

# The Seven Bhāvasvabhāvas and Seven Paramārthas in the Laṅkāvatārasūtra: Methodological Remarks on the New Edition of Chapter II of the Laṅkāvatārasūtra<sup>1</sup>

Toshio HORIUCHI

## Introductory Remarks

The status of the research on the Sanskrit (Skt) text of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* (LAS) is as follows. As is too often pointed out, this text is complicated. This is because first, Nanjio's (Nj) (1923) version has many errors. However, it is a product of its time, and we must be grateful to Nj for providing us with the whole text anyway<sup>2</sup>. We should instead be embarrassed that no complete re-edition of this text has been compiled based on the original manuscripts (mss.)<sup>3</sup>, although more than 90 years have passed since the publication of Nj's version. Additionally, the text itself is difficult to understand: overly long compounds, enumerations of terms without explanation, unsystematic paragraph structure, great differences between texts (the Skt text and its translations) etc. However, in this case too, it is sometimes the problem with the understanding of scholars and not with the text itself<sup>4</sup>.

In 2015, Professor Jikido Takasaki and I published a work entitled *Ryōgakyō* (*Ryōgaabatsutarahōkyō*, T&H 2015), which is partly based on Takasaki (1980) that includes an annotated Japanese *kundoku* translation and studies on one-fourth to one-third of Guṇabhadra's *Ryōgaabatsutarahōkyō* (Sung, AD 443). Our work, on the other hand, constitutes one of the volumes of the *Shinkokuyakudaizōkyō* (新国訳大蔵経) series, whose body contains Japanese *kundoku* translation, headnotes, and supplementary notes on Guṇabhadra's whole text. In that book, we tried to read Sung—the oldest Chinese translation of the LAS—as a translation from the Skt. In doing so, we consulted the Skt side by side and took notes from it for every important term. We also consulted two commentaries preserved as Tibetan versions (Jñānaśrībhadrā (Jś) and Jñānavajra (Jv)<sup>5</sup>) to read the text in Indian and Tibetan contexts. Therefore, our text is not a regular translation of Sung as a Chinese text, but rather to some extent a mixture of different things<sup>6</sup>.

We did our best, and we believe that we made some progress. Of course, this was not without limitations and faults<sup>7</sup>. What was especially frustrating was that Nj, the only edition based on mss., was sometimes unreliable. Therefore, we also consulted Tibetan translations (one from the Skt (T (1)), and the other, from Sung (T (2))) and Skt mss. However, because of the nature of the book (Japanese *kundoku* translation of a Chinese text) and the limitation of time, we could not consult it thoroughly.

## Strategy Toward the New Edition

It seems like the right time to create a completely new edition of the LAS based on mss. However, the number of mss. found so far is so high that even if a scholar deals with them, he or she stops doing so on

account of being tired or bored after dealing with a small portion. Nevertheless, we need to make use of mss. for new editions.

In the first year of my four-year plan for creating a new Skt text of Chapter II of the LAS (Nj. 22-135), I would like to plot my strategy or rule as follows. (Of course, these rules are not purely theoretical, nor totally inflexible; rather they will be tested and if necessary modified as the edition, of which a preliminary form is presented in this paper, progresses.)

(Rule 1) Choose several important mss.

After Nj, Takasaki (1981) is the only work that re-edited one chapter of the Skt of LAS based on mss. It dealt with Chapter VI (Nj. 220-239) and used 17 mss. However, according to Takasaki, “one can not hardly think of the difference of recension” among these mss. Although he classifies these mss. into four groups, according to him, these are groups based on “some characteristics” among mss. Schmithausen (2010: 90) also says that “... the mss. preserved are only a part of a much larger number of mss. (as appears to be the case with the Lañk).”

Actually, Nj’s main problem is not the limited number of mss. he used, but rather his errors in reading them and occasional lapses in judgment in the choice of reading to be preferred<sup>8</sup>. In the course of examining the readings of the mss., it should be possible to identify several manuscripts as relatively important or unimportant. The edition can then be based mainly on the former, whose readings should be reported fully, while the readings of the latter would not be reported. Although in this article I will not be able to already come to conclusions about the relative importance of the manuscripts, I would like to examine some points related to this, and make some preliminary comments about some of the characteristics of the manuscripts which may help in their evaluation.

(Rule 2) Use Tibetan translations (Tib) as “complemental” material.

Tib are, generally, faithful translations of the Skt. There are some cases where a Tib, even if it is lacking in Nj’s footnotes, is better than other translations in addition to being supported by mss. In editing the Skt text, we can use Tib as “complemental” material. Since the vocabulary of Sanskrit is much more extensive than that of Tibetan, there are often several Sanskrit words which might lie behind a Tibetan one. Moreover, as I will show in this article, the original Skt that the Tib referred to may have differed from the current Skt mss. Additionally, Tib (T (1)) of LAS was translated in the 9th century. All the Skt mss. we have access to are dated from much later (although their original(s) may be older).

We can emend the Skt text using italics based on Tib when at least indirect support is provided by Skt mss. (Rule 2-1) and when support is provided by other usages (Rule 2-2) (including the Sung. see rule 3). By the word “indirect,” I refer to cases where an emendation based on the Tib is a relatively tiny emendation to the Skt, which can be explained as a sort of a morphographical variant of Skt.

(Rule 3) Use Chinese translations (Sung) as “supplemental” material.

It is true that among the three [extant] Chinese translations, the Sung translation is the most faithful one to the Skt. It is sometimes too faithful even to the word order of the Skt, making it unreadable as an orthodox Chinese text. However, unlike in the case of Tib, we cannot obtain the Skt original only by referring to the Chinese text. Moreover, even the Sung translation is not always faithful to the Skt<sup>9</sup>.

Thus, we can use the Chinese versions (esp., that of Guṇabhadra) as a touchstone to choose variant

readings among Skt mss. (Rule 3-1). A similar suggestion is made by Takasaki 1981: (4): “in the case that [the reading of] Sung and Tib agrees, I think that we should emend the [Skt text] even when there is no basis on mss.” This is what I mean about using the Sung as “supplementary.” However, we do not have to emend the Skt solely based on Chinese translations (Rule 3-2).

(Rule 4) Take note of the variant readings assumed by two commentaries preserved as Tib, that is, Jś and Jv.

As I will show below, these two commentaries are useful for reading the LAS in an Indo-Tibetan context, although their explanation cannot be taken as infallible guides to the meaning(s) of the text.

## The Purpose of this Article

In this article, I will take up a passage that enumerates seven *bhāvasvabhāvas* and seven *paramārthas* (Nj. 39.9-40.10, paragraph [2]) according to the division of Shinron by Kokwan Shiren<sup>10</sup>. As is seen from the table below, we have many variants (not only between Skt and Chin, Tib but also among the Skt mss. too) that must have occurred because there are only enumerations of the seven items and no explanation as to their contents. Therefore, I will trace the changes, seeking the background behind them. By doing so, I would also like to suggest a preliminary form of an edition of the LAS.

**Table 1: Seven bhāvasvabhāvas**

|      | 1  | 2   | 3  | 4  | 5                            | 6                                     | 7                                    |
|------|--|---|--|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Ni   | samudayasvabhāva                                       | bhāvasvabhāva   | lakṣanasvabhāva                          | mahābhūtiyasvabhāva  | hetusvabhāva                 | pratayasvabhāva                       | niṣpattisvabhāva                     |
| Skt  | samudaya-bhāva-svabhāva                                | bhāvasvabhāva   | lakṣanasvabhāva                          | mahābhūtiyasvabhāva  | hetubhāva                    | pratayasvabhāva                       | niṣpattibhāva                        |
| T(1) | 'du ba dngos po'i rang bzhin (*samudaya-bhāvasvabhāva) | dngos po'i rang bzhin gyi dngos po (*bhāvasvabhāva-bhāva) | mtshan nyid kyi dngos po (*lakṣaṇabhāva) | 'byung ba chen po'i rang bzhin gyi dngos po (*mahābhūtiyasvabhāvasvabhāva) | rgyu'i dngos po (*hetubhāva) | rkyen gyi dngos po (*pratayasvabhāva) | 'grub pa'i dngos po (*niṣpattibhāva) |
| Sung | 集性自性   | 性自性   | 相性自性                                     | 大種性自性  | 因性自性                         | 緣性自性                                  | 成性自性                                 |
| T(2) | 'du ba dngos po'i rang bzhin                           | ∅   | mtshan nyid kyi rang bzhin               | 'byung ba chen po'i dngos po'i rang bzhin                                  | rgyu'i rang bzhin            | rkyen gyi rang bzhin                  | mngon par grub pa'i rang bzhin       |
| Wei  | 集性自性   | 性自性   | 相性自性                                     | 大性自性   | 因性自性                         | 緣性自性                                  | 成性自性                                 |
| Tang | 集自性  | 性自性   | 相自性                                      | 大種自性   | 因自性                          | 緣自性                                   | 成自性                                  |
| Jz   | 'du ba dngos po'i rang bzhin                           | dngos po'i rang bzhin gyi dngos po                        | mtshan nyid kyi dngos po                 | 'byung ba chen po'i rang bzhin gyi dngos po                                | zhing gyi dngos po           | rgyu rkyen gyi dngos po               | 'grub pa'i dngos po                  |
| Jv   | 'du ba'i dngos po'i rang bzhin                         | dngos po'i rang bzhin gyi dngos po                        | mtshan nyid kyi dngos po                 | 'byung ba chen po'i rang bzhin gyi dngos po                                | rgyu'i dngos po              | rkyen gyi dngos po                    | 'grub pa'i dngos po                  |

