

# JIASBS

Journal of the International  
Association of Buddhist Studies



Volume 36/37 2013/2014 (2015)

The *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* (ISSN 0193-600XX) is the organ of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, Inc. As a peer-reviewed journal, it welcomes scholarly contributions pertaining to all facets of Buddhist Studies. JIABS is published yearly.

The JIABS is now available online in open access at <http://journals.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/index.php/jiabs>. Articles become available online for free 24 months after their appearance in print. Current articles are not accessible online. Subscribers can choose between receiving new issues in print or as PDF.

Manuscripts should preferably be submitted as e-mail attachments to: [editors@iabsinfo.net](mailto:editors@iabsinfo.net) as one single file, complete with footnotes and references, in two different formats: in PDF-format, and in Rich-Text-Format (RTF) or Open-Document-Format (created e.g. by Open Office).

Address subscription orders and dues, changes of address, and business correspondence (including advertising orders) to:

Dr. Danielle Feller,  
IABS Assistant-Treasurer, IABS  
Department of Slavic and South Asian  
Studies (SLAS)  
Anthropole  
University of Lausanne  
CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland  
E-mail: [iabs.treasurer@unil.ch](mailto:iabs.treasurer@unil.ch)  
Web: <http://www.iabsinfo.net>

Subscriptions to JIABS are USD 65 per year for individuals and USD 105 per year for libraries and other institutions. For informations on membership in IABS, see back cover.

## EDITORIAL BOARD

KELLNER Birgit  
STRAUCH Ingo  
Joint Editors

BUSWELL Robert  
CHEN Jinhua  
COLLINS Steven  
COX Collett  
GÓMEZ Luis O.  
HARRISON Paul  
VON HINÜBER Oskar  
JACKSON Roger  
JAINI Padmanabh S.  
KATSURA Shōryū  
KUO Li-ying  
LOPEZ, Jr. Donald S.  
MACDONALD Alexander  
SCHERRER-SCHAUB Cristina  
SEYFORT RUEGG David  
SHARF Robert  
STEINKELLNER Ernst  
TILLEMANS Tom

Cover: Cristina Scherrer-Schaub

Font: "Gandhari Unicode"  
designed by Andrew Glass  
(<http://andrewglass.org/fonts.php>)

© Copyright 2015 by the  
International Association of  
Buddhist Studies, Inc.

Print: Ferdinand Berger & Söhne  
GesmbH, A-3580 Horn

# JIABS

Journal of the International  
Association of Buddhist Studies

Volume 36/37 2013/2014 (2015)

BRANDON DOTSON

*The Remains of the Dharma: Editing, Rejecting, and  
Replacing the Buddha's Words in Officially Commissioned  
Sūtras from Dunhuang, 820s to 840s . . . . .* 5

SEONG-UK KIM

*The Zen Theory of Language: Linji Yixuan's Teaching of  
"Three Statements, Three Mysteries, and Three Essentials"  
(sanju sanxuan sanyao 三句三玄三要) . . . . .* 69

---

***New Approaches to Studying the Materiality of Buddhist Manuscripts***

---

ORNA ALMOGI, EMANUEL KINDZORRA, OLIVER HAHN, IRA RABIN

*Inks, Pigments, Paper: In Quest of Unveiling the History of  
the Production of a Tibetan Buddhist Manuscript Collection  
from the Tibetan-Nepalese Borderlands . . . . .* 93

MARTIN DELHEY, EMANUEL KINDZORRA, OLIVER HAHN, IRA RABIN

*Material Analysis of Sanskrit Palm-Leaf Manuscripts  
Preserved in Nepal . . . . .* 119

ORNA ALMOGI, MARTIN DELHEY, CLAIRE MACDONALD,  
BORYANA POUVKOVA

*Recovering Lost Writing and Beyond: Multispectral Imaging  
for Text-related and Codicological Studies of Tibetan  
Paper and Sanskrit Palm-Leaf Manuscripts . . . . .* 153

---

 CONFERENCE

*Authors and Editors in the Literary Traditions of Asian Buddhism*

Guest editors

 CATHY CANTWELL, JOWITA KRAMER, ROBERT MAYER,  
 AND STEFANO ZACCHETTI
 

---

CATHY CANTWELL AND ROBERT MAYER

*Authors and Editors in the Literary Traditions of Asian Buddhism* 195

JONATHAN A. SILK

*Establishing/Interpreting/Translating: Is It Just That Easy?* . . . 205

ROBERT MAYER

*gTer ston and Tradent: Innovation and Conservation in  
 Tibetan Treasure Literature* . . . . . 227

CATHY CANTWELL

*Different Kinds of Composition/Compilation Within the  
 Dudjom Revelatory Tradition* . . . . . 243

JOWITA KRAMER

*Innovation and the Role of Intertextuality in the Pañca-  
 skandhaka and Related Yogācāra Works.* . . . . . 281

OSKAR VON HINÜBER

*Building the Theravāda Commentaries: Buddhaghosa and  
 Dhammapāla as Authors, Compilers, Redactors, Editors and  
 Critics* . . . . . 353

L. S. COUSINS †

*The Case of the Abhidhamma Commentary* . . . . . 389

SARAH SHAW

*In What Way is There a Saṅghavacana? Finding the  
 Narrator, Author and Editor in Pāli Texts* . . . . . 423

MARTA SERNESI

*The Collected Sayings of the Master: On Authorship,  
 Author-function, and Authority* . . . . . 459

MARTIN SEEGER

*'The (Dis)appearance of an Author: ' Some Observations  
and Reflections on Authorship in Modern Thai Buddhism . . . .* 499

PÉTER-DÁNIEL SZÁNTÓ

*Early Works and Persons Related to the So-called  
Jñānapāda School . . . . .* 537

---

ULRICH PAGEL (GENERAL SECRETARY, IABS)

*Report of the XVI<sup>th</sup> Congress of the International Association  
of Buddhist Studies. . . . .* 563

*Notes on the contributors . . . . .* 571



## Innovation and the Role of Intertextuality in the *Pañcaskandhaka* and Related Yogācāra Works\*

Jowita Kramer

The present paper focuses on Vasubandhu's *Pañcaskandhaka*, its three commentaries, and the *Triṃśīkāvijñaptibhāṣya*, a closely related commentary on the *Triṃśīkā* composed by Sthiramati (6<sup>th</sup> c.). The three commentaries on the *Pañcaskandhaka* comprise the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* by Sthiramati, the *Pañcaskandhavivarāṇa* by Guṇaprabha, and the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya* composed by an unknown author.<sup>1</sup> By providing examples for various forms of bor-

---

\* I would like to thank Martin Delhey, Kazuo Kano, Ralf Kramer, Alexander von Rospatt, Lambert Schmithausen, Jonathan Silk, and Stefano Zacchetti for very valuable comments on previous drafts of this paper. I am also grateful for the support received from the German Research Foundation (DFG), which enabled me to complete this article.

<sup>1</sup> Though the *Bhāṣya* is ascribed to the author "Sa'i rtsa lag" in the colophon of its Tibetan translation, there are some indications that this ascription is based on a misunderstanding of the Tibetan translator or scribe who composed the colophon. The expression *sa'i rtsa lag* poses two questions, namely which Sanskrit name it corresponds to, and which text the person bearing this name composed. As already pointed out by Kazunobu Matsuda (Matsuda 1984: 12, n. 5), the name *sa'i rtsa lag* is mentioned at the beginning of the Peking edition of the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya*, where it occurs as the name of the author of the *Prakarāṇa* (i.e. the root text *Pañcaskandhaka*), not as the name of the author of the commentary (P 5569, 101a8: *slob dpon sa'i rtsa lag gis mdzad de / rab tu byed pa 'di*; notably, the phrase *slob dpon sa'i rtsa lag gis mdzad de* is missing in the Derge edition). Therefore Matsuda takes *sa'i rtsa lag* to be a translation of the name "Vasubandhu," the author of the *Pañcaskandhaka*. According to Matsuda, *sa'i rtsa lag* is only mentioned in the colophon as the author of the *Bhāṣya* because of the Tibetan translator's or scribe's misunderstanding of the phrase occurring at the beginning of the text. The assumption that *sa'i rtsa lag* is an alternative rendering of the name Vasubandhu is confirmed by another occurrence of this expression, namely in Sthiramati's commentary on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* (see the

rowings and additions this study aims at exploring the amount of innovation and the role of intertextuality in these texts, thereby contributing to our understanding of the functions of Indian commentaries as well as of the motives and compositional techniques of their authors. An appendix at the end of the paper offers a comparative overview of the parallels between the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* and the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya* to be found in the section explaining the mental (*caitasika*) factors.

## 1 Introduction

Although the commentary seems to have represented the main literary genre in ancient India the study of its form and function has only recently gained popularity in modern scholarship.<sup>2</sup> One of the first modern attempts to characterize the peculiarities of various kinds of Indian commentaries is to be found in R. S. Bhattacharya's article "Kinds of Expositions in Sanskrit Literature" published in 1955. Bhattacharya distinguishes seven main kinds of commentaries: *vṛtti*, *vārttika*, *bhāṣya*, *pañjikā*, *īkā*, *paspaśa*, as well as *upodghāta* and identifies the *vṛtti*-commentary as the oldest form of

---

edition of the 11<sup>th</sup> chapter of the text in Hayashima 1983: 14), where it refers to the author of the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkārabhāṣya*, that is Vasubandhu. The fact that *sa'i rtsa lag* was used in Tibetan translations as an alternative rendering of the name "Vasubandhu" has also been pointed out by Samten Karmay (Karmay 1988: 150). Karmay's remark has been rejected by Dan Martin, who moreover states that *sa'i rtsa lag* refers to the "Singhalese commentator Pṛthivībandhu" who wrote Abhidharma commentaries (i.e. the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya*?) and who has been "active during the reign of King Gopāla; 685–720 CE" (Martin 2002: 338, n. 7). Martin's dating is probably based on a note in Tāranātha's history of Buddhism, in which a *paṇḍita sa'i rtsa lag* is mentioned to have belonged to this period (see Chimpa and Chattopadhyaya 1997: 261). The idea that this *sa'i rtsa lag* was Singhalese probably originates from the colophon of a Tibetan translation of a commentary on the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (translated from the Chinese; see D 4017, 302a7) where *siñ ga la'i slob dpon sa'i rtsa lag* is mentioned as its author.

<sup>2</sup> It is assumed that within the corpus of Indian Sanskrit literature commentaries take a share of around 75 % (see von Hinüber [2007: 99f.], who speaks of the "Kommentierungswut der Inder" in this context, and also Brückner 1995: 237).



exposition.<sup>3</sup> The characterization of the different types of commentaries offered by Bhattacharya remains vague and is based on a few selected (non-Buddhist) sources. The study of Indian commentaries had not been significantly brought forward for several decades after Bhattacharya's investigation. It was not until the 1990s that the nature of Indian commentaries returned into the focus of research, mainly due to the publication of two interdisciplinary volumes on the topic (see below).<sup>4</sup> Nonetheless, the question still remains open whether the different expressions for Indian commentaries always refer to the same specific commentarial style and type and whether Indian authors did indeed follow the theoretical rules of composition described in exegetical handbooks like the *Vyākhyāyukti*.

The present paper is part of a more extensive study of Indian Buddhist commentaries which I am currently working on. While the overall aim of this project is to understand, on the basis of Yogācāra commentaries, the relations between the various commentarial types and to identify the differences and parallels between them, the focus of the present paper is limited to the question of how much intertextuality on the one hand and innovation and creativity on the other are to be found in the commentaries and also in their root text.<sup>5</sup> By dealing with some examples illustrating the reuse of older material and inclusion of innovative parts I hope to contribute new insights to questions regarding the functions of Indian commentaries and the motivations of their authors.

Commentaries have played an essential role not only in ancient India but in most pre-modern cultures, and thus these cultures have even been called “commentary cultures” (“Kommentarkulturen”) by modern scholars.<sup>6</sup> A number of publications have already ad-

---

<sup>3</sup> Bhattacharya 1955: 124–129.

<sup>4</sup> Most of the relevant publications published from the 1990s on are mentioned below. Further studies include, e.g., Bronkhorst 1991, Ganeri 2011 (chapter 8), Houben 1997 and 1999, Nance 2012, and Slaje 2007. Notable remarks on Tibetan commentaries are to be found in Cabezón 2001.

<sup>5</sup> The role of intertextuality in Indian *śāstric* literature has been dealt with before, e.g., in Olivelle 2004 and Freschi 2011.

<sup>6</sup> Quisinsky and Walter 2007: 1 and 7.

dressed the function of commentaries in, for instance, the Egyptian, Greek, Islamic and the Indian tradition, of which the three volumes Assmann and Gladigow 1995, Most 1999, and Quisinsky and Walter 2007 should be singled out in particular.

One of the ideas emphasized by some authors who have contributed to these volumes is that commentaries were composed in order to preserve old or traditional knowledge on the one hand and to introduce new ideas on the other.<sup>7</sup> In the introduction to his own volume Jan Assmann states that commentaries were not only produced because the (root) texts “needed” them due to gaps in the transmission, scribal mistakes that crept in over time, and due to “*verschwundene[n] Wissenshorizonte*” (“lost knowledge horizons”),<sup>8</sup> but because some texts were considered so valuable that they “deserved” a commentary.<sup>9</sup>

Notable remarks on the functions of commentaries are also to be found in an article published by Karin Preisendanz in 2008. Preisendanz characterizes the philosophical Indian commentary as a tool enabling the author to add new philosophical concepts to his tradition, to systematize the teachings, to update the terminology, and to avoid inconsistencies.<sup>10</sup> According to Preisendanz we should distinguish these “creative” commentaries from philosophically “unproductive” works. The latter often only consist of citations and of comments on difficult terminology and grammatical constructions and could actually be collections of notes or “*scholialia*.”<sup>11</sup> Preisendanz also mentions that creative commentaries often became more important within their tradition than the root text in the course of time and could eventually even replace it.<sup>12</sup> Another fact pointed out by Preisendanz is that Indian commentators usu-

<sup>7</sup> See, e.g., Quisinsky and Walter 2007: 10f., Most 1999: x, and Brückner 1995: 247.

<sup>8</sup> With this expression Assmann refers to the idea that old texts are usually not entirely understood in a new socio-cultural environment.

<sup>9</sup> Assmann and Gladigow 1995: 19.

<sup>10</sup> Preisendanz 2008: 606f.

<sup>11</sup> Preisendanz 2008: 609f.

<sup>12</sup> Preisendanz 2008: 606 and 612. See also Brückner 1995: 247.

ally do not seem to have attached great importance to presenting their innovative ideas as new and original. Instead they appear to have aimed for reducing them to, as Preisendanz writes (citing Radhakrishnan), “a new name for an old way of thinking.”<sup>13</sup>

Thus, a commentary might, on the one hand, have the purpose of transferring a text from the past to the present, thereby recovering and reconfirming it by adapting it to the modern, present-day vocabulary and perspective. On the other hand, it might be used as a tool to incorporate an old authoritative source into a new context, for instance a newly established tradition, in order to authorize the latter and its newly developed ideas. Moreover, the motives for composing a commentary may be characterized as the commentator’s striving for prestige and ‘empowerment’ by creating a direct connection to a powerful root text. According to Glenn Most this empowerment may happen on four different levels.<sup>14</sup> The first to be empowered by the commentary is the author of the root text, who is brought back, as Most says, “from the exile of having written too long ago and of no longer being fully understandable.” The second is the author of the commentary who profits from the prestige of the root text. The third is the reader or student who benefits from the commentary because he gains access to the root text and to the tradition the root text and the commentary belong to. Finally the institution is strengthened because – if the commentary is successful – it binds the root text and the reader to its tradition and thus makes the latter more important.

A further important fact to be considered is pointed out in Heinrich von Stietencron’s and in Wolfgang Raible’s contributions to Assmann and Gladigow 1995. Von Stietencron states that the brief root text itself should not necessarily be considered the starting point for a particular set of teachings. Instead, the brief root text often represents a “secondary” summary of a complex conglomerate of doctrines, which was composed in retrospect.<sup>15</sup> Wolfgang Raible seems to be thinking in a similar vein when he

---

<sup>13</sup> Preisendanz 2008: 607f. and Radhakrishnan 1923: 46.

<sup>14</sup> Most 1999: x–xi.

<sup>15</sup> Von Stietencron 1995: 252.

speaks of “amplification” and “reduction” as possible variants of relations between texts.<sup>16</sup>

Von Stietencron also emphasizes the idea that commentaries mainly grew out of student-teacher relationships, the student noting down the master’s explanations as well as the results of discussions and additionally enriching these notes with his own thoughts. Later his own students might have proceeded in the same way, and thus the tradition continued to develop constantly.<sup>17</sup> The idea that commentaries were mainly produced within the teaching process is also indicated by Ineke Sluiter in her study of Greek commentaries. According to Sluiter the existence of a commentary on a particular text may be regarded as a proof for the fact that the root text was used as a teaching aid and that the commentator acted as a teacher.<sup>18</sup>

The *Pañcaskandhaka* and its commentaries seem to confirm most of the above-mentioned theories of how and why commentaries were produced. On the one hand all three commentaries follow the *Pañcaskandhaka* very closely with regard to its structure and main teachings and do not contradict the root text explicitly. On the other all three contain phrases, longer passages, and teachings which clearly go beyond the root text. With regard to this additional material we can distinguish those parts which probably were created by the commentator himself from those that were borrowed from other older sources without being officially marked as quotations. The latter additions may be considered as not innovative because they are copied from earlier sources. At the same time they represent a creative act insofar as the commentators combined this borrowed textual material with that of the root text and thus created new texts.

Another point to be stressed is the fact that it is not only the commentary that is characterized by intertextuality but that the root text also includes both, innovative passages and phrases and

---

<sup>16</sup> Raible 1995: 57.

<sup>17</sup> Von Stietencron 1995: 252f. See also Krasser 2011: 49 and 70.

<sup>18</sup> Sluiter 1999: 173.

concepts borrowed from other works. Examples from the commentaries and from the root text illustrating these two aspects of textual production are presented below in sections two and three. The observation that the root text is also characterized by intertextuality is important insofar as it is generally the root text that is assumed to be original and innovative, while the commentary is often regarded a secondary product following the ideas of the root text and relying on previous sources.<sup>19</sup> But taking into account the fact that the amount of innovation and textual reuse is similar in Vasubandhu's root text and, for instance, in Sthiramati's commentary, the commentary does not necessarily occupy a very specific position in terms of intertextuality.

As pointed out by von Stietencron and Raible it is important to note that the relations between earlier and later texts and teachings do not only manifest themselves in a root text's expansion into a more detailed commentary. These relations may also become visible in a short root text aiming at reducing or summarizing the extensive doctrinal material existing prior to its production. The *Pañcaskandhaka* and its commentaries illustrate this in a very clear way. While the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* is obviously extending the contents of the *Pañcaskandhaka*, the *Pañcakandhaka* itself is not a direct commentary on anything but nonetheless it is clearly based on material that has been there before in the sense that it is reducing something more extensive. The *Pañcaskandhaka* is so brief that no one would have understood it, if it were not summarizing doctrinal material available prior to its composition.

Thus, the main difference between an 'official' commentary and a text that is not designated as such seems not to be the extent of innovation or creativity but the fact that the commentary follows in a very obvious way the structure of the root text, whereas the root text can have an individual structure. Notably, at least in the case of the *Pañcaskandhaka* the root text is also bound to a particular structure through its specific topic, the five *skandhas*. By following

---

<sup>19</sup> See for instance Cabezón 2001: 251, where the great amount of commentarial literature in Tibet is given as a reason for the recurrent use of recycling from older sources to be found in Tibetan texts.

the conventional structure of the latter, the *Pañcaskandhaka* automatically repeats and copies certain patterns and phrases from earlier sources dealing with the same topic.

The above-mentioned idea that commentaries arose mainly from a didactical context seems to be supported by certain characteristic features of Sthiramati's commentaries, in particular his *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* and *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*. As becomes obvious from the examples provided below, Sthiramati's comments do not give the impression of a conscious plan of the author to employ specific strategies of textual reuse in a systematic way. In some cases Sthiramati quotes explicitly from other works, sometimes providing the title of the source, sometimes not. In other cases he borrows the material 'silently,' without any indication that he is quoting another text. Only *sūtra* citations seem to be marked as such regularly, though only very rarely an explicit title is given.

