to have been written some time between the twelfth and thirteenth century. I do not take into consideration secondary handwritten transcripts (Mss. E-I), which are modern copies of C/D. See Mimaki et al. (1989: xi): "Originally C and D constituted one and the same manuscript. ... Now, so far as the other manuscripts (E-I) of the *Triṃśikābhāṣya* collected here are concerned, I is a modern copy of D. E through H are nothing but copies of C." (E contains a number of notes by Lévi.) See also Funahashi 1986: 16-21 and Sugawara's survey of the *Triṃśikābhāṣya*'s manuscripts (Tsukamoto et al. 1990: 363).

¹⁴ C covers Lévi 15.1-21.4 and 35.10-45.4; D covers 21.4-35.10. They were once preserved at different places (C in the collection of Hem Raj Sharma [1878-1953] and D at the Bir Library), and hence they are labeled with different sigla. See Funahashi 1986: 19-20 and Mimaki et al. 1989.

¹⁵ For the Tibetan translation, I mainly refer to Teramoto's critical edition, which depends on the Peking, Derge, and Narthang Tanjurs. However, the edition contains some errors, which I emend on the basis of readings of the Peking and Derge Tanjur.

and some other Yogācāra works are also referred to. Vin is partially preserved in Sanskrit (abbr. Vin-skt). The commentary on the text of our first folio is available in Sanskrit. As for the text of the second folio, I have made use of a Tibetan translation of Vin (abbr. Vin-tib). I have also used lists of emendations to Lévi's edition by modern scholars such as Ui and Wogihara (abbr. Ui/W).¹⁶

One will easily notice, owing to some significant variants, that the transmission line of our manuscript differs from that of C/D. Some readings in Xc are traceable only in Vinūta-deva's commentary, which, in comparison to other extant sources, contains older readings. Thus, I consider these readings closer to Sthiramati's original and, for this reason, have given more weight to them.

The folio number of our palm leaves is unknown since the photo of the *verso* sides is lacking in the Göttingen collection. I thus refer to these two folios as "folio A" (Xc14/1, plate 5, leaf 7) and "folio B" (leaf 8).

In my diplomatic transcription, boldfaced letters refer to variant readings that differ from those in Lévi's edition. Circular symbols (○) indicate string holes in the palm leaves. Triple slashes (///) mark the broken points at the right ends of the leaves. "+" signs indicate lost *akṣaras*. Square brackets enclose damaged *akṣaras*.

For my critical edition, I follow the standard orthography with regard to gemination/degemination after or before semi-vowels and sandhi. Verse-numberings inserted in the text are Lévi's. Italics denote readings which present equally possible variants. Raised lowercase letters in round brackets refer to a note on the word, phrase or sentence. Asterisks indicate reconstructed Sanskrit words mostly based on Tibetan renderings. The raised letters ^{ac} (*ante correctionem*) and ^{pc} (*post correctionem*) after manuscript sigla indicate readings before and after scribal correction.

¹⁶ For some other related studies, see Tsukamoto et al. 1990: 364-366.

Table 1: Contents of Xc14/1 plate 5 (= 6)

leaf 1: Ratnagotravibhāga, 20r	= Xc14/1a
leaf 2: Ratnagotravibhāga, 25r	
leaf 3: Ratnagotravibhāga, 26r	
leaf 4: unknown <i>pramāṇa</i> text (r)	= Xc14/1d
leaf 5: unknown <i>pramāṇa</i> text (r)	
leaf 6: unknown <i>pramāṇa</i> text (r)	
leaf 7: Triṃśikābhāṣya fol. A (r)	= Xc14/1e
leaf 8: Triṃśikābhāṣya fol. B (r)	

Table 2: Concordance of Xc14/1e and related passages in other versions

	fol. A	fol. B
Lévi	34.9-35.17	36.25-37.23
C/D	18v7-20r3	21r5-22r3
Tib	59.12-63.14	67.5-70.1
	De 163v2-164v4	165v3-166r7
	P 191r8-192v7	194r2-196v3
Vin-skt	487.24-489.10	—
Vin-tib	De 43v4-45v5	47v3-49v1
	P 48r2-50r4	52r1-53v7
A	4v6-5r1 (verses 16 and 17)	5r2 (verse 19)
J	1r8-9 (verses 16 and 17)	1v1 (verse 19)

DIPLOMATIC TRANSCRIPTION

[Folio A]

[A1]dhye | ekenaiivotpattavyaṃ | na pañcabhir apīti | tasmād ālam-
banasadbhāve pañcānām **evotpattiḥ** | **naiva votpattir** ity abhyupeyaṃ
| ida ○ m idānīm vaktavyaṃ kiṃ ma[no]vi¹⁷jñānaṃ cakṣurādivijñā-
naiḥ saha pravarttate | vinā ca | uta naiveya ata āha | manovijñāna-
saṃbhūtiḥ sarvvadā 'saṃjñikād ṛte | samāpatti ○ dvayān middhān
mūrechanād apy ac[i]ttakād iti | sarvvadeti | sarvvakālam | cakṣur-
ādivijñānaiḥ saha vinā vety arthaḥ | asyotsargga[sye]/// +

¹⁷ *vi* is added in the upper margin.

[A2]m apavādam ārabhate | āsamjñikād ṛte samāpattidvayān mūrchanād apy acittakād iti | tatrāsamjñikam asaṃjñisattveṣu deveṣūpapa ○ nasya yaś cittacaitasikānāṃ nirodhaḥ || samāpattidvayam asaṃjñisamāpattir nirodhasamāpattiś ca || tatrāsamjñisamāpattis tr̥tīyād dhyānād vītarāgasya ○ rdhvam avītarāgasya niḥsaraṇasamjñāpūrvvakeṇa manasikāreṇa manovijñānasya tatsamprayuktānāṃ caittānāṃ yo nirodha/// ++

[A3]trāsamjñisamāpattir ity ucyate | nirudhyate 'neneti nirodhaḥ | sa punaḥ sa¹⁸ samprayogasya manovijñānasya samudācārani ○ rodhaḥ | āśrayasyāvasthāviśeṣaḥ | sa ca samāpatticittānantaram cit-tāntarotpattiviruddhāśrayaḥ prāpyata iti samāpattir ity ucyate || nirodhasamāpa ○ ttir ākiñcanyāyatanavītarāgasya śāntavihārasamjñāpūrvvakeṇa manasikāreṇa sa¹⁹samprayogasya manovijñānasya kliṣṭ[a]/// ++

[A4]manaso yo nirodhaḥ | iyam apy asaṃjñisamāpattivad āśrayasyāvasthāviśeṣe prajñāpyate | acittakaṃ middhaṃ gādhamiddho ○ pahatatvād āśrayasya tāvatkālam manovijñānāpravṛtter acittakam ity ucyate | acittikā mūrcehā āgantukenābhighātena vātapittaslesmavaīṣamyē ○ ṇa vā yad āśrayavaīṣamyam manovijñānapravṛttiviruddhaṃ tatrācittikā mūrcehopacaryate | etāḥ pañcāvasthā varjayi/// ++

[A5]danyāsu sarvāsv avasthāsu manovijñānapravṛttir veditavyā || evam āsamjñikādiṣu **vijñāne** niruddhe tadapagame ○ punaḥ kuta utpadyate yatas tasya **na** kālakriyā bhavati | tat punar ālayavijñānād evotpadyate | tad dhi sarvavijñānabijakam iti | **tatra** vijñānapari ○ ṇāme ātmadharmopacāraḥ sa punas trividhe **py** uddiśya vistareṇa trividho 'pi nirdiṣṭaḥ | idānīm ātmadharmo[pa]/// ++

[A6]yaḥ pravarttate sa vijñānapariṇāma eva vijñānapariṇāmān **na** pṛthag asty ātmā dharmmaś ceti yat pratijñātaṃ tatpra ○ sādhanārtham āha || vijñānapariṇāmo yaṃ vikalpo yad vikalpyate | tena tan nāsti tenedaṃ sarvaṃ vijñāptimātrakam iti | yo yaṃ vijñānapa ○ riṇāmaḥ | trividho nantaram abhīhitaḥ | **ayaṃ** vikalpo adhyāropitākāras²⁰ traidhātukāś cittaś caittā vika/// +++

[A7]te || yathoktam abhūtaparikalpas tu cittacaittās tridhātukā iti | tena trividhena vikalpenālayavijñānaṃ kli ○ ṣṭam manāḥ pravṛttijñā-

¹⁸ *sa* is added in the upper margin.

¹⁹ *sa* is added in the upper margin.

²⁰ After *tā*, *ā* has been erased.

nasvabhāvena sasamprayogena yad vikalpyate | bhājanam ātmā
skandhadhātvaṅyatanam rūpaśabdādikaṃ vastu tan nāstī O ty ato
vijñānapariṇāmo vikalpa ucyate | asadāmbanatvāt | katham pu-
nar etad vijñāyate | tadā[a]/// ++

[Folio B]

[B1]adhyāsitaṃ grāhyam astīty adhyavasāyo grāhyagrāhakaṃ | tac
ca vijñānena pratīyate | vijñāyate grhyata iti O yo yaṃ niścayaḥ sa
grāhakaḥ²¹ | pūrvotpannagrāhyagrāhakaḥ²² | anā-
gatatajjātīyagrāhyagrāhakaḥ²³ O tpattibījaṃ grāhadvayavāsanā
| tatra karmavāsanābhedaḥ gatibhedaḥ²⁴ | bīja-
bheda[d a]/// ++

[B2]rabhedavat | grāhadvayavāsanā tu sarvakarmavāsanānām
yathāsvam akṣiptātmabhāvotpādane pravṛttānām O saha-kāritvaṃ
pratipadyate tadyathā pṛthivyādayo bījasyāmkurotpattāv iti | evaṃ
ca kevalāḥ karmavāsanā grāhadvayavāsanānūgr O hitā vipākam
janayantīty uktaṃ bhavati | ata evāha || grāhadvayavāsanāyā sa-
heti | kṣiṇe pūrvvapipā[ke]/// +

[B3]vipākam janayanti | tad iti pūrvvajānamopacitena²⁵ karmmanā
ya iha vipāko bhinirvartitaṃ | tasmin kṣiṇai O ti | ākṣepakālaparyan-
tāvasthite yathābalaṃ karmavāsanā grāhadvayavāsanānsahitā upa-
yuktād vipākād anyam vipākam tad evāla O yavijñānam janayanti
ālayavijñānavyatirikasyā²⁶nyasya vipākasyā²⁵bhāvāt | kṣiṇe pūrvva-
vipāka ity anena/// +

[B4]śvatāntam pariharati | anyam vipākam janayantīty ucchedān-
tam | cakṣurādivijñānavyatiriktam ālayavijñānam asti O tad eva ca
sarvabījan na cakṣurādivijñānam iti | kuta etad āgamād yuktitatas
ca | uktaṃ hi bhagavatā 'bhidharmmasūtre | anādikā O liko dhātuḥ
sarvadharmmasamāśrayas tasmin sati gatīḥ sarvā nirvāṇādhighamo
pi ca | na cālayavijñāna/// ++

[B5]reṇa saṃsārapravṛttir nirvṛtir vā yujyate | tatra saṃsārapravṛt-
tir nikāyasabhāgā²⁶ntareṣu pratisandhibandha O ḥ | nirvṛtiḥ sopa-

²¹ The scribe corrects *grāhakaḥ* to *grāhakaḥ*.