**Table 2: Seven Paramārthas**

|         | 1                  | 2,3,(2)                  | 4(3)                       | 5(4)                                 | (5')                        | 6(5)                                 | (6') | 7  |
|---------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|--|
| Skt =Nj | cittagocara        | jñānagocara prajñāgocara | dṛṣṭīdvaya-gocara          | dṛṣṭīdvayātkrānti-gocara             |                             | sūta-bhūmyanu-kramaṇa-gocara         |      | tathāgatasya pratyātmagatigocara                       |
| T(1)    | sems kyi spyod yul | ye shes kyi spyod yul    | lta ba gnyis kyi spyod yul | lta ba gnyis las 'das pa'i spyod yul | snang ba med pa'i spyod yul | stras kyi sa las 'da' ba'i spyod yul |      | de bzhin gshegs pa'i so so rang gis rig pa'i spyod yul |
| Sung    | 心境界                | 慧境界                      | 見境界                        | 超二見境界                                |                             | 超子地境界                                |      | 如來自到境界   |
| T(2)    | sems kyi spyod yul | shes rab kyi spyod yul   | lta ba 'i spyod yul        | lta ba gnyis las 'das pa'i spyod yul |                             | stras kyi sa las 'das pa'i spyod yul |      | de bzhin gshegs pa nyid byon pa'i spyod yul            |
| Wei     | 心境界                | 慧境界                      | 二見境界                       | 過二見境界                                |                             | 過佛子地境界                               |      | 入如來地內行境界   |
| Tang    | 心所行                | 智所行                      | 二見所行                       | 超二見所行                                |                             | 超子地所行                                |      | 如來自證聖智所行   |
| Jz      | sems kyi spyod yul | shes rab kyi spyod yul   | lta ba gnyis kyi spyod yul | lta ba gnyis las 'das pa'i spyod yul | snang ba med pa'i spyod yul | stras kyi sa las 'das pa'i spyod yul |      | de bzhin gshegs pa'i so so rang gis rig pa'i spyod yul |
| Jv      | sems kyi spyod yul | ye shes kyi spyod yul    | lta ba gnyis kyi spyod yul | lta ba gnyis las 'das pa'i spyod yul | snang ba med pa'i spyod yul | stras kyi sa las 'da' ba'i spyod yul |      | de bzhin gshegs pa so so rang gis rig pa'i spyod yul   |

## LAS, Paragraph [2]

(Nj. 39.9-; Sung, 483b11-b23; T (2), D 199a5-, P 8.4.7-; T (1), sT (1) da 147b5-, sT (2) ra 174b2-, D 70a5-, P 32.5.5-; Wei, 522a28-; Tang, 593c9-; Jś, D 71b5- (Hadano et al 1993: 143-); Jv, D 80b4-, P93a6-)

Symbols and Sigla:

\* *virāma*

◦ indicates that part of a word, before or after the part given, has been omitted.

● separates entries commented on in the same footnote.

/ or

, caesura by the editor (author of this article)

++ unreadable akṣara (++ per *akṣara*; + for part of an *akṣara*)

| *danḍa*

] separates the accepted reading, emendations or conjectures from other readings

[ ] enclose number added by the editor

{ { } } enclose cancellation by the scribe(s)

<< >> enclose insertion by the scribe(s), [usually] at the margine

() after Ω enclose the actual reading in the particular ms., although it finally (*post correctionem*) accords with the reading in other mss. For example, *saptamaḥ*] Ω (*sapta*<<ma>>*ḥ* T1).

em. emendation by the editor

Ω all other mss. available

Φ not existent

Italics means emendation not based on mss. but on Tib/Chin.

I do not note variant readings such as *varttate/vartate*, *sambu/sambu*, *nti/ṃti*, and *s/ś*. I do not mention the variants of *danḍa*. To avoid overburdening the critical apparatus, I do not even note the variant readings of the ending of the word (-a/ -aḥ/ -o) as found in the lists of seven items (1 and 2 in this paper).

As for the abbreviations of Skt mss., see Takasaki 1981. Among the 17 mss. used there, C8 is C, R10 is A, T2 is K, and T1 is T in Nj. As for the part this article deals with, T4 is illegible. N15 and T2 lack this part.

I put abbreviations in alphabetical order (except Nj.). But as for the abbreviations of secondary sources (Tib, Chin), the order is: Tibetan, Chinese translations, Commentaries (Jś, Jv), and they are put in ().

## 1. Seven *bhāvasvabhāvas* (nature of things)

punar aparāṃ mahāmate saptavidho bhāvasvabhāvo bhavati yaduta [1] samudayabhāvasvabhāvaḥ<sup>1</sup> [2]  
<sup>2</sup>bhāvasvabhāvaḥ [3] lakṣaṇasvabhāvaḥ<sup>2</sup> [4] mahābhūtasvabhāvaḥ [5] hetubhāvaḥ<sup>3</sup> [6] pratyayabhāvaḥ<sup>4</sup>  
[7] niṣpattibhāvaś<sup>5</sup> ca saptamaḥ<sup>6</sup> ||<sup>7</sup>

Notes:

1: *samudayabhāvasvabhāvaḥ*] Ry, T1, T6, (Tib, Sung, Wei, Jś, Jv); *samudayasvabhāvaḥ* C8, C9, N11, N12, N15, N16, N17, T3, T5, T7, (Tang), Nj.

2~2: *bhāvasvabhāvaḥ lakṣaṇasvabhāvaḥ*] Ω; *lakṣaṇasvabhāvaḥ svabhāvo* T6

- 3: *hetubhāvaḥ*] C9, N11, N12, Ry, T1, (Tib, Jv); Φ C8, N17, R10; *hehetubhāvaḥ* {{*bhāvasvabhāvo bhavati yaduta samudayasvabhā*}} N15; *hetusvabhāvaḥ* N16, T3, T5, T6, T7, Nj.  
 4: *pratyayabhāvaḥ*] Ω, (Jv); *pratyeyebhāvo* N11; *pratyayasvabhāvaḥ* T6, Nj.  
 5: *niṣpattibhāvaś*] Ω, (Jś, Jv); *niṣpattisvabhāvaś* T6, Nj.  
 6: *saptamaḥ*] Ω (*sapta*<<*ma*>>*ḥ* T1)  
 7: number 7 is inserted here in mss. except N14, T6

## 1.1. Skt

### 1.1.1. *Samudayabhāvasvabhāva*

Three mss., two Chinese translations, and two commentaries have *bhāva* after *samudaya* in [1]. Although many other mss. lack it (*bhāva*), and no previous studies have adopted it, I adopt the reading with *bhāva* because T (1), Sung, and Wei have *dn̄gos po* and 性 (Rules 2, 3). Since the Sung is said to be faithful to the original text (and I also have the same impression), it is not probable that the Sung inserted the previously non-existent term *bhāva* to the text (although cases where authors choose not to translate existing words have been known to occur). Thus, we can be assured of the reliability of Ry, T1, and T6 at least here (Rule 1). In particular, T1 is the only available palm leaf ms. of the LAS, and it seems to be the oldest among the mss. I stressed the importance of this ms. before (Horiuchi (2015)), and it seems that it has a better reading here too. (It has many errors, of course. Moreover, it is not complete. However at least it should be recognized as one of the most important sources on which any edition of the LAS should be based.)

### 1.1.2. *Svabhāva* or *bhāva* or *bhāvasvabhāva*

From [2] to [7], we have a unique discrepancy between Skt and Tib, although the latter is generally regarded as a faithful translation of the former. In Tib, these items end in *dn̄gos po*, *\*-bhāva*, not *-svabhāva*. In [2], we have *\*bhāvasvabhāvabhāva* in Tib instead of *bhāvasvabhāva* in Skt (mss.), and in [4], we have *\*mahābhūtasvabhāvabhāva* instead of *mahābhūtasvabhāva*. How did it happen, and what is the original reading?

In order to consider this problem, let me first investigate [5] to [7] based on Skt and Tib. As for [5], we have some readings with *sva* and some without *sva* in Skt mss. However, in [6] and [7], we have a reading of *sva* only in T6. Thus, we can adopt *-bhāva* in [6] and [7] for the Skt edition. (Interestingly enough, Nj has *-svabhāva* in all these seven items without any footnotes although he did not consult T6. This seems to be the result of the human tendency to make things uniform. I am not being cynical here. We will see a similar case with Tib and Chinese translations below.) What about [5]? Although the number of mss. (as far as I know) with *sva* is equal to that without *sva*, I would like to eliminate *sva* based on the pair of *hetu* and *pratyaya* (and Tib): when [6] is *pratyayabhāva*, there is no reason that the pair term in [5] should be *\*hetusvabhāva*.