It is also notable that Sthiramati does not utilize his sources in a systematic way. In some cases he reproduces relevant passages from related texts like the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*, but he does not extract all the passages that could be of relevance for his own comments. What is more, in some instances his wording is identical to the other text, in some it differs without any obvious reason. Thus, the theory that commentaries like Sthiramati's were produced in the context of teaching may offer a possible explanation for the unsystematic usage of other sources.

The decision to proceed in a particular way, i.e. to copy text from a different source literally or not literally, to mark this text as a quotation (without providing a particular title), or to mention the title of the source explicitly, appears to have been made more or less randomly.<sup>20</sup> Maybe the reason why the title of the source is provided at some instances but not at others is simply that the teacher mentioned it in the case of one teaching but not with reference to another. In those cases in which the text is not officially quoted the teacher might have not used it consciously as a citation. Taking

---

<sup>20</sup> However, one has to be cautious with any definite conclusions as it is also possible that Sthiramati was using sources no longer extant or different versions of works available to us today.

into account the fact that scholars like Sthiramati knew the texts by heart, it is possible that they were simply reproducing what they knew about the topic under discussion without even being aware of the fact that they were citing specific texts. Their main aim might have been to provide the standard explanations that were regarded as authoritative in the milieu they belonged to and it might not have been considered important to indicate what the particular source of a passage was as long as the explanation was in accord with the author's tradition.<sup>21</sup> Another commentarial feature that makes the teaching scenario probable is the fact that in some cases Sthiramati explains rather obvious grammatical constructions or word meanings while in other, similar, instances he does not.<sup>22</sup>

In summary, commentaries like the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* or the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya* give the impression of having been produced in a didactical context. At the same time they contain well thought through, philosophically challenging passages, which must have been composed by a mature scholar, that is the teacher himself. Thus, the scenario that they actually arose from notes taken by students during the teaching process (as suggested in Krasser 2011: 49 and 70, for portions of Bhāviveka's *Prajñāpradīpa*) may only be applied to some selected parts. In addition to Karin Preisendanz' above-mentioned differentiation between creative and philosophically unproductive commentaries, it is worthwhile noting that characteristics of both types of commentaries may also be found within one single work, as in the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* and the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*.

The fact that Sthiramati explains grammar and syntax of the root text so randomly and provides synonyms and counter-arguments (of opponents) in such an irregular way is particularly remarkable

<sup>21</sup> See also Freschi 2011: 171.

<sup>22</sup> See, e.g., the explanation of *ābhoga* as *ābhujana* (PSkV 20b1), of *pravīcaya* as *pravīcinoti* (PSkV 22a6), of *kausīdya* as *kutsitaṃ sīdatīti kusīdaḥ / tadbhāvaḥ kausīdyam* (PSkV 26b4), and of *staimīya* as *stimitabhāva* (PSkV 38b6). The fact that Sthiramati explains Vasubandhu's root text in this way only sporadically but not regularly may suggest that he was asked (by a student?) to explain a certain word in more detail.

when we try to understand the relations between his commentarial methods and the rules prescribed in various Indian exegetical handbooks. One of the most important Buddhist manuals on exegesis appears to have been the *Vyākhyāyukti*, according to which *sūtras* are commented on with regard to the five criteria “intention,” “summarized meaning,” “word meaning,” “connection,” and “objections and answers.”<sup>23</sup> Further exegetical rules are to be found, for instance, in the *Nettipakarāṇa* and *Peṭakopadesa*<sup>24</sup> as well as in the (non-Buddhist) *Parāśarapurāṇa*, which served as the basis for Gary Tubb’s and Emery Boose’s *Scholastic Sanskrit: A Handbook for Students*. The *Parāśarapurāṇa* lists five tasks which a commentary aims to fulfill: “word-division,” “paraphrasing,” “analysis of grammatical complexes,” “construing the sentences,” and “answering of objections.”<sup>25</sup> While most of Sthiramati’s comments can certainly be assigned to one of the categories of the *Vyākhyāyukti* and the *Parāśarapurāṇa*, it is also obvious that he does not follow these rules in a systematic and regular way. He, for example, paraphrases the meaning of the root text in most cases and very often gives synonyms for the words, but usually does not (explicitly) explain the division of compounds and the construction of sentences.<sup>26</sup> Grammatical complexes are also clari-

<sup>23</sup> Schoening 1995: 38, Skilling 2000: 318, and Verhagen 2005: 574. Verhagen (2008: 238) points out that these five criteria could be related to a set of principles for scholastic exposition, the so-called *tantrayuktis*, known from the Brahmanical context (mainly medical and political). On the *tantrayuktis*, see also Lele 1981, Oberhammer 1996: 110–112, and Manevskaia 2008.

<sup>24</sup> See Verhagen 2008: 233f.

<sup>25</sup> Tubb and Boose 2007: 3–5.

<sup>26</sup> Two of the few examples which show Sthiramati dividing compounds explicitly in his commentary may be visible in PSkV 37a1, where he explains *caṇḍavacodāśītā* as *caṇḍena vacasā pradaśati*, and in PSkV 42a2, where he understands *asaṃjñīsamāpattiḥ* to mean either *asaṃjñā samāpattiḥ* or *asaṃjñānām samāpattiḥ*. There are, of course, countless instances in which Sthiramati explains the meaning of every single word, some of these words being part of a compound. In these cases he is ‘indirectly’ dividing compounds, too. However, it is not clear whether the rule ‘word division’ also refers to this indirect separation of words. As for comments on the syntax, an example for Sthiramati commenting on it may be found in PSkV 54a6f. and PSkV 57b6, where Sthiramati explains that the term *upādāya* which appears



fied only sporadically by Sthiramati,<sup>27</sup> and the viewpoints of opponents are discussed only in the context of some specific topics, as for instance, the understanding of the concept of “feeling” (*vedanā*) or of the mental functions of someone emerging from the state of *nirodhasamāpatti*.<sup>28</sup> A detailed analysis of the nature of Sthiramati’s comments and of their relation to the above-mentioned categories, which I am planning to complete in the near future, will certainly result in more specific insights with regard to the commentarial methods of Indian authors.

## 2 Examples of Intertextuality

The comparison of the *Pañcaskandhaka* and its three commentaries with other Abhidharma and Yogācāra works shows that the authors of the four texts drew extensively on material from earlier sources. Notably, they used the other texts ‘silently,’ explicit quotations being completely absent in the root text and appearing only very rarely in the commentaries. The relations of the *Pañcaskandhaka* itself to the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* have been discussed in detail in Kramer 2013a, where I have compared the definitions of the *saṃskāras* provided in the three texts. As is evident from this comparison only very few of the definitions are completely identical in all three works. At the same time most of the statements appear at least partly related to each other. This is evident, for instance, in the definition of faith (*śraddhā*):

PSk 6,5f.: *karmaphalasatyaratneṣv abhisampratayayaś cetasaḥ prasādaḥ* (“firm belief [and] mental clarity with regard to karma, [its] results, the [four] truths, and the [three] jewels”)

AS 16,7: *astivaguṇavattvaśakyatveṣv abhisampratayayaḥ prasādo ’bhilāṣaḥ* (“firm belief, clarity, [and] aspiration with regard to that which exists, that which possesses virtues, and the capabilities”)

---

at the end of the passage also applies to the part of the passage he is commenting on.

<sup>27</sup> One prominent example of a grammatical explanation is found in PSkV 3a1–3b2, where Sthiramati discusses the grammar of the compound *rūpaskandha*.

<sup>28</sup> PSkV 14b6ff. and 51b4ff.

AKBh 55,6: *cetasah prasādaḥ* (“mental clarity”); AKBh 55,6f. adds that “others” (*apare*) define *śraddhā* as “firm belief in the [four] truths, the [three] jewels, karma, and [its] results” (*satyaratnakarmaphalābhī-sampratyaḥ*)

Some of the divergences that become visible when we examine the *saṃskāra* definitions might be explained as having occurred due to the employment of synonyms, as for example the usage of the term *abhiprete* instead of the expression *īpsite* in the definition of “wish” (*chanda*):

PSk 5,8: *abhiprete vastuny abhilāṣaḥ* (“craving for the desired object”)

AS 16,1f.: *īpsite vastuni tattadupasaṃhatā kartukāmatā* (“the desire for action [directed] at an object longed for, connected to this or that”)

The same applies to the definition of “contact” (*sparśa*), in which Vasubandhu uses the term *samavāya* instead of *sannipāta*:

PSk 5,4: *trikasamavāye paricchedaḥ* (“determination in the moment of contact of the three [*indriya*, *viśaya*, and *viññāna*]”)

AS 15,38f.: *trikasannipāta indriyavikāraparicchedaḥ* (“determination of the change of the sense faculty in the moment of the encounter of the three [*indriya*, *viśaya*, and *viññāna*]”)

Another explanation for the fact that the definitions seem to correspond to each other on the one hand, but also diverge from each other on the other may be found in a possible shortening of the text, as for example in the definition of “enmity” (*pratigha*), in which the phrase *duḥkhe duḥkhasthānīyeṣu ca dharmeṣv* (appearing in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*) is omitted:<sup>29</sup>

PSk 8,1: *sattveṣv āghātaḥ* (“anger towards living beings”)

AS 16,20f.: *sattveṣu duḥkhe duḥkhasthānīyeṣu ca dharmeṣv āghātaḥ* (“anger towards living beings, suffering, and the factors belonging to suffering”)

<sup>29</sup> However, it should be noted that Vasubandhu might simply be quoting a traditional explanation of *pratigha* here without referring to the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and that he thus is not directly abbreviating the latter’s definition.

A third possible explanation for the simultaneous appearance of parallels and differences in the three texts may be found in the combination of two sources. For example the definition of the category “deceit” (*māyā*) seems to have been produced in this way:

PSk 11,6f.: *paravañcanābhiprāyasyābhūtārthasandarśanatā* (“showing unreal things by someone having the intention of betraying others”)

AS 17,22: *lābhasatkārādhyavasitasya rāgamohāmśikābhūtaguṇasaṃdarśanā* (“showing unreal virtues by someone who is attached to gain and honour; it is part of passion and delusion”)

AKBh 313,13: *paravañcanā* (“betraying others”)

It is important to note in this context that the *Pañcaskandhaka*’s definitions of *pratigha* and *māyā* appear to be closely related to the corresponding explanations in the *Xianyang shengjiao lun* 顯揚聖教論 (see *Xianyang* 482a3–5 and 482b19–20). Since the latter is probably older than the *Pañcaskandhaka*,<sup>30</sup> Vasubandhu might have copied his definitions from the latter.

As for the commentaries, they are also characterized by intertextual passages and ‘silent’ copying from other sources. Since they are written in a less concise and abbreviated style than the root text the borrowings are clearer and easier to identify. In contrast to the root text the commentaries also contain explicit quotations, though only very few titles of specific works are mentioned.

In the case of Sthiramati’s commentary it is notable that he borrows a great number of passages from the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and its *Bhāṣya*, but he mentions the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* as his source only once (the *Bhāṣya* is not referred to at all explicitly), namely when explaining the meaning of the expression “being associated with thoughts” (*vikalpaka*).<sup>31</sup> Interestingly, the quotation in fact does not originate from the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* but has a parallel in its *Bhāṣya*.<sup>32</sup> However, the wording of the passage as

<sup>30</sup> See Schmithausen 1987: 11 and 261f., n. 99.

<sup>31</sup> PSkV 72a2f.

<sup>32</sup> ASBh 16,9f.

cited by Sthiramati is not entirely identical to the wording found in the *Bhāṣya* (the divergences are marked in bold):<sup>33</sup>

PSkV 72a2f.: *anusmaraṇavikalpaḥ katamaḥ* / yo 'nubhūtapūrvasaṃskārākāraḥ / *abhinirūpaṇāvikalpaḥ katamaḥ* / yo 'tītānāgatavartamāneṣu viparokṣeṣv abhyūhanākāro vikalpaḥ //

ASBh 16,9f.: *anusmaraṇavikalpo yo 'nubhūtapūrvasaṃskārākāraḥ / abhinirūpaṇāvikalpo yo 'tītānāgatapratyutpanneṣu viparokṣeṣv abhyūhanākāro vikalpaḥ //*

The imprecise attribution of the quote to the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and the small divergences in Sthiramati's text could indicate that Sthiramati was citing the passage from memory. This scenario may be a general explanation for the fact that most passages in the works under discussion that are quoted or borrowed from other sources include minor textual variations.<sup>34</sup>

The presently unanswered question that remains in the context of Sthiramati's reference to the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and that cannot be answered at the moment is why in this particular case he decided to reveal his source after having been using the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*(*bhāṣya*) 'silently' before. One could assume that Sthiramati chose to quote 'officially' when he deemed it necessary to support one of his own statements with a similar teaching from an authoritative source. But the statement he makes in the context of the term *vikalpaka* is not more disputed or controversial than many of the comments he has made before. Therefore, it appears most probable that this explicit reference to the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* was made by Sthiramati randomly, without a particular purpose.

<sup>33</sup> For a translation, see Engle 2009: 366.

<sup>34</sup> However, it should be kept in mind that these divergences could also result from the possibility that Sthiramati was using different versions of the texts than those available to us today. Moreover, the possibility should also be taken into consideration that Sthiramati refers to the commentary on the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* using the title of the root text because the two were regarded as a 'unit' and it was not considered important to distinguish between them when quoting. It is also possible that Sthiramati uses the title *Abhidharmasamuccaya* as an abbreviation for *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* and that it was obvious to other scholars of his time that he is actually referring to the latter.

The vast majority of the explicit citations occurring in the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* are marked as originating from *sūtras*, though Sthiramati gives specific titles only for two of around twenty *sūtra* quotations that could be located in the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*, namely the *Samḍhinirmocanasūtra* and the *Abhidharmasūtra*.<sup>35</sup> Most of the other *sūtra* quotations seem to originate from the early Buddhist canon. The fact that Sthiramati does not refer to particular *sūtra* titles might indicate that he did not have an actual ‘canon’ in front of him, but that he was again quoting from memory or from a collection of *sūtra* citations.<sup>36</sup> As for the *Vivarāṇa* and *Bhāṣya* commentaries on the *Pañcaskandhaka*, the exact number of quotations occurring in the two works cannot be provided at this stage. But the *Vivarāṇa* seems to quote from *sūtras* only a few times and *sūtra* citations seem also to be less frequent in the *Bhāṣya* than in the *Vibhāṣā*.

Most of the borrowings from other sources found in the commentaries under discussion are not marked as quotations at all. A passage in the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* that appears particularly interesting from the viewpoint of intertextuality is Sthiramati’s treatment of the “factors dissociated from mind” (*cittaviprayuktāḥ saṃskārāḥ*). The *Pañcaskandhaka*, following the Sarvāstivāda system, lists only fourteen factors as belonging to this category, while other Yogācāra works, as for instance the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, have 23 *cittaviprayukta* categories.<sup>37</sup> In his commentary Sthiramati decided to supplement the missing nine factors by means of copying the definitions of the nine as they appear in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*. Thus, the explanations of the additional nine *cittaviprayukta* factors in

<sup>35</sup> PSkV 51a5f.

<sup>36</sup> In addition to the *sūtra* citations the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* includes one explicit quotation of “master Saṅghabhadra” (PSkV 14b6f.) and one from the “*pratītyasamutpāda*” (i.e. the *Pratītyasamutpādavyākhyā*; PSkV 15b1), a quotation from the *Śatapañcāśatka* (PSkV 24a3f.; marked as a quote, but without a specific title), and a few unidentified quotations (marked as quotes without specific titles).

<sup>37</sup> Note that the Sarvāstivāda and the *Pañcaskandhaka* lists are not completely identical. For details, see Kramer 2013a: 1020f.

the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* are identical to the definitions in the latter two texts, but they are not explicitly marked as quotations, as is obvious, for instance, in the following characterization of the concept of “time” (*kāla*), in which the first part is identical to the text in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and the second (almost) identical to that in the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*:<sup>38</sup>

*hetuphalaprabandhapravṛttau kāla iti prajñaptiḥ* / [= AS 19,9]  
*hetuphalayoḥ prabandhena pravṛttau satyāṃ yat tatra hetuphalam*  
*utpannaniruddhaṃ so 'ītaḥ kāla iti prajñāpyate* / *yad anutpannaṃ*  
*so 'nāgataḥ* / *yad utpannāniruddhaṃ sa pratyutpannaḥ kālaḥ*  
 (≈ ASBh 10,20–22; “‘Time’ is an expression for the continuous occurrence of causes and results. When there is the continuous occurrence of causes and results, then the arisen causes and results which have ceased are designated as passed time, those which have not arisen [yet] as future [time], and those which have arisen, but have not ceased as present time.”)

The question why Sthiramati himself did not comment on the additional nine *cittaviprayukta* factors remains open. But maybe in this very particular case Sthiramati did not feel ‘entitled’ to add individual comments on the nine factors which were not part of the root text.

The author of the *Pañcaskandhavivaraṇa* only lists the additional nine factors, but does not comment on them at all, while the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya* provides a commentary on the nine categories which does not seem to be copied directly from the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*.<sup>39</sup> The concepts presented in the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya* appear related to those of the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*, but the wording is not identical like in the case of the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*. The following comparison of the Tibetan text of the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*’s definition of *kāla* and the parallel section in the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya* shows these divergences (identical phrases are marked in bold):

ASBh(T) 9a5f.: *rgyu dañ 'bras bu* rgyun tu *'byuñ* bar gyur pa de la  
 rgyu dañ 'bras bu byuñ zin pa dañ *'gags* zin pa gañ yin pa *de ni 'das*

<sup>38</sup> PSkV 48a4f.

<sup>39</sup> See PSkBh 92b5–93b3.

*pa'i dus zes gdags so // gañ ma byuñ ba de ni ma 'oñs pa'i dus zes gdags so // gañ byuñ ba la ma 'gags pa de ni da ltar byuñ ba'i dus zes gdags so //*

PSk Bh 93a4f.: *dus gañ ze na rgyu dañ 'bras bu 'brel bar 'jug pa la dus zes bya ste / ji lta ze na / rgyu dañ 'bras bu byuñ ste 'gag pa de ni 'das pa'i dus zes bya'o // rgyu dañ 'bras bu ma byuñ ma 'gags pa la ni ma 'oñs pa'i dus zes bya'o // rgyu dañ 'bras bu byuñ la ma 'gags pa la ni da ltar gyi dus zes bya'o // de bas na 'di yañ phuñ po lña la btags pas gzugs dañ sems dañ sems las byuñ ba'i dus la gdags par zad kyi rdzas su med do //*

In the case of the *cittaviprayukta* factor “speed” (*java*) the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* does not provide any comments. Therefore the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* reproduces only the definition of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*. The *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya*, however, includes some additional explanations not to be found in any of the other texts:

PSkV(T) 31a1f.: *mgyogs pa gañ ze na / rgyu dañ 'bras bu myur du 'byuñ ba la mgyogs pa zes gdags so //* (= AS 19,7f.; “What is speed? ‘Speed’ is an expression for the fast occurrence of causes and results.”)

PSk Bh 93a2f.: *mgyogs pa gañ ze na / rgyus 'bras bu myur du skyed par byed pa'am / skad cig ma rnams la skad cig ma sna ma'i rjes su bar chad med par phyi ma skyed 'byuñ ba la mgyogs pa zes bya ste / 'di yañ phuñ po lña la gdags pas gzugs dañ / sems dañ sems las byuñ ba'i dus la gdags par zad kyi rdzas su med do //* (“What is speed? ‘Speed’ is an expression for the fast production of results through causes or, with regard to moments, for the occurrence of a later [moment] immediately after an earlier moment. Since it is nominally ascribed to the five *skandhas*, it is nominally ascribed to states of matter, mind, and mental factors, but it does not exist as a real entity.”)

The fact that Sthiramati used the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and its *Bhāṣya* when composing his commentary is evident from a number of other passages, in which he supplemented Vasubandhu’s explanations with unmarked quotations from these two works. Some of the clearest examples for citations from the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* are the phrases explaining the function (*karman*) of each mental (*caitasika*) factor, which Sthiramati adds regularly in the section on “impulses” (*saṃskāra*). Thus, for instance, the function of “wish”

(*chanda*) is described as “providing the basis for generating effort” (*vīryārambhasanniśrayadānakarmakaḥ*; = AS 16,2) and that of “conviction” (*adhimokṣa*) as “[not being able] to be led astray” (*asaṃhāryatākarmakaḥ*; = AS 16,3). Interestingly, while Sthiramati supplements most of the *karmaka* phrases without marking them as citations, in a couple of cases the phrases are followed by the word *iti*, as for instance the explanation of the function of “non-desire” (*alobha*):<sup>40</sup> “It has the providing of the basis for non-occurrence of misdeeds as its function” (*ayaṃ ca duṣcaritāpravṛttisanniśrayadānakarmaka iti*).