²² The scribe corrects *bho* to *bhā*.

²³ After *ja, ma* (?) has been erased.

²⁴ *ga*, which is still visible, has been overwritten with *syā*.

²⁵ *syā* is added in the lower margin of the leaf.

²⁶ After *gā, bha* (?) is erased.

dhiṣeṣo nirupadhiṣeṣaś ca nirvāṇadhātuh | tatrālayavijñānād anyat
saṃskārapratyayaṃ vijñānaṃ na yujyate | ○ saṃskārapratyaya**ā**bhā-
ve pravṛtter apy abhāvah | ālayavijñānānabhyupagame pratisandhi-
vijñānaṃ vā saṃ/// +

[B6]rapratyayaṃ parikalpyeta | saṃskāraparibhāvitā vā ṣaḍ vijñā-
nakāyāḥ | tatra ye saṃskārāḥ pratisandhika ○ vijñānapratyayatve-
neṣyante | teṣāṃ ciraniruddhatvān niruddhasya cāsatvād asataś ca
pratyayatvābhāvān na saṃskārapratyayaṃ prati ○ sandhivijñānaṃ
yujyate | pratisandhau ca nāmarūpam api na kevalaṃ vijñānaṃ |
tatra vijñānaṃ eva saṃskār[a]/// +

CRITICAL EDITION

[Folio A: Lévi 34.9-35.17]

°dhye | ekenaivotpattavyam | na pañcabhir apīti | tasmād ālambana-
sadbhāve pañcānām ²⁷→evotpattiḥ | naiva votpattir^{←27} ity abhyupe-
yam | ^(a)

idam idānīm vaktavyaṃ kiṃ manovijñānaṃ²⁸ cakṣurādivijñānaiḥ
saha pravartate | vinā vā²⁹ | uta naivety^{30(b)} ata āha |

manovijñānasambhūtiḥ sarvadāsaṃjñikād ṛte |

samāpattidvayān middhān mūrchanād apy acittakād (16) iti |

sarvadeti | sarvakālam | cakṣurādivijñānaiḥ saha vinā vety arthaḥ |
asyotsargasyemam³¹ apavādam ārabhate | ^(c) āsaṃjñikād ṛte samā-
pattidvayān middhān³² mūrchanād apy acittakād iti | ^(d) tatrāsaṃjñi-
kam asaṃjñisattveṣu deveṣūpapannasya yaś cittacaitasikānāṃ dhar-
mānāṃ³³ nirodhaḥ || ^(e) samāpattidvayam asaṃjñisamāpattir nirodha-
samāpattiś ca || tatrāsaṃjñisamāpattis tṛtīyād³⁴ dhyānād^(f) vītarā-
gasyordhvaṃ³⁵ avītarāgasya^(g) niḥsaraṇasaṃjñāpūrvakeṇa manasi-
kāreṇa manovijñānasya tatsaṃprayuktānāṃ ca³⁶ caittānāṃ^(h) yo ni-

²⁷ *api cotpattir* D (= Lévi); *apy utpattir* Ui.

²⁸ *manojñānaṃ* Xc^{ac}.

²⁹ *ca* Xc D (= Lévi); em. (with Tib).

³⁰ Om. Tib.

³¹ *asyotsargasya* D (= Lévi) Vin-skt ≈ Tib (*spyir btañ ba 'di'i*).

³² Om. Xc.

³³ Om. Xc.

³⁴ *tṛtīya*^o D (= Lévi).

³⁵ *vītarāgasya nordhvaṃ* D^{pc} (= Lévi); *vītavītarāgasyordhvaṃ* D^{ac}. Ui suggests to omit *na*.

³⁶ Om. Xc.

rodhaḥ so 'trāsaṃjñīsamāpattir ity ucyate | nirudhyate 'neneti nirodhaḥ | sapunaḥ sasamprayogasya³⁷ manovijñānasya samudācāranirodhaḥ | āśrayasyāvasthāviśeṣaḥ | sa ca samāpatticittād anantaraṃ cittāntarotpattiviruddha āśrayaḥ³⁸ prāpyata iti samāpattir ity ucyate ||⁽ⁱ⁾ nirodhasamāpattir ākiñcanyāyatanavītarāgasya śāntavihārasaṃjñāpūrvakeṇa manasikāreṇa sasamprayogasya³⁹ manovijñānasya kliṣṭasya ca manaso yo nirodhaḥ | iyam apy asaṃjñīsamāpattivad āśrayasyāvasthāviśeṣe prajñāpyate | acittakaṃ⁴⁰ middhaṃ gāḍhamiddhopahata tvād āśrayasya tāvatkālam manovijñānāpravṛtter acittakaṃ ity ucyate | acittikā mūrchāgantukēnābhīghātena⁴¹⁽ⁱ⁾ vā tapittaśleṣamavaiśamyēṇa⁴² vā yad āśrayavaiśamyam manovijñānapravṛttiviruddhaṃ⁴³ tatrācittikā⁴⁴ mūrhopacaryate | etāḥ pañcāvasthā⁴⁵ varjayitvā tadanyāsu sarvāsv avasthāsu manovijñānapravṛttir veditavyā || evam āsaṃjñīkādiṣu manovijñāne^{46(k)} niruddhe tadapagame punaḥ kuta utpadyate⁴⁷ 48→yat tasya kālakriyā na bhavati^{←48} |^(l) tat punar ālayavijñānād evotpadyate | tad dhi sarvavijñānabījakam iti |

yatra⁴⁹ vijñānapariṇāma⁵⁰ ātmadharmopacāraḥ sa punas tridhety⁵¹ uddiṣya vistareṇa trividho 'pi nirdiṣṭaḥ | idānīm ātmadharmopacāro yaḥ pravartate⁵² sa vijñānapariṇāma eva^(m) 53→vijñānapariṇāmān na pṛthag asty ātmā dharmāś ceti^{←53(n)} yat pratijñātaṃ⁵⁴ tatprasādhanārtham āha ||

³⁷ *samprayogasya* Xc^{ac}.

³⁸ *samāpatticittānantaraṃ cittāntarotpattiviruddhāśrayaḥ* Xc; *samāpatticittād anantarotpattiviruddhāśrayaḥ* D^{ac}.

³⁹ *samprayogasya* Xc^{ac}.

⁴⁰ *acittaka* D.

⁴¹ °*gantunābhīghātena* D (= Lévi).

⁴² °*śleṣavaiśamyēṇa* D.

⁴³ *manovijñānapravṛttiviruddhaṃ* D^{ac}.

⁴⁴ *tatrācittikā* D.

⁴⁵ *pañcāvasthāṃ* D.

⁴⁶ *mano* is omitted in Xc and Tib.

⁴⁷ D adds a *daṇḍa*.

⁴⁸ *yatas tasya na kālakriyā bhavati* Xc.

⁴⁹ *tatra* Xc.

⁵⁰ °*pariṇāme* Xc D (= Lévi).

⁵¹ *trividhe py* Xc.

⁵² *prajñāpyate* D (= Lévi).

⁵³ *na vijñānapariṇāmāt sa pṛthag asti ātmā dharmāś ceti* D; *na vijñānapariṇāmāt sa pṛthag asti ātmā dharmā veti* Lévi. Ui proposes to omit *sa*.

Xc14/1e, fol. B (r)


left



middle



right



vijñānapariṇāmo 'yaṃ vikalpo yad vikalpyate |
 tena tan nāsti tenedaṃ sarvaṃ vijñaptimātrakaṃ⁵⁵ (17) iti |⁵⁶
 yo 'yaṃ vijñānapariṇāmas⁵⁷ trividho 'nantaram abhihitah | so⁵⁸ 'yaṃ
 vikalpah |⁵⁹ adhyāropitārthākārās⁶⁰ traidhātukās⁶¹ cittacaittā⁶² vi-
 kalpa ucyate ||⁽⁶⁾ yathoktam

abhūtaparikalpas tu cittacaittās tridhātukā⁶³ iti |
 tena trividhena vikalpenālayavijñānakliṣṭamanahpravṛttivijñānasva-
 bhāvena⁶⁴ sasamprayogeṇa yad vikalpyate^{65(p)} bhājanam ātmā skan-
 dhadhātvāyatanam⁶⁶ rūpaśabdādikaṃ vastu tan nāstīty atah sa⁶⁷
 vijñānapariṇāmo vikalpa ucyate |^(q) asadāmbanāt⁶⁸ | katham
 punar etad vijñāyate | tadāmbana^o

[Folio B: Lévi 36.25-37.23]

*svasantānādhyāsitaṃ*⁶⁹ grāhyam astīty adhyavasāyo grāhyagrāhaḥ⁷⁰
 |^(r) tac ca vijñānena pratīyate vijñāyate grhyata iti yo 'yaṃ niścayaḥ
 sa grāhakagrāhaḥ⁷¹ | pūrvotpannagrāhyagrāhakagrāhākṣiptam | anā-
 gatatajjātīyagrāhya⁷²grāhakagrāhotpattibijam grāhadvayavāsana |
 tatra karmavāsanābhedād gatibhedenātmabhāvabhedah⁷³ | bijabhe-

⁵⁴ *pratijñā* D^{ac}.

⁵⁵ °*mātram* D (unmetrical).

⁵⁶ Lévi omits the *daṇḍa*.

⁵⁷ *pariṇāmah* | Xc.

⁵⁸ Om. Xc.

⁵⁹ *vikalpo* Xc.

⁶⁰ *adhyāropitākāras* Xc^{pc}; *adhyāropitā ākāras* Xc^{ac}; C adds a *daṇḍa* after °*ākārāḥ*.

⁶¹ *traidhātukās* Lévi (typo).

⁶² *cittas caittā* Xc.

⁶³ *tridhātukāḥ* Lévi.

⁶⁴ *ālayavijñānam kliṣṭam manah pravṛttivijñānasvabhāvena* Xc; *ālayavijñā-
 nakliṣṭamanah* | *pravṛttivijñānasvabhāvena* C.

⁶⁵ *vikalpyate* | Xc.