Then, what about [2]–[4]? Since mss. have unanimously [2] *bhāvasvabhāvaḥ*, [3] *lakṣaṇasvabhāvaḥ*, and [4] *mahābhūtasvabhāvaḥ*, I think that when we create a critical edition of the Skt, we do not have to emend these as *\*bhāvasvabhāva-bhāvaḥ*, *\*lakṣaṇa-bhāvaḥ*, and *\*mahābhūtasvabhāva-bhāvaḥ* based on Tib because we are dealing with Skt texts (Rule 2). However, it is true that this is a strange discrepancy between Skt and Tib, although the latter is said to be a faithful translation of the former.

A clue to consider this discrepancy is found in the Sung translation.

Sung has 性自性 (\**bhāvasvabhāva*) at the end of all seven items (except [2] in which *bhāvasvabhāva* is not the ending but the item itself), although the ending *bhāvasvabhāva* is not confirmed by Skt and T(1) as far as [4] to [7] are concerned. Why has this happened? There are two possibilities. (1) The Sung arranged the ending as \**bhāvasvabhāva* to suit the context and the readings in [1] and [2]. (2) Another possibility is hinted at by Shiren's Shinron, which comments on [2] 性自性 as follows: 此句譯家恐缺一字。補之當作性性自性。 (For this phrase [=性自性], the translator probably lacked one word. Adding [one word: 性] to this, [this phrase should be] 性性自性). Namely, according to him, this phrase should be read as \**bhāva-bhāvasvabhāva* instead of *bhāvasvabhāva*. Although this is not attested by any material, I find this an excellent and even beautiful emendation<sup>11</sup>, first, because this can be explained as a mere haplography of one simple and frequently appearing word (性, *bhāva*); second, because using this, the endings of all seven items are unified to *-bhāvasvabhāva*, which suits the topic of the paragraph “*saptavidho bhāvasvabhāvo bhavati* (“there are seven kinds of *bhāvasvabhāvas*”); and third, because this assumption solves the strange situation that *bhāvasvabhāva* is enumerated as the second item of seven *bhāvasvabhāvas*.

Thus, if we refer to the Sung translation and Shinron's emendation, the “original” text of the seven items [at least of the Sung] can be assumed as follows:

\**samudayabhāvasvabhāvaḥbhāvabhāvasvabhāvaḥlakṣaṇabhāvasvabhāvaḥmahābhūtabhāvasvabhāvaḥhetubhāvasvabhāvaḥpratīyabhāvasvabhāvaḥniṣpattibhāvasvabhāvaścāsaptamaḥ*. (If this is the original, who can criticize the scribe for being confused? As we see below (1.2), a haplography in translating the Sung into Tibetan can actually happen.)

In this case, one can further guess the situation as follows: with the change in times, the haplography of *bhāva* in [2] \**bhāvabhāvasvabhāva* first occurred. The Sung 性自性 may reflect that the Skt original of the Sung already lacked *bhāva* 性. Even if this is not the case, it is true that the second item is *bhāvasvabhāva* at the time of Sung. This very expression seems to become a stumbling block because by this, the ending is understood as *-svabhāva* instead of *-bhāvasvabhāva*. Then, it would be natural for the endings of the following items to also be understood and changed into *-svabhāva* (as is seen in [2] and [3] unanimously. Moreover, as for [1], many mss. lack *-bhāva-*, making the ending *-svabhāva* instead of *-bhāvasvabhāva*). This tendency culminates in Tang (and in Nj!), which unifies the endings of all seven to 自性 *-svabhāva*, showing sharp contrast to Sung.

This assumption of the original text, although faithfully based on Sung, which is said to be faithful to the Skt, might be seen as somewhat extravagant. However, it seems to me that the Tibetan readings of [2] \**bhāvasvabhāvabhāva* and [4] \**mahābhūtasvabhāvabhāva*, which are not attested by any material, show a confusion of transmission that can most easily be explained by this assumption.<sup>12</sup> (If so, the stumbling block for the Tibetan must also be [2] \**bhāvasvabhāvabhāva*, by which the ending of the following items were unified to \**-bhāva*).

Although I would like to assume that the above is the original form, in creating a Skt edition, one might wish to avoid possibly going too far, and decide to remain closer to the readings of the Skt mss. However, it would not be meaningless to note variant readings based on Tib and Chin.



## 1.2. Translations and Commentaries

I would like to consider the variants in translations and commentaries here.

1.2.1. T (2), the translation from Sung lacks [2], although Sung has it. This seems to be a mere haplography because of the sequence of 集性自性性自性 (or \*集性自性性性自性).

1.2.2. Interestingly, although Jv accords perfectly to Tib (it is understandable that later translator(s) (here, of Jv) use existing previous translations (Tib)), Jś differs in [5] and [6]. It has *zhing gyi dngos po* and *rgyu rkyen gyi dngos po*, for which we may assume as underlying Skt \**kṣetrabhāva* and \**hetupratyayabhāva* respectively. It may be possible that *he* of *hetu* was read as *kṣe*, *tu* as *tra*, and [6] as a dittography of *hetu*. There are no such readings in mss. I am not sure if the Skt that Jś consulted was actually so or if Jś intentionally emended the text. Anyway, it seems that the situation of the commentaries preserved as Tib translation is not simple, even though it may be worth noting (Rule 4). We will see a similar case below as well (2.2.3.).

## 1.3. Contents of the Seven *Bhāvasvabhāvas*

What about the contents of these seven items? Since there is no explanation by the sutra, we have to rely on commentaries. Here, I would like to introduce two commentaries preserved as Tib. Apparently in association with the *samudaya* in the first item, the two commentaries relate this to \**samudaya* (origin) [and \**duḥkha* (suffering)]-*satya* (reality).

### 1.3.1. Jś

Jś, D71b5ff. ():

[1] Ignorance and action that have the appearance of origin (*samudaya[satya]*). (*kun 'byung gi rnam par ma rig pa dang las*). [2] The accumulation of *skandhas* that has the mark of suffering (*sdug bsngal gyi mtshan nyid kyi phung po 'phungs pa*). [3] Further, it is considered that it has [its] seeds (*yang sa bon dang ldan par [b]rtag go*). [4] Earth etc. (*sa la sogs pa*. i.e., four elements). [5] Attachment to the world (*'jig rten chags pa*). [6] Cause (or that belongs to cause, *gang rgyu'i*). [7] That which is accomplished from it (*gang de las 'grub pa*).

### 1.3.2. Jv

Jv understands that these seven items briefly explain the manner of the twelve \**bhavāṅgas* (constituents of being), which constitute the two realities (\**satyas*) of suffering (\**duḥkha*) and their origin (\**samudaya*) and relate them to Mahāmati's question in LAS Ch. II.31ab (Nj. 26.4)<sup>13</sup>. Below is a brief summary of his commentary.

[1] The reality of origin (\**samudayasatya*). [2] Accomplishment of five aggregates (\**skandhas*), which are constituted in the reality of suffering (\**duḥkhasatya*). [3] craving (\**trṣṇā*), grasping (\**upādāna*), and the seeds of \**saṃskāra* which become powerful to accomplish the future *skandhas*. [4] elements of inner and outer. [5] Store consciousness (\**ālayavijñāna*) which has the seeds of \**saṃskāras*. [6] Such as ignorance (\**avidyā*), \**saṃskāra*, and craving (\**trṣṇā*). [7] By these causes and conditions, that which



constitutes the birth and age and death (\**jarāmaraṇa*) and future *skandhas* are accomplished<sup>14</sup>.

I will come back to these interpretations in 3.2 after examining the following. The next items listed in this paragraph are as follows:

## 2. Seven *paramārthas*

punar aparāṃ mahāmate saptavidhaḥ paramārthaḥ yaduta [1] cittagocaraḥ [2] <sup>1</sup>-jñānagocaraḥ [3] prajñāgocaraḥ<sup>-1</sup> [4] <sup>3</sup>-dr̥ṣṭidvayagocaraḥ<sup>2</sup> [5] dr̥ṣṭidvayātikrāntagocaraḥ<sup>-3,4</sup> [6] sutabhūmyanukramaṇagocaraḥ<sup>5</sup> [7] tathāgatasya pratyātmagatigocaraḥ<sup>6</sup> |

Notes:

1~1: *jñānagocaraḥ prajñāgocaraḥ*] C9, N12, N14, N16, N17, Ry, T3, T6, Nj.; *prajñāgocaraḥ* C8, N15, R10; *jñānagocaraḥ* N11, N13; Φ T1

2: *dr̥ṣṭidvayagocaraḥ*] Ω (*dr̥ṣṭi*<<*dvaya*>>*gocaraḥ* Ry); Φ N13; *dr̥ṣṭigocaraḥ* T5

3~3: *dr̥ṣṭidvayagocaraḥ dr̥ṣṭidvayātikrāntagocaraḥ*] *dr̥ṣṭidvayāt nikrāntagocaraḥ* N11

4: *dr̥ṣṭidvayātikrāntagocaraḥ*] Ω; °*ākrānta*° T1

5: *sutabhūmyanukramaṇagocaraḥ*] *suta*° em. (Nj. sugg. *suta*° acc. to Chin. and Tib); *sūtra*° Ω; *sutra*° N12, T3; *sata*° T1; ● °*anukramaṇa*° Ω; °*akrama*° N15; °*anukramaṇa gocaraḥ* T1; Nj. sugg. *atikramaṇa*°.