Passages that have clear parallels in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣya* and are not specified as originating from another source are visible (apart from the *cittaviprayukta* section mentioned above) for example in Sthiramati’s comments on “ideation” (*saṃjñā*),<sup>41</sup> on “energy” (*vīrya*),<sup>42</sup> “ease” (*prasrabdhi*),<sup>43</sup> and on “regret” (*kaukr̥tya*).<sup>44</sup>

In a few instances Sthiramati seems to have also drawn on the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, most of the borrowings being found in the last part of the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*, which contains a list of different qualities ascribed to the 18 “elements” (*dhātu*).<sup>45</sup> A particularly notable example of an inclusion of *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* material is visible within the explanation of “non-representation” (*avijñapti*), in which Sthiramati appears to have combined a passage from the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (not marked explicitly as such) with a Yogācāra statement:<sup>46</sup>

<sup>40</sup> PSkV 26a2f. and AS 16,10. See also PSkV 26a5. Notably, *iti* is missing in the Tibetan translation of these passages and in the version of these passages appearing in Sthiramati’s *Triṃśikā* commentary.

<sup>41</sup> PSkV 17b5–18a1 and ASBh 4,14–16.

<sup>42</sup> PSkV 27a2 and ASBh 5,16f.

<sup>43</sup> PSkV 27b2 and ASBh 5,18.

<sup>44</sup> PSkV 40a2f. and ASBh 8,23–26.

<sup>45</sup> See, e.g., PSkV 68a3–5 and AKBh 19,6–8; PSkV 69b4f. and AKBh 21,18–20; PSkV 70b6f. and AKBh 27,6.

<sup>46</sup> PSkV 13b2f. For a translation of the passage, see also Engle 2009: 265.



... *yayā cetanayā kṛtābhyupagama upasampadādividhānapūrvakaṃ pratiṣiddhāt karmaṇaḥ kāyavācau saṃvṛṇoti* (≈ AKBh 199,5), *tayā cetanayālayavijñāne 'nāgatatajjātīyacetanotpattaye bījam āhitam* ... (“The intention through which someone who has promised to observe [the precepts] restrains his body and speech from misdeeds after the ritual of ordination etc. plants a seed in the store mind so that a similar kind of intention arises in the future.”)

While the first part of this comment closely corresponds to a passage in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, the second part seems to have been composed by Sthiramati himself. Thus, Sthiramati did apparently try to place the very specific Yogācāra concept of *ālayavijñāna* into a wider context by inserting it next to a statement from the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.

Apart from these instances of non-explicit reuse of text originating probably from the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (*bhāṣya*) and *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* there are examples of borrowings in the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* which are marked explicitly as citations (concluding, e.g., with *iti* or the phrase *ity evamādi*) but whose exact sources are not specified. One example for such an explicit quotation has already been mentioned in connection with the explanation of *alobha*. Another example is to be found, for instance, within the definition of *śraddhā*, in which Sthiramati indicates that he is quoting a passage by embedding it in the phrase *yathoktam ... iti*, however, without providing the title of his source.<sup>47</sup> A further instance of explicit quoting without mentioning the title of the source might be visible in the definition of “sound” (*śabda*):<sup>48</sup>

*tatropāttamahābhūtahetuko hastavākchabda ity evamādi | anupāttamahābhūtahetuko vāyuvanaspatinadīśabda ity evamādi | ubhaya-mahābhūtahetuko mṛdaṅgaśabda ity evamādi ||* (≈ AKBh 6,23–25; “In this context [sounds] caused by the basic elements that are appropriated are sounds of [clapping] hands or the voice,’ and so on. [Sounds] caused by the basic elements that are not appropriated are

<sup>47</sup> See PSkV 24a3f. The source of this quotation is the *Śatapañcāśatka*.

<sup>48</sup> PSkV 9b5f. However, it should be noted that *ity evamādi* may not have been used in this passage to mark citations but to indicate incomplete enumerations of examples.

sounds of the wind, trees, or a river,’ and so on. ‘[Sounds] caused by the basic elements that are both are sounds of a drum’ and so on.’”)

Notably, in the explanation of “smell” (*gandha*), which follows the definition of *śabda*, Sthiramati again seems to reuse material from other sources—this time apparently from the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and its *Bhāṣya*—but in this case he does not indicate it in any way:<sup>49</sup>

*sa ca gandhaḥ sahajaḥ sāṃyogikaḥ pārīṇāmikaś ca* / (≈ AS\* 4,6) *tatra sahajaś candanakuṅkumādīnām / sāṃyogiko dhūpavartigandhādīnām / pārīṇāmikaḥ pakvāmrāphalādīnām* (≈ ASBh 3,24f.; “Smell is either natural, arising from a combination, or arising from change. In this context ‘natural’ [smell] is that of sandalwood, saffron, etc. Smell ‘arising from a combination’ is that of incense etc. Smell ‘arising from change’ is that of a ripe mango fruit etc.”)

Following the definition of *gandha* the category “taste” (*rasa*) is treated in the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*. Notably, in the context of the latter Sthiramati does not include text from any other source, although there would have been additional material available in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (in which *rasa* is divided into the same three categories as *gandha*: *sahaja*, *sāṃyogika*, and *pārīṇāmika*).<sup>50</sup> These three ways of treating older textual material, i.e. quoting it explicitly, using it ‘silently,’ and neglecting it, make it quite clear that Sthiramati was not using sources like the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*(*bhāṣya*) in a systematic way.

Another important point to mention is that a great number of *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* passages are reused by Sthiramati himself in his *Triṃśikā* commentary without any explicit indication of the source. Sthiramati mentions his *Pañcaskandhaka* commentary only once in the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*, namely when he refers the reader to the “commentary on the *Pañcaskandhaka*” (*pañcaskandhakopanibandha*) for more information on the topic of the “store mind” (*ālayavijñāna*) being necessary for arising in and being liberated from *saṃsāra*.<sup>51</sup> Apart from this single refer-

<sup>49</sup> PSkV 10a1f.

<sup>50</sup> AS\* 4,8f.

<sup>51</sup> TrBh 120,20.

ence, Sthiramati does not mention the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*, although most of the latter's explanations of the mental (*caitasika*) factors and some of its passages referring to the *ālayavijñāna* are quoted verbatim in the *Triṃśikā* commentary.<sup>52</sup>

The sections dealing with the mental factors in the two commentaries offer a number of examples illustrating the variety of possible ways of how a text can be reused in another work. Thus, on the one hand, some of the definitions of the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* are quoted as a whole (and almost literally) in the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*, as in the case of “enmity” (*pratigha*):<sup>53</sup>

*\*pratighaḥ katamaḥ / sattveṣv āghāta iti / (TrBh: pratighaḥ sattveṣv) āghātaḥ sattveṣu rūkṣacittatā yenāviṣṭaḥ sattvānām vadhabandhādikam (TrBh: vadhabandhanādikam) anarthaṃ cintayati / sa punar asparśavihāraduṣcaritasanniśrayadānakarmakaḥ / sparśaḥ sukham / tena sahito vihāraḥ sparśavihāraḥ / na sparśavihāro 'sparśavihāraḥ, duḥkhasahita ity arthaḥ / āghātacittasyāvaśyaṃ daurmanasyasamudācārāc cittaṃ tapyate / cittānuvidhānāc ca kāyo 'pi tapyata eveti / sarveryāpatheṣu saduḥkhasaviḥāto 'sya vihāro bhavati / pratihatacittasya ca na kiñcid duṣcaritaṃ vidūre – iti pratigho 'sparśavihāraduṣcaritasanniśrayadānakarmaka uktaḥ //*

On the other hand, Sthiramati presents some of the definitions in an abbreviated form, probably extracting only those phrases from his *Pañcaskandhaka* commentary that appeared most relevant to him, as is visible in the following characterization of “energy” (*vīrya*), the phrases reused in the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya* being marked in bold:<sup>54</sup>

*vīryam katamat / **kausīdyapratipakṣaḥ kuśale cetaso 'bhyutsāhaḥ** / kutsitaṃ sīdatīti kuśidaḥ / tadbhāvaḥ kausīdyam / ālasyam ity arthaḥ / tac ca kuśalākuśalayoś cittasyānutsāhaḥ / tatpratipakṣaś ca*

<sup>52</sup> See, e.g., PSkV 50b1–3 and TrBh 52,1–5; PSkV 51a4–6 and TrBh 114,13–116,2; PSkV 58a1f. and TrBh 50,14–17.

<sup>53</sup> PSkV 29b2–6 and TrBh 84,5–12. For a translation, see Engle 2009: 292. The asterisks in the following quotations mark the beginning of the phrases that differ in the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*.

<sup>54</sup> PSkV 26b4–27a2 and TrBh 78,13–15. For a translation, see Engle 2009: 287.

*vīryam ity atah kausīdyavad ubhayaprasaṅge vyvacchedārtham āha – kuśale cetaso 'bhyutsāho vīryam, na tu kliṣṭa iti / kliṣṭe tūtsāhaḥ kutsītatvāt kausīdyam eva / nanu ca kliṣṭam svabhyastatvāt svarenaiva pravartate, kiṃ tatrotsāhena / prāyeṇaivam / asti tu kiñcid yatrotsāho 'py apekṣyate / tat punar yatsamprayogāt sannāhe prayoge vālīnatve vāvyāvṛttau vāsantuṣṭau vā kuśaleṣu dharmeṣu cetaso 'bhyutsāhaḥ, tad vīryam / kuśalapakṣaparipūraṇapariniṣpādanakarmakam / paripūraṇam yathā maularaveśaḥ / pariniṣpādanam tasyaiva parikarmakṛtatvam //*

Although the definitions of the mental factors included in the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya* are clearly copied from the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* in general, in some instances Sthiramati did not follow the wording of the *Pañcaskandhaka(vibhāṣā)*, but seems to have quoted the text directly from the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*. Thus, when dealing with “contact” (*sparśa*), in the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* Sthiramati follows Vasubandhu’s root text and comments on the latter’s definition (PSk 5,4: *sparśaḥ katamaḥ / trikasamavāye paricchedaḥ /*), while in the *Triṃśikā* commentary he reproduces the *sparśa* definition of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (AS 15,38f.: *sparśaḥ katamaḥ / trikasannipāta indriyavikāraparicchedaḥ /*). The remaining part of the *sparśa* explanation in the *Triṃśikā* commentary is very similar to the characterization offered in the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* (parallels marked in bold):<sup>55</sup>

*\*sparśaḥ katamaḥ / [..] trikasamavāyapariccheda iti prakṛtam* (TrBh: *tatra sparśas trikasannipāta indriyavikāraparicchedaḥ / vedanāsamniśrayadānakarmakaḥ indriyaviṣayavijñānāni trīṇy eva trikam / tasya kāryakāraṇabhāvena samavasthānam \*samavāyaḥ* (TrBh: *trikasannipātaḥ / tasmīn sati tatkālam* (TrBh: *tatsamakālam*) *evendriyasya sukhādivedanotpattyanukūlo yo vikārah, tena sadṛśo viṣayasya sukhādivedanīyākāraparicchedo yaḥ sa sparśaḥ / indriyam punar yena viśeṣeṇa sukhaduḥkhādīhetutvaṃ pratipadyate, sa tasya vikāra \*indriyavikārah / sādṛśyenendriyam* (TrBh: *sparśaḥ punar indriyavikārasādṛśyenendriyam*) *spṛśatīndriyeṇa vā spṛśyata iti \*sparśaḥ /* (TrBh: *sparśa ucyate / ata eva viṣayavikāraparicchedātmako*

<sup>55</sup> PSkV 20a1–6 and TrBh 54,14–56,7. For a translation, see Engle 2009: 276.

*'pīndriyavikārapariccheda uktaḥ) vedanāsanniśrayatvam asya karma / evaṃ hy uktaṃ sūtre – sukhavedanīyaṃ sparśaṃ pratītyotpadyate \*sukhā vedaneti* (TrBh: *sukhaṃ veditam iti vistarahaḥ*) //

The phrase *ata eva viśayavikāraparicchedātmake 'pīndriyavikārapariccheda uktaḥ* (“therefore it is said to be a determination of the change of the sense faculty, though it has the nature of a determination of the change of the object”) seems to have been added by Sthiramati in his *Triṃśikā* commentary. This illustrates that in some instances Sthiramati considered it necessary to supplement his *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* comments with additional explanations in the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*.

A further example for an additional explanation is to be found within the characterization of “attention” (*manaskāra*), in which Sthiramati adds the phrase “this [latter *manaskāra*] functions only in a particular moment, not in another moment” (*tasya hi pratikṣaṇam eva vyāpāro na kṣaṇāntare*) in his *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*:<sup>56</sup>

*\*manaskāraḥ katamaḥ / cetasa ābhoga iti* (TrBh: *manaskāraś cetasa ābhogaḥ*) / *ābhujanam ābhogaḥ / ālambane yena cittam abhimukhīkriyate, sa cittasyābhogaḥ / sa punar ālambane cittadhāraṇakarmakaḥ / cittadhāraṇam punas tatraivālambane punaḥ punaś cittasyāvarjanam / etac ca karma cittasantater ālambananiyamena viśiṣṭaṃ manaskāram adhiḥkṛtyoktam, na tu yaḥ pracittakṣaṇam /* (TrBh adds: *tasya hi pratikṣaṇam eva vyāpāro na kṣaṇāntare* /) *yad apy atra nidarśanam ucyate – samādhilābhī manaskāralābhīty ucyate iti, tatra viśiṣṭamanaskāralābhād eva manaskāralābhīty ucyate / anyathā hi sarvasattvā eva manaskāralābhinaḥ syuḥ, sarveṣāṃ pracittakṣaṇam manaskārabhāvāt //*

While some of the definitions of mental factors appear almost identical in the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* and the *Triṃśikā* commentary, as for instance that of *pratigha* mentioned above, others include only a few parallels, like the following explanation of “passion” (*rāga*), the factor that is described immediately after *pratigha*:<sup>57</sup>

<sup>56</sup> PSkV 20a6–20b4 and TrBh 56,8–12. For a translation of the passage, see Engle 2009: 276.

<sup>57</sup> PSkV 29a2–29b2 and TrBh 84,1–4. A part of the text provided in the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* has been omitted here, as it does not contain

*rāgaḥ* katamaḥ / pañcasūpādānaskandheṣu sneho \**dhyavasānam* (TrBh: *bhavabhogayor adhyavasānam prārthanā ca*) / [...] *sa punar duḥkhasañjananakarmakaḥ* / triduḥkhatāyogād yathāsambhavaṃ traidhātukāḥ \**pañca skandhā duḥkham* abhipretam, tasya ca duḥkhasya *kāmarūpārūpyatṛṣṇāvaśenābhinirvṛttito* (TrBh: *duḥkham atopādānaskandhās teṣāṃ kāmarūpārūpyatṛṣṇāvaśād abhinirvṛtteḥ / ato*) *rāgasya duḥkhasañjananam karma nirdeśyate* //

Another notable case in this regard is the explanation of “absence of delusion” (*amoha*) in the two commentaries, which contains only a few parallels at the beginning and the end of the definition:<sup>58</sup>

*amohaḥ* katamaḥ / *mohapratipakṣo* (TrBh adds: *yathā*-)*bhūtasampratipattiḥ* / (TrBh adds: *mohaḥ karmaphalasyaratneṣv ajñānam / mohapratipakṣatvād amohas teṣv eva karmaphalasyaratneṣu sampratipattiḥ* /) *sarva eva hi kuśalā dharmāḥ kliṣṭānāṃ dharmānāṃ samudācāravirodhāt pratipakṣa ity ata āha – bhūtasampratipattir iti / samyagaviparītapratipattibhedāt / sā punar dvidivdhā – jñānam pratisaṅkhyā ca / punaś caturvidhā vipākāgamacintādhiḡgamānimittā / pratisaṅkhyā tu prajñāiva dhairyasahitā / dhairyam iti prajñāvīryasamādhaya ucyante / tatra dvaḥ prajñādravyayoḥ samavadhānāsambhavād vīryeṇa samādhinā vā samprayuktā prajñā pratisaṅkhyety ucyate, yadbalenānuddhṛtānupahatakleśābījo 'pi kleśānām avakāśaṃ na dadati / ayam atra vākyārthaḥ – yathābhūtajñānātmakaḥ pratisaṅkhyātmakaś ca jñānaviśeṣo 'moha ity ucyate / ata evāmoho* (TrBh adds: *ayam api*) *duścaritāpravṛtti-sannīśrayadānakarmakaḥ* //

Interestingly, the word *yathā*- in *yathābhūtasampratipattiḥ* appearing in the *Triṃśikā* commentary (but not in the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*) also occurs in Vasubandhu's *Pañcaskandhaka* as it is preserved in the Sanskrit text edited in Li and Steinkellner 2008 (PSK 6,13). The Tibetan translation of this passage has, like the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*, only *yañ dag pa*, which seems to represent *bhūta*-. Thus, the Sanskrit text of the *Pañcaskandhaka* and of the

---

any parallels with the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*. The complete passage is to be found in the appendix at the end of this paper. For a translation of the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* definition, see Engle 2009: 291f.

<sup>58</sup> PSKv 26a5–26b4 and TrBh 78,9–12. See also Kramer 2013a: 1018f. For a translation, see Engle 2009: 286f.

*Triṃśīkāvijñaptibhāṣya* reads *yathābhūtasampratipattiḥ* (“understanding of [things] as they really are”), whereas the Tibetan translation of the *Pañcaskandhaka* and the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* (Sanskrit and Tibetan) seem to have preserved the reading *bhūtasampratipattiḥ* (“understanding of the real”).

As for the additional phrase *karmaphalasadatyaṭneṣv ajñānam* (“lack of knowledge with regard to the [threefold division of] karma, the results, the [four] truths, and the [three] jewels”) in the *Triṃśīkāvijñaptibhāṣya*, it is identical to the first part of the *Pañcaskandhaka*’s definition of “ignorance” (*avidyā*).<sup>59</sup> The latter is not included in the list of mental factors provided in Sthiramati’s *Triṃśīkā* commentary, which seems to mention the category *moha* instead (appearing as *mūḍhi* in Vasubandhu’s *Triṃśīkā*, verse 11d).<sup>60</sup> However, the definition of *moha* is only slightly related to the characterization of *avidyā* in the *Pañcaskandhaka(vibhāṣā)* and to the explanations of *amoha* in the *Triṃśīkā* commentary mentioned above:

*avidyā* in PSk 9,5f.: *karmaphalasadatyaṭneṣv ajñānam / sā punaḥ sahajā parikalpitā ca /* (“[It] is a lack of knowledge with regard to karma, [its] results, the [four] truths, and the [three] jewels. It is either inborn or conceptualized.”)<sup>61</sup>

*moha* in TrBh 78,9f. (within the definition of *amoha*): *mohaḥ karmaphalasadatyaṭneṣv ajñānam /* (“Delusion is a lack of knowledge with regard to karma, [its] results, the [four] truths, and the [three] jewels.”)

*moha* in TrBh 84,13–86,2: *moho ’pāyeṣu sugatau nirvāṇe tatpratiṣṭhāpākeṣu hetuṣu teṣāṃ cāvīparīte hetuphalasaṃbandhe yad ajñānam / ayañ ca saṃkleśotpattisaṃniśrayadānakarmakaḥ / tatra kleśakarmajanmātmakas trividhaḥ saṃkleśaḥ / tasyotpattiḥ pūrvapūrvasaṃkleśanimitād uttarottarasya saṃkleśasyātmalābhāḥ / tasyotpatteḥ saṃniśrayadānaṃ karma / mūḍhasyaiva hi mithyā-*

<sup>59</sup> PSk 9,5.

<sup>60</sup> It should be noted that the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* also mentions *moha* instead of *avidyā* and defines it as *avidyājñānam asamprakhyānam* (“ignorance, lack of knowledge, non-clarity”). See AKBh 56,6.

<sup>61</sup> For the text of Sthiramati’s commentary on *avidyā*, see the appendix below.

*jñānasamśayarāgādikleśapaunarbhavikakarmajanmanāṃ pravṛttir nāmūḍhasyeti* / (“Delusion is a lack of knowledge with regard to bad and good states of existence, *nirvāṇa*, the causes that lead to them, and the correct relations between the causes and their results. Its function is to provide the basis for the arising of affliction. In this context affliction is of a threefold nature: contamination, karma, and birth. The arising of the [affliction] is the coming into existence of later affliction caused by earlier affliction. The function is the providing of a basis for the arising of the [affliction]. Contaminations like false knowledge, doubt, and passion as well as karma [leading to] rebirth and birth occur for the one who is deluded, not for the one who is not.”)