⁶⁶ °*āyatana* C (= Lévi).

⁶⁷ *ato* Xc (instead of *ataḥ sa*).

⁶⁸ *asadāmbanātāt* D^{ac}.

⁶⁹ **svasantāna-* (or: **svasantāne*) *adhyāsitaṃ* Xc; **svasattādhyāsitaṃ* (*rañ
 god pas gnas pa'i*) Tib Vin-tib.

⁷⁰ *grāhyagrāhakaṃ* Xc.

⁷¹ *grāhakagrāhakaṃ* Xc^{ac}.

⁷² °*grāhyaka* C^{ac}.

⁷³ °*bhōvabhedah* Xc^{ac}.

dād aṅkurabhedavat | grāhadvayavāsanā⁷⁴ tusarvakarmavāsanānām
yathāsvam ākṣiptātmbabhāvotpādane pravṛttānām sahakāritvaṃ
pratipadyate^(s) tadyathā *pṛthivyādayo*^{75(u)} bījasyāṅkurotpattāv⁷⁶ iti |
evaṃ ca na⁷⁷ kevalāḥ karmavāsanā grāhadvayavāsanānānugṛhītā⁷⁸
vipākaṃ janayanti^(u) uktaṃ bhavati | ata evāha || grāhadvayavāsa-
nāyā⁷⁹ saheti | kṣīṇe pūrvavipāke 'nyam⁸⁰ vipākaṃ janayanti⁸¹ tad
iti |⁸² pūrvajanmo⁸³ pacitena karmanā ya iha vipāko 'bhinirvṛttas⁸⁴
tasmin kṣīṇa ity⁸⁵ ākṣepakālaparyantāvasthite⁸⁶ yathābalaṃ karma-
vāsanā grāhadvayavāsanāśahitā⁸⁷ *upayuktād*⁸⁸ vipākād anyam⁸⁹ vipā-
kaṃ tad evālayavijñānaṃ janayanti |^{90(v)}

ālayavijñānavyatiriktasyānyasya⁹¹ vipākasyābhāvāt⁹² |^(w) kṣīṇe pūrv-
vavipāka ity anena śāśvatāntaṃ pariharati | anyam⁹³ vipākaṃ jana-
yantīty ucchedāntam |

caḥṣurādivijñānavyatiriktam ālayavijñānam asti tad eva ca sarva-
bījakam⁹⁴ na caḥṣurādivijñānam⁹⁵ iti⁹⁶ →kuta etat | āgamād yuktitaś
ca |^{←96} uktaṃ hi bhagavatābhidharmasūtre |

⁷⁴ °vāsanās C; °vāsanāyās Lévi (em. silently).

⁷⁵ *arvādayo* C^{ac} (= Lévi); *arvādayo* C^{ac}; *abādayo* Lévi 1932 ≈ Tib (*chu la sogs pa*); *aṃbvādayo* W.

⁷⁶ *ṅkurasgotpattāv* C (= Lévi).

⁷⁷ Om. Xc.

⁷⁸ °vāsanānugṛhītā Xc Lévi ≈ Tib (*bag chags kyis zin pas*).

⁷⁹ °vāsanāyā C^{ac}.

⁸⁰ *anyadvipākaṃ* C (= Lévi). 'nyam is lacking in Xc because of the loss of the right end of the palm leaf but can be restored on the basis of the analogy to the next sentence.

⁸¹ Xc adds a *daṇḍa*.

⁸² Om. Xc.

⁸³ *pūrvajama* (?) Xc^{ac}.

⁸⁴ *bhinirvṛttas* C; *bhinirvartitaṃ* | Xc. Cf. Tib: **abhinirhṛtas* (*mñon par bsgrubs pa*).

⁸⁵ *kṣīṇa iti* | Xc; *kṣīṇe iti* | C (= Lévi).

⁸⁶ °*kāle paryantāvasthite* Lévi (em.).

⁸⁷ *grāhadbaya*° Lévi (typo).

⁸⁸ *upabhuktād* C (= Lévi).

⁸⁹ *anyad* C (= Lévi).

⁹⁰ *janayanty* Xc.

⁹¹ °*vyatirekeṇānyasya* C (= Lévi); °*vyatiriktaga*(?)*nyasya* Xc^{ac}.

⁹² *vipākabhāvāt* Xc^{ac}.

⁹³ *anyad* C (= Lévi).

⁹⁴ *sarvabījan* Xc.

⁹⁵ *ḥṣurādivijñānam* C.

⁹⁶ | *kuta etad āgamād yuktitataś ca* | Xc.

anādikāliko dhātuḥ sarvadharmasamāśrayaḥ |
 tasmin sati gatiḥ⁹⁷ sarvā nirvāṇadhigamo 'pi ca⁹⁸ |^(x)
 na cālayavijñānam antareṇa saṃsārapravṛttir nirvṛttir⁹⁹ vā yujyate |
 tatra saṃsārapravṛttir nikāyasabhāgā¹⁰⁰ntareṣu pratisandhibandhaḥ
 | nirvṛttiḥ¹⁰¹sopadhiśeṣo nirupadhiśeṣaś ca nirvāṇadhātuḥ | tatrālaya-
 vijñānād anyat saṃskārapratyayaṃ vijñānaṃ na yujyate | saṃskā-
 rapratyayavijñānābhāve¹⁰² pravṛtter apy abhāvaḥ |¹⁰³ ālayavijñānā-
 nabhyupagame pratisandhivijñānaṃ vā saṃskārapratyayaṃ pari-
 kalpyeta¹⁰⁴ | saṃskāraparibhāvitā vā¹⁰⁵ ṣaḍ vijñānakāyāḥ | tatra ye¹⁰⁶
 saṃskārāḥ prātisandhika¹⁰⁷vijñānapratyayatveneṣyante¹⁰⁸ teṣāṃ ci-
 raniruddhatvān¹⁰⁹ niruddhasya¹¹⁰ cāsattvād¹¹¹ asataś ca pratyayatvā-
 bhāvān¹¹² na saṃskārapratyayaṃ pratisandhivijñānaṃ yujyate |^(y)
 pratisandhau ca nāmarūpam apy asti¹¹³ na kevalaṃ vijñānaṃ |¹¹⁴
 tatra vijñānaṃ eva saṃskārapra^{o(z)}

NOTES

(a) *tasmād ālambanasadbhāve pañcānām evotpattiḥ | naiva votpattir ity abhyupeyam.*

D's reading (= Lévi) is possible,¹¹⁵ but the adopted reading of Xc is more understandable:

⁹⁷ *gatiḥ* Xc; *gati*^o C.

⁹⁸ *vā* C (= Lévi).

⁹⁹ *nirvṛttir* Xc.

¹⁰⁰ *nikāyasabhāgābha* Xc^{ac}.

¹⁰¹ *nirvṛttiḥ* Xc.

¹⁰² *pratyayābhāve* Xc.

¹⁰³ C (= Lévi) adds *saṃsārasya* (which relates to *pravṛtter* but seems to be a later addition).

¹⁰⁴ *parikalpyetaḥ* C.

¹⁰⁵ *saṃskārabhāvitāḥ* | C; *saṃskārabhāvitā vā* Lévi (em.).

¹⁰⁶ *tatre* U.

¹⁰⁷ *pratisandhika*^o Xc; *prātisandhikā*^o C.

¹⁰⁸ Xc and C (= Lévi) add a *daṇḍa*.

¹⁰⁹ *tvāt* | C (= Lévi).

¹¹⁰ *nirudhasya* C.

¹¹¹ *tvāt* C (= Lévi).

¹¹² *ābhāvāt* | C (= Lévi).

¹¹³ *api* Xc (instead of *apy asti*).

¹¹⁴ Om. C (= Lévi).

¹¹⁵ D (= Lévi) reads *tasmād ālambanasadbhāve pañcānām api cotpattir ity abhyupeyam*, "Therefore, one has to accept that, when [all five kinds of] objects are present, also (*ca*) all (*api*) five [sense-perceptions (*vijñāna*) may] arise [in addition to the *manovijñāna*]." Cf. Lévi 1932: 104.

Therefore, one has to accept that, when [all five kinds of] objects are present, [either] all the five [sense-perceptions (*viññāna*)] arise, or that [there is] no arising [of sense-perception] at all (*naiva votpattir*) [because there is no reason to single out one and to neglect the others].

This is supported by the Tibetan translation¹¹⁶ and Vinītadeva's gloss (*yadi vā pañcānām api viññānānām utpattiyā bhavitavyam, yadi vā naikasyāpīti*).¹¹⁷

(b) *kiṃ manovijñānaṃ cakṣurādivijñānaiḥ saha pravartate | vinā vā | uta naivety.*

In place of *vinā ca* (Xc; D = Lévi), **vinā vā* (Tib)¹¹⁸ is required in the present context, in which Sthiramati presents a threefold alternative as follows:

[May] non-sensory cognition (*manovijñāna*) arise together with sense-perceptions such as [cognition by means of the] eyes etc. (*cakṣurādivijñāna*) or (*vā*) [may it] arise without them or even (*uta*) not arise at all?

This is supported by a later sentence (*cakṣurādivijñānaiḥ saha vinā vety arthah*).¹¹⁹

The Tibetan translation, on the other hand, omits the third alternative (i.e., *manovijñāna* does not arise at all), which is found in all other versions. This omission is not acceptable since Sthiramati provides his answer to the third alternative in a subsequent passage, i.e., in the five situations¹²⁰ *manovijñāna* does not arise at all.

(c) *asyotsargasyemam apavādam ārabhate.*

The *akṣara* °*syē*° is badly damaged and °*ma*° is missing due to the loss of the right edge of the leaf.¹²¹ Despite the fact that *imam* is

¹¹⁶ Tib 59.13-14: *de lta bas na dmigs pa yod na lña char 'byuñ ba'am | yañ na mi 'byuñ bar khas blañ dgos so.*

¹¹⁷ Vin-skt 487.27.

¹¹⁸ Tib 60.1-2. Lévi (1932) emends *ca* to *vā*.

¹¹⁹ Lévi 34.15.

¹²⁰ I.e., *āsaṃjñika, asaṃjñīsamāpatti, nirodhasamāpatti, acittakaṃ middham, acittikā mūrchā*. See verse 16 and Lévi 34.15-35.2.

¹²¹ One can presuppose that one or two *akṣaras* were lost here, judging from broken parts of other lines.

partly illegible and omitted in the other versions (D = Lévi; ≈ Tib; Vin-skt), this reconstructed reading is supported by a parallel formula in the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya (*tasyotsargasyāyam apavādah*).¹²² Moreover, *imam apavādam* (“the following exception”) corresponds to *iti* in the next sentence and hence fits better with the present context.