6: *tathāgatasya pratyātmagatigocaraḥ*] Ω (*tathāgatasya* <<*pratyātmagati*>>*gocaraḥ* Ry); *tathāgatasya gocaraḥ* C8, T5; *tathāgatapratyātmagatigocaraḥ* N11; *tathāgatapratyātmagocaraḥ* T6

### 2.1. Skt

There is no discrepancy in the endings: all end in *gocara*. As Takasaki (T&H 2015: 310) points out, “*paramārtha* means such as supreme significance, ultimate object, ultimate goal, or true meaning. [These] seven are classifications by the degree of approach toward such objects (sphere=*\*artha*).”

2.1.1. As for [2] and [3], some mss. lack either. Tib has only *\*jñānagocara*. However, if we lack either, the number will not be seven; I adopt *jñānagocaraḥ* and *prajñāgocaraḥ* as Nj did.

2.1.2. As for [6] *sutabhūmyanukramaṇagocaraḥ*, I also follow Nj’s emendation. Although almost all mss. have *sūtra* instead of *suta*, both Tib *sras* (*\*suta*) and Chinese 子、佛子 suggest *suta*. In this case, the reading in T1 *sata* may be the nearest to the original reading (Rule 1). As for *anukramaṇa*, however, although Nj’s footnotes suggest reading *atikramaṇa*, since there is no support by mss., I will not emend it. However, with variant readings (超、過、~ las ’da’ ba) the occurrence below should be noted: Paragraph [19], Nj. 70.4: *buddhasutabhūmim atikramya, sangs rgyas kyi sras kyi sa las ’das nas* (T (1), D 82b5). 黃 takes *anukramaṇa* and translates it as 依次入 (enter in order) which seems to be a faithful translation to *anu\kram*.

2.1.3. As can be seen in Notes 2 and 6, there is an interesting relationship between T5 and Ry. In these cases, the text of Ry corresponds to T5. However, in the margin of Ry, there is an insertion (emendation) by which the reading become suitable to other mss. Although we cannot go further with these two examples (I am

aware of the counterexample), it may be possible that the Ry originally consulted the ms(s). in which lineage T5 is also included and emended it based on other ms(s). This seems to show the uniqueness and importance of this Ry (Rule 1).

## 2.2. Translations and Commentaries

2.2.1. Skt has seven items that correspond to Wei perfectly and to, except in the order of [2] and [3], Sung as well.

2.2.2. Sung has 見境界 in the fourth, and T (2) faithfully translates *lta ba'i spyod yul*. However, in view of the other texts and in comparison with [5] *drṣṭīdvayātikrāntagocara*, which seems to be paired to this, we should add 二 (two) to the text (and then make it 二見境界). As we see below (2.3.2), this reading of Sung led to great differences in the understanding of this item by commentators compared to Jś and Jv, which were based on Skt.

2.2.3. T (1), the translation from Skt, lacks *prajñāgocara* and instead has *snang ba med pa'i spyod yul*, *\*nirābhāsagocara* as the fifth item ([5]<sup>15</sup>). Interestingly, the latter is not attested by any Skt mss. Nor Chinese translations, and therefore we do not have to emend the Skt (against Rule 2) found in commentaries by Jś and Jv (see 2.3.2).

2.2.4. Tang also lacks *prajñāgocara* and instead has 如来所行 *\*tathāgatasya gocara* before [7]. By this, the number becomes seven. This might be [intentional? since otherwise the number does not become seven] the dittography of the next [7] *tathāgatasya pratyātmagatigocara*.

## 2.3. Contents of the Seven Paramārthas

What about the contents of these seven items? Although there is merely an enumeration of items, and we have no explanation for them by the sutra itself, it is not that we have no clue at all.

First, [4] and [5] are a pair, and [5] is the higher version compared to [4]. Second, [7] is undoubtedly the highest stage of *gocara*, as is attested by the other occurrences in this sutra (T&H 2015: 89. n.11). Then, there are grounds to assume that these seven go higher in this order. Although Jś does not follow this plot, Jv seems to have understood these seven systematically, following this plot. I will first introduce Jś and, together with it, analyze the explanation by Jv.

### 2.3.1. Jś

[1] *Citta* (mind) means store-consciousness (*\*ālayavijñāna*). [2] When one does not percept the object to be known by way of wisdom, one becomes a yoga practitioner of non-duality. [3] the sphere of continually view of self (*\*ātman*) and mine (*\*ātmīya*). [4] Because one completely comprehends the selflessnesses of phenomenon (*\*dharma*) and soul (*\*puḍgala*). [5] Above the eighth stage (*\*bhūmi*). [6] The yogin who surmounted the ten bhūmis of the bodhisattvas enters into the bhūmi of the omniscient. [7] The sphere of the gnosis of the omniscient, etc.

### 2.3.2. Jv

Jv explains that this paragraph teaches that the nature of the dependent origination (*\*pratītyasamutpāda=bhavāṅga*. He connects this to the previous seven *bhāvasvabhāvas*) is *sūnyatā*, namely

*paramārthasatya*. Further, he understands this paragraph as an answer to the question by Mahāmāti in Chap. II.28c, Nj. 25.17, which questions the number of thusness (*tatathā*). Then, the point of his commentary is as follows:

- [1] The object of measure of reasoning (*\*anumāna*) that destroys proliferation (*\*prapañca*) (*spros pa gcod byed kyī rjes su dpag pa'i tshad ma*), which (i.e., measure) is the wisdom (*\*prajñā*) that arises from hearing and thinking of which objective support (*\*ālabana*) is thusness (*\*tathatā*).
- [2] A little undiscriminating gnosis, which is the wisdom which arises from mundane contemplation, which constitute in the state of heat (*\*ūṣmagata*) and summit (*\*mūrdhan*). And thusness that became its (gnosisses) sphere.
- [3] The gnosis of the state of receptivity (*\*kṣānti*) and prime-in-the-world condition(s) (*\*laukikāgradharma*), which possesses the view of self of soul (*\*pudgala*) and phenomena (*\*dharma*), and its object.
- [4] The gnosis above the path of seeing (*\*darśanamārga*) which abandoned coarse conceptual thought of this kind, and the thusness which became its object and is free from all proliferation (*\*prapañca*).
- [5] Since this very sutra states “non-appearance is the eighth [stage, *\*bhūmi*],” this means the gnosis above eighth stage and its object.
- [6] The gnosis of the state of concentration (*\*samādhi*) of *\*śūraṅgama* and *\*vajropama* [, which belong to those who] entered into the buddha-stage (*\*buddhabhūmi*), and its object.
- [7] The gnosis of *\*dharmakāya*, which constitutes the *buddhabhūmi*, and what became its object<sup>16</sup>.

In this way, Jv allots these seven to the stages of practitioner in this order.

2.3.2.1: As for the term [*spros pa gcod byed kyī rjes su dpag pa'i tshad ma*], which appears in the explanation to [1], Jv explains in detail after explaining the seventh item (D 91b6-92a4). To sum up, this surely belongs to the ordinal people (*tha mal pa*) in the view that this destroys *prapañca* to some extent. This can be called right measure (*yang dag pa'i tshad ma*).

2.3.2.2. [2] and [3] are allotted to “four *kuśalamūlas* or the four roots of wholesome elements,” namely, *ūṣmagata*, *mūrdhan*, *kṣānti*, and *laukikāgradharma*.

### 2.3.2.3. *drṣṭidvaya*

As for the *drṣṭidvaya* in [3], Jv understands the “two” as the self of soul (*pudgala*) and phenomena (*dharma*). Jś understands it as self (*ātman*) and mine (*ātmīya*). In any case, these two are regarded as something negative by both commentators.

Additionally, as I have pointed out before (2.2.2), Sung had only 見 without two (二). In this case, this term can be understood both negatively and positively. In view of the subject *paramārtha*, however, one may be inclined to understand this term (見) rather positively. Actually, Shinron relates this to the bodhisattva from the first stage up to the seventh. He understands the 見 here as “seeing” the two selflessnesses (見境界者。初至七地諸大菩薩正證真如。見二無我得第一義)。Another commentary to Sung also understands this as 正見 “right view”<sup>17</sup>.