The first passage seems to deal with similar issues, that is, karma, rebirth, liberation, and the relations between causes and results, in the *Pañcaskandhaka* and in the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*. However the way these themes are expressed differs substantially. The only phrase in the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya* that seems to be directly related to the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* is *saṃkleśotpattisamṅgīśrayādānakarmakaḥ* (PSkV 31b2: *dharmeṣu mithyāniścayavicikitsā-saṅkleśotpattisamṅgīśrayādānakarmikā*). However, this phrase could have also been copied directly from the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (AS 16,23), in which it occurs in exactly the same form as in the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*.

Another remarkable passage within the section dealing with the mental factors is the treatment of the five kinds of “[false] views” (*dṛṣṭi*).<sup>62</sup> Sthiramati provides only the definitions of Vasubandhu’s *Pañcaskandhaka* in his *Triṃśikā* commentary (often even copying only the most important parts), without referring to his comments in the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*. This is visible, for instance, in the case of “clinging to morality and observances” *śīlavrataparāmarśa* (parallels in the *Pañcaskandhaka* marked in bold):

TrBh 90,1f.: *śīlavrataparāmarśaḥ pañcasūpādānaskandheṣu śuddhito muktito nairyaṅikataś ca yad darśanam* / (“‘Clinging to morality and observances’ is a view with regard to the five constituents of appropriation as purification, liberation, and as conducive to emancipation.”)

<sup>62</sup> See also Kramer 2013a: 1019.



PSk 10,6–8: *śīlavrataparāmarśaḥ katamaḥ / śīlaṃ vrataṃ tad-āśrayāṃś ca pañcopādānaskandhān śuddhito muktito nairyāṇikataś ca samanupaśyato yā kliṣṭā prajñā* / (“What is ‘clinging to morality and observances’? [It] is the contaminated discrimination of someone who regards morality [and] observance and the five constituents of appropriation, which are their basis, as purification, liberation, and as conducive to emancipation.”)<sup>63</sup>

Notably, Sthiramati replaces the phrase *kliṣṭā prajñā* with the expression *darśanam* in his *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*, the phrases *kliṣṭā prajñā* and *darśanam* occurring at the end of the definitions of all the *drṣṭis* in the two texts.<sup>64</sup> The original source of the explanations of the *drṣṭis* seems to be the *Yogācārabhūmi*, which characterizes *śīlavrataparāmarśa* as follows:

YBh 163,5–8: *asatpuruṣasaṃsevām āgamyāsaddharmaśravaṇam ayoniśomanaskāram, yat tām eva drṣṭim taddrṣṭyanucaram <ca>*<sup>65</sup> *śīlaṃ vā vrataṃ vā sāśrayaṃ sālambanaṃ sanidānaṃ sasahabhū-samprayogaṃ śuddhito muktito nairyāṇikataś ca samanupaśyato yā nirdhāritaiva kliṣṭā prajñā* (“[It] is the merely explicit<sup>66</sup> contaminated discrimination of someone who regards this view and the morality or observance accompanying this view together with their basis, object, cause, and [the factors] which accompany them and are associated with them, as purification, liberation, and as conducive to emancipation, due to association with bad people, to hearing bad doctrines, or to wrong attention.”)

A comparison of this explanation with that found in the *Pañca-skandhaka* clearly shows that the latter is an abbreviated version of the former. Interestingly, the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* presents the *drṣṭis* in an almost identical way, apart from the fact that it replaces *kliṣṭā prajñā* with the phrase *kṣāntī rucir matih prekṣā drṣṭih*:

AS 16,30f.: *śīlaṃ vrataṃ śīlavratāśrayāṃś ca pañcopādānaskandhān chuddhito yuktito* (read: *muktito*) *nairyāṇikataś ca samanupaśyato yā*

<sup>63</sup> See also Kramer 2013a: 1009.

<sup>64</sup> The term *darśanam* is only missing in the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*’s explanation of *mithyādrṣṭi*. See TrBh 88,19f.

<sup>65</sup> See Ahn 2003: 64.

<sup>66</sup> On the terms *nirdhārita* and *anirdhārita*, see Ahn 2003: 170.

*kṣāntī rucir matiḥ prekṣā drṣṭiḥ* (“[It] is an admission, an inclination, a notion, an opinion, [or] a view of someone who regards morality and observance and the five constituents of appropriation, which are the basis of morality and observance, as purification, liberation, and as conducive to emancipation.”)

As for the other two commentaries on the *Pañcaskandhaka*, the *Vivaraṇa* and the *Bhāṣya*, parallels with the explanations of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (*bhāṣya*) and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* are also common in these works, though the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and the *Kośa* are referred to explicitly only a few times.<sup>67</sup> Borrowings from the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* are to be found very frequently, for instance in the section on mental (*caitasika*) factors, in which the *Vivaraṇa* and the *Bhāṣya* reproduce the “*karmaka* phrase” (i.e. the phrase describing the function of the respective mental factor) regularly.<sup>68</sup> These “*karmaka* phrases” are, as mentioned above, also included in the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* (but not in the *Pañcaskandhaka*) and most probably originate from the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*.<sup>69</sup>

An example for a case in which the *Vivaraṇa* refers to a teaching occurring in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and not in Sthiramati’s *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* is to be found in the context of the description of “taste” (*rasa*). According to the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, taste can be “pleasant” (*manojña*), “unpleasant” (*amanojña*), and “neutral” or “natural” (*sahaja*), “arising from a combination” (*sāmyogika*), and “arising from change” (*pāriṇāmika*).<sup>70</sup> Although the *Vivaraṇa*’s com-

<sup>67</sup> The *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* is mentioned in PSkViv 1a3 and in PSkBh 32a3 and 32b2. The *Abhidharmasamuccaya* is referred to in PSkBh 48a1 (where also the *Triṃśikā* is mentioned) and in 137a5.

<sup>68</sup> See, e.g., PSkViv 11a7f., 11b2, and 19b7, as well as PSkBh 49b3f., 50a2, and 74a6.

<sup>69</sup> The *Xianyang shengjiao lun* seems to provide the *karmaka* phrases, too. However, not all of those phrases are identical to the *karmaka* phrases given in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (and the *Pañcaskandhaka* commentaries which follow the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*). See, e.g., the function of “faith” (*śraddhā*) defined in *Xianyang* 481b22ff., AS 16,7, PSkV 25a4, PSkViv 14a3, and PSkBh 54b1.

<sup>70</sup> AS\* 4,8f. See also Kramer 2013b: 91.

ments on the *Pañcaskandhaka* are generally less elaborate and detailed than those by Sthiramati, in contrast to the latter the *Vivaraṇa* mentions all these six kinds of taste.<sup>71</sup>

As for parallels with the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*, it is notable that the *Vivaraṇa* includes a great number of passages and concepts which seem very close to the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* and which, at least in some cases, are not considered in Sthiramati's commentary. This close relationship between the *Vivaraṇa* and the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* is, again, particularly obvious in the section on mental factors. Thus, for instance, the definition of "guile" (*śāṭhya*) concludes in both, the *Vivaraṇa* and the *Vibhāṣā*, with an explanation of the function (*karman*) of *śāṭhya*, the first part of which is clearly borrowed from the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*. This first part is (almost) identical in the *Vivaraṇa* and the *Vibhāṣā*, whereas the second part of the explanation differs in the two commentaries. While the *Vivaraṇa* seems to have transmitted the same text as the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*, the *Vibhāṣā* provides a different reading:

PSkViv 19a5: *yañ dag pa'i gdams ñag thob pa'i bar du gcod pa'i las byas te* / (= AS 17,23f.: *samyagavavādalābhaparipanthakaram*; "It causes obstacles to obtaining correct instruction.")

*bdag yañ dag pa ji lta ba bzin ma smras pas gdams ñag gi 'os ma yin pa'i phyir ro* // (= ASBh 7,20: *yathābhūtam ātmānam anāviṣkṛtyāvavādāyogyatvāt*; "since one is incapable of [receiving] instructions not having revealed how one really is.")

PSkV 38a1: *samyagavavādalābhaparipanthakarmakam* / (≈ AS 17,23f.; "It has the function of obstructing [a person] from obtaining correct instruction.")

PSkV 38a1f.: *samyagavavāde yo lābho yoniśomanaskāraḥ, tasyāntarāyaṃ karotīti* // ("When [a person] is instructed correctly the obtainment is correct attention. [That which] hinders this [obtainment] is guile.")

Further examples of parallels between the *Vivaraṇa* and the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* are to be found in the following two

<sup>71</sup> PSkViv 6b6.

passages, the first characterizing “intention” (*cetanā*), the second being part of the definition of “equanimity” (*upekṣā*):

1. PSkViv 11a6f.: *gaṇi dge ba daṇi mi dge ba daṇi / luṇi du ma bstan pa la yaṇi sems gtoṇ ba ni las bstan pa'i ste / 'di ltar ji ltar mñon par 'du byed pa bžin du dge ba la sogs pa'i chos rnams la sems 'jug par 'gyur ro //* (≈ ASBh 4,25f.: *kuśalākuśalāvvyākṛteṣu cittapreraṇakarmiketi karmanirdeśaḥ / tathā hi yathābhisamskāraṃ kuśalādiṣu dharmeṣu cittasya pravṛttir bhavātīti*; “[Its] function is explained [as follows]: ‘[Its] function is to direct the mind towards the wholesome, the unwholesome and the neutral. Thus, according to [how] it is activated, the mind engages in wholesome etc. factors.’”)

PSkV 21a2f.: *guṇato doṣato 'nubhayataś cittābhisamskāra iti karma-nirdeśaḥ /* (“[Its] function is explained [as follows]: ‘[It] is that which activates the mind towards the virtuous, unvirtuous and neither [virtuous] nor [unvirtuous].’”)

2. PSkViv 15a3f.: *'di ltar btaṇi sñoms daṇi ldan pa'i sems la byiṇ ba la sogs pa'i mi mñam pa med pas 'dir sems mñam pa ñid do // de'i 'og tu mñon par 'du byed pa med par 'jug pas rnal du 'jug pa'o // de'i 'og tu kun nas ñon moṇs pa'i dogs pa med pas lhun gyis grub par gnas pa žes bya'o //* (≈ ASBh 5,21f.: *tathā hy upekṣayā yuktaṃ cittaṃ layādivaiśamyābhāvād āditaḥ samam / tato 'nabhisamskāreṇa vahanāt praśaṭham / tataḥ saṃkleśāsaṅkābhāvād anābhogāvasthitam iti /*; “Thus, the mind associated with equanimity at the beginning [becomes] equal due to absence of inequality like languor. Then [it becomes] tranquil because of being engaged without being activated. Following that it is fixed in effortlessness because of the absence of uncertainty with regard to [the reoccurrence of] afflictions.”)

PSkV 28a5–28b2: *tatra layauddhatyaṃ cetaso vaiśamyam / tasyābhāvād ādau cittasya samatā / tato 'nabhisamskāreṇāprayatnena samāhitasya cetaso yathāyogaṃ samasyaiva pravṛtīḥ praśaṭhatā / sā punar avasthā layauddhatyāsaṅkānugatā, acirabhāvitatvāt / tato bhāvanāprakaraṣagamanāt tadvipakṣadūrībhāvāt tacchāṅkābhāve layauddhatyapratipakṣanimitteṣv ābhogam akurvato 'nābhogāvasthatā cittasyānābhogatā //* (“In this context languor and excitement are [states of] mental inequality. When the [latter] is absent, at the beginning ‘equality’ of the mind occurs. Then the contemplative mind engages appropriately in equality, without being activated or making any effort – [this condition is called] ‘tranquility.’ This state is accompanied by uncertainty with regard to [the reoccurrence of]

languor and excitement since [the practitioner] has not been practicing long. Following that, when there is no uncertainty with regard to the two due to having reached excellence in practice and due to having distanced oneself from these obstacles, the fixation in non-effort [occurs], no effort being made with regard to the causes of the antidotes to languor and excitement – [this condition is the] ‘effortlessness of the mind’.”)

In the first example only the phrase *iti karmanirdeśaḥ* is identical in the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* and the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*, whereas the text in the *Vivaraṇa* resembles the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* explanation very closely. In the second example the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*, on the one hand, appears related to the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*, on the other it includes material that does not depend on the latter. Notably, the *Vivaraṇa* contains phrases identical to the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* which are not to be found in the *Vibhāṣā* (e.g. *tathā hy upekṣayā yuktaṃ cittaṃ*), while the *Vibhāṣā* includes at least one phrase of the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* text which does not appear in the *Vivaraṇa*, namely *ādau* (*ādītaḥ* in the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*). This suggests that the authors of the two *Pañcaskandhaka* commentaries did not copy each other, but must have been drawing on another common source, probably the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*. However, it should also be noted that the phrase *cittasya samatā* (*sems mñam pa ñid*) occurs in this form in both, the *Vibhāṣā* and the *Vivaraṇa*, but is represented only by the expression *samam* in the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*.

Passages demonstrating close relations between the *Vivaraṇa* and the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* are also visible in other parts of the *Vivaraṇa*, as for example in the context of the definition of “sound” (*śabda*). The following four classes of *śabda*, the explanation of which seems to originate from the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*, are mentioned in the *Vivaraṇa* and are not referred to in the *Pañcaskandhaka* or the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*:<sup>72</sup>

<sup>72</sup> PSkViv 6b1–3.

*'jig rten gyi grags pa ni 'jig rten pa'i brjod pa ste; ≈ ASBh 3,20f.: lokaprasiddho laukikabhāṣāsamgrhītaḥ* (“[A sound] ‘known in the world’ is [included in] ‘common talk’.”)

*yoñs su brtags pa ni mu stegs can rnam kyis brjod pa ste; = ASBh 3,21: parikalpītas tīrthyair deśītaḥ* (“A ‘fabricated’ [sound] is a statement of the non-Buddhists.”)

*grub pas bstan pa ni 'phags pas bstan pa ste; = ASBh 3,21: siddhopenīta āryair deśītaḥ* (“[A sound] ‘spoken by the *siddhas*’ is [a sound] taught by the *āryas*.”)

*tha sñad pa ni 'phags pa dan 'phags pa ma yin pa'i ste / mthoñ ba dan ma mthoñ ba la sogs pa'i tha sñad kyī dbaṅ du byas par rig par bya'o; ≈ ASBh 3,21f.: āryānāryavyāvahārikau tu dṛṣṭādīn aṣṭau vyavahārān adhikṛtya veditavyau* (“[A sound] ‘belonging to conventions’ is [a sound belonging to the conventions] of the *āryas* or [to the conventions] of the non-*āryas*. The two are to be known as referring to the conventions like ‘seen’ and ‘not seen,’ etc.”)

It is notable that the *Vivaraṇa* also provides some additional (i.e. probably ‘innovative’) examples for each of the first three categories, which are not to be found in the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*, as for instance “pot” and “chariot” as examples for sounds “known in the world” and the statement “all conditioned factors are impermanent” as an example for sounds “spoken by the *siddhas*.”<sup>73</sup>

It should also be mentioned that the *Vivaraṇa* presents the concept of the four *śabda* categories which seems to originate from the *Abhidharmasamuccaya(bhāṣya)*, but it does not include in its explanation of sound two other classes of sounds mentioned in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: sounds of living beings (*sattva*), e.g. the “representation of speech” (*vāgvijñapti*), and sounds not belonging to living beings.<sup>74</sup> This fact is interesting insofar as the author of the *Vivaraṇa* relates the *Pañcaskandhaka* explicitly to the *Kośa* at the very beginning of his text.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>73</sup> PSkViv 6b1f.

<sup>74</sup> AKBh 6,24.

<sup>75</sup> See Skilling 2000: 304f., and Buescher 2010: 334f. Both scholars take this reference, appearing in a similar form also at the beginning of the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya*, as an indication for the *Pañcaskandhaka*’s direct con-

In spite of these close similarities between the *Vivaraṇa* and the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* there are, however, also instances to be found in the two *Pañcaskandhaka* commentaries in which the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* is closer to the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* explanation than the *Vivaraṇa*. Thus, for instance, the characterization of the category “attention” (*manaskāra*) presented in the *Vivaraṇa* does not include any phrases identical to the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*.<sup>76</sup> In contrast, the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* reproduces almost all of the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*’s comments:

---

nection to the *Kośa*. Both commentaries explain that a statement of homage is missing at the beginning of the *Pañcaskandhaka* because it is already included at the beginning of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. Thus, the *Pañcaskandhaka* appears like an appendix to the latter. Although the *Pañcaskandhaka* is certainly related doctrinally to the *Kośa*, and it seems very probable that it was composed by the same Vasubandhu, it should also be kept in mind that it contains a number of variant explanations and does not give the impression of a direct continuation of the *Kośa*. One could, however, argue that the reason why the *Pañcaskandhaka* includes so many different definitions is to be found in Vasubandhu’s wish to supplement the *Kośa* with teachings not yet mentioned in it. But it should also be noted in this context that the *Vivaraṇa* actually says that the statement of homage of the “*Kośaśāstra* and so on” should be supplied in the *Pañcaskandhaka* (PSkViv 1a3: *mdzod kyi bstan bcos la sogs pa*). Thus, it does not seem to aim at stating that the *Pañcaskandhaka* is very specifically an appendix to the *Kośa*, but probably that it is an appendix to (Abhidharmic) works like the *Kośa*, an “appendix” that supplements the traditional understanding of the five *skandhas* (presented, e.g., in the *Kośa*) with the doctrines of the *Yogācāras*, e.g. the concept of the *ālayavijñāna*. Interestingly, Sthiramati, at the beginning of his commentary, does not refer to the *Kośa* at all and only says that the *Pañcaskandhaka* has been composed in order to abbreviate the presentation of more extensive works like the *Yogācārabhūmi* (PSkV 1b1ff.). The *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya*, which most probably was composed later than the *Vivaraṇa* and the *Vibhāṣā* and the authorship of which, as mentioned above, remains obscure, explains in a similar statement that the *Pañcaskandhaka* was produced as a short version of texts like the *Yogācārabhūmi* and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (PSkBh 32b2). This statement gives the impression that the author wished to combine the statements of the *Vivaraṇa* and the *Vibhāṣā*.

<sup>76</sup> PSkViv 11a4f.: *yid la byed pa gañ ze na / gañ sems kyi 'jug pa'o // rtsol bar byed pas 'jug pa ste / sems dan sems las byuñ ba god ciñ ma lus par sems pa ni yid la byed pa'o // dmigs pa la sems 'dzin pa'i las can no //*

ASBh 5,1–3: *ālambane cittadhāraṇaṃ tatraiva punaḥ punar āvarjanam veditavyam / ata eva samādhilābhī manaḥsaṃskāralābhīty* (read: *manaskāralābhīty*) *ucyate* / (“Holding the mind at the object is to be known as turning [it] towards that very [object] again and again. Therefore one who has attained *samādhi* is called ‘one who has attained *manaskāra*’.”)

PSkV 20b1–3: *cittadhāraṇaṃ punas tatraivālambane punaḥ punaś cittasyāvarjanam [...] samādhilābhī manaskāralābhīty ucyata iti* (“Holding the mind at that very [object] is turning the mind towards the object again and again. [...] One who has attained *samādhi* is called ‘one who has attained *manaskāra*’.”)

In the light of these observations on the parallels and differences between the texts a number of questions arise with regard to the chronology of the three commentaries, the *Pañcaskandhavivaraṇa*, the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*, and the *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣya*. Is the *Vivaraṇa* older than the *Vibhāṣā* and is it possible that Sthiramati drew on the former when composing his commentary? Did Guṇaprabha, the author of the *Vivaraṇa*, know the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* or, alternatively, might the author of the latter have used the *Vivaraṇa*?

In Tibetan sources Guṇaprabha is mentioned as a disciple of Vasubandhu and as a teacher of Guṇamati, who is sometimes regarded to have been the teacher of Sthiramati.<sup>77</sup> The authorship of the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* is a highly disputed issue. While the commentary is sometimes ascribed to Sthiramati, J. W. de Jong and Lambert Schmithausen have pointed out that either Jinaputra or Buddhasiṃha are much more probable as authors of the text.<sup>78</sup> De Jong further notes that a Buddhasiṃha is mentioned as a student of Asaṅga by Xuanzang.