(d) *āsaṃjñīkāḍ ṛte samāpattidvayān middhān mūrchanād apy acittakād iti*.

The omission of *middhān* in Xc is unacceptable insofar as Sthiramati repeats here verse 16. None of the other versions (D = Lévi; ≈ Tib; Vin-skt) omits *middhān*.

(e) *yaś cittacaitasikānām dharmānām nirodhaḥ*.

The omission of *dharmānām* in Xc seems problematic. From a grammatical point of view, the adjective *caitasikānām* presupposes a substantive in general. Also Sthiramati uses a parallel wording in a previous sentence (*yac caitasikam dharmāntaram*).¹²³ *caitasika dharmā* is a fixed expression. As a phrase equivalent to *cittacaitasikānām dharmānām nirodhaḥ*, Sthiramati (in the Triṃśikābhāṣya), Vinīta-deva (in the Triṃśikāṭīkā) and Vasubandhu (in the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya) present *cittacaitānām nirodhaḥ* (without *dharmānām*).¹²⁴

(f) *ṛtīyād dhyānād*

This reading of Xc is supported by Vinīta-deva's commentary.¹²⁵ The reading *ṛtīyadhyānād* (D = Lévi) as a compound does not seem to be acceptable. The words *ṛtīya* and *dhyāna* usually occur separately.¹²⁶

¹²² AKBh 65.5, 230.21.

¹²³ Lévi 27.18.

¹²⁴ See Lévi 34.20-21: *tatsaṃprayuktānām ca caittānām yo nirodhaḥ so 'trāsaṃjñīsamāpattir ity ucyate*; Vin-skt 487.41-42: *teṣūpapannasya yaś cittacaitānām nirodhas tad āsaṃjñīkam ucyate*; AKBh 68.13-14 (ad II.41): *asaṃjñīsattveṣu deveṣūpapannānām yaś cittacaitānām nirodhas tad āsaṃjñīkam nāma dravyam*; AKBh 68.26 (ad II.41): *yathāivāsaṃjñīkam uktaṃ nirodhas cittacaitānām iti*; AKBh 70.2 (ad II.43): *nirodhas cittacaitānām iti*.

¹²⁵ Vin-skt 488.3.

¹²⁶ Compounds like *ṛtīyadhyāna* seem to be comparatively rare except as members of larger compounds. See AKBh 35.14, etc., but also *ibid.* 228.9.

(g) *ūrdhvam avītarāgasya*

D (= Lévi) adds the negative particle (*nordhvam avītarāgasya*), which is not required from a semantic point of view.¹²⁷ The adopted reading is interpreted as “[a *yogin*] who is not free from attachment to [stages] higher [than the third level of *dhyāna*].” This is attested verbatim¹²⁸ in Vinītadeva’s commentary and supported by a gloss on the same verse in the Cheng wei shi lun (37b25-26):

謂有異生伏遍淨貪未伏上染 “Namely, there are ordinary persons (*prthagjana*) who have suppressed the attachment to Śubhakṛtsna [in the third *dhyāna*] but have not yet suppressed the defilements of the higher level.”

(h) *manovijñānasya tatsaṃprayuktānāṃ ca caittānāṃ*.

The omission of *ca* before *caittānāṃ* in Xc is not acceptable. The context requires the conjunction *ca* as attested in all other versions (D = Lévi; ≈ Tib; Vin-skt): “[the extinction (*nirodha*)] of non-sensory cognition (*manovijñāna*) and (*ca*) of the mental factors associated with it (= *manovijñāna*).”

(i) *sa ca samāpatticittād anantaram cittaṅtarotpattiviruddha āśrayaḥ prāpyata iti samāpattiv ity ucyate*.

The reading *samāpatticittād anantaram* (D = Lévi) in place of *samāpatticittānantaram* (Xc) is syntactically more explicit. This is also traceable in Vinītadeva’s gloss (*°cittād ityādi*).¹²⁹

Instead of the compound *cittaṅtarotpattiviruddhāśrayaḥ* (Xc), D (= Lévi) reads *āśraya* separate from *°viruddha*. I adopt this reading of D since the compound seems to be rather odd.¹³⁰ D’s reading is

¹²⁷ Lévi (1932: 105) understands *nordhvam* and *avītarāgasya* separately as “mais qui n’est pas encore au-dessus (de celle-ci), n’étant pas encore Libéré des Attractions (du stage supérieur).”

¹²⁸ Vin-skt 488.4. In the Sanskrit edition of Vinītadeva’s commentary, the editor, P.S. Jaini, proposes to add *na* before *ūrdhvam*, but the manuscript he used lacks the negation.

¹²⁹ Vin-skt 488.13.

¹³⁰ There is a semantic difference between the following two cases: a substantive is preceded by an adjective that is either separated from it or occurs as part of the same compound, e.g., *mahān matsyaḥ* versus *mahā-matsyaḥ*. The former connotes a general idea, whereas the latter indicates something specific, e.g., a special kind of fish. The present context requires the former (suggestion by Prof. Schmithausen).

supported by Vinītadeva's commentary (*cittāntarotpattiviruddha āśrayaḥ*)¹³¹ and by a phrase in the Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya (*°nirodhy āśrayasyāvasthāviśeṣaḥ*), in which *nirodhin* and *āśraya* are not compounded.¹³² Accordingly, the reading of D is preferable: "And this [extinction] is called *samāpatti* because (*iti*) [this] *āśraya* (= *ālaya-vijñāna*) which blocks the arising of other [kinds of] minds is obtained immediately after the mind of Absorption."

The Tibetan rendering, on the other hand, is problematic; it reads: **sā ca samāpattis cittād anantaram (sñoms par 'jug pa de yan sems kyi 'og tu)*.¹³³ If one follows the rendering which takes *sā* as being in apposition to *samāpatti*, a semantic problem would inevitably arise: "And this *samāpatti* is called *samāpatti* ..." ¹³⁴

(j) *āgantukena*

Instead of *āgantukena* (Xc), D (= Lévi) reads *āgantunā*. Both readings are semantically identical ("accidentally"), but *āgantukena* is slightly better since it is traceable in Vinītadeva's testimony (*āgantukena*).¹³⁵ Sthiramati uses *āgantuka* in a previous passage (Lévi 21.16) and chooses to use the same word also in his Madhyāntavibhāgaṭkā.¹³⁶

(k) *manovijñāne*

Xc and Tib omit *mano*. However, the context requires *manovijñāne*, and the expression is traceable in Vinītadeva's gloss (*manovijñānam adhikṛtya pṛcchann āha*).¹³⁷

(l) *tadapagame punaḥ kuta utpadyate yat tasya kālakriyā na bhavati*.

This means: "How [can *manovijñāna*] re-arise, when those [meditative states] end, so that (*yatas* or *yat*)¹³⁸ the [respective person] does

¹³¹ Vin-skt 488.14.

¹³² ASBh 9.18. The Tibetan translation of the Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya reads **°viruddhā°* instead of *°nirodhy*. See De (4053), li, 8v1, P [113] (5554), śi, 10r4-5: ... *dan mi mthun pa'i*.

¹³³ Tib 61.6-7. This Sanskrit reconstruction is based on Nozawa – Yamaguchi 1952: 333, n. 1.

¹³⁴ This conflicts with Vinītadeva's interpretation (Vin-skt 488.13-15).

¹³⁵ Vin-skt 488.27.

¹³⁶ MAVṬ 223.2, etc.

¹³⁷ Vin-skt 488.31.

¹³⁸ These pronouns indicate an undesired consequence (cf. Tib ... *'gyur*). One can also take *yatas* or *yat* in the sense of "because" in this context: "because

not die?”¹³⁹ Of the readings *yat* (D = Lévi) and *yatas* (Xc), *yat* seems to be a *lectio difficilior*. But *yat* and *yatas*, as well as Vinītadeva’s gloss *yena*, have the same meaning.¹⁴⁰

Instead of *na kālakriyā bhavati* (Xc), D (= Lévi) provides a different word order (*kālakriyā na bhavati*). D’s sequence is attested in Vinītadeva’s gloss (*yena tasya yogīnah kālakriyā na bhavatīti*).¹⁴¹

(m) *ātmadharmopacāro yaḥ pravartate sa vijñānapariṇāma eva*.

The reading *pravartate* (Xc), in place of *prajñāpyate* (D = Lévi), is semantically better and supported by the Tibetan rendering (*’byun*)¹⁴² and the parallel in verse 1 (*ātmadharmopacāro hi vividho yaḥ pravartate*).¹⁴³

(n) *vijñānapariṇāmān na pṛthag asty ātmā dharmās ceti*.

This means: “Self (*ātman*) and phenomenon¹⁴⁴ do not exist independent of the transformation of consciousness (*vijñānapariṇāma*).” D’s reading *na vijñānapariṇāmāt sa pṛthag asti ātmā dharmās ceti* is possible, but the adopted reading of Xc is syntactically smoother and supported by both Vinītadeva’s commentary and the Tibetan rendering.¹⁴⁵ The singular form *dharmās* (Xc; ≈ Tib), instead of the plural form (D = Lévi), grammatically fits better with *asti*, although *asti* is to be construed with the first subject (*ātmā*) and in the altered word order of Vinītadeva *bhavanti* is related to *dharmāḥ*.

[it has to re-emerge since] the [respective person] does not die (lit. no dying occurred).”

¹³⁹ Sthiramati presents the answer as *tat punar ālayavijñānād evotpadyate*. The idea presupposes the “Initial Passage” of the *ālayavijñāna* in the Yogācārabhūmi and related passages (see Schmithausen 1987: 18, 21).

¹⁴⁰ The Tibetan translation reads *gan gi phyir* (Tib 62.6).

¹⁴¹ Vin-skt 488.32-33.

¹⁴² Tib 62.11.

¹⁴³ See also Lévi 16.5-6: *ātmaḍyupacāro rūpādidharmopacāras cānādikālikah pravartate*, as well as l. 11-12: *yatrātmadharmopacārah pravartate*.

¹⁴⁴ See Lévi 16.6: *rūpādidharmopācārah*.