What, then, is close to the original meaning? First, judging from [5], the opposite pair of [4], the term “two

view” should be understood as a negative one that should be surpassed (*atīkram*). Moreover, the term *drṣṭidvaya* is, in other places of the sutra, something to be denied. I will first take up the description at the end of this very paragraph, which runs as follows:

bālaprthagjanā bhāvābhāvasvabhāvaparamārthadrṣṭidvayavādino bhavanti || (Nj. 40.9-10)

T (1): byis pa so so'i skye bo rnam dngos po dang/ dngos po med pa'i rang bzhin don dam par lta ba gnyis su smra bar 'gyur to//

Cf. Jv: dngos po dang dngos po med pa'i rang bzhin don dam par lta ba'i lta ba gnyis su ltung bar (\*patito) 'gyur te/

Sung, 483b23: 愚痴凡夫性無性自性第一義作二見論。

T (2): byis pa so so'i skye bo rnam dngos po dang/ dngos po med pa'i rang bzhin don dam pa la lta ba gnyis su smra bar gyur to//

Wei, 522b13-14: 諸愚痴凡夫無有實體以爲第一義。說二見論

Tang, 593c19-20: 於自性第一義。見有見無而起言說。

The result of my edition based on mss. became the same as that of Nj's, but this is still problematic. It is evident that the two views are negative here, because they are related to the “foolish.” However, what is their content? As for the meaning, as Suzuki, we would like to relate the two views with *bhāva* and *abhāva* (Suzuki 1932: 36: they cherish the dualism of being and non-being). Yasui (1976)<sup>18</sup> translates this as “fools are the advocators of dualistic view toward the nature [of things] and paramārtha.” Namely, he reads similar to Suzuki and adds *bhāva* to the text. Takasaki, when he translates the Sung, emends the text as (愚痴凡夫)\* 於性自性与第一義、作性無性二見之論 and translates it “as regards the nature of things and paramārtha, [they] advocate the dualistic view of existence and non-existence.” This construction is similar to that of Tang. Here, Takasaki also suggests that 性無性自性 should be emended to 性無性性自性, which means to emend the Skt to *\*bhāvābhāva-bhāvasvabhāva-*.

As for the meaning, their understanding seems to be proper (although I doubt if one can read the Skt that way). However, since there is no support by mss., we should just note it and leave the text as it is. Actually, many mss. have *bhāvābhāvasvabhāva*, as I noted above. There are two variant readings. N11 has *bhāvābhāvābhāva-*. N17 and R10 have *bhāvasvabhāva-*. The latter is simple and corresponds to the theme of this paragraph (seven *bhāvasvabhāvas* and *paramārthas*). However, since many mss. as well as Sung and T (1) have *bhāvābhāva*, we cannot take the reading. The reading of N11 seems to be a confusion of *bhāvābhāvasvabhāva*.

There are other occurrences of the term *drṣṭidvaya* in this sutra, but the meaning is not clear since it does not explain its content. According to the commentaries, however, it means a kind of dualistic view such as existence/non-existence, *samāropa/apavāda*, subject/object<sup>19</sup>.

Anyway, this dualistic view seems to be a wrong view that should be denied. However, can the sphere of such a “wrong” view be called *paramārtha*? In this sense too, Jv's understanding that this means a sphere for a practitioner of a lower level seems to suit the context.

2.3.2.4. [4]-[7]: especially on *\*nirābhāsagocara*

As for [4], both Jś and Jv relate to the first *bhūmi* (stage) of bodhisattvas (Jv comments that this is “above” the first *bhūmi*).

[5] in the two commentaries ((5') in the Table 2 above) is, as I noted in 2.2.3, \**nirābhāsagocara*, which accords to the T (1) but is not attested by any other materials (Chin, Skt mss.). This cannot be explained as a morphological error (as can perhaps be done in 1.1.2 ([5] *hetu-* to *kṣetra-*)). It is also not possible to assume that the description in the two commentaries affected T (1), because Jś is said to have lived in the 11<sup>th</sup> century whereas T (1) is assumed to have been translated in the 9<sup>th</sup> century.

The situation is as follows: since none of the Chinese translations include this term, it is after 704 (Tang) and before 9<sup>th</sup> century that the [5] become *nirābhāsabhūmi*. The text that Jś and Jv consulted included this item. All the Skt mss. available to us, which are newer than them (although their original(s) may be older), lack this item completely. I cannot explain why this happened, but according to the commentaries, \**nirābhāsabhūmi* seems to exist with reason.

Actually, the term *nirābhāsa* is important in this sutra and is related to the eighth stage. First, as Jv cites, this sutra says that the eighth stage is called *nirābhāsa* (fn. 15.n.7). Second, *nirābhāsa* is highly estimated in this sutra. Takasaki (T&H 2015: 106.n.19) interprets the term '*nirābhāsa-gocara*' that appears in paragraph [3] as "a sphere in which there is no appearance of subject and object. A state without image" and comments that "this is a realm which is separated from the polarity of subject and object. The LAS frequently uses this term in order to describe the ideal state (the realm of awakening)." This term actually appears in paragraphs [16] [19] etc. Likewise, the eighth *bhūmi* is also estimated in paragraphs [25] [51] etc. Third, even some Chinese commentaries mention the eighth *bhūmi* even though there is no mention of *nirābhāsabhūmi* in their text (T No. 1791 T39.446a4 etc.).

In this way, among the ten stages, this sutra stresses the importance of the eighth stage, which is characterized as *nirābhāsa*. Therefore, the original of T (1) seems to have inserted *nirābhāsagocara* between [4] (first or above the first stage) and [5] (above ten stages) to relate this to the eighth stage.

At any rate, by the previous seven items and by this item, we can point out that T (1), which is generally assumed to be a faithful translation of the Skt, sometimes differs greatly to Skt. This is why we need Rule 2.

### 3. Rest of Paragraph [2]

Lastly, let me present the rest of paragraph [2].

<sup>2</sup>etat<sup>1</sup> mahāmate<sup>-2,3</sup> atītānāgatapratyutpannānām tathāgatānām arhatām<sup>4</sup> samyaksambuddhānām<sup>5</sup>  
<sup>6</sup>bhāvasvabhāvaparamārthahṛdayam, yena bhāvasvabhāvaparamārthahṛdayena<sup>-6</sup> <sup>7</sup>samanvāgatās  
tathāgatā<sup>-7</sup> laukikalokottaratamān dharmān āryeṇa<sup>8</sup> prajñācakṣuṣā <sup>9</sup>svasāmānyalakṣaṇapatitān  
vyavasthāpayanti<sup>9</sup> | tathā ca vyavasthāpayanti yathā tīrthakaravādakudṛṣṭisādhāraṇā<sup>12</sup>-na bhavanti |  
<sup>13</sup>-katham ca mahāmate<sup>10</sup> tīrthakaravādakudṛṣṭisādhāraṇā<sup>11,12</sup> bhavanti<sup>-13</sup>, yaduta  
svaviṣayavikalpadṛṣṭyanavabodhanā<sup>14</sup> vijñānānām, svacittadṛśyamātrānavatāreṇa mahāmate  
bālaprthagjanā bhāvabhāvasvabhāvaparamārthadṛṣṭidvayavādinā<sup>15</sup> bhavanti ||

Note:

1: *etat*] N11, T1; *evam/m* Ω; *evam etat*\* T6; Φ N11, T5; ('di dag ni Tib)