It seems likely that both, the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* and the *Pañcaskandhavivaraṇa*, were composed before the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*, but it is very difficult to tell which was produced earlier. It should also be taken into consideration that the parallels

<sup>77</sup> Skilling 2000: 313f.

<sup>78</sup> Schmithausen 1969: 101, n. 34y, Schmithausen 1987: 411, n. 755, and de Jong 1973: 340f.



shared by the two works may have occurred because the texts relied on common sources (which may not be available to us today). The situation is further complicated by the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*'s apparent reliance on textual material from the *Xianyang shengjiao lun*.<sup>79</sup> Therefore, in order to establish the provenance of certain passages it would be necessary to firstly compare in detail the *Vivarāṇa*'s statements with parallel explanations in the *Xianyang shengjiao lun*. The fact that the *Vivarāṇa* contains passages closely related to the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* which are in some cases not to be found in the *Vibhāṣā* and that the same is true for some passages of the *Vibhāṣā* with regard to the *Vivarāṇa* makes it very probable that the authors of the two commentaries were not copying each other but a common third source.

Although the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya* also seems to include parallels with the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* and with the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, it appears difficult to determine with certainty how these similarities are to be explained. The main difficulty is posed by the specific style of the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya*. The author tends to express ideas closely related to those presented in the other texts in a slightly different way, often tearing apart the copied phrases and embedding them in his own comments. Thus, for instance, the 'karmaka phrase' describing the function of *manaskāra* has the form *dmigs pa la sems 'dzin pa'i las can te/no* in the Tibetan versions of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, the *Vibhāṣā*, and the *Vivarāṇa*, whereas the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya* presents this phrase as *de'i las ni dmigs pa la sems 'dzin pa'o*.<sup>80</sup> Examples of what appears to be *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* phrases cut into pieces are to be found frequently in the section defining the "impulses" (*saṃskāra*).<sup>81</sup> In addition to the specific style of the author, the Tibetan expressions used in the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya* often differ from the Tibetan translations appearing in the other two commentaries, the *Vivarāṇa* and the *Vibhāṣā*. What is more, the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya*

<sup>79</sup> For an example, see Schmithausen 1987: 315, n. 297.

<sup>80</sup> AS(T) 48b1, PSkViv 11a5, PSkV(T) 209b6, PSk Bh 48b3.

<sup>81</sup> PSk Bh 48b4, 48b1f., 50a2f., 74a5f. See also the above-mentioned definition of *kāla*.

was probably composed later than the *Vibhāṣā*<sup>82</sup> and the *Vivaraṇa*, and thus, it is difficult to know definitely whether the passages parallel to the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*(*bhāṣya*) and the *Kośa* were borrowed directly from the latter or whether they were copied from the *Vibhāṣā* or the *Vivaraṇa*. A more detailed investigation of the style and contents of the *Bhāṣya* appears necessary and is currently under preparation.

There are, however, a few examples of passages to be found in the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya* which apparently are related to the material presented in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and which definitely cannot have been borrowed from the other two commentaries as they have no parallels there. These include, for instance, parts of the definition of the term “being associated with thoughts” (*savikalpa*),<sup>83</sup> the explanation of various reasons for giving up restraint (*saṃvara*),<sup>84</sup> and several instances, in which the author of the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya* refers to the *rnam par smra ba pa rnam* (= *Vaibhāṣikas*).<sup>85</sup>

Of particular interest is the explanation of the concept of *vikalpa*/*savikalpa*, which was already mentioned above. While Sthiramati in his *Vibhāṣā* distinguishes only two kinds of *vikalpa*, namely the “thought being an examination” (*abhinirūpaṇāvikalpa*) and the “thought being a recollection” (*anusmaraṇavikalpa*),<sup>86</sup> the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya*, in accordance with the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, additionally mentions the “natural thought” (*svabhāvavikalpa*) as a third kind of *vikalpa*.<sup>87</sup> The *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya*, like the *Vibhāṣā* (see above), quotes the explanation of the *abhinirūpaṇā*- and the *anusmaraṇavikalpa* from the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* ascrib-

<sup>82</sup> See also Schmithausen 1987: 247, n. 21.

<sup>83</sup> PSkBh 137a2.

<sup>84</sup> PSkBh 42b4–7. See also Kramer 2013b: 94.

<sup>85</sup> See, e.g., PSkBh 87b3f., 101a6f., 104b6ff., 108a1ff.

<sup>86</sup> PSkV 71b6.

<sup>87</sup> PSkBh 137a2, ASBh 16,6f., and AKBh 22,20.

ing it to the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*.<sup>88</sup> Following this citation the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya* provides an example very similar to a passage included in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* in order to illustrate the idea that sense perception is considered “not being accompanied by thought” (*avikalpaka*) although it is associated with the *svabhāvavikalpa*.<sup>89</sup> However, while the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*’s example is a horse having only one leg, the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya* mentions a stool with only one leg instead. In both cases, the fact of having only one leg causes either the horse or the stool to be defined as “without legs” (*apādaka*). Interestingly, the same example, i.e. a stool with only one leg, is provided in a commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa* (D 4091, 104b2) in the context of the explanation of *svabhāvavikalpa* and in the *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa* in a different context.<sup>90</sup> Whether the author of the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya* was drawing on one of these works when he composed his commentary cannot be answered at the moment.

### 3 Examples of Innovation

Examples proving the creativity of an Indian author, as for instance Vasubandhu or Sthiramati, are difficult to come up with. First of all, we do not know how many of the relevant texts that existed at, for example, Sthiramati’s times are still extant and to which extent the works available today drew on texts that are no longer accessible, especially as the authors under discussion very rarely provide titles of any sources. The second difficulty is that even if we actually have access to the works the Indian authors were using they might have had different versions of these works at hand. In this case what appears like an ‘innovation’ may simply reflect a different reading of the same text. Finally, it is impossible for us to know with certainty if an author like Sthiramati was innovative himself or whether he was summarizing the (innovative) doctrines which have arisen in the course of time (and were discussed and

---

<sup>88</sup> ASBh 16,9f and PSkBh 137a5f.

<sup>89</sup> AKBh 22,20f. and PSkBh 137a6f.

<sup>90</sup> KSi 198.31.

transmitted only orally for a while) within the milieu and tradition he belonged to. If this was the actual scenario, the author's works may appear creative compared to earlier texts, but the creative ideas would not necessarily be bound to him as an individual. Thus, when dealing with text passages that seem innovative to us the only conclusion we can draw is that they are innovative compared to an earlier work. However, it seems impossible to ascribe the innovative energy behind them to a particular person.

Another aspect to be considered when dealing with the topic of innovation is that creativity can not only show itself in the introduction of fundamentally new doctrines, but also on a much smaller or subtler level. On the one hand, an author may be considered 'innovative' because he presents an entirely new idea, not having been expressed before by another author. On the other hand, there may be innovative passages found in the texts that express a teaching already known from another source in a different way. Thus, when trying to identify innovative components in a text, it seems useful to distinguish between innovation with regard to ideas or doctrines and innovation with regard to the way how certain concepts are expressed. In general, it can be stated that the boundaries between the two extremes 'intertextuality' or 'textual reuse' and 'creativity' or 'innovation' are fluid and that countless nuances of both can be identified in between.

The following examples aim at demonstrating as many of these nuances of creative changes and additions as possible. From the viewpoint of the extreme of textual reuse already the utilization of synonyms may be considered as creative. The next step towards the extreme of a completely innovative passage would be shorter and longer supplements within a sentence or abbreviations of the latter (as an abbreviation of a sentence or passage may also be considered to represent a creative act). Moving even further away from the pure reuse of older material the new text may be characterized by changes in the structure of the older doctrines, by the addition of longer new passages and by new interpretations of the old teachings. Further it may include a rejection of earlier teachings and finally contain completely new expressions and ideas. As will become obvious in the following examples, most of these different

levels of creative composition can be identified in Vasubandhu's root text as well as in the three commentaries.

Several examples for smaller variations in the text borrowed from other works, like the application of synonyms, abbreviation, or the combination of two sources, and also for larger additions (in the case of Sthiramati's *Triṃśikā* commentary) have already been provided in the previous section. An illustrative example for what it means to express a similar idea in an alternative way is found in the following definition of "shame in relation to others" (*apatrāpya*):

PSk 6,9f.: *lokam adhipatiṃ kṛtvāvadyena lajjā* / ("embarrassment about a fault [for reasons] being related to common people")

AS 16,9: *parato 'vadyena lajjanā* / ("embarrassment about a fault [for reasons] being related to others")

However, the innovative impetus in this case is apparently not to be ascribed to Vasubandhu himself, since the phrase *lokam adhipatiṃ kṛtvā* seems to occur in the *Xianyang shengjiao lun*, too.<sup>91</sup>

The same applies to the extended version of the definition of "intention" (*cetanā*), in which the explanation known from sources like the *Yogācārabhūmi* or the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* is supplemented by the three qualities *guṇatas*, *doṣatas*, and *anubhayatas*:

YBh 60,3: *cittābhisamskāraḥ* / ("activating the mind")

AKBh 54,20/AS 15,37: *cittābhisamskāro manaskarma* / ("mental activity, activating the mind")

PSk 5,6f.: *guṇato doṣato 'nubhayataś cittābhisamskāro manaskarma* / ("mental activity, activating the mind towards the virtuous, unvirtuous, and neither [virtuous] nor [unvirtuous]")

Again, the *Pañcaskandhaka* seems to be relying on the explanation of *cetanā* as given in the *Xianyang shengjiao lun*.<sup>92</sup>

Phrases composed by the commentators which do not represent significant innovations on the doctrinal level but might nonetheless be regarded as 'creative' acts are particularly visible in the *Pañca-*

<sup>91</sup> *Xianyang* 481b28f.

<sup>92</sup> *Xianyang* 481a29f.

*skandhabhāṣya*. For instance, in the section on mental factors the author introduces every factor with a recurrent phrase, which, most probably, was composed in this way by himself. While Sthiramati begins his comments on, for example, *manaskāra* with a simple quotation of Vasubandhu's definition, the author of the *Bhāṣya* embeds the same two sentences in a more elaborate structure:

PSkV 20a6f.: *manaskāraḥ katamaḥ | cetasa ābhoga iti |*

(PSkV[T] 9b5f.: *yid la byed pa gaṅ ḥe na | sems kyi 'jug pa'o ḥes bya ba ni*; “It is said: ‘What is attention? It is the bending of the mind.’”)

PSkBh 48b1f.: *yid la byed pa'i raṅ bžin bstan pa'i phyir | yid la byed pa gaṅ ḥes dris te | yid la byed pa'i raṅ bžin daṅ mtshan ṅid gaṅ ḥe na ḥes dris pa'i don to || lan du sems kyi 'jug pa'o ḥes bya ba smos te |* (“In order to explain the nature of attention, it is asked ‘What is attention?’ in the sense of asking ‘What is the nature of attention and what are its characteristics?’ As an answer it is said: ‘It is the bending of the mind.’”)

The phrases enclosing the quotation of the root text occur in this form at the beginning of the definition of every single mental factor in the *Bhāṣya*.

Of particular interest are also the numerous examples provided by the author of the *Bhāṣya* which are not to be found in any other of the available sources. Thus, the author offers, for instance, examples for the two kinds of imprints *niṣyandavāsanā* (“imprint [entailing] a homogeneous result”) and *vipākavāsanā* (“imprint of maturation”). The first is explained as “If one practises giving in the present life, one will enjoy the fruit, [that is] giving, in another life.” ([...] *tshe 'dir sbyin pa byas na tshe rabs gžan du yaṅ 'bras bu sbyin pa la dga' ba'o ||*), the second as “Because of the practice of giving great pleasure will arise after the *ālayavijñāna* has been reborn among gods or human beings.” ([...] *sbyin pa'i rgyus lha daṅ mi'i naṅ du kun gži rnam par śes pa skyes nas loṅs spyod chen por 'gyur ba'o ||*).<sup>93</sup>

Other notable examples are provided in the section discussing *kliṣṭamanas* and the mental factors accompanying it. The *Bhāṣya*

<sup>93</sup> PSkBh 96a5f.

explains “wrong attitude towards the self” (*ātmamoha*) as “not understanding that the *ālayavijñāna* is without a self, though it is without a self” (*kun gzi bdag med pa la bdag med par khoñ du ma chud pa ni bdag tu gti mug pa zes bya’o //*),<sup>94</sup> “[false] view of the self” (*ātmadr̥ṣṭi*) as “thinking with regard to the *ālayavijñāna* that it is a permanent self because of not understanding that it is without a self” (*bdag med par khoñ du ma chud pas kun gzi la bdag rtag pa ni ’di yin no sñam du ’dzin pa ni bdag tu lta ba zes bya’o //*), “conceitful conception of the self” (*ātmamāna*) as “exaltation and bloating of the mind because of this regarding [it] as a self” (*bdag tu bltas pa’i rgyu des sems mtho ba dan̄ kheñs par gyur pa ni bdag tu ña rgyal ba zes bya’o //*), and “self-love” (*ātmasneha*) as “clinging to this self and holding on to [it] as a beloved [thing], [resulting] from the three *ātmamoha*, *ātmadr̥ṣṭi*, and *ātmamāna*” (*bdag tu gti mug pa dan̄ / bdag tu lta ba dan̄ / bdag tu ña rgyal ba gsum las / bdag de la chags śiñ phañs par ’dzin pa ni bdag la chags pa zes bya ste /*).<sup>95</sup> Moreover, a notable example added by the author of the *Bhāṣya* is to be found in the passage characterizing *manaskāra*, where “a skeleton and [similar objects]” (*keñ rus la sog pa*) are mentioned in order to illustrate the objects of this mental factor.<sup>96</sup>

Examples for innovative changes in the structure of particular teachings and doctrines are visible in Vasubandhu’s *Pañca-skandhaka* in several contexts. One of the more prominent cases is his treatment of the category “the unconditioned” (*asaṃskṛta*), in which he enumerates four factors: “space” (*ākāśa*), “cessation not [resulting] from consideration” (*apratisaṅkhyānirodha*), “cessation [resulting] from consideration” (*pratisaṅkhyānirodha*), and “true reality” (*tathatā*).<sup>97</sup> As already pointed out in a previous publication the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* presents a list of eight unconditioned entities, while the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* mentions

<sup>94</sup> See also Schmithausen 1987: 519, n. 1421.

<sup>95</sup> PSkBh 115a5–7. See also TrBh 64,14–19, where the four factors are explained in a different way.

<sup>96</sup> PSkBh 48b4.

<sup>97</sup> PSk 18,12f.

only three categories.<sup>98</sup> Vasubandhu seems to have tried to find a compromise on these two divergent systems by adding *tathatā*, an important concept in Yogācāra, to the threefold list of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. Through this innovative act he created a new structure for the *asaṃskṛta* class.

The combination of the three “conceptions of a self” (*ātma-grāha*), “conception of unity” (*ekatvagrāha*), “conception of an experiencer” (*bhokṛtvagrāha*), and “conception of an agent” (*karṛtvagrāha*), with the five “constituents of a person” (*skandha*), the twelve “bases” (*āyatana*), and the eighteen “elements” (*dhātu*) seems to represent another example of innovation on the structural level. Especially a parallel for Vasubandhu’s explanation that the understanding of the *skandhas*, *āyatanas*, *dhātus* results in the removal of the three *ātmagrāhas* could not be located in an earlier source.<sup>99</sup>

The most innovative chapter of the *Pañcaskandhaka* is doubtlessly the section characterizing the mind (*viññāna*). It appears very likely that Vasubandhu’s main intention while composing the *Pañcaskandhaka* was to update and extend the understanding of *viññāna* in the context of the five *skandhas* by supplementing it with Yogācāra concepts like that of the “store mind” (*ālayaviññāna*) or the “notion of ‘I’” (*kliṣṭamanas*). A notable example of restructuring in this section is visible in Vasubandhu’s presentation of the proofs for the existence of the “store mind” (*ālayaviññāna*). While the *Yogācārabhūmi* contains nine proofs and the *Mahāyānasamgraha* six groups of arguments, Vasubandhu determines four proofs. The relations of these three lists of proofs have been studied in more detail in another publication, and it seems that some of the arguments provided in the *Yogācārabhūmi* are missing in the *Pañcaskandhaka*, while those that overlap, at least in some cases, have a different focus.<sup>100</sup> Nonetheless all four proofs presented by

<sup>98</sup> See Kramer 2012: 125–137.

<sup>99</sup> PSk 20,10–12. A passage that seems remotely related to this teaching and which might have inspired the creation of the latter is to be found in the *Yogācārabhūmi* (see ŚrBh 174,21ff.).

<sup>100</sup> See Kramer (forthcoming).



Vasubandhu have parallels in the other texts. Thus, it seems that Vasubandhu was aiming at restructuring the existing systems in order to adjust them to doctrinal developments of his times.

A concept taught by Vasubandhu that might also be regarded as an example of innovation on the structural level is his enumeration of three differences between the “store mind” (*ālayavijñāna*) and “actual perception” (*pravṛttivijñāna*): its having “an indefinable object and an indefinable mode [of apprehending it]” (*aparicchinālabhānākāra*), its “being of one kind” (*ekajātīya*), and its “uninterrupted continuity” (*santānānuvṛtti*).<sup>101</sup> Although these or similar qualities have been ascribed to the *ālayavijñāna* in earlier Yogācāra works already,<sup>102</sup> listing them in such a systematic way appears ‘innovative.’

Another example of innovation in the *vijñāna* chapter of the *Pañcaskandhaka* is Vasubandhu’s list of the contaminations that accompany the *kliṣṭamanas*. While the *Yogācārabhūmi* lists “[false] view of the five constituents [as being the self]” (*satkāyadrṣṭi*), “conceitful conception of the self” (*asmimāna*), “self-love” (*ātmasneha*), and “ignorance” (*avidyā*) as accompanying factors and the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* has *ātmadrṣṭi* (“[false] view of the self”) instead of *satkāyadrṣṭi*, the *Pañcaskandhaka* mentions *ātmamoha* (“wrong attitude towards the self”), *ātmadrṣṭi*, *ātmamāna*, and *ātmāsneha*.<sup>103</sup>

The *vijñāna* chapter is not only the most innovative part of Vasubandhu’s root text, but also the most creative section of Sthiramati’s commentary. In contrast to the other parts of the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* the *vijñāna* chapter contains barely any borrowings from the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (*bhāṣya*) and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. Sthiramati appears to have composed large parts of his comments not depending directly on any

<sup>101</sup> PSk 16,10f. See also Kramer 2014: 315.

<sup>102</sup> On related earlier characterizations of the *ālayavijñāna*, see Schmithausen 1987: 31, 41f., 46f., 88–93, 103–106, 153f.

<sup>103</sup> YBh(T) 7b8–8a3, AS 19,15, PSk 17,7f. See also Schmithausen 1987: 442f., n. 943, and 150f.

of the sources available to us today, especially those refuting the Sarvāstivāda idea of “activity” (*kāritra*)<sup>104</sup> or those explaining the fourth *ālayavijñāna* proof, which he, for the most part, reproduces literally in his *Triṃśikā* commentary.<sup>105</sup>

A remarkable example of rearranging already existing structures is to be found in the context of Sthiramati’s treatment of “mental perception” (*manovijñāna*). While the *Yogācārabhūmi* includes an explanation of *manovijñāna* as having two stages, namely the moment of “investigating” (*paryeṣaka*) and the moment of “determining” (*niścita*), in which the object is conceptualized (*vikalpyate*),<sup>106</sup> Sthiramati offers an alternative structure in his *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*. According to his understanding *manovijñāna* consists of three successive stages: “investigating” (*paryeṣaka*), “classifying” (*vyavasthāpaka*), and “conceptualizing” (*vikalpaka*).<sup>107</sup> This explanation of *manovijñāna* is particularly notable as it represents an illustrative example for the Indian commentator’s freedom to go beyond the root text’s doctrinal standpoints and to deal with terms and ideas that are neither explicitly mentioned nor implicitly indicated in the latter.

Other cases of this kind are to be found in Sthiramati’s comments regarding the concept of an “imprint [entailing] a homogeneous result” (*niṣyandavāsanā*) versus an “imprint of maturation” (*vipākavāsanā*)<sup>108</sup> and in Sthiramati’s treatment of the topic “objects of the *ālayavijñāna*.” As for the latter topic, being a perception (*vi-jñāna*) the store mind also requires an object, but since the store mind operates on a subliminal level, the exact nature of its objects was partly disputed among the *Yogācāras*. While Vasubandhu ex-

<sup>104</sup> PSkV 51b4ff.