¹⁴⁵ Vin-skt 488.38: *ātmā dharmās ca vijñānapariṇāmān na bahir bhavantīti*; Tib 62.12-13: *rnam par śes pa gyur pa las gud na bdag dan chos med do źes*. Cf. Cheng wei shi lun 38c14: 依識所變假說我法非別實有。

(o) *so 'yaṃ vikalpaḥ | adhyāropitārthākārās traidhātukās cittacaittā vikalpa ucyate.*

This means:

This is (none other than) *vikalpa*. The mind and mental factors belonging to the three spheres, which have forms of objects superimposed [on them], are called *vikalpa*.¹⁴⁶

The reading *so 'yaṃ* (D = Lévi), in place of *ayaṃ* (Xc), is syntactically preferable since *so 'yaṃ* corresponds to *yo 'yam*.¹⁴⁷

Instead of *vikalpaḥ | adhyāropitārthākārās* (D = Lévi; ≈ Tib), Xc reads *vikalpo adhyāropitākāras* (wrong sandhi); *adhyāropitākāras* modifies *vikalpo*, and does not relate to *cittacaittā*. This is not in accordance with Vinītadeva's understanding (*adhyāropitārthākārā ityādi | ye traidhātukās cittacaittā adhyāropitākāreṇa pravartante te vikalpaśabdenocyante*).¹⁴⁸

(p) *tena trividhena vikalpenālayavijñānakliṣṭamanahpravṛttivijñānasvabhāvena sasamprayogeṇa yad vikalpyate.*

This reading of C (= Lévi) is supported by the Tibetan rendering and Vinītadeva's gloss.¹⁴⁹ Xc's rendering is corrupt (*ālayavijñānam kliṣṭam manah pravṛttivijñānasvabhāvena*): *pravṛttivijñāna*^o should be corrected to ^o*pravṛttivijñāna*^o and all words should be joined in a *bahuvrīhi* compound, which modifies *vikalpena*.

(q) *ataḥ sa vijñānapariṇāmo vikalpa ucyate |.*

For *ato* (Xc), I adopted *ataḥ sa* (C = Lévi) since the pronoun *sa* is used to refer to the word *vijñānapariṇāmo* in verse 17. The use of *sa* can be traced in Vinītadeva's gloss (*tasmāt sa*) and the Tibetan rendering (*rnam par śes pa gyur pa de*).¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁶ This corresponds to the Tibetan translation (Tib 63.4-6): *de ni rnam par rtog pa'o || sgro btags pa'i don gyi rnam pa kham s gum pa'i sems dan sems las byuñ ba ni rnam par rtog pa žes bya ste |.*

¹⁴⁷ Lévi 35.10.

¹⁴⁸ Vin-skt 489.1-2.

¹⁴⁹ Tib 63.8-9: *kun gzi rnam par śes pa dan ñon moñs pa can gyi yid dan | jug pa'i rnam par śes pa'i rañ bzin*; Vin-skt 489.5-7: *yasmād anena trividhenālayavijñānādikena sasamprayogeṇa yad vastu vikalpyate bhājanādikaṃ tad bhūtārthena nāsti.*

¹⁵⁰ Vin-skt 489.7 and Tib 63.12.

(r) *svasantānādhyāsitaṃ grāhyam astīty adhyavasāyo grāhyagrāhaḥ*.

C (= Lévi) reads *svasantānādhyāsitaṃ*. In Xc, the *recto* side of folio B begins with *adhyāsitaṃ* with *akṣara a* and thus the *verso* side of folio A (unavailable) may well have ended with **svasantāna* (or an irregular **svasantāne adhy°*; cf. A6 *vikalpo adhy°*). On the other hand, **svasattādhyāsitaṃ* (Tib; Vin-tib) is also possible.¹⁵¹ It is difficult to decide on the best reading.¹⁵²

The reading *grāhyagrāhakaṃ* (Xc) is merely a corruption and should be corrected to *grāhyagrāhaḥ* (C = Lévi; ≈ Tib). The scribe possibly forgot to delete *ka* because he made a similar error in the same line, where he actually struck through *ka* correcting *grāhyagrāhakaḥ* to *grāhyagrāhaḥ*.

(s) *grāhadvayavāsanā tu sarvakarmavāsanānām yathāsvam ākṣiptātma bhāvotpādane pravṛttānām sahakāritvaṃ pratipadyate*.

In place of °*vāsanā* (Xc), C reads °*vāsanās*, which is emended to °*vāsanāyās* by Lévi. From the syntactic viewpoint, only the reading °*vāsanā* (Xc) should be adopted because of *pratipadyate*. The sentence means:

“However, the impression of the twofold clinging (*grāhadvaya*) becomes an auxiliary (or co-operative) [cause] (*sahakāritvaṃ pratipadyate*) for all the karmic impressions which have become active in producing the [new] individual existence (*ātmabhāva*) projected (*ākṣipta*) [by them] in accordance with their respective [qualities] (*yathāsvam*).”¹⁵³

(t) *pr̥thivyādayo*

Xc reads *pr̥thivyādayo*, the Tibetan translation **abādayo*. Vinītadeva’s gloss has both *pr̥thivī* and *ap* (**pr̥thivyabādayo, sa dan chu la sogs*

¹⁵¹ Tib 67.4-5 = Vin-tib De 47v4, P 52r3.

¹⁵² The whole sentence as preserved in C runs: *tatra vijñānāt pr̥thag eva svasantānādhyāsitaṃ grāhyam astīty adhyavasāyo grāhyagrāhaḥ* “Of the [twofold clinging], the clinging to an object is the ascertainment that there is an object which is absolutely separated from the mind [and] superimposed (*adhyāsita*) on its own stream (according to the reading of Tib and Vin-tib: as an independent existence).”

¹⁵³ Cf. Tib 67.12-14: ‘*dzin pa gñis kyi bag chags ni las kyi bag chags thams cad ji ltar rañ gis* (text: *gi*) ‘*phañs pa’i* (text: *pa*) *lus skyed* (text: *bskyed*) *pa la zugs pa rñams kyi lhan cig byed pa ñid du ’gyur te* || (I have emended Teramoto’s readings based on Trimsikābhāṣya De 165v5, P 194r5 and Vin-tib De 48r1-2, P 52r7-8).

pa).¹⁵⁴ In the light of the context, both earth (*pr̥thivī*) and water (*ap*) are suitable as an example of an auxiliary (or co-operative) cause (*sahakārin*) that assists a bud in sprouting from a seed. But the use of earth is more common.¹⁵⁵ On the other hand, C reads *arvādayo*, which could be a corruption of *urvyādayo* (“earth, etc.”).

(u) *evam ca na kevalāḥ karmavāsanā grāhadvayavāsanānanuḡrhitā vipākam janayantīty.*

Xc omits *na* and the negative prefix *an*^o before *anuḡrhitā*, whereas C has both *na* and *an*^o (reading *ananuḡrhitā*).¹⁵⁶ C's reading is supported by Vinītadeva's gloss.¹⁵⁷ The Tibetan rendering, on the other hand, suggests the presence of *na* and the lack of *an*^o.¹⁵⁸ All of them can be interpreted in a similar way, namely, only karmic impressions supported by the impression of twofold clinging can produce the result-of-maturation. The semantics of Xc, however, may seem awkward since *kevalāḥ* “alone” and *anuḡrhitā* “supported” could collide with each other. Therefore I adopt C's reading: “Thus, what is expressed [by verse 19] is that the karmic impressions alone (*kevalāḥ*), unsupported (*ananuḡrhitā*) by the impression of the twofold clinging (*grāhadvayavāsanā*), [can]not produce (*na janayanti*) the [result-of-] maturation (*vipāka*).”

(v) *tasmin kṣīṇa ity ākṣepakālaparyantāvasthite yathābalaṃ karmavāsanā grāhadvayavāsanāsahitā upayuktād vipākād anyam vipākam tad evālayaviññānam janayanti.*

The two Sanskrit manuscripts (Xc; C) contain a *daṇḍa* after *iti*, which could obscure the fact that *ākṣepakālaparyantāvasthite* is just a gloss on *kṣīṇe pūrvavipāke* (19c) (or its altered form *tasmin kṣīṇe*).

¹⁵⁴ Vin-tib De 48r2, P 52r8.

¹⁵⁵ For instance, in his MAVT 43.1, Sthiramati refers to the example of earth.

¹⁵⁶ Lévi's conjecture to read *anuḡrhitā* is not necessary. Ui suggests to read *ananuḡrhitā*.

¹⁵⁷ Vin-tib De 48r2, P 52r8 (*'ba' zig ma yin gyi*) and De 48r3, P 52v1 (*'dzin pa gñis kyī bag chags med par*). However, the gloss *'ba' zig ma yin gyi* seems to confirm the reading **na kevalam* instead of *na kevalāḥ*.

¹⁵⁸ Note that the Tibetan rendering has a different syntactical structure (Tib 67.15-17): *de lta na las kyī bag chags 'ba' zig ma yin gyi | 'dzin pa gñis kyī bag chags kyīs zin pas rnam par smin pa skyed do ||* “Thus, ... the karmic impressions, not alone (**na kevalam*) but (*gyi*) supported (*anuḡrhitā*) by the *grāhadvayavāsanā*, produce the *vipāka*.”

Lévi's conjecture that reads *ākṣepakāle paryantāvasthite* in place of *ākṣepakālaparyantāvasthite* (Xc, C; ≈ Tib & Vin-tib) is not necessary.¹⁵⁹

Instead of *upayuktād* (Xc), C (= Lévi) reads *upabhuktād* and Vinitadeva paraphrases **paribhuktād* (*yoṅs su spyod pa*).¹⁶⁰ The two expressions are almost synonymous ("enjoyed" or "consumed").¹⁶¹

Sthiramati rephrases here verse 19 by stating: *karmavāsanā ... anyam* (C reads *anyad*) *vipākam tad evālayavijñānam janayanti*. On the basis of the reading of Xc, Schmithausen (1987: 337 n. 419) corrected *anyad* (C = Lévi) to *anyam* in the verse and translated it as follows:

"When [the present *ālayavijñāna* which is the result of] the Maturation of previous [karman] is exhausted, the Impression of [not yet retributed] karman along with the Impression of the two false conceptions ... generate it (= *ālayavijñāna*) [anew] as another [result of] Maturation" (*karmaṇo vāsanā grāha-dvaya-vāsanayā saha | kṣīṇe pūrvavipāke 'nyam vipākam janayanti tat ||*).

Schmithausen interprets *anyam vipākam tad* as a double accusative, in which *anyam* modifies *vipākam* (*tad* referring to *ālayavijñāna*). This is supported by the next sentence, where *anya* modifies *vipāka*.

If we read *anyad vipākam* (not compounded), *anyad* (neuter) can only modify *ālayavijñānam*. But in this case it would collide with *tad*: the interpretation **tad eva anyad ālayavijñānam* "precisely that other *ālayavijñāna*" does not suit the context because no other *ālayavijñāna* is expected. On the other hand, if we read *anyadvipākam* (an irregular compound), it could, from the semantic point of view, only be a *karmadhāraya* or genitive *tatpuruṣa* ("ripening of another [karman]"). However, a genitive *tatpuruṣa* is not possible according to Pāṇini 6.3.99.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁹ The Tibetan rendering *dus kyi mtha'* (Tib 68.4; Vin-tib De 48r5, P 52v3) supports the reading *°kālaparyanta°* in a compound.