2~2: *etat mahamate*] ΦT5

3: *mahāmate*] Ω; *mahāma* N11

- 4: *arhatām*] Ω; *arhantādvaya* C8; *ahatā* N11; *aharntām* Ry; *arhantām* N15, T3  
5: *samyaksaṃ/mbuddhānām/m*] Ω; *samyaksaṃbuddhānām bhagavatām* N12, T7  
6: *bhāvasvabhāvaparamārthahṛdayaṃ yena bhāvasvabhāvaparamārthahṛdayena*] N11, N12, N13, N14, N16, T1, T3, T4, T5, T7, (° snying po yin te/ dngos po'i rang bzhin dang don dam pa'i snying po de dang ldan pas Tib; ° 以性自性第一義心 Sung; ° 依此性自性第一義心 Wei); ° *hṛdayena bhāvasvabhāvaparamārthahṛdayena* C8; ° *hṛdayena* C9, N15, N17, R10, T6; ° *hṛdayaṃ yena bhāvasvabhāvaparamārthahṛdayaṃ yena bhāvasvabhāvaparamārthahṛdayena* N11; ° *hṛdayaṃ yena* ° Nj (° *hṛdayaṃ {{yena bhāvasvabhāvaparamārthahṛdayaṃ}}* yena ° Ry); (° 心以此心 (\*°*hṛdayaṃ yena hṛdayena*) Tang)  
7~7: *samanvāgatās tathāgatā*] *samanvāgatā* N11  
8: *dharmān āryeṇa*] Ω; *dharmān āryena* C8; *dharmān ārye* T1  
9~9: *svasāmānyalakṣaṇapatitān/ṃ vyavasthāpayanti*] Ω (° *patitā{{++++}}* <<n vyava>>° Ry); ° *nāpati*° T6 ● *vyavasthāpayanti* Ω; *vyepayanti* N15; *vyapayanti* N17, R10  
10: *mahāmate*] Ω *mahāmati* N11  
11: *tīrthakaravādakudrṣṭisādhāraṇā*] Ω (° *sādhāraṇā {{na}}* Ry); ° *sādhāraṇā na* C8  
12~12: Φ N15  
13~13: *kathaṃ ca mahāmate tīrthakaravādakudrṣṭisādhāraṇā bhavanti*] *kathaṃ ca mahāmate tīrthakaravādakudrṣṭisādhāraṇā na bhavanti* *kathaṃ ca mahāmate tīrthakaravādakudrṣṭisādhāraṇā bhavanti* C8  
14: *svaviṣayavikalpadrṣṭyanavabodhanād*] *svaviṣaya*° T1 (bdag gyi yul° Tib; 自境界 (\**svaviṣaya*)° Sung; bdag yul° Jś); *svacittaviṣaya*° Ω (*sva*<<*cittaviṣaya*>>° Ry), (自心境界 (\**svacittaviṣaya*)° Wei); ● ° *drṣṭyana*° Ω; ° *dṛna*° C9, N14, T3; ° *dana*° N13; ° *drṣṭyāna*° R10, T1, T6; ° *drṣṭa*<<na>>° Ry; ● ° *bodhanād* T6; ° *bodhanāt/t\** Ω; *bodhanāta* N15; ° *bodhād* N16  
15: *bhāvābhāvasvabhāvaparamārthadrṣṭidvayavādino*] Ω; *bhāvābhāvābhāva*° N11; *bhāvābhāva* N15; *bhāvasvabhāva*° N17, R10; ● ° *vādino* Ω; ° *vādito* T1

### 3.1. Skt

I will comment a little about the variants. As for the reading in note 6, although Nj does not read it that way and all other studies just follow him, based on mss., Tib (T (1)), Sung, and Wei, that is the way it should be read. As for the reading in the first part of note 13, although all mss. except T1 reads *svacitta*, based on T1, T (1), and Sung, we should take the reading *sva*. The readings of C9, N14, T3 and N13 which are recorded after the first ● in note 14 show that for the scribes of these mss., one akṣara (*ṣṭya* or *ṣṭyā*) was unreadable, and then omitted. These two examples just show [later] confusing readings. The reading of N12 and T7 in note 5 shows that it is an addition based on the association from *tathāgatānām* etc.

Although I believe that my examination of the above three passages provides some basis for evaluating the relative importance of the manuscripts, the amount of material dealt with here is too little to draw firm conclusions from. Further investigation is certainly required.



## 3.2. Content

These are the concluding sentences of this paragraph. The above two sets are called “the heart of nature of existence and *paramārtha*,” and tathāgatās who possess (*samanvāgata*, Jv comments on it as “to possess as something to be understood (*rtogs bya nyid du ldan pa*)”) it are said to establish dharmas. Jś relates these two sets of seven items to defilement (*\*saṃkleśa*) and purification (*\*vyavadāna*)<sup>20</sup>. Jv, however, after characterizing the previous seven *paramārthas* to the realities of path (*\*mārga*) and suppression (*\*nirodha*), comments that these two sets teach the four realities that should be known (*shes bya bden pa bzhi*). Moreover, he says that these two sets are also included in convention (*\*samvṛti*) and supreme reality (*\*paramārtha*)<sup>21</sup>, namely, in two truths. This seems to be a harmonious and systematic interpretation of this paragraph.

## Conclusion

In this article, I took up paragraph [2] of the LAS (Nj. 39.9-40.10) and examined the possibility of a new Skt edition based on mss. Since there are only enumerations of items and no explanations here, over the course of time, the text (Skt itself and translations) seems to have changed greatly. In such a case, it would be reasonable to assume that each translation has its uniqueness that reflects the uniqueness of the original Skt that the translators (or commentators) consulted. It may often be difficult or virtually impossible to decide on one “original” or “true” reading. In the case of the LAS [as a whole], therefore, I believe that we have to take note of the readings of translations and even commentaries carefully and exhaustively, tracing the changes to the texts.

## Abbreviations

黄: 黄宝生 訳注『梵漢対勘 入楞伽經』中国社会科学出版社、2011.

D: Derge edition

Jś: Jñānaśrībhadrā: *\*Ārya-Laṅkāvatāravṛtti*, D, No. 4018, P, No. 5519. (Hadano et al. (1993): *Jñānaśrībhadrā Ārya-laṅkāvatāravṛtti Tohoku University Catalogue No. 4018 by Hakuyu Hadano, Professor Emeritus of Tohoku University with Hirofumi Isoda, Keinosuke Mitsuhashi, Koichi Furusaka, The Institute of Tibetan Buddhist Textual Studies, Hozokan, Japan, 1993.*)

Jv: Jñānavajra: *\*Āryalaṅkāvatāra-nāma-mahāyānasūtravṛtti tathāgatahṛdayālamkāra-nāma*, D, No. 4019, P, No. 5520.

LAS: Laṅkāvatārasūtra.

Nj: Nanjio, Bunyiu. ed., *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*. Bibliotheca Otaniensis 1, Kyoto, Japan, 1923.

P: Peking edition of Tibetan Tripiṭaka.

Ry: 梵文佛典写本聚英 Bonbun Butten Shahon Jyuei [Sanskrit Manuscripts of the Buddhist Sutras from Nepal], 井ノ口泰淳 Inoguchi Taijyun; 龍谷大学仏教文化研究所[Research Institute for Buddhist Culture, Ryukoku University], 1990, 法蔵館 Hozokan, Kyoto, Japan.

Shinron: 虎関師鍊 Kokwan Shiren, 仏語心論 *Butsugoshinron*, 日本大蔵経 Nihon Daizōkyō, 方等部



章疏三 Hōdōbu Shōso 3).

sT: sTog palace edition of Tibetan Tripiṭaka (Cf. Tadeusz Skorupski, *A Catalogue of the sTog Palace Kanjur*, Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica. Series Maior IV, Tokyo, The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1985.)

Sung: 求那跋陀羅訳 楞伽阿跋多羅宝経. Taisho (T) No. 670 (Vol.16.480a-514b): Sung (宋) translation by Guṇabhadra in 443, in 4 fasciculi.

T: Taisho tripitaka.

T1: Matsunami Catalogue No.333 (Originally collected by J. Takakusu). Cf. Takasaki (1981:1).

T&H 2015 Takasaki Jikido and Horiuchi Toshio, *Ryōgakyō (Ryōga Abatsutara Hōkyō)*, Daizō Shuppan.

Tang: 実叉難陀訳 大乘入楞伽経. T No. 672 (Vol.16.587b-640c): Tang (唐) translation by Sikṣānanda in 700-704 in 7 fas.

T (1): *'Phags pa Lang kar gshegs pa chen po'i mdo*. D No. 107, P No. 775. sT (1) (No. 96), sT (2) (No. 245)

T (2): *'Phags pa Lang kar gshegs pa rin po che'i mdo las Sangs rgyas thams cad kyi gsung gyi snying po zhes bya ba'i le'u.* , D No.108, P No.776.

Wei: 菩提流支訳 入楞伽経. T No. 671 (Vol.16.514c-586b): Wei (魏) translation by Bodhiruci in 513 in 10 fas.

## Bibliographies

Horiuchi (2015): Horiuchi Toshio, “Toward a Critical Edition of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*: The Significance of the Palm-leaf Manuscript”, インド論理学研究第 VIII 号 *Indoronrigakukenyū* 8, The Sankibo Press, 275-286.

Pine (2012): Red Pine, *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra Translation and Commentary*, Counterpoint, Berkeley, USA, 2012.

Schmithausen (2010): Lambert Schmithausen, “Some Philological Remarks on Chapter VIII of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*”, 古写経研究の最前線 シンポジウム講演資料集成 *Koshakyokenkyu no Saizensen: Simposiumkoenshiryoshusei*, 国際仏教学大学院大学 [International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies], 86-107.

Suzuki (1932): Suzuki Daisetsu, *The Laṅkāvatārasūtra: A Mahāyāna Text*, Delhi, rep. in 1999.

Takasaki (1980): Takasaki Jikido, 楞伽経 *Ryōgakyō* (仏典講座 Butten Kōza 17), 大蔵出版 Daizō Shuppan, 1980.

Takasaki (1981): Takasaki Jikido, *A Revised Edition of the Laṅkāvatārasūtra Kṣānika-Parivarta*, Tokyo, Japan, 1981. (rerecorded in Takasaki 2014).

Takasaki (2014): *Collected Papers on the Thatāgatagarbha Doctrine*, Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass.