<sup>105</sup> PSkV 55b2–57b5 and TrBh 116,3–120,19. Other (longer) passages which Sthiramati seems to have composed not copying the text directly from a particular source include most of his comments on “space” (*ākāśa*; PSkV 4a3–4b1), on the *satkāyadr̥ṣṭi* (PSkV 31b4–34b6), and on the three “conceptions of a self” (*ātmagrāha*; PSkV 66a2–67a4).

<sup>106</sup> YBh 10,2f. and 58,18f.

<sup>107</sup> PSkV 49b4f. For more details, see Kramer (forthcoming).

<sup>108</sup> PSkV 49b6ff.

plains in the *Pañcaskandhaka* that, as mentioned above, the store mind has an object but that this object cannot be clearly determined,<sup>109</sup> Sthiramati specifies the object as being twofold: internally the *ālayavijñāna* perceives the “appropriation” (*upādāna*), i.e. the “imprint of the sticking to the imagined nature” (*parikalpitasvabhāvābhīniveśavāsanā*) and the matter of the sense faculties together with their bases, and externally the surrounding world (*bhājana*).<sup>110</sup>

Interestingly, even Vasubandhu himself seems to have varying views on the objects of the store mind. While he obviously does not want to determine the object clearly in the *Pañcaskandhaka*, in a later work, the *Triṃśikā*, he defines the objects of the *ālayavijñāna* as the surrounding world and the “appropriation” (*upādi*).<sup>111</sup> Notably, Sthiramati does not follow the root text in his *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya* either and seems to contradict himself in his two commentaries, stating in the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya* that the store mind is cognizing only one object, namely the surrounding world, and that it is appropriating (not perceiving) the sense faculties and containing (not perceiving) the imprints (*vāsanā*).<sup>112</sup>

A final example illustrating Sthiramati’s independence from the root text to be mentioned here is a comment in the section on “matter” (*rūpa*). When dealing with the (disputed) question whether colour (*varṇa*) and shape (*saṃsthāna*) are really existing entities Sthiramati mentions in a brief explanation that from the standpoint of highest reality even colour actually cannot be the object of the faculty of sight. According to Sthiramati the reason for this impos-

<sup>109</sup> PSk 16,10.

<sup>110</sup> PSkV 50b2–4. See also Schmithausen 1987: 106, according to whom Sthiramati follows a parallel explanation in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* here. It should be noted that Sthiramati cannot have copied the comments on the *manovijñāna*, the two types of *vāsanā*, and the *ālayavijñāna*’s objects from the *Vivaraṇa*. The latter does not include the differentiation of the two *vāsanās*, does not list any specific objects, and mentions only the idea that the *manovijñāna* follows the sense perceptions and conceptualizes the objects (PSkViv 25a7f.).

<sup>111</sup> TrBh 52,6. See also Schmithausen 1987: 104.

<sup>112</sup> See Schmithausen 1987: 104f., and TrBh 52,7–21.

sibility is that the assumption of really existing atoms and external sense objects is not appropriate.<sup>113</sup> This statement is notable insofar as Vasubandhu does not refer to the *vijñaptimātratā* concept at all in his *Pañcaskandhaka*. What is more, in other parts of the *rūpa* section Sthiramati deals with all the different aspects of matter in great detail without ever mentioning the idea that matter does not really exist.

As mentioned before, creativity and innovation can manifest themselves not only in the form of addition of certain phrases and doctrines but also in the rejection of a teaching. Since a rejection usually makes a longer argumentation necessary and the *Pañcaskandhaka* aims at brevity and conciseness it is difficult to find examples for this kind of innovation in Vasubandhu's root text. In contrast, Sthiramati's commentary shows a number of instances in which the author disagrees with teachings offered in other (Yogācāra) texts. However, he does not reject any of the *Pañcaskandhaka*'s statements. A good example for a rejection of a concept found in other Yogācāra texts is Sthiramati's critical discussion of the five categories of invisible (*anidarśana*) and penetrable (*apratigha*) matter.<sup>114</sup> While the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* teaches five entities of this kind,<sup>115</sup> Sthiramati accepts only one, namely the "non-representation" (*avijñapti*). It should be noted that Sthiramati follows Vasubandhu's root text insofar as in the latter only *avijñapti* is mentioned out of the five categories as invisible and penetrable *rūpa*. However, it is not clear whether Vasubandhu was aware of the other four entities and if he consciously rejected (or neglected) them. The way Sthiramati deals with the situation suggests that he himself presumed that Vasubandhu did not mention the four intentionally. After providing explanations showing the four being redundant, Sthiramati ends his comments with the remark that he is not able to fully understand the reasoning of such a great master as Vasubandhu and that this matter has to be further investigated.

---

<sup>113</sup> PSkV 9a6f.

<sup>114</sup> PSkV 12b4–13a5.

<sup>115</sup> AS\* 4,13f. See also Kramer 2013b: 93f.

Another example of rejection is to be found in the context of the question of how many different colours and shapes are to be distinguished. While Vasubandhu does not specify any particular colour or shape, Sthiramati explains that there are four different colours and eight various shapes.<sup>116</sup> At the same time Sthiramati rejects a number of other possible colours and shapes mentioned in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.<sup>117</sup> Interestingly, most of these additional categories are listed in the other two *Pañcaskandhaka* commentaries without any indication of the fact that they are disputed.<sup>118</sup>

#### 4 Conclusions

In summary it can be stated that both, the root text *Pañcaskandhaka* and its three commentaries, include considerable amounts of innovation and textual reuse. It is therefore important to emphasize that the classification of a text as a ‘commentary’ does not necessarily predicate that the text is less original or innovative than a work not belonging to the commentarial genre. The reason for Sthiramati’s work having received far less attention from modern scholars than the scriptures of other Yogācāra authors like Asaṅga or Vasubandhu is probably mainly to be found in the perception of Sthiramati as a commentator and not as a ‘real’ author in his own right.<sup>119</sup> Since the above-mentioned examples clearly depict the commentators, especially Sthiramati, as creative and innovative authors, this negligence appears unjustified. It is also important to note that the creative energy of these authors does not mainly manifest itself in the production of entirely new ideas, but rather in the reorganisation of previous teachings and the association of terms and doctrines with the *Pañcaskandhaka*, which are not mentioned in the latter but which are already known from other

<sup>116</sup> PSkV 7b1–5.

<sup>117</sup> AS\* 3,24–26 and AKBh 6,11f.

<sup>118</sup> PSkViv 6a1 and PSkBh 38b6–39a1. See also Kramer 2013b: 88f.

<sup>119</sup> For example, in an article dealing with the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra* and its commentaries Paul Griffiths states that Sthiramati “was not an especially original or exciting thinker” (Griffiths 1990: 46).

texts. However, this ‘limitation’ of creative activity is not bound to commentarial literature alone. Vasubandhu’s *Pañcaskandhaka* is also largely characterized by the restructuring and summarizing of known doctrines, rather than by the introduction of completely new concepts. It appears quite likely that the *Pañcaskandhaka* was produced as a ‘secondary’ brief summary of a previously existing complex conglomerate of teachings (in the sense of von Stietencron 1995: 252) which might have been transmitted and discussed only orally for some time.

While the *Pañcaskandhaka* includes only ‘silent’ borrowings from other texts, i.e. quotations not explicitly marked as such, the commentaries present a wide variety of textual reuse, like explicit citations with reference to specific sources, citations marked as such but without an explicit title, and paraphrase. On the whole the commentaries give the impression of a very irregular employment of particular kinds of reuse and also of an inconsistent utilization of earlier textual material. It is particularly striking that a quoted text (even if explicitly marked as such) is almost never identical to its source.<sup>120</sup>

Why a commentator like Sthiramati chose to quote explicitly in some cases and ‘silently’ in others, decided to copy older material literally or to paraphrase it, and chose to incorporate particular teachings from texts like the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* while ignoring others is difficult to answer. It seems at least probable that phrases are reused randomly, not systematically, and that most of the text is quoted from memory. If we assume that the texts have been produced mainly in the context of teaching, at least some of the inconsistencies might reflect the teacher’s ‘spontaneous’ answers to particular questions posed by the students.

The comparison of parallels and differences in the three commentaries gives rise to a number of questions concerning the chronological order of the texts. Of particular interest is the close relationship between the *Pañcaskandhavivaraṇa* and the *Abhi-*

---

<sup>120</sup> A similar observation is reported in Freschi 2011: 177, with regard to other *śāstric* texts.

*dharmasamuccayabhāṣya*. The fact that the *Vivarāṇa* includes passages and concepts which seem very close to the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* and which, at least in some cases, are not considered in Sthiramati's commentary suggests that either the author of the *Vivarāṇa* was drawing on the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* or vice versa or that both texts rely on a common third source. It seems likely that the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* and the *Pañcaskandhavivarāṇa* are older than the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*, but it is very difficult to ascertain which of the former two was composed earlier.

The obscure identity of the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya*'s author, its specific style, and the fact that the Tibetan expressions used in it often differ from the Tibetan translations of the other two commentaries make an assessment of its chronological position very difficult. Although the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya* also seems to show parallels with the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* and with the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, it appears difficult to determine with certainty if the passages were borrowed directly from the latter or whether they were copied from the *Vivarāṇa* or the *Vibhāṣā*. As already pointed out by Lambert Schmithausen,<sup>121</sup> the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya* seems to have been produced later than the *Vibhāṣā*. Considering that with some probability the *Vibhāṣā* is later than the *Vivarāṇa*, we might assume that the *Bhāṣya* is the latest of the three commentaries. A detailed study of the style and contents of the *Bhāṣya*, which is currently under preparation, will hopefully shed more light on these questions.

---

<sup>121</sup> Schmithausen 1987: 247, n. 21.

## Appendix

(Text reproduced from PSkV 20a1–41a2 [critical edition]; parallel text in TrBh 54,14–100,3 marked in bold; the asterisks indicate the beginning of the phrases that differ in the *Triṃśīkāvijñaptibhāṣya*.)

**\*sparśaḥ** katamaḥ [...] **trikasamavāyapariccheda** iti prakṛtam (TrBh: tatra sparśas trikasaṃnipāta indriyavikāraparicchedaḥ / vedanāsaṃniśrayadānakarmakaḥ) **indriyaviśayavijñānāni trīṇy eva trikam / tasya kāryakāraṇabhāvena samavasthānaṃ samavāyaḥ** (TrBh: trikasaṃnipātaḥ instead of samavāyaḥ) / **tasmin sati tatkālam** (TrBh: tatsamakālam) **evendriyasya sukhāivedanotpattyanukūlo yo vikāraḥ, tena sadṛśo viśayasya sukhāivedanīyākāraparicchedo yaḥ sa sparśaḥ / indriyaṃ punar yena viśeṣeṇa sukhaduḥkhādihetutvaṃ pratipadyate, sa tasya vikāra** (TrBh adds: sparśaḥ punar) **indriyavikāraḥ / sādṛśyenendriyaṃ sprśatīndriyeṇa vā sprśyata iti \*sparśaḥ** / (TrBh: sparśa ucyate / ata eva viśayavikāraparicchedātmako 'pīndriyavikārapariccheda uktaḥ /) **vedanāsaṃniśrayatvam asya karma / evaṃ hy uktaṃ sūtre – sukhavedanīyaṃ sparśaṃ pratīyotpadyate \*sukhā vedaneti** (TrBh: sukhaṃ veditam iti vistaraḥ)/

**\*manaskāraḥ** katamaḥ / **cetasa ābhoga** iti / (TrBh: manaskāraś cetasa ābhogaḥ) **ābhujanam ābhogaḥ / ālambane yena cittam abhimukhīkriyate, sa cittasyābhogaḥ / sa punar ālambane cittadhāraṇakarmakaḥ / cittadhāraṇaṃ punas tatraivālambane punaḥ punaś cittasyāvarjanam / etac ca karma cittasantater ālambananiyamena viśiṣṭaṃ manaskāram adhikṛtyoktam, na tu yaḥ pratīcittakṣaṇam** / (TrBh adds: tasya hi pratīkṣaṇam eva vyāpāro na kṣaṇāntare /) **yad apy atra nidarśanam ucyate – samādhilābhī manaskāralābhīty ucyata iti / tatra viśiṣṭamanaskāralābhād eva manaskāralābhīty ucyate / anyathā hi sarvasattvā eva manaskāralābhinaḥ syuḥ, sarveṣāṃ pracīcittakṣaṇaṃ manaskārabhāvāt //**

**cetanā** katamā / **guṇato doṣato nobhayataś cittābhisaṃskāro manaskarmeti / guṇataḥ kuśaleṣu dharmeṣu, doṣato 'kuśaleṣu, anubhayato 'vyākṛteṣu / athavā guṇata ity upakariṣu, doṣata ity apakariṣu, anubhayata iti madhyastheṣu / cittābhisaṃskāra** iti **manaśceṣṭā** (TrBh: manasaś ceṣṭā) / **yasyāṃ satyāṃ ālambanaṃ**



*prati cetasaḥ praspando* (TrBh adds: *iva*) *bhavati*, *ayaskāntavaśād ayahprasvandavat* / *āha ca – kṣaṇāntarānavasthānaṃ nirvyāpāraṃ yayā manaḥ* / *savyāpāraṃ ivākhyāti sā manaskarma cetanā* // *iti* / *cittābhisaṃskāra ity ukte manaskarmeti kimartham* / *sarvair eva caitasikaīś cittam abhisaṃskriyate* / *tebhyo vyavacchedārthaṃ manaskarmety āha*, *viññānasya parispanda iva yo dharmah, sa eva cetanā nānya iti jñāpanārtham* / *gunato doṣato 'nubhayataś cittābhisaṃskāra iti karmanirdeśaḥ* / *manaskarmeti cetanāyāḥ svarūpanirdeśaḥ* //

(TrBh adds: *tatra*) *chandaḥ* (TrBh adds: *abhiprete vastuny abhilāṣaḥ*) *katamaḥ* / *abhiprete vastuny abhilāṣa iti* / *\*abhipretagrahaṇam anabhiprete chandābhāvajñāpanārtham* / *evam ca cchandasya pratiniyataviśayatvaṃ jñāpitaṃ bhavati* / (TrBh: *pratiniyataviśayatvaṃ jñāpitaṃ bhavaty anabhiprete chandābhāvāt* /) *darśanaśravaṇādikriyāviśayatvena yad abhimataṃ vastu tad abhipretam* / *tatra \*darśanaśravaṇābhilāṣaḥ prārthanā* (TrBh: *darśanaśravaṇādiprārthanā chandaḥ*) / *yady abhilāṣātmakaś chandaḥ, tṛṣṇācchandayoḥ kaḥ prativiśeṣaḥ* / *tṛṣṇābhiṣvaṅgalakṣaṇā* / *chando 'bhilāṣalakṣaṇa ity asti viśeṣaḥ* / *sa ca vīryārambhasanniśrayadānakarmakaḥ* //

*adhimokṣaḥ* *katamaḥ* / *niścite vastuni tathaiṅvādhāraṇam iti* / *niścitagrahaṇam* (TrBh adds: *aniścitaḥpratiśedhārtham*) *adhimokṣasya sarvaviśayāsattvaprajñāpanārtham* / *na hy aniścite vastuni tathaiṅvādhāraṇasambhavo 'stīti* / *yuktita āptopadeśād* (TrBh: *āptopadeśato*) *vā yad vastu niḥsandigdham* (TrBh: *asandigdham*) *tan niścitam* / *yenaivākāreṇa tan niścitam anityaduḥkḥādyaḥkāreṇa, tenaivākāreṇa tadvastunaś* (TrBh: *tasya vastunaś*) *cetasi niveśanam* (TrBh: *abhiniveśanam*) *evam evaitan nānyathety avadhāraṇam adhimokṣaḥ* / *sa cāsaṃhāryatākarmakaḥ* / *adhimuktiḥpradhāno hi svasiddhāntāt parapravādhir apahartuṃ na śakyate* //

*smṛtiḥ* *katamā* / *saṃstute vastuny asaṃpramoṣaś cetaso 'bhi-lapanateti* / *saṃstuta ity asaṃstute smṛtyabhāvapradaśanārtham* / *saṃstutaṃ ca vastu pūrvānubhūtam* / *\*asaṃpramoṣa ālambanagrahaṇāvipraṇāśakāraṇam* (TrBh: *ālambanagrahaṇāvipraṇāśakāraṇatvād asaṃpramoṣaḥ*) / *tat pūrvagrhitasya vas-*

*tunaḥ punaḥ punar ālambanākārasmaranam abhilapanatā / abhilapanam ivābhilapanam, abhilapanam evābhilapanatā / sā punar* (TrBh adds: avikṣepakarmikā /) *ālambanābhilapanane sati \*na cittasyālambanāntara ākārāntare vā vikṣepo bhavātīty ato* (TrBh: cittasyālambanāntara ākārāntare vā vikṣepābhāvād) *'vikṣepakarmikā //*

*samādhiḥ* katamaḥ / *upaparīkṣye vastuni cittasyaikāgrateti / upaparīkṣya iti nānyatra / evaṃ ca samādheḥ pratiniyataviṣayatvam uktaṃ bhavati / \*upaparīkṣye vastuni* (TrBh: upaparīkṣyaṃ vastu) *guṇato doṣato vā / cittasyaikāgratety* (TrBh: ekāgratā) *ekālambanatā / agraṃ hy atrālambanam ucyate / jñānasanniśrayadānakarmakah, samāhite citte yathābhūtaparijñānāt / upaparīkṣyaṃ vastu satyacatuṣṭayam / guṇato nirodhasatyaṃ mārgasatyaṃ ca / nirodhasatyaṃ śāntādyākārair upaparīkṣyam / mārgasatyaṃ nairyāṇikādyākārair / duḥkhasamudayasatye doṣataḥ / duḥkham anityādyākārair, hetvādyākārair samudayaḥ / tathā navānām bhūmīnām adharāṃ doṣataḥ, ūrdhvāṃ guṇataḥ / evaṃ anyeṣv api sāmānyālbaneṣu yathāsambhavaṃ vaktavyam //*

(TrBh adds: dhīḥ) *prajñā* katamā / *tatraiva pravicyo yogāyogavihito 'nyathā ceti / tatraivety* (TrBh adds: sāpy) *upaparīkṣya eva vastuni* (TrBh adds: pravicyo yogāyogavihito 'nyathā veti) / *evaṃ ca samādhivat prajñāpi pratiniyataviṣayety uktaṃ bhavati / pravicinotīti pravicyaḥ /* (TrBh adds: yaḥ) *samyag mithyā vā saṅkīrṇasvasāmānyalakṣaṇeṣv iva dharmeṣu vivekāvabodhaḥ, yuktir yogaḥ* (TrBh adds: sa punar) – *āptopadeśo 'numānaṃ pratyakṣaṃ ca / tena triprakāreṇa* (TrBh adds: yogena) *yo janitaḥ sa yogavihitaḥ / sa punaḥ śrutamayaś cintāmāyo bhāvanāmayaś ca / tatrāptavacanaprāmāṇyajo* (TrBh: -prāmāṇyād yo) *'vabodhaḥ* (TrBh adds: sa) *śrutamayaḥ / yuktinidhyānaś cintāmayaḥ / samādhiḥ bhāvanāmayaḥ / ayogaḥ punar anāptopadeśo 'numānābhāso mithyāpraṇihitaś ca samādhiḥ / \*tena* yo (TrBh om.: tenāyogena) *janitaḥ so* (TrBh om.: so) *'yogavihitaḥ / tatra saṅkhyavaiśeṣikādīnām śrutamayaś cintāmayaś cānāptopadeśajanitatvāt kutarkajanitatvād ayogavihitaḥ / vītarāgānām tu śāśvatocchedavādinām ekatyāśāśvatikādīnām ca mithyāpraṇihitasamādhijanitatvād ayogavihitaḥ / upapattiprātilambhiko laukikavyavahārāvabodhaś ca naiva yogavihito nāyogavihitaḥ / eṣa ca saṃśayavyāvartana-*

**karmakaḥ** (TrBh: *-karmikā*) / **saṃśayavyāvartanaṃ tu prajñayā dharmān pravacinvato niścayaalābhāt** (TrBh adds: *iti*) //

(TrBh adds: *tatra*) **śraddhā katamā** / (TrBh adds: *astitvaguṇavattvaśakyatveṣu*)<sup>122</sup> **karmaphalasatyaratneṣv abhisampratrayo \*'bhilāṣaś cetasaḥ prasāda** (TrBh: *prasādaś cetaso 'bhilāṣaḥ*) / *karma trividham, puṇyam apuṇyam āniṅjyaṃ ca / tatrāpuṇyaṃ kāmāptam eva, akuśalamūlasamprayogāt / puṇyam api vipākānīyamāt kāmāptam eva / karmavipākam praty āniṅjanād āniṅjyam / apuṇyasya kāmādhātāv aniṣṭo vipākāḥ, puṇyasyeṣṭaḥ / āniṅjasya rūpārūpadhātvor iṣṭa eva vipākāḥ / [...]*<sup>123</sup> **śraddhā hi trividhā** (TrBh: *tridhā*) **pravartate / sati vastuni guṇavaty aguṇavati vā sampratrayākārā, sati guṇavati ca prasādākārā, sati guṇavati ca prāptum utpādayitum** (TrBh adds: *vā*) **śakye 'bhilāṣākārā** / *nanv evam abhilāṣākāratvāt tṛṣṇācchandayor anyatarā bhavati / naitad evam / kuśalaviṣayatvān na tṛṣṇā, śraddhāpūrvakatvāc chandasya na cchandaḥ / cetasaḥ prasāda iti / śraddhā hi cittakāluṣyavairodhikīty atas tatsamprayoge kleśopakleśamalakāluṣyavigamāc cittaṃ śraddhām āgamyā prasādatīti cetasaḥ prasāda ucyate / udakaprasādakamaṇīsthānīyaṃ dharmāntaraṃ caitasikam śraddhā, na rūpaprasādātmiketi pradārśanārtham āha – cetasaḥ prasāda iti / cetasaḥ prasādaḥ, na rūpasyeti / sā punaś chandasanniśrayadānakarmikā //*

**hrīḥ katamā / ātmānaṃ dharmāṃ vādhipatiṃ kṛtvāvadyena lajjā / yatpratibaddhā yasya kriyāsu pravṛttir nivṛttir vā sa tasyādhipatiḥ svāmīty arthaḥ / ātmānaṃ dharmāṃ vādhipatiṃ svāmīnaṃ kṛtvā / sadbhir vigarhitatvād** (TrBh: *garhitatvād*) **aniṣṭavipākatvāc ca pāpam evāvadyam / tenāvadyena kṛtenākṛtena vā** (TrBh adds: *yā*) **cittasyāvalīnatā lajjā** / *kulaṅṅānādibhir guṇaiḥ pāpakriyāyām ātmānaṃ ayogyāṃ matvā, kathaṃ hi nāma mayaiṣaṃvidhenaivaṃ pāpam kṛtam kriyate kariṣyate vā, dharme 'py etad aniṣṭavipākatvāt paropaghātāpravṛttatvāc ca garhitam – ity evaṃ yātmānaṃ dharmāṃ cāvekṣamāṇasyāvadyena lajjā, sā hrīḥ / iyaṃ ca duś-caritasamyamanasanniśrayadānakarmikā //*

<sup>122</sup> See Buescher 2007: 76, n. 6.