¹⁶⁰ *yoṅs su spyod pa* is my emendation based on the equivalent found in the Mahāvīyutpattī, no. 2581 (*yoṅs su spyad pa = paribhukta*). The readings in the Tanjur are problematic (Vin-tib De 48r5: *yoṅs su dpyad pa*; P 52v4: *yoṅs su bcaḍ pa*).

¹⁶¹ *upayuktād*, which is ambiguous, might be a *lectio difficilior*.

¹⁶² See Wackernagel 1930: 592 (though Patañjali allows such a compound, almost all the cases discussed by him are considered problematic).

(w) *ālayavijñānavyatiriktasyānyasya vipākasyābhāvāt.*

Instead of *vyatiriktasya*, C (= Lévi) reads *vyatirekeṇa*. Both readings are possible. *vyatirekeṇa* is closer to the Tibetan rendering (*ma glogṣ par*)¹⁶³ and used in Sthiramati's Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā.¹⁶⁴ The alternative reading *vyatiriktasya*, on the other hand, occurs in a previous phrase (even though compounded): *tadvyatiriktānyakuśalābhāvācca*.¹⁶⁵

(x) *nirvāṇādhigamo 'pi ca*

This verse from the Abhidharmasūtra¹⁶⁶ is also quoted in the Ratnagoṭravibhāga, which likewise has *'pi ca*.¹⁶⁷ C (= Lévi) reads *'pi vā*, which is not inconceivable since Sthiramati uses *vā* in his gloss to this verse (*saṃsārapravṛttir nivṛttir vā*).¹⁶⁸

(y) *tatra ye saṃskārāḥ prāṭisandhikavijñānapratyayatvenesyante teṣāṃ ciraniruddhatvān niruddhasya cāsattvād asataś ca pratyayatvābhāvān na saṃskārapratyayaṃ prāṭisandhivijñānaṃ yujyate.*

Except for punctuation and the obvious error *prāṭisandhika*^o (Xc) for *prāṭisandhika*^o (C), Xc and C (= Lévi) are essentially identical. The sentence means:

Because the *saṃskāras* which are [in the first alternative]¹⁶⁹ maintained (*iṣyante*) to be the condition of the *vijñāna* at the moment of “rebirth” (*prāṭisandhika*-) have long ceased [to exist at the time of “rebirth”], since what has ceased [to exist] is non-existent and something non-existent does not have any condition, the *prāṭisandhivijñāna* cannot be conditioned by the *saṃskāras*.

¹⁶³ Tib 68.8 = Vin-tib De 48r6, P 52v4-5.

¹⁶⁴ MAVT 20.5, 149.22.

¹⁶⁵ Lévi 27.24. *vyatirikta* appears also in Lévi 17.26, 19.2, 37.9-10 and 39.2, whereas *vyatireka* never occurs in the present work, except for the alternative reading here.

¹⁶⁶ In his Triṃśikāṭīkāvivṛti (a commentary on Vinītadeva's Triṃśikāṭīkā), Vairocanarakṣita explains *abhidharmasūtra* as follows: *abhidharme mahāyānābhidharme. kimbhūte. mahāyānaṃ sūtryate* (3r3).

¹⁶⁷ RGV 72.14.

¹⁶⁸ Lévi 37.14. *vā* is used here in the sense of “whether you take A or B: both will (or will not) work.”

¹⁶⁹ This is supplied on the basis of a previous sentence: *prāṭisandhivijñānaṃ vā* (Lévi 37.18).

The Tibetan rendering (= Vin-tib) has a different syntactic structure:

**ye saṃskārās te na prāṭisandhikavijñānapratyayatvenēṣyante | ('du byed gañ yin pa de dag ni ñiñ mtshams sbyor ba'i rnam par śes pa'i rkyen ñid du mi 'dod de |)* “The *saṃskāras* are not maintained (*iṣyan-te*) to be a condition (*pratyaya*) of the *prāṭisandhikavijñāna*. [Because ...]”¹⁷⁰

This is also possible from a semantic point of view but syntactically less elegant since *ye* correspond to *teṣāṃ*.

(z) *pratisandhau ca nāmarūpam apy asti na kevalaṃ vijñānam | tatra vijñānam eva saṃskārapra^o*.

Folio B ends with *saṃskār[a]*. *°pra^o* is missing due to the loss of the right edge of the leaf. Instead of *api* (Xc), the reading of the other versions, *apy asti* (C = Lévi; ≈ Tib & Vin-tib), is more likely:

pratisandhau ca nāmarūpam apy asti na kevalaṃ vijñānam | tatra vijñānam eva saṃskārapratyayaṃ na nāmarūpam iti kā tatra yuktiḥ | “[Given that] there exists not only *vijñāna* but also *nāmarūpa* at the moment of ‘rebirth,’ how can it be appropriate that only *vijñāna* is conditioned by *saṃskāra* but *nāmarūpa* is not [conditioned]?”

APPENDIX A

CORRECTIONS AND ALTERNATIVE READINGS TO LÉVI'S EDITION OF THE TRIMŚIKĀBHĀṢYA

In the following, arrows (→) designate corrections, and single slashes (/) indicate alternative possible readings.

	Lévi 34.9-35.17		Xc14/1e, fol. A
34.10-11	<i>api cotpattir</i>	→	<i>evotpattiḥ naiva votpattir</i>
34.12	<i>vinā ca</i>	→	<i>vinā vā</i>
34.15-16	<i>utsargasya</i>	→	<i>utsargasyeyam</i>
34.19	<i>ṭṛtīya^o</i>	→	<i>ṭṛtīyād</i>
34.19	<i>°sya nordh^o</i>	→	<i>°syordh^o</i>

¹⁷⁰ Tib 69.11-12, Vin-tib De 49v4, P 53v2-3. Xc also inserts a *danḍa* after *iṣyante*. W's suggestion to read **°pratyayatve neṣyante* for *°pratyayatvenēṣyante* is unlikely. This is probably based on the Tibetan translation but *°pratyayatve* does not work as an equivalent for *rkyen du* (“as a condition [of]”).

	Lévi 34.9-35.17		Xc14/Ie, fol. A
34.29	āgantunā°	→	āgantukenā°
35.4	°pariṇāme ātma°	→	°pariṇāma ātma°
35.6	prajñapyate	→	pravartate
35.6-7	na vijñānapariṇā- māt sa pṛthag asti	→	vijñānapariṇāmān na pṛthag asti
35.7	dharmā veti	→	dharmāś ceti
35.10	iti yo	→	iti yo
35.11	traithātukā°	→	traidhātukā°
35.13	°dhātukāḥ iti	→	°dhātukā iti
35.15	°āyatana°	→	°āyatanaṃ
	Lévi 36.25-37.23		Xc14/Ie, fol. B
36.30	°vāsanāyās	→	°vāsanā
37.1	arvādayo	→	pṛthivyādayo
37.1-2	°ṅkurasyotpattāv	→	bījasyāṅkurotpattāv
37.2	°vāsanānu°	→	°vāsanānanu°
37.4	anyadvipākam	→	anyaṃ vipākam
37.5	kṣiṇe iti	→	kṣiṇa iti
37.5	°kāle	→	°kāla°
37.6	°dba°	→	°dva°
37.6	upabhuktād	/	upayuktād
37.7	anyadvipākam	→	anyaṃ vipākam
37.7-8	vyatirekenā°	/	vyatiriktasyā°
37.9	anyadvipākam	→	anyaṃ vipākam
37.13	°pi vā	/	°pi ca
37.18	saṃsārasya	→	om.
37.19	saṃskārabhā°	→	saṃskāraparibhā°
37.20	°neṣyante teṣāṃ	→	°neṣyante teṣāṃ
37.20	°tvāt niruddhasya	→	°tvān niruddhasya
37.21	°tvāt asataś	→	°tvād asataś
37.21	°ābhāvāt na	→	°ābhāvān na
37.22	°naṃ tatra	→	°naṃ tatra

APPENDIX B

IDENTIFICATIONS OF TEXTS NOT IDENTIFIED IN BANDURSKI 1994

Bandurski 1994 was the first attempt to publish a complete catalogue of the plates with images of the Sanskrit manuscripts photographed by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana, stored at the Niedersächsische

Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek in Göttingen.¹⁷¹ Thanks to this catalogue, Sāṅkrtyāyana's photographs have become easily accessible. The catalogue, however, left many items unidentified.¹⁷² After its publication, many scholars have contributed to identify these unidentified items in independent reports. It thus seems worthwhile to list all of them in one place. Here, I provide such a register of identified texts together with their original descriptions in Bandurski 1994. Identifications of other texts will be discussed in future studies. As for Xc14/1c, Xc14/1d, Xc14/34a, and Xc14/57, I am currently preparing critical editions (in collaboration with Prof. Francesco Sferra).

Xc14/1c

“Mahāyānottaratantraśāstropadeśaḥ von Sajjana” (p. 33): This print shows three folios but the text in question consists of only one folio (plates 7/8, leaf 3[r/v] = plates 13/14, leaf 7[r/v]); the remaining two folios (plates 7/8, leaves 1-2[r/v] = plates 13/14, leaves 5-6[r/v]) are wrongly ascribed by Bandurski to the same work. They remain unidentified.¹⁷³

Xc14/1d

“Text nicht identifiziert” (ibid.): Three folios from an unknown *pramāṇa* work; see Kano 2004. The first folio discusses *sarvajña*, the second quotes verses from the *Pramāṇavārttika* (*Pramāṇasiddhi* chapter, verses 126-130), and the third discusses momentariness (*kaśanabhāṅga*). Unfortunately the plate which shows the *verso* sides of the folios is not preserved at Göttingen.

¹⁷¹ Some original palm leaf manuscripts brought out by Sāṅkrtyāyana are also preserved at Göttingen and included in the catalogue; see Bandurski 1994: 16-17. A Tibetan work, the biography of Chag Lo-tsa-ba, is exceptionally contained in the same collection with the shelf-mark Xc14/71.

¹⁷² Note that Bandurski overlooked some reports of identifications; e.g., Xc14/1e was identified by Schmithausen (1987: 337, n. 419) and Xc14/84b-g were edited by Sāṅkrtyāyana in 1937-1940 (see Watanabe 1998b: iv, 30-33). Supplementary notes concerning bibliographical information, such as Bretfeld 1997, are, by the way, very helpful and most welcome, for they enhance the value of the catalogue.

¹⁷³ They are almost illegible because of the bad quality of the photograph. Takasaki (1975: 55) already pointed out this fact after having studied the original negatives preserved in Patna.