Yasui (1976): Yasui Kōsai, 梵文和訳 入楞伽経 *Bonbun Wayaku: Nyūryōgakyō [A Japanese Translation of the Sanskrit Laṅkāvatārasūtra]*, Hōzōkan, Kyoto, Japan, 1976.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 16K16697. This paper is a modified version of the paper I presented at Khyentse Center Lecture Series, held at the University of Hamburg, Germany, November 9, 2016. I would like to express my gratitude to the participants for precious comments (especially to Prof. Dr. Harunaga Isaacson). I also thank Professor Seishi Karashima and colleagues at the Brahmi club (manuscript reading club) for reading the T1 manuscript with me and giving suggestions.

<sup>2</sup> An anecdote about the “formation” of LAS:

Bunyu Nanjo (1849-1927) writes in the preface of the text (Nj) that says he owes much to Unrai Wogihara (1869-1937). In the English preface (Nj. vii-vii), he writes as follows:

“... but as there were still many points which could not be made out quite clearly, I earnestly entreated Dr Wogihara to revise my copy by the aid of the Tibetan translation. He was willing to undertake the task. Not only was the Tibetan *Lankāvatāra* used but the three Chinese translations were also consulted to clear up whatever difficulties he met in the reading of my text. That I am now able to offer this edition of the Buddhist Sūtra to the public is altogether due to the ungrudging assistance given by Dr Wogihara to whom my hearty thanks are due.” He also writes the same thing in the Japanese preface (Nj. ii).

However, Wogihara allegedly seems to have suggested much more than Nj accepted or even took notes. Since this seems not to be known even to Japanese scholars, I will cite his testimony, which is an anecdote on the formation (!) of LAS with the Japanese original (I changed the old forms of the Chinese characters in the text to new ones).

In an essay in Japanese entitled 楓窓漫筆 一 梵文出版 “Fusomanpitsu: one: Bonbunshuppan (Random jottings at the fenster near acer (1): publications of Skt texts)” (first published in 1931, later included in Wogihara (1938: 874-875)), Wogihara first points out the situation of the flourishing numbers of publication of Buddhist texts at that time. However, he adds that the manuscripts that they were based on have so many mistakes and dittographies with the change of the times. Then, he continues as follows (I put some words in [] for clarity):

“By the way, to correct and repair the words of the original text in order to bring into the proper meaning, namely, in order to manifest their true meanings, is the most difficult task and what requires the ability mostly. Moreover, this is the most required thing. Other persons cannot imagine how difficult it is. This can only be understood by those who have the experience of publishing the original texts.

Let me enumerate several examples of the difficulties of this kind. When Dr. Nj was alive, I was required by him to peruse the draft that the doctor prepared for publishing the Skt text of the *Lankāvatārasūtra*. In the process, I consulted the Tibetan translations, guessed the [better] reading based on both Chinese and Tibetan translations whenever the meaning was unclear, and sent it to the doctor. However, in many cases, the doctor did not easily change the text, usually only mentioned them in the footnotes, but sometimes he did not use [=took note] my suggestions at all. For me, although I did this in my spare time, I was surprised by the number of the omissions when I read the [published] text again. Anyway, those who see the published Skt text of the *Lankāvatārasūtra* might be astonished how many variant words and emendations are listed in the footnotes.”

所で、正当の意義あらしむる様、原本の正義を詮顕する様に文句を訂正補修することが原典出版者の最も困難なる所で、又た最も手腕を要する所である。而も又た是が最も必要なのである。此の困難は他人の想像のつかぬもので、原典を出版せし経験のある人のみ能く了解するものである。

此の困難なる事例一二挙げんか、僕は南條博士の在世当時、入楞伽經の梵文を出版するが為に博士の準備せられたる原稿を博士の委嘱を受け閲読し、其の大途に於て西藏訳を参照し、意義の不審なる個処あるときは一一蔵漢両訳に依りて読み方を推測し、博士に送付せしが、博士は多くの場合は容易に本文を変更せず、大抵は僅に脚注に之を出し、時としては全然僕の提言を用ひられざりしこともあった。僕としても、他の研究の余暇になしたる事とて、再び本文を読んで其の遺漏の多きに驚きたるほどである。兎も角も今現に出版せられてある楞伽の梵本を見る人は、脚注に出せる異本の字句及び訂正の如何に多きかに一驚を喫せらるゝならん。

<sup>3</sup> A minor exception is Takasaki (1981), which is, as the title shows, a critical re-edition of the LAS Chapter VI,

which utilized 17 manuscripts. Of course, other than that, I am aware that some scholars studying this text based on manuscripts. Schmithausen (2010) is also important. For example, until the appearance of that article, we generally thought that the Skt title of the LAS Chapter VIII was *Māṃsabhakṣaṇa* instead of *Amāṃsabhakṣaṇa*)).

4 Cf. Horiuchi 2015.

5 These two are Indian. However, Hadano et al. (1993: II) points out, “It is assumed from the word usages of the text that it is not a translation from [Skt] original but it was composed based on the lecture on LAS he did in Tibet”. As for Jv too, I (the author of this article) have a same impression.

6 Texts can be read from various points of view. Scholars of Chinese could read the same text in Chinese contexts with reference to Chinese commentaries.

7 The following are some emendations to T&H (2015), and Horiuchi (2015), which I have to continue and report. In T&H (2015: 93.n.32), I noted the term 覆 and commented that in Skt, it is *adha-m-ūrdha*, meaning upside down, Cf. BHS. However, first, *-ūrdha* is a typo for *-ūrdhya*. Second, although I cited BHS, which understood *adhamūrdhya* here as *adha-m-ūrdhya*, commenting that “with “Hiatus-bridging” m, for \**adha-ūrdhya*,” as far as LAS is concerned, this explanation is needless. This is a wrong reading by Nj because T1 has *avamūrdha* (=T (1) spyi tshugs, Cf. Mvy, 3068). In any case, the meaning is the same (upside down).

In Horiuchi (2015: 281) (last word of III, just above IV. Example 4), *anekārthānārthato* should be emended to *anekārthānānārthato*.

8 This text sometimes seems to confuse T (=T1 ms.) and Tib, and I (abbreviation of a text) and T, which seems to be an error that occurred during the printing.

9 For example, as Takasaki pointed out (T&H 2015: 127.n.10), Guṇabhadra, as a translator of the \**Śrīmālādevīsūtra*, inserts some phrases that relate to the doctrine delineated in that sutra but not found in any other texts of LAS (Skt, Tib, and two other Chinese translations). These can be understood as an insertion by Guṇabhadra, and we do not have to assume that the “original” of LAS included these phrases. There is even a case in which Sung seems to have added some commentarial words for Chinese readers (T&H 2015: 384. II.10-13.). Moreover, although the Sung was translated in 443, as is seen in the case of the Chapter VIII (*Amāṃsabhakṣaṇa*), the Skt we can access is greatly different from that of the Sung. Schmithausen (2010: 88) points out that “At any rate, we can be sure that those parts and phrases of the Skt text that are confirmed by G[Guṇabhadra] did already exist around 440 AD, whereas the other parts may be the result of a redaction which must have taken place before B[odhiruci], i.e. before 513.”

10 LAS is divided into ten chapters in Skt. However, Kokwan Shiren (虎関師鍊, 1278-1346, a Japanese monk scholar of the Kamakura period divided the text of the Sung translation into 86 paragraphs in his Shinron. Although some of the divisions of the paragraph should be re-considered, Takasaki (1980) and T&H (2015) adopted his division of paragraphs. In this article too, I will adopt it (this is a practical measure: once this kind of division is adopted and used widely or to some extent, it is wise not to change it except when it includes fatal errors. Likewise, if a new edition of the entire LAS appears, I believe that it should note Nj’s page numbers because almost all of the LAS studies had referred to his page number, although we do not have to list the “variant” readings only found in Nj any more).

11 Pine (2012: 69) translates *bhāvasvabhāva* as “self-existence” and translates the second term [2] as “the self-existence of existence.” Although he does not note it, he seems to have emended the text as Shinron did.

12 I am not so naïve as to assume that the original text was perfect and it degenerated with the change in the times. I am also aware of the principle *lectio brevior* (shorter reading). However, in this case of simple and insipid enumeration of items, it would be natural to assume that haplography (and confusion based on it), instead of dittography or addition occurred. The insertion of number 7 after the enumeration may indicate something.

13 Let me briefly outline the structure of the LAS. At the beginning of Chapter II of LAS, Mahāmati, the interlocutor

of the sutra, after praising the Buddha, asks 108 questions (Nj. 23.17-29.8). The Buddha answers these questions (all in verses., Nj. 29.9-34.10). However, he does not answer his questions properly. Therefore, commentators sought to find answers in the body part of the sutra (Nj. 37.6ff.). (If these questions and the body of the sutra are related systematically, this may be a clue to clarifying the system of the LAS.) Shinron, on the other hand, relates this whole paragraph (on both seven *bhāvasvabhavas* and *paramārthas*) to the question found in LAS, Chap. II.37ab (Nj. 26.17).