<sup>123</sup> A longer passage of the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* has been omitted here as it does not contain any parallels with the *Triṃśīkāvijñaptibhāṣya*.

*apatrāpyam* katamat / *lokam adhipatiṃ krtvāvadyena lajjā* / *loke hy etad garhitam, māṃ caivaṅkarmāṇaṃ viditvā vigarhiṣyantīty* (TrBh: *garhiṣyantīty*) *aślokādibhayād avadyena lajjate* / *idam api duṣcaritasamyamanasanniśrayadānakarmakam* (TrBh: *-samyama-sanniśraya-*) *eva* / *duṣcaritād viratiḥ saṃyamanam* / *lajjamānasyā-patrapamāṇasya vā kṛte 'pi duṣcarite 'vaśyam tadviramaṇād anayos tatsanniśrayadānakarmakatvam* //

*alobha* iti / *ayam akāras triṣv artheṣu vartate* / *abhāve 'nyasmin pratipakṣe ca* / *atra pratipakṣa eva vartate nānyasmin nābhāva iti pradarśanārtham āha – lobhapratipakṣa* iti / *evam adveṣe amohe ca vaktavyam* / *nirvid anāgraha* iti *tatsvarūpanirūpaṇam* / *lobho nāma bhava bhavopakaraneṣu ca āsaktiḥ* (TrBh: *yāsaktiḥ*) *prārthanā ca* / *tatpratipakṣo 'lobho bhava bhavopakaraneṣu cānāsaktir vaimukhyam ca* / *nirvid bhavabhogādīnavānāṃ pariḷḷānād bhava bhavopakaraneṣu ca vaimukhyam* / *anāgraho bhavabhavabhogayor asaktiḥ* / *athavānāgrahaviśeṣanārthaṃ nirvidgrahaṇam – bhava bhavopakaraneṣu ca vaimukhyākāro yo 'nāgraho 'yam alobha iti* / *ayam ca duṣcaritāpravṛttisanniśrayadānakarmaka* iti //

*adveṣaḥ* katamaḥ / *dveṣapratipakṣo maitrī* / *dveṣo hi sattveṣu duḥkhe duḥkhashthānīyeṣu ca dharmeṣv āghātaḥ* / *\*tatpratipakṣo 'nāghātaḥ* (TrBh: *adveṣo dveṣapratipakṣatvāt sattveṣu duḥkhe duḥkhashthānīyeṣu ca dharmeṣv anāghātaḥ*) / *dveṣasyānye 'pi pratipakṣāḥ santīty ata āha – maitrī* / *maitrātmako dveṣasya yaḥ pratipakṣaḥ so 'dveṣaḥ nānya iti* / *ayam api duṣcaritāpravṛttisanniśrayadānakarmaka* iti //

*amohaḥ* katamaḥ / *mohapratipakṣo* (TrBh adds: *yathā-)* *bhūta-sampratipattiḥ* / (TrBh adds: *mohaḥ karmaphalasyaratneṣv ajñānam* / *mohapratipakṣatvād amohaḥ teṣv eva karmaphalasyaratneṣu sampratipattiḥ* /) *sarva eva hi kuśalā dharmāḥ kliṣṭānāṃ dharmānāṃ samudācāravirodhāt pratipakṣa ity ata āha – bhūtasampratipattir iti* / *samyagaviparītapratipattibhedāt* / *sā punar dvividhā – jñānaṃ pratisaṅkhyā ca* / *punaś caturvidhā vipākāgamacintādhiḡamanimittā* / *pratisaṅkhyā tu prajñāiva dhairyasahitā* / *dhairyam iti prajñāvīryasamādhaya ucyanate* / *tatra dvayoḥ prajñādravyayoḥ samavadhānāsambhavād vīryeṇa samādhinā vā samprayuktā prajñā pratisaṅkhyety ucyanate, yad-*

*balenānuddhṛtānupahatakleśabījo 'pi kleśānām avakāśaṃ na dadati / ayam atra vākyārthaḥ – yathābhūtajñānātmakaḥ pratisankhyātmakaś ca jñānaviśeṣo 'moha ity ucyate / ata evāmoho (TrBh adds: ayam api) duścāritāpravṛttisanniśraya-dānakarmakaḥ //*

*vīryaṃ katamat / kausīdyapratipakṣaḥ kuśale cetaso 'bhyutsāhaḥ / kutsitaṃ sīdatīti kuśīdaḥ / tadbhāvaḥ kausīdyam / ālasyam ity arthaḥ / tac ca kuśalākuśalayoś cittasyānutaśahaḥ, tatpratipakṣaś ca vīryam ity ataḥ kausīdyavad ubhayaprasaṅge vyavacchedārtham āha – kuśale cetaso 'bhyutsāho vīryam, na tu kliṣṭa iti / kliṣṭe tūtsāhaḥ kutsitavāt kausīdyam eva / nanu ca kliṣṭaṃ svabhyastavāt svarasenaiva pravartate, kiṃ tatrotsāhena / prāyenaivam, asti tu kiñcid yatrotsāho 'py apekṣyate / tat punar yatsamprayogāt sannāhe prayoge vālinatve vāvyāvṛttau vāsantuṣṭau vā kuśaleṣu dharmeṣu cetaso 'bhyutsāhaḥ, tad vīryam / (TrBh adds: etac ca) kuśalapakṣaparipūraṇapariniṣpādanakarmakam / paripūraṇaṃ yathā maulapraveśaḥ / pariniṣpādanaṃ tasyaiva parikarmakṛtatvam /*

*prasrabdhīḥ katamā / dauṣṭhulyapratipakṣaḥ kāyacittakarmanyatā / dauṣṭhulyaṃ kāyacittayor akarmanyatā sāṅkleśikadharmabījāni ca / tadapagame prasrabdhisadbhāvād dauṣṭhulyapratipakṣaḥ / lakṣaṇaṃ tu prasrabdheḥ kāyacittakarmanyatā / tatra kāyakarmanyatā kāyasya svakāryeṣu laghusamutthānatā yato bhavati / cittakarmanyatā samyaṅmanasikāraprayuktasya (TrBh adds: cittasyā-) hlādalāghavanimittaṃ yac caitasikaṃ dharmāntaram / tadyogāc cittam asaktam ālambane pravartata ity atas tac cittakarmanyatety ucyate / kāyasya punaḥ spraṣṭavyaviśeṣa eva prītyāhṛtaḥ kāyaprasrabdhir veditavyā / prītamanasaḥ kāyaḥ prasrabhyata iti sūtre vacanāt / atra caitasikādhikārād acaitasiky api kāyaprasrabdhīḥ prasrabdhisambodhyaṅgatvenoktā kāyakarmanyatā vā cittakarmanyatām āvāhayatīty ato 'caitasiky api kāyakarmanyatātrottā / iyaṃ ca tadbalenāśrayaparāvṛttito (TrBh: tadvaśenā- instead of tadbalenā-) 'śeṣakleśādyāvaraṇa-niṣkarṣaṇakarmikā //*

(TrBh adds: sāpramādikā / sahāpramādena pravartata iti sāpramādikā / kā punar asau / upekṣā / kuta etat / ekāntakuśalatvāt

*sarvakuśalānāṃ ceha nirdeśādhikārāc chraddhādivat sākṣād anirdeśāt tadvyatiriktānyakuśalābhāvāc copekṣaiva vijñāyate / tatra)*

**apramādaḥ** katamaḥ / **pramādapratipakṣo 'lobho** (TrBh: *alobhād*) **yāvad vīryam** (TrBh adds: *apramādaḥ*), **yān** (TrBh adds: *alobhādīn*) **niśrityākuśalān dharmān prajahāti, tatpratipakṣāṃś ca kuśalān dharmān bhāvayatīti** / (TrBh adds: *te 'lobhādayo 'pramādaḥ / ata eva pramādapratipakṣaḥ pramādasyāto viparītatvāt /*) **pramādo hi yena kleśebhyaś cittaṃ na rakṣati kuśalaṃ ca hāpayati / apramādena punaḥ kleśān prajahāti pratipakṣāṃś ca dharmān bhāvayatīty ato 'pramādaḥ pramādapratipakṣa uktaḥ / alobho yāvad vīryam ity alobhādveśāmohāḥ saha vīryeṇa gr̥hyante / yān alobhādīn vīryaparyantān niśrityāgamyā prāpyākuśalān dharmān prajahātīty anena sarve 'lobhādayo 'pramāda ity uktaṃ bhavati / akuśalā dharmā āsravā āsravasthānīyās ca viṣayā veditavyāḥ / tatra āsravānāṃ vinodanaviṣkambhaṇābījasamuddhārātmaḥ prahāṇam. viṣayānāṃ punaḥ parivarjanena prahāṇam / tatpratipakṣā ity akuśaladharmapratipakṣāḥ / te punaḥ kuśalasāsravā anāsravās ca / teṣāṃ abhyāso bhāvanā paunaḥpunyena sam-mukhikaraṇam / yasmād vīryasahitān alobhādīn niśrityākuśalān dharmān prajahāti tatpratipakṣāṃś ca dharmān bhāvayati, tasmāt savīryeṣv alobhādīṣv apramādaḥ prajñāpyate – ity anena sādhiṣṭhānā sakāraṇā cāpramādasya prajñāptir ukta / **sa punaḥ sarvalaukikalokottarasampattiparipūraṇakarmakaḥ** / tatra laukikasampattir bhavabhogaviśeṣalābhāḥ, lokottarā śrāvakādi-bodhyadhigamaḥ //**

**upekṣā** katamā / **sa evālobho yāvad vīryam ityādi – apramāda ivātrāpi vyākhyānam / \*cittasamatādibhis** (TrBh: *cittasamatā cittaprasaṭhatā cittānābhogatā ebhis*) **tribhiḥ padair upekṣāyā ādimadhyāvāsānāvasthā dyotitā / tatra layauddhatyaṃ** (TrBh adds: *vā*) **cetaso vaiṣamyam / tasyābhāvād ādau cittasya samatā** (TrBh: *cittasamatā*) / **tato 'nabhisamskāreṇāprayatnena samāhitasya cetaso yathāyogaṃ samasyaiva pravṛtīḥ praśaṭhatā / sā punar avasthā layauddhatyāsāṅkānugatā, acirabhāvitvāt / tato bhāvanāprakarṣagamanāt tadvipakṣadūrībhāvāt tacchaṅkābhāve layauddhatyapratipakṣanimitteṣv ābhogam akurvato 'nābhogāvasthatā** (TrBh: *'nābhogāvasthā*) **cittasyānābhogatā**

/ yayā nirvāsitesu kliṣṭeṣu dharmeṣv iti / yayety upekṣaiva sambadhyate / kliṣṭā dharmā rāgādisahitāḥ / teṣāṃ nirvāsanam punaranutpattiḥ / upekṣā hi saṅkliṣṭavihāravairodhikīty avaśyaṃ tayā rāgādipravṛttivibandhe varitavyam ity atas tayā nirvāsitesv ity uktam / yataś ca saṅkliṣṭena vihāreṇopekṣā virūdyate, tenopekṣāvihāry asaṅkliṣṭavihārī bhavatīti / ataś \*copekṣā **saṅkleśānavakāśasanniśrayadānakarmikā** (TrBh: iyañ ca sarvakleśopakleśānavakāśasamniśrayadānakarmikā) //

**avihiṃsā** katamā / **vihiṃsāpratipakṣaḥ** karuṇeti / \***vadhabandhādibhir** (TrBh: vadhabandhanādibhir sattvānām) **aviheṭhanam** adrohaṇam \***sattvānām avihimseti** (TrBh: avihimṣā sattveṣu karuṇā) vihiṃsāpratipakṣaḥ / **kaṃ ruṇaddhīti karuṇā** / **kaṃ iti sukhasyākhyā** / **sukhaṃ ruṇaddhīty arthaḥ** / **kāruṇiko hi paraduḥkhaduḥkhī bhavatīti** / **iyam cā**pramādat prajñaptita eva, na dravyasatī, adveṣāṃśa eva prajñapanāt / **aviheṭhanakarmikā** //

(TrBh adds: tatra) **rāgaḥ** katamaḥ / pañcasūpādānaskandheṣu sneho (TrBh adds: bhavabhogayor) **'dhyavasānam** (TrBh adds prārthanā ca) / sāsravāṇi rūpavedanāsañjñāsaṃskāravijñānāni pañca rūpavedanāsañjñāsaṃskāravijñānopadānaskandhāḥ / tatra rūpopādānaskandho dvaidhātukaṃ rūpam / vedanādy-upādānaskandhās catvāras traidhātukā vedanādayaḥ / upādīyate 'nayā trṣṇayā tribhavotpattiḥ paunarbhavikaṃ vā karmeti trṣṇāyā upādānākhyā / upādānasambhūtatvād upādānavidheyatvād upādānāni vā tebhyaḥ sambhavantīty upādānaskandhāḥ / sneha iva snehaḥ / yathā hi tailādikaḥ sneho vastrādikam āśrayam anupraviśya vyāpnoti, mahatāpi ca yatnena svāśrayād durvivecyāḥ, evaṃ rāgo 'pi svālambanam anupraviśyaiva vyāpnoti, mahatāpi ca prayāsenā tasmād ālambanād durvivecyā iti sneha ucyate / adhyavasānaṃ tanmayatā / athavā spraṣṭavyaviśeṣo 'pi sneha iti vyavacchedārtham āha – adhyavasānam iti / sa punar duḥkhasañjananakarmakaḥ / triduḥkhatāyogād yathāsam-bhavaṃ traidhātukāḥ \*pañca **skandhā duḥkham** abhipretam, tasya ca duḥkhasya **kāmarūpārūpyatrṣṇāvaśenābhinirvṛtito** (TrBh: duḥkham atropādānaskandhās teṣāṃ kāmarūpārūpyatrṣṇāvaśād abhinirvṛtteḥ / ato) **rāgasya duḥkhasañjananaṃ karma nirdīśyate** //

*pratighaḥ katamaḥ / sattveṣv āghāta iti / āghātaḥ sattveṣu rūkṣacittatā yenāviṣṭaḥ sattvānāṃ vadhabandhādīkam anarthaṃ cintayati / sa punar asparśavihāraduṣcaritasanniśrayadānakarmakaḥ / sparśaḥ sukham / tena sahito vihāraḥ sparśavihāraḥ / na sparśavihāro 'sparśavihāraḥ, duḥkhasahita ity arthaḥ / āghātacittasyāvaśyaṃ daurmanasyasamudācārāc cittam tapyate / cittānuvidhānāc ca kāyo 'pi tapyata eveti / sarveryāpatheṣu saduḥkhasaviḥāto 'sya vihāro bhavati / pratihatacittasya ca na kiñcid duṣcaritaṃ vidūre – iti pratigho 'sparśavihāraduṣcaritasanniśrayadānakarmaka uktāḥ //*

(TrBh adds: *moho 'pāyeṣu sugatau nirvāṇe tatpratiṣṭhāpākeṣu hetuṣu teṣāṃ cāvīparīte hetuphalasaṃbandhe yad ajñānam / ayañ ca saṃkleśotpattisaṃniśrayadānakarmakaḥ / tatra kleśakarmajanmātmakas trividhaḥ saṃkleśaḥ / tasyotpattiḥ pūrva-pūrvasaṃkleśanimittād uttarottaraśya saṃkleśasyātmalābhaḥ / tasyotpattēḥ saṃniśrayadānaṃ karma / mūḍhasyaiva hi mithyājñānasaṃśayarāgādikleśapaunarbhavikakarmajanmanāṃ pravṛttir nāmūḍhasyeti /)*

*avidyā katamā /<sup>124</sup> karmaphalasaṅyatratneṣv ajñānam / sā punaḥ sahaajā parikalpitā ca / tatra sahaajānyakleśasaṃprayogād āveṇikī / parikalpitā vicikitsāmithyādṛṣṭiśilavrataparāmarśādīkleśasaṃprayuktā / karmaṇy ajñānam puṇyāpuṇyāniñjyakarmāstitve yad ajñānam apratipattir anavabodhaḥ, iyaṃ sahaajā avidyā / puṇyāpuṇyāniñjyakarmāstitve vicikitsato vāpavadato vā nāsti puṇyam apuṇyam āniñjyaṃ ceti, paśubandhāgnipraveśādinivartane puṇye 'puṇyasañjñinām, paśubandhāgnipraveśādike vāpuṇye puṇyasañjñinām yā vicikitsāmithyādṛṣṭisaṃprayuktā avidyā, sā parikalpitā / sā dharmeṣu mithyāniścayavicikitsasaṅkleśotpattisaṃniśrayadānakarmikā //*

*mānaḥ katamaḥ / sapta mānā iti / māno hi sarva eva satkāyadrṣṭi-sanniśrayeṇa* (TrBh: *-samāśrayeṇa*) *pravartate*, (TrBh adds: *sa punaś*) *cittasya connatilakṣaṇaḥ / tathā hy ātmātmīyabhāvaṃ*

<sup>124</sup> The mental factor *avidyā* is actually discussed after the category *māna* in the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*. However, *avidya* appears in the latter instead of *moha* and therefore it is listed here together with the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*'s definition of *moha*.