Xc14/1e

“Text nicht identifiziert” (ibid.): The two folios belong to Sthiramati's Triṃśikābhāṣya; see Schmithausen 1987: 337, n. 419. I have discussed them in the present paper.

Xc14/3

“Text nicht identifiziert” (p. 36): Pramāṇavārttikabhāṣya (= Pramāṇavārttikālaṃkāra) of Prajñākaragupta; see Watanabe 1998a: iii-vi.¹⁷⁴

Xc14/4a

“Text nicht identifiziert” (ibid.): Pramāṇavārttikabhāṣya; see Watanabe 1998a: iii-vi.¹⁷⁵

Xc14/30a

Bandurski (1994: 67) lists seven works, i.e., the Pañcakrama, Vajrasattvasādhana, Anuttarasamvara, Utpattikramasādhana, Piṇḍikrama, Balitattvādhikāra and Karmāntavibhāgamelāvaṇa. The plates actually contain images of ten works, i.e., Nāgārjuna's Piṇḍikrama, his Pañcakrama, Candrakīrti's Vajrasattvasādhana, Śākyamitra's Anuttarasandhi, Nāgabodhi's Vyavastholi, Śrīguhyasamājasya Sādhyanopāyikā, Piṇḍikramasamgraha, Āryadeva's Svādhiṣṭhāna[krama]prabheda, an unidentified work,¹⁷⁶ and Āryadeva's Caryāmelāpaka-pradīpa; see Tomabechi 2004.¹⁷⁷

Xc14/30b

“Text nicht identifiziert” (ibid.): The plates contain images of three works, i.e., an anonymous¹⁷⁸ work which quotes a number of pas-

¹⁷⁴ Ms. E (a palm leaf manuscript of the Pramāṇavārttikabhāṣya in Māgadhī script, consisting of 71 folios, photographed at Nōr in 1934, ca. 11¹/₃ x 2 inches, incomplete), fol. 214-249 (225 and 235 are missing).

¹⁷⁵ Ms. E, fol. 250-272.

¹⁷⁶ This work contains two chapters, i.e., the Rakṣācakra-tattvādhikāra and Balitattvādhikāra.

¹⁷⁷ I owe a detailed description of the manuscript photographs in Xc14/30 to Toru Tomabechi (personal communication).

¹⁷⁸ The text states that the work is composed by a scholar who stands in the lineage of disciples two generations after Rāhulagupta; see Tomabechi 2004: 45.

sages from the Vajrācāryanayottama (fifty-nine folios), Śākyamitra's Anuttarasandhi (seven folios), and the Kālacakratāntra (162 folios); see Tomabechi 2004.

Xc14/30c

“Text nicht identifiziert” (p. 68): The plates show photographs of Devagupta's commentary on the Cakrasaṃvara; see Tomabechi 2004: 49, n. 7.¹⁷⁹

Xc14/34a

“Viṃśikāvivṛtti, Autor unbekannt” (p. 72): The plates contain images of forty-seven folios consisting of six commentarial works by Vairocanarakṣita, i.e., the Viṃśikāṭīkāvivṛtti (1v1-2r1, a commentary on Vinīta-deva's Viṃśikāṭīkā or Viṃśatikāṭīkā), the Triṃśikāṭīkāvivṛtti (2r1-3r6, a commentary on Vinīta-deva's Triṃśikāṭīkā), the Madhyāntavibhāgakatipayapadavivṛtti (3r6-9v2, a commentary on Sthiramati's MAVṬ), the Mahāyānottaratantraṭippaṇī (9v2-17r5, a commentary on the RGV), Sūtrālaṃkāra (sic, 17r5-47r2, a commentary on Vasubandhu's Sūtrālaṃkārabhāṣya; note that Sthiramati's and *Asvabhāva's commentaries are used in this work), and the Dharmadharmatāvibhā[gaṭīkā] (47r2-47v7, a commentary on Vasubandhu's Dharmadharmatāvibhāgavṛtti). Gokhale (1978) studied the same plates and presented the titles of the works. As for the Mahāyānottaratantraṭippaṇī, Nakamura (1985) edited fol. 9v2-14v7 and Jagdishwar Pandey transcribed the full text (fol. 9v2-17r5).¹⁸⁰ Mathes (1996: 37, 115-135) used glosses of the Dharmadharmatāvibhāgaṭīkā. Tucci most likely photographed the same manuscript.¹⁸¹

Xc14/34b

“Text nicht identifiziert” (ibid.): Pramāṇavārttikabhāṣya; see Watanabe 1998a: iii-vi.¹⁸²

¹⁷⁹ This text corresponds to the Śrīcakrasaṃvarasādhanaśarvasālā-nāmatīkā (De [1407]; P [49] [2123]). The Sanskrit manuscript itself suggests the title *Śrīherukābhīdhānapañjikā Sādhanaṇidhi; see 8r4: *śrīherukābhīdhāne sādhananīdhau pañjikāyāṃ prathamāḥ* (sic for *prathama-*) *paṭalavyākhyā*.

¹⁸⁰ Jagdishwar's transcription is preserved with shelf-mark Xc14/90 at Göttingen (see Bandurski 1994: 116). Unfortunately, Nakamura's and Jagdishwar's texts contain a number of errors.

¹⁸¹ See Sferra 2000: 411: “Uttara-tantra-ṭippaṇī, Vairocanarakṣita.”

¹⁸² Xc14/34b, plate 6/5(= 4), leaves 19-32(r/v); Ms. E, fol. 200-213.

Xc14/39

“Hevajrasādhana” (p. 76): The plates contain images of 272 folios, which consist of forty-two works, mainly of Hevajrasādhana. Isaacson¹⁸³ corrects Bandurski and gives an improved and more detailed description of the contents of the manuscripts.

Xc14/40c

“Text nicht identifiziert” (p. 77): The plates contain photographs of twenty-six folios, which are part of the *Suvarṇavarṇāvadāna (fol. 1v-16v and 19r-29v). See Kano 2004: 50-51, n. 4. Sāṅkrtyāyana photographed the same leaves once more; the photographs are contained in the plates shelf-marked Xc14/48a.¹⁸⁴

Xc14/57

“Fragmente des Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra und zwei Fragmente von Sthiramatis Triṣīkāvijñāptibhāṣya” (p. 93): The plates show eleven folios, consisting of text fragments of three works, i.e., the Triṣīkābhāṣya (two folios), the Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra (eight folios), and Śākyabuddhi's Pramānavārttikaṭikā (one folio); see Gokhale 1968 and Kano 2004. Gokhale studied the two folios of the Triṣīkābhāṣya in detail. He also identified the remaining eight folios as the Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra, without, however, referring to details.¹⁸⁵ We can, for instance, recover a part lacking in Lévi's edition with the help of these folios.¹⁸⁶ Gokhale did not identify a folio of the Pramānavārttikaṭikā, which was hidden among these leaves.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸³ See his forthcoming *A Collection of Hevajrasādhana and Related Works in Sanskrit*.

¹⁸⁴ See Roy 1971: 218-233 and Bandurski 1994: 84.

¹⁸⁵ For the details, see Kano 2004. Xc14/57 retains fol. 23, 27, 32, 41, 47, 54, and 58 (plate 1, leaves 3-4[r], 6-9[r]; plate 2, leaves 2[v], 4-9[v]; plates 3/4, [r/v]). They correspond to Lévi 1907: 52.8-54.22; 58.24-61.15; 72.22-74.17; 93.20-98.1; 106.24-109.5; 123.20-126.6; 133.18-136.10.

¹⁸⁶ Lévi 1907: 74.1-3 = Xc14/57, fol. 32v2-3 (plate 2, leaf 4[v]): *sarvalokābhijudgatāmabhāvabhogapratilābhena* (sic for °lābhe) *sati vipākanirapekṣatā* || *apakṣapātāḥ sattveṣu mātmyasya ca darśana* (sic for darśanam) || *pratikāre paraṅṇais trayāśāstir niranāre* || (X1.69) *apakṣapātamanasikārah* | *dānādibhiḥ sarvasa*(32v3)*ttvasamatāpravṛty*(sic for °pravṛty)*abhisamskaraṇāt* | *mātmyasandarśanamanasikārah* *sattvopakāritvasandarśanāt pāramitabhiḥ* (sic for pāramitābhiḥ) |. See Kano 2004: 45-46.

¹⁸⁷ See Kano 2004: 39-40. The text (plate 1, leaf 5[r]; plate 2, leaf 3[v]) corresponds to part of the Pramānasiddhi chapter: De (4220), *ñe*, 115v7-117v3; P [131] (5718), *ñe*, 141v4-143v6.

Xc14/89b

“Text nicht identifiziert” (p. 111): A Kroḍapattra. The text is included in Sāṅkṛtyāyana’s edition of the PVV (p. 526-529). See Watanabe 1998b: iv, Appendix 2, and cf. Xc14/89h.

Xc14/89d

“Text nicht identifiziert” (ibid.): Vibhūticandra’s notes. The text is included in Sāṅkṛtyāyana’s edition of the PVV (p. 513). See Watanabe 1998b: iv, Appendix 1.

Xc14/89e

“Text nicht identifiziert” (ibid.): Vibhūticandra’s notes. The text is included in Sāṅkṛtyāyana’s edition of the PVV (p. 290-291). See Watanabe 1998b: iv, Appendix 1.

Xc14/89f

“Text nicht identifiziert” (p. 112): Verses by Vibhūticandra. Sāṅkṛtyāyana (1937: 11-13) presents a transcription. See Watanabe 1998b: iv, Appendix 4.

Xc14/89g

“Text nicht identifiziert” (ibid.): Vyākhyāntara. The text is included in Sāṅkṛtyāyana’s edition of the PVV (p. 472-475). See Watanabe 1998b: iv, Appendix 3.

Cod. ms. sanscr. 259b

“Text(e) nicht identifiziert” (p. 115): Tomabechi identified the folio to be a text fragment from Abhayākaragupta’s *Āmnāyamañjarī*.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁸ The folio corresponds to the Tibetan translation in De (1198), *cha*, 32v7-34v4; P [55] (2328), *dza*, 36v3-38v3. I owe this information to Toru Tomabechi (personal communication).