14 Jv, D80b4-81a4, P93a6-93b7: gzhan yang blo gros chen po zhes pa la sogs pas sngar gyi rkyen gyis skye ba'i khyad par sdug bsngal dang kun 'byung gi bden pa gnyis kyis bsdus pa srid pa'i yan lag bcu gnyis kyi tshul mdor bsdus te bstan pa 'am/ yang/ sems can dngos po'i rnam (rnam] D; sna P) grangs dang/ mngon par brjod pa su yis bskyed (LAS, Chap. II.31ab (Nj. 26.4)// ces pa'i lan bsdus te bstan pa'o// de las [1] 'du ba'i dngos po'i rang bzhin ni rgyu kun 'byung gi bden pa ste/ las dang nyon mongs pa la sogs pa'i rgyu rkyen phan tshun 'du zhing sbyor pa'i dngos po'o// [2] dngos po'i rang bzhin gyi dngos po ni de las da ltar gyi ming dang gzugs la sogs pa'i phung po mngon par 'grub pa sdug bsngal gyi [P93b] bden par gtogs (gtogs] em.; rtogs DP) pa'o// [3] mtshan nyid kyi dngos po ni da ltar gyi phung pos bsdus pa'i tshor ba 'am tshor ba'i rgyu la mngon par chags pa'i sred pa dang/ len pa dang/ de dag gis ma 'ongs pa'i phung po 'grub par byed pa'i 'du byed kyi sa bon mthu dang ldan par byas pa ste/ srid pa zhes grags pa'o// de rnams kyang sdug bsngal dang kun 'byung gnyi ga'i char gtogs pa ste/ sngon gyi las dang nyon mongs pa'i 'bras bur gyur pa dang/ ma 'ongs pa'i zag pa dang bcas pa'i [D81a] phung po 'grub par byed pa'i rgyur gyur pa'o// de nyid kyi phyir de ni kun nas nyon mongs pa'i mtshan nyid yin pas mtshan nyid kyi dngos po zhes bya'o// [4] 'byung ba chen po'i rang bzhin gyi dngos po ni de dag gis bsdus pa phyi dang nang gi 'byung ba ste/ sems can gyi skye ba'i gnas kyis bsdus pa'o// de yang sems kyi snang ba las ma gtogs pa bem (bem] P; bems D) po'i ngo bo ni grub pa med ces bstan to// [5] rgyu'i dngos po ni 'du byed kyi sa bon dang ldan pa kun gzhi rnam par shes pa ste/ ma rtogs na 'khor ba'i nye bar len pa'i rgyur 'gyur ba'o// [6] rkyen gyi dngos po ni ma rig pa dang 'du byed dang sred pa la sogs pa ste/ sngar gyi 'du ba'i don nyid kyang gsal bar bstan pa ste/ 'on kyang da ltar gyi gnas skabs las ma 'ongs pa'i phung po 'grub par byed pa'i rgyu dang rkyen la sbyor bas zlos pa'i nyes par 'gyur ba ni ma yin no// [7] 'grub pa'i dngos po ni rgyu rkyen de dag la brten nas skye ba dang rga shis bsdus pa dang/ ma 'ongs pa'i phung po 'grub pa ste/ de ltar na srid (srid] em.; sred DP) pa'i yan lag rnams kyang tshe gsum gyis bsdus pa ste/ zhib tu ni 'og nas bstan par bya'o//

15 sT (2) has “snang ba chen po'i spyod yul”.

16 Jv, D81a4-81b6, P93a6-94b2: yang blo gros chen po zhes pa la sogs pas ni rten 'brel de rnams kyi rang bzhin stong pa nyid don dam pa'i bden pa ston te/ sngar gyi de bzhin nyid ni rnam pa du<sup>1</sup> zhes pa'i lan (lan] D; lam P) du sbyar bar bya'o// de la [1] sams kyi spyod yul ni de bzhin nyid la dmigs pa'i thos pa dang bsam [P94a] pa las byung ba'i shes rab spros pa gcod byed kyi rjes su dpag pa'i tshad ma'i yul lo// de yang slu ba med pas rigs (P rig) pa ni// don dam yin te<sup>2</sup> zhes pa dang/ des gtan la phab pa'i don kyang don (kyang don] P; Φ D) dam pa ste<sup>3</sup> zhes gsungs pa'o// [2] ye shes kyi spyod yul ni 'jig rten pa'i bsgom pa las byung ba'i shes rab drod dang rtse mo'i gnas skabs kyis bsdus pa cung zad rnam par mi rtog pa'i ye shes dang/ de'i yul du gyur pa'i de bzhin nyid de/ de skad du yang ye shes kyi tshogs ni drod dang rtse mo'i gnas skabs yan chad la *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i 'grel pa*<sup>4</sup> las bshad pas so// [3] lta ba gnyis kyi spyod yul ni gang zag dang chos kyi [D81b] bdag tu lta ba dang bcas pa bzod pa dang 'jig rten chos kyi mchog gi gnas skabs kyi ye shes dang/ de'i yul du gyur pa'i de bzhin nyid de/ de skad du yang/ gang zag dang chos kyi bdag la kun tu (tu] P; du D) rmongs pas sa dang po la sgrib po<sup>5</sup> zhes sngar bstan pa dang/ *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa* las kyang bzod pa dang 'jig rten chos kyi mchog gi gnas skabs na go rims (rims] D; rim P) bzhin du/ gang zag rdzas la brten pa dang/ skyes bu btags pa la brten pa'i 'dzin pa'i rtog pa gnyis dang ldan no<sup>6</sup> zhes gsungs pa'i phyir ro// [4] lta ba gnyis las 'das pa'i spyod yul ni de 'dra ba'i rnam rtog rags pa spangs pa mthong lam yan chod kyi ye shes dang/ de'i yul du gyur pa'i de bzhin nyid spros pa thams cad dang bral ba'o// de skad du yang/ sngar gyi lta ba gnyis la sogs pa mthong ba dang/ bsgom pa'i lam gyis spang bar bya ba nyid du gsungs pa dang de 'dra ba'i rmongs pa'i sgrib pa spangs pas sa dang po thob pa nyid du gsungs pas so// [5] snang ba med pa'i spyod yul ni *mdo sde 'di nyid las// snang ba med pa brgyad pa ste*<sup>7</sup>// zhes gsungs pas

khyad par du sa brgyad pa yan chad kyi ye shes dang de'i yul lo// [6] sras kyi sa las 'da' ba'i spyod yul ni sangs rgyas kyi sa [P94b] la 'jug pa dpa' bar 'gro ba 'am/ rdo rje lta bu'i ting nge 'dzin gyi gnas skabs kyi ye shes dang de'i yul lo// [7] de bzhin gshegs pa so so rang gis rig pa'i spyod yul ni sangs rgyas kyi sas bsdu pa chos kyi sku'i ye shes mnyam par gzhaq pa dang rjes kyi gnas skabs dang de'i yul du 'gyur ba'o// 'dir thams cad du yang yul dang yul can tha dad pa ni min te/ 'on kyang so so rang rig pa'i tshul du rang rang gi chos nyid la sgro 'dogs gcod pa'o//

Note:

1: LAS, Chap. II.28c (Nj. 25.17)

2: *Satyadvayavibhaṅgakārikā*, D No. 3881 Sa 1b4.

3: Cf. *Satyadvayavibhaṅgaṭīkā*, D No. 3882 Sa 4a5: des gtan la phab pa'i don kyang don dam pa ste/

4: Cf. *Abhisamayālamkāralokā* (AAA, U. Wogihara ed.)

5: Jv, D 27b7, P 32a8: sa dang po la ni gang zag dang chos la mngon par zhen pa'i kun tu (tu] P; du D) rmongs pa dang/

6: AAA, 36.30-37.1: *dravyasatpuruṣādhiṣṭhānaḥ prajñaptisatpuruṣādhiṣṭhānaś ceti dvividho grāhakavikalpa iti.*

7: LAS, Chap. IV.2b (Nj. 215.11), Sagāthakam, v.106b (Nj. 278.9)

<sup>17</sup> T No. 1789, T39. 351b16. However, I have to admit that there is a commentary to Tang that interpreted 二見 as seeing two *nairātmyas* (T No. 1791, T39. 446a).

<sup>18</sup> Ironically, among the modern translations of the Skt LAS I consulted, Yasui (1976) seems to be a relatively better one, because he sometimes avoids the errors of Nj's text by consulting the Tibetan translation.

<sup>19</sup> For the term *drṣṭidvayaṃ* found in other places (ad., Nj. 30.6), Jv comments that this refers to subject and object (*grāhya* and *grāhaka*). For the same term in another place (ad., Nj. 149.7), Jv relates this to *samāropa* and *apavāda*. There is a similar term *kudṛṣṭi*, which appears in a similar context.

<sup>20</sup> Jś, D 72b3-4: bdun pa gnyis la kun nas nyon mongs pa dang/ rnam par byang ba gnyis su gzhaq go//

<sup>21</sup> Jv, D82a5, P95a2: de yang kun rdzob dang don dam pa'i bden pa gnyis su 'dus la/

Keywords: Guṇabhadra, Jñānaśrībhadra, Jñānavajra, *svabhāva*, *nirābhāsa*