Abbreviations and Bibliography

- A A palm leaf manuscript of the Triṃśikākārikā preserved at the National Archives, Kathmandu. Ms. No. 5-6462. NGMPP Reel No. B23/18. Mimaki et al. 1989: 1-8 (facsimile edition).
- AKBh Vasubandhu, Abhidharmakośabhāṣya, ed. P. Pradhan. Patna 1967.
- ASBh Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya, ed. N. Tatia. Patna 1976.
- Bandurski 1994 F. Bandurski, Übersicht über die Göttinger Sammlungen der von RĀHULA SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA in Tibet aufgefundenen buddhistischen Sanskrit-Texte (Funde buddhistischer Sanskrit-Handschriften, III). In: *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur*. [*Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, Beiheft 5]. Göttingen 1994, p. 9-126.
- Bretfeld 1997 S. Bretfeld, Nachträge zur "Übersicht über die Göttinger Sammlungen der von Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana in Tibet aufgefundenen buddhistischen Sanskrit-Texte" von Frank Bandurski. In: *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur II*. [*Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, Beiheft 8]. Göttingen 1997, p. 41-46.
- C A palm leaf manuscript of the Triṃśikābhāṣya preserved at the National Archives, Kathmandu. Ms. No. 5-136 vi. NGMPP Reel No. B22/21. Mimaki et al. 1989: 16-29 (facsimile edition).
- Cheng wei shi lun 成唯識論. Taishō, vol. 31, no. 1585.
- D A palm leaf manuscript of the Triṃśikābhāṣya preserved at the National Archives, Kathmandu. Ms. No. 1-1697 iv. NGMPP Reel No. B23/22. Mimaki et al. 1989: 30-49 (facsimile edition).
- De Derge Tanjur.
- dGe 'dun chos 'phel 1939-1940 *rGyal khamṣ rig pas bskor ba'i glam rgyud gser gyi than ma, Thog mar lha sa nas phebs thon mdzad pa'i tshul*. Ed. Zam gdoñ pa Blo bzañ bstan 'dzin. Varanasi 1986; ed. Hor khañ bSod nams dpal 'bar. Lhasa 1994. Vol. 1, p. 3-40.
- fol. A Plate 5 (= 6) leaf 7(r) in Xc14/1.
- fol. B Plate 5 (= 6) leaf 8(r) in Xc14/1.
- Funahashi 1986 N. Funahashi, Nepal shahon taishō niyuru "Yuishikisanjūju" no gentenkō narabini "Yuishikinijūju" daiichige dainige no genpon ni tsuite – Lévi hon no genten wo

- motomete – (On the Sanskrit Text of the Trimśikā and the First and Second Verses of the Viṃśatikā according to the Nepalese Manuscripts – In Search of the Original Text of Lévi’s Edition –). *Bukkyōgaku Semina* 43 (1986) 15-30.
- Gokhale 1968 V.V. Gokhale, Fragments of Sthiramati’s *Trimśikāvi-jñaptibhāṣya* in the Patna collection of Tibetan Manuscript Materials. *Journal of the University of Poona, Humanities Section* 27 (1968) 175-179.
- Gokhale 1978 Id., Yogācāra Works Annotated by Vairocanarakṣita (Discovered in the Tibetan Photographic Materials at the K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute at Patna). *ABORI* 58-59 (1977-1978) 635-643.
- J A palm leaf manuscript of the Trimśikākārikā preserved in Beijing. Mimaki et al. 1989: 159 (facsimile edition).
- Kaḥ thog 1920 Kaḥ thog si tu Chos kyi rgya mtsho, *Kaḥ thog si tu’i dbus gtsaṅ gnas yig*. Ed. Khams sprul Don brgyud ṅi ma. Palampur 1972; ed. bSod nams tshe brtan. Lhasa 1999.
- Kano 2004 K. Kano, Göttingen shozō no Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana satsuei bonbun shahon Xc14/1, Xc14/57 ni tsuite (The Photocopies of Sanskrit Manuscripts Photographed by Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana preserved in Göttingen, Xc14/1 and Xc14/57). *Mikkyō Bunka* 212 (2004) 35-54.
- Lévi S. Lévi (ed.), *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi* – Deux traités de Vasubandhu, Viṃśatikā (La Vingtaine) accompagnée d’une explication en prose et Trimśikā (La Trentaine) avec le commentaire de Sthiramati. Paris 1925.
- Lévi 1907 Id. (ed.), *Asaṅga: Mahāyāna-Sūtrālamkāra*. Paris 1907.
- Lévi 1932 Id. (ed.), *Matériaux pour l’étude du système Vijñaptimātra*. Paris 1932.
- Mathes 1996 K.-D. Mathes, *Unterscheidung der Gegebenheiten von ihrem wahren Wesen (Dharmadharmatāvibhāga)*. [*Indica et Tibetica* 26]. Swisttal-Odendorf 1996.
- MAVT Sthiramati, *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā*, ed. S. Yamaguchi. Nagoya 1934.
- Mimaki et al. 1989 K. Mimaki – M. Tachikawa – A. Yuyama, *Three Works of Vasubandhu in Sanskrit Manuscript, the Trisvabhāvanirdeśa, the Viṃśatikā with its Vṛtti, and the Trimśikā with Sthiramati’s commentary*. [*Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum* 1]. Tokyo 1989.
- Much 1988 M.T. Much, *A Visit to Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana’s Collection of Negatives at the Bihar Research Society*. Texts from the

- Buddhist Epistemological School. [*Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde* 18]. Vienna 1988.
- Nakamura 1985 Z. Nakamura, Mahāyānottaratantra-śāstra-tiṣṭhānī by Vairocanaśāstra. In: *Hirakawa Akira kokikinen ronshū*. Bukkyō shisō no shomondai. Tokyo 1985, p. 1-16.
- Nozawa – Yamaguchi 1952 J. Nozawa – S. Yamaguchi, *Seshin yuishiki no genten kaimei (Textual Analysis of Vasubandhu's Teachings of the Vijñaptimātratā)*. Kyoto 1952.
- P Peking Tanjur.
- Petech 1984 L. Petech, *Mediaeval History of Nepal (c. 750-1482)*. Second, thoroughly revised edition. [*Serie Orientale Roma* 54]. Roma 1984.
- PVV Manorathanandin, Pramānavārttikavṛtti, ed. R. Sāṅkrtyāyana. Appendices to *JBORS* 24,3-26,1 (1938-1940).
- r *recto*
- (r) Photograph of a *recto* side of a palm leaf on a plate.
- RGV Ratnagotravibhāga-Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra, ed. E. H. Johnston. Patna 1950.
- Roy 1971 S.R. Roy, *Suvarṇavarṇāvadāna (Decipherment and Historical Study of a Palm-leaf Sanskrit Manuscript – An Unknown Mahāyāna (avadāna) Text from Tibet)*. Patna 1971.
- Sāṅkrtyāyana 1935 R. Sāṅkrtyāyana, Sanskrit Palm-Leaf Mss. in Tibet. *JBORS* 21,1 (1935) 21-43.
- Sāṅkrtyāyana 1937 Id., Second Search of Sanskrit Palm-Leaf Mss. in Tibet. *JBORS* 23,1 (1937) 1-57.
- Sāṅkrtyāyana 1938 Id., Search for Sanskrit Mss. in Tibet. *JBORS* 24,4 (1938) 137-163.
- Schmithausen 1987 L. Schmithausen, *Ālayavijñāna*. On the Origin of the Early Development of a Central Concept of Yogācāra Philosophy. Part I: *Text* – Part II: *Notes, Bibliography and Indices*. [*Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series* 4]. Tokyo 1987.
- Sferra 2000 F. Sferra, Sanskrit Manuscripts and Photos of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Giuseppe Tucci's Collection. A Preliminary Report. In: P. Balcerowicz – M. Mejer (ed.), *On the Understanding of Other Cultures*. Proceedings of the International Conference on Sanskrit and Related Studies to Commemorate the Centenary of the Birth of Stanislaw Schayer. [*Studia Indologica* 7]. Warsaw 2000, p. 397-447.

- Steinkellner 2004 E. Steinkellner, *A Tale of Leaves*. On Sanskrit Manuscripts in Tibet, their Past and their Future. Amsterdam 2004.
- Takasaki 1975 J. Takasaki, Hōshōron no chūshaku Mahāyānottaratantraśāstropadeśa no shahon (The Manuscript of Mahāyānottaratantraśāstropadeśa, a Commentary of the Ratnagotravibhāga). *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenyū* 32,2 (1975) 52-59.
- Tib Tibetan translation of the Triṃśikābhāṣya, ed. E. Teramoto. Kyoto 1933. Cf. De (4064) and P [113] (5565).
- Tomabechi 2004 T. Tomabechi, Iwayuru Vajrācāryanayottama ni tsuite – Shinshutsu kanren shahon no shōkai – (On the So-called Vajrācāryanayottama – Sanskrit Manuscript of a Related Text). *Mikkyō Zuzō* 23 (2004) 40-50.
- Triṃśikāṭikāvivṛti Vairocanarakṣita. Xc14/34, plate 1, leaves 1-2(r), plate 2, leaf 2(v) (fol. 2r1-3r6).
- Tsukamoto et al. 1990 K. Tsukamoto – Y. Matsunaga – H. Isoda (ed.), *Bongo butten no kenkyū*. III. *Ronjohen (A Descriptive Bibliography of the Sanskrit Buddhist Literature*. Vol. 3: *Abhidharma, Madhyamaka, Yogācāra, Buddhist Epistemology and Logic*). Kyoto 1990.
- Ui H. Ui, *Anne, Gohō Yuishiki sanjūju shakuron (The Commentaries on the Triṃśikāṭikā by Sthiramati and Dharmapāla)*. Tokyo 1952.
- v *verso*
- (v) Photograph of a *verso* side of a palm leaf on a plate.
- Vin-skt Vinītadeva, Triṃśikāṭikā (Sanskrit fragments): P.S. Jaini, The Sanskrit Fragments of Vinītadeva's *Triṃśikāṭikā*. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 48 (1985) 470-492.
- Vin-tib Vinītadeva, Triṃśikāṭikā (Tibetan translation): De (4070), P [114] (5571).
- W U. Wogihara, Annezō Sanjū yuishiki no shakuron wayaku (Japanese Translation of the Triṃśikābhāṣya by Sthiramati). *Taishō Daigaku Gakuhō* 2 (1927) 1-9.
- Wackernagel 1930 J. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*. Band III: *Nominalflexion – Zahlwort – Pronomen*. Göttingen 1930.
- Wang 1985 Sen Wang, *Minzu tushuguan zang fanwen beiyejing mulu (Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in Palm Leaf Preserved in the Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities)*. Beijing 1985.
- Watanabe 1998a S. Watanabe, *Sanskrit Manuscripts of Prajñākaragupta's Pramāṇavārtikabhāṣyam*. Facsimile Edition. Patna – Narita 1998.

- Watanabe 1998b Id., *Sanskrit Manuscripts of Manorathanandin's Pramānavārttikavṛtti*. Facsimile Edition. Patna – Narita 1998.
- Xc Xc14/1e, a photograph of two palm leaves with text fragments of Sthiramati's Trimśikābhāṣya, plate 5 (= 6) leaves 7(r) and 8(r) of Xc 14/1, preserved at the Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen.