*skandheṣv adhyāropyāyam aham idaṃ mamety ātmānaṃ tena tena viśeṣeṇonnamayati, anyebhyo 'dhikaṃ manyate / sa cāguravaduḥkhotpattisanniśrayadānakarmakāḥ / agauravaṃ guruṣu guṇavatsu ca pudgaleṣu stabdhatā kāyavācor aprasṛtatā / duḥkhotpattiḥ punar atra punarbhavotpattir veditavyā / sa punaś cittonnatisvabhāvābhede* (TrBh: -svarūpābhede) *'pi cittonnatinimittabhedāt* (TrBh: cittasyonnati-) *saptadhā bhidyate – māno 'timāna ity evamādi //*

*hīnāt kulavijñānavittādibhiḥ śreyān asmi kulavijñānavittādibhir iti yā cittasyonnatiḥ, sadṛśena vā kulādibhis tair eva sadṛśo 'smīti yā cittasyonnatiḥ, sa mānaḥ //*

*atimānaḥ kulavijñānavittādibhiḥ sadṛśāt tyāgaśīlapauruṣādibhiḥ śreyān asmi, śreyasā vā kulavittādibhiḥ* (TrBh: kulavidyādibhiḥ) *sadṛśo 'smi vijñānavittādibhir iti yā cittasyonnatiḥ, ayam atimāna iti //*

*mānātimānaḥ śreyasaḥ kulavijñānavittair aham eva śreyān kulavijñānavittair iti yā cittasyonnatiḥ, ayam mānātimānaḥ //*

*asmimānaḥ pañcopādānaskandhān iti / chandarāgau hy atropādānam / anāgatātmabhāvābhilāśaś chandaḥ / vartamānādhyavasānaṃ rāgaḥ / tatṛānāgatātmabhāvaṃ chandamukhenopādatte / vartamānaskandhān rāgamukhenāparityāgata upādatte / ata etad eva dvayam upādānam ity ucyate / tena yuktāḥ skandhā upādānaskandhāḥ / \*teṣūpādānaskandheṣv* (TrBh: \*pañcasūpādāna-) *ātmātmīyarahiteṣv ātmātmīyābhiniveśād yā cittasyonnatiḥ, ayam* (TrBh: so instead of ayam) *asmimānaḥ //*

*abhimāno 'prāpta uttariviśeṣādhigame prāpto mayeti yā cittasyonnatiḥ / manuṣyadharmā rāgadveṣamohādayaḥ, tatpravartitaṃ ca kāyavānmanaskarma / tatpratipakṣabhūtaṃ yad dhyānasamāpattiyādikam, tan manuṣyadharmebhya uttariviśeṣa ucyate / tasmin viśeṣādhigama 'prāpte sati prāpto mayā uttariviśeṣādhigama iti yā cittasyonnatiḥ, so 'bhimānaḥ //*

*ūnamāno bahvantaraviśiṣṭāt kulavidyāvittādibhir* (TrBh: kulavidyādibhir) *alpāntarahīno 'smi kulādibhir iti yā cittasyonnatiḥ* (TrBh adds: ayam ūnamānaḥ) */ yuktaṃ tāvat samena samaḥ, samānād vā viśiṣṭaḥ, viśiṣṭād vā viśiṣṭa ity unnatisthānatvān*

*mānaḥ, ātmānaṃ tu nyūnaṃ paśyataḥ kim unnatisthānam, yatas tasya māna ucyate / etad evonnatisthānaṃ bahvantaraviśiṣṭād alpāntarahīno 'smi, na yathābahvantaraṃ hīna iti / api ca santi kecid ye prakṛṣṭe ca sattvarāśau hīnam apy ātmānaṃ bahu man-yante //*

*mithyāmāno 'guṇavato guṇavān asmīti yā cittasyonnatiḥ* (TrBh adds: *sa mithyāmānaḥ*) / *guṇā dānaśīlakṣāntyādayaḥ / te yasya na vidyante so 'guṇavān / athavā 'guṇā* (TrBh adds: *hi*) *dauḥśīlyādayaḥ / te yasya santi* (TrBh: *vidyante* instead of *santi*) *so 'guṇavān / tasmād aguṇavato guṇavān asmīti / aguṇavata iti – anena hi dānaśīlādyabhāve guṇavattvam abhyupagataṃ bhavaṭīty ato nirvastukatvān mithyāmāna ucyate* (TrBh: *ity ucyate*) //

*\*prajñā nitīraṇātmikā drṣṭir ucyata ity ato laukikīsamya-g-drṣṭyādiprasaṅge drṣṭir iti satkāyadrṣṭyādikāḥ pañca drṣṭaya ihābhipretā iti pradarsān āha – pañca drṣṭaya iti / tāsāṃ kliṣṭa-tvāviśeṣe 'py ālambanākārabhedād bhedapradarsānārthaṃ punar apy āha – satkāyadrṣṭir antagrāhadṣṭir iti vistaraḥ //* (TrBh: *drṣ* iti *sāmānyanirdeśe 'pi kleśādhikārāt pañcaiva kleśātmikāḥ satkāyadrṣṭyādikā drṣṭayaḥ sambadhyante / na laukikī samya-g-drṣṭir anāsravā vā / āsāṃ tu kliṣṭanitīraṇākāratvād aviśeṣe 'py ālambanākārabhedāt parasparato bhedaḥ /*)

*sīdatīti sat / cayaḥ kāyaḥ / vinaśvare saṅghāte iyaṃ drṣṭir nātmani nātmye ceti jñāpitaṃ bhavati. ātmā hi nityaś caikaś cātma-vādi-bhir abhyupagamyate, iyaṃ cānityānekaviśaya-tvān nātma-viśayety uktaṃ bhavati / \*pañcopādānaskandhān ityādi [...]<sup>125</sup> ātmata ātmīyato cety antagrāhadṣṭīto vyavacchinatti / samanupaśyata iti niścinvataḥ / yā kliṣṭā prajñeti /* (TrBh: *tatra satkāyadrṣṭir yat pañcasūpādānaskandheṣv ātmātmīyadarśanam*) *na hy amūḍhasyānātmany ātmeti jñānaṃ bhavati / ato mohasampra-yogād viparyastatvāc ca kliṣṭā / tatra svasantatipatitān ātmatvena samanupaśyati, parasantatipatitān anupāttāṃś cātmyatvena / yadāpi svasantatipatitānām ekadeśam ātmatvena, tadā itarān apy ātmīyatvena / iyaṃ ca sarvadrṣṭīgatasanniśrayadānakarmikā //*

<sup>125</sup> A longer passage of the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* has been omitted here as it does not contain any parallels with the *Triṃśīkāvijñaptibhāṣya*.

*tām evādhipatiṃ kṛtveti satkāyadr̥ṣṭim / satkāyadr̥ṣṭibalena tad-  
utpatteḥ, satkāyadr̥ṣṭis tasyā adhipatiḥ / \*śāśvatata ucchedato veti  
– yat satkāyadr̥ṣṭyātmavena vastv ālambitam, tad eva śāśvatata  
iti nityataḥ, ucchedata ity ucchedo 'trāpratisandhiko vināśaḥ /  
samanupaśyato yā kliṣṭā prajñeti (TrBh: antagrāhadr̥ṣṭis teṣv  
eva pañcasūpādānaskandheṣv ātmātmīyatvena gṛhīteṣu yad  
ucchedataḥ śāśvatato vā darśanam) pūrvavad vācyam / iyaṃ ca  
madhyamāpratipanniryānaparipanthakarmikā / madhyamā prati-  
pac chāśvatocchedagrāhavarjitaṃ pratītyasamutpādayānānam //*

(TrBh adds: mithyādr̥ṣṭiḥ / yayā mithyādr̥ṣṭyā) **hetum vāpavadataḥ**  
(TrBh: vāpavadatai) **phalaṃ vā kriyāṃ vā sad vā vastu \*nāśayata**  
(TrBh: nāśayati sā sarvadarśanapāpatvān mithyādr̥ṣṭir ity ucyate)  
*ityādi –sucaritādikaṃ sugatidurgatī mātādikriyām arhadādikam ca  
yathākramam hetvādikam / kuśalamūlasamucchedakarmikākuśala-  
mūladṛḍhatāsanniśrayadānakarmikā ceyam / sā tu viśiṣṭaiva na  
sarvā //*

**dr̥ṣṭiparāmarśaḥ** katama iti / dr̥ṣṭyādīn paratvenāmṛṣatīti dr̥ṣṭi-  
parāmarśaḥ / tām eva ca trividhāṃ dr̥ṣṭim iti satkāyadr̥ṣṭim  
antagrāhadr̥ṣṭim mithyādr̥ṣṭim ca / tadāśrayāṃś ca skandhān iti / ye  
draṣṭur ātmabhāvasaṃśabdītāḥ, yān āśritya dr̥ṣṭayaḥ pravartante,  
te tadāśrayāḥ / (TrBh adds: pañcasūpādānaskandheṣv) **agrataḥ**  
**\*śreṣṭhato viśiṣṭataḥ** (TrBh **viśiṣṭataḥ śreṣṭhataḥ**) **paramata** (TrBh  
adds: ca yad darśanam) iti / ete 'grādayaḥ śabdās tulyārthā apy  
uttarottaravyākhyānatvenopāttāḥ / ayaṃ cāsaddr̥ṣṭyābhiniveśa-  
sanniśrayadānakarmakaḥ / dr̥ṣṭilakṣaṇasyābhiniveśasya guṇa-  
rūpeṇa grahaṇāt tadaparitṛyāgamukhena sarvadr̥ṣṭīnām ayaṃ  
sanniśraya ity uktaṃ bhavati //

**\*śīlam vratam** tadāśrayāṃś ca **skandhān** iti (TrBh: śīlavrata-  
parāmarśaḥ pañcasūpādānaskandheṣu) / dauḥśīlyaviratiḥ śīlam,  
veśavṛttakāyavākpravṛttiniyamo vratam / yān āśritya skandhān  
chīlam vratam vā pravartate, te śīlavratāśrayāḥ skandhāḥ /  
kutsitāṃ dr̥ṣṭim guṇato gṛhītvā tatpūrvakaṃ śīlam vratam vā para-  
tvenāmṛṣatīti śīlavrataparāmarśaḥ / ata eva śīlavrataparāmarśād  
dr̥ṣṭiparāmarśaḥ pūrva uktaḥ / śudhyate 'nena vā pāpācayanāt  
śīlena vratena ceti **\*suddhiḥ** / mucyate 'nena kleśabandhād iti  
**mukṭiḥ** / niryāty anena saṃsārād iti niryāṇam / niryāṇam eva

**nairyāniko** (TrBh: *śuddhito muktito nairyānikataś ca yad darśanam /* mokṣamārga ity arthaḥ / samanupaśyata iti nirūpayataḥ / śīle vrata vā śuddhyādyākārair abhiniveśātmikā prajñā śīlavrata-parāmarśaḥ / kliṣṭā tu viparītāmbanavāt / ayaṃ ca śramavai-phalyasanniśrayadānakarmakaḥ //

**vicikitsā** katamā / satyādiṣu yā **\*vimatir** iti / ādiśabdena **karmaphalaratnāni** (TrBh: *karmaphalasatyaratneṣu vimatiḥ*) gṛhyante / **dvidhā** (TrBh: *vividhā*) **matir vimatiḥ** – **syān na syād iti** / **prajñātaś ceyaṃ jātyantaram eva** (TrBh adds: *-uktā*) draṣṭavyā / sā kuśalapakṣāpravṛttisanniśrayadānakarmikā //

(TrBh adds: *tatra krodho*) **vartamānam** pratyutpannam, nānā-gatam aītaṃ vā / **apakāram āgamyety** apakāram gṛhītvety anena krodhasya viśayaṃ nirūpayati / krodho hy apakāravastuny eva *vartamāna eva pravartate, nānyatreṭi* / (TrBh adds: *yaś*) **cetasa āghāta** ity atrāpi vijñānasambandhitvaṃ svarūpaṃ ca nirūpitam / **ayaṃ cāghātasvarūpatvāt pratighān na bhidyate**, **\*kim tarhi pratighāṃśika** eva, **pratighasyāṃśe viśeṣe prajñaptatvāt** (TrBh *kim tv asya pratighasyāvasthāviśeṣe prajñaptatvāt pratighāṃśikah*) / **vartamānam apakāram adhikṛtya** (TrBh: *āgamyā instead of adhikṛtya*) **yaś cetasa āghātaḥ sattvāsattvaviśayo daṇḍādānādisanniśrayadānakarmakaś** (TrBh: *daṇḍadānā-*) **ca, sa krodha iti prajñapyate** //

(TrBh adds: *upanāho vairānubandhaḥ /*) **krodhād ūrdhvaṃ mamānenedam apakṛtam ity etasya** (TrBh: *asya*) **vairātma-kasyāśayasyānubandho** (TrBh: *-ānuśayasya-*) **'nutsargaḥ, prabandhena pravartanam upanāhaḥ** / (TrBh adds: *ayañ ca-*) **akṣāntisanniśrayadānakarmakaḥ / akṣāntir apakārāmarśanam, pratyapakāracikṛṣety** (TrBh adds: *ca*) arthaḥ / **ayaṃ ca** (TrBh: *api instead of ca*) **krodhavat pradveṣāvasthāviśeṣe prajñapyata iti \*prajñaptisan** (TrBh: *ataḥ prajñaptisann eva*) **veditavyaḥ** //

(TrBh adds: *mraṁśa ātmano 'vadyapracchādanā /*) **chandadveṣa-bhayādīms tirakṛtya** (TrBh: *nirākṛtya*) **kāle taddhitaiṣiṇā codakena** (TrBh adds: *taḥ*) **tvam evaṅkārīty anuyuktasya mohāṃśiky avadyapracchādanā mraṁśaḥ / mohāṃśikatvaṃ tu mraṁśasyāvaccchādanākāratvāt** / (TrBh: *mraṁśasya pracchādanākāratvāt / ayañ ca*) **kaukṛtyāsparśavihārasanniśrayadānakarmakaḥ / dharmataiṣā**

*yad avadyaṃ pracchādayataḥ kaukr̥tyam* (TrBh adds: *utpadyate*) / *kaukr̥tyāc cāvaśyaṃ daurmanasyena samprayogād asparśavihāra iti* //

(TrBh adds: *pradāśaś caṇḍavacodāśitā*) / *caṇḍaṃ vacaḥ pragāḍham pāruṣyaṃ marmaghaṭṭanayogena / daśanaśīlo dāśī / tadbhāvo dāśitā / ayaṃ ca bhāvapratyayaḥ svārthikaḥ / caṇḍena vacasā pradaśatīti caṇḍavacodāśitā pradāśaḥ / ayaṃ ca krodhopanāhapūrvanḡamaś* (TrBh: *-pūrvakaś*) *cetasa āghātasvabhāva iti pratighāṃśika eveti na dravyato vidyate / ayaṃ ca vāgduścaritaprasavanakarmako* (TrBh: *-prasavakarmakaḥ*) / *'sparśavihārakarmakaś ca / tadvataḥ pudgalasya duḥsaṃvāsavāt* //

(TrBh adds: *īrṣyā parasampattau cetaso vyāroṣaḥ / lābhasatkārādhyavasitasya*) *lābhasatkāraśīlaśrutādīn \*guṇān upalabhya* (TrBh: *guṇaviśeṣān parasyopalabhya*) *dveṣāṃśikaś* (TrBh adds: *amarśakṛtaś*) *cetaso vyāroṣa īrṣyā / svam āśayaṃ* (TrBh: *āśrayaṃ*) *vyāpya roṣo vyāroṣaḥ / daurmanasyasamprayogāt tatpūrvakaś cāsparśavihāra iti daurmanasyāsparśavihārakarmikā* (TrBh: *-karmikocyate*) //

(TrBh adds: *mātsaryam dānavirodhī cetasa āgrahaḥ*) / *upāttaṃ vastu dharmāmiśakaūśalātmakaṃ yena pūjānugrahakāmyayārthine 'narthine vā dīyate, tad dānam / tasmin sati dānābhāvāt tadvirodhīty ucyate / lābhasatkārādhyavasitasya jīvitopakaraṇeṣu rāgāṃśikaś cetasa āgraho 'parityāgeccā mātsaryam / idaṃ cāsamlekhasanniśrayadānakarmakam / asaṃlekhaḥ punar mātsaryeṇānupayujyamānānām apy upakaraṇānāṃ sannicayād veditavyaḥ* //

*māyā paravañcanāyā abhūtārthasandarśanā* (TrBh: *-saṃdarśanatā*) / *lābhasatkārādhyavasitasya paravañcanābhiprāyeṇānyathā vyavasthitasya* (TrBh: *-ānyathāvasthitasya*) *śīlāder arthasyānyathā prakāśanā / iyaṃ ca yābhyāṃ* (TrBh: *sahitābhyāṃ* instead of *yābhyāṃ*) *rāgamohābhyāṃ abhūtān guṇān prakāśayate*, (TrBh: *prakāśayatas*) *tayoḥ samuditayoḥ prajñapyate – iti krodhādivat prajñaptita eva, na dravyataḥ* (TrBh adds: *iti*) / *mithyājīvasanniśrayadānakarmikā / kāyavākkuhanopāttāḥ śayyāsanādāya upajīvyante, na ca vyāyāmalabdā iti mithyājīva ucyate* //

*śāthyaṃ katamat / svadoṣapracchādanopāyasaṅgrhītaṃ cetasaḥ kauṭilyam / svadoṣapracchādanopāyaḥ paravyāmohanam / tat*

*punar anyenānyat \*pratisarati kṣipaty* (TrBh: *pratisaran vikṣipaty*)  
*aparispḥuṭam vā pratipadyate / ata eva śāṭhyam mrakṣād*  
*bhidyate / sa hi parisphuṭam* (TrBh: *sphuṭam*) *eva pracchādayati*  
 (TrBh adds: *na kākṣvā*) / *svadoṣapracchādanopāyasaṅgrahas*  
*tannimittatvāt / cetasaḥ kauṭilyam vaṅkatā, yasya yogāc cittam*  
*ṛjumārgam na pratipadyate / idaṃ ca* (TrBh: *api* instead of *ca*)  
*lābhasatkārādhyavasito yābhyām* (TrBh: *-ādhyavasitopāyābhyām*)  
*rāgamohābhyām svadoṣapracchādanārtham paramohanāya*  
 (TrBh: *paravyāmohanāya*) *pravartate, tayoṛ eva sahitayos tat pra-*  
*jñapyate / idaṃ ca samyagavavādālābhaparipanthakarmakam /*  
*samyagavavāde* (TrBh: *-avavādasya*) *yo lābho yoniṣo manaskāraḥ,*  
 (TrBh: *manasikāras*) *tasyāntarāyam karotīti //*

*madaḥ svasampattau raktasyoddharṣaś cetasaḥ paryādānam /*  
*kulārogyarūpayauvanabalaiśvāryabuddhimedhādiprakarṣaḥ*  
 (TrBh: *kulārogyayauvanabalarūpaiśvāryabuddhimedhaprakarṣaḥ*)  
*svasampattiḥ / uddharṣo harṣaviśeṣaḥ / harṣaviśeṣam eva vyācaṣṭe*  
*– cetasaḥ paryādānam iti / yena harṣaviśeṣeṇa cittam asvatantrī-*  
*kṛtam* (TrBh: *asvatantrīkrīyate*) *tena tad ātmatantrīkaraṇāt*  
*paryātam bhavatīty ata* (TrBh: *etad* instead of *ata*) *uktam – cetasaḥ*  
*paryādānam iti / eṣa saṅkṣepaḥ – harṣaviśeṣasahitas trṣṇāprakāro*  
*mada iti / ayam ca sarvakleśopakleśasanniśrayadānakarmakaḥ //*

(TrBh adds: *vihimsā sattvaviheṭhanā*) *viidhair vadhabandhana-*  
*tādanatarjanādibhiḥ sattvānām hiṃsā vihimsā / viheṭhyante 'nayā*  
*sattvā vadhabandhanādibhir duḥkhadaurmanasyotpādanād iti*  
 (TrBh adds: *sattva-*) *viheṭhanā / sā punaḥ pratighāṃśikā nirghṛṇatā*  
*niṣkaruṇatā nirdayatā ca / etāś ca nirghṛṇatādayaḥ svayam*  
*vadhādiṃ kurvataḥ kārayataḥ paraiś ca kriyamāṇān drṣṭvā*  
*śrutvā vānumodataś ca yathākramaṃ boddhavyāḥ, uttarottara-*  
*vyākhyānato vā / eṣa tu saṅkṣepaḥ – pratighāṃśikā sattveṣu citta-*  
*rūkṣatā sattvaviheṭhanakarmikā vihimsety ucyate //*

(TrBh adds: *āhrīkyam svayam avadyenālajjā*) *nāsyā hrīr astīty*  
*ahrīḥ / sa yadyogād evam ucyate, \*hrīvipakṣabhūtam tad āhrīkyam /*  
*tasmīn karmany ātmanam ayogyam avekṣyamāṇasyāpi yāvadyenā-*  
*lajjā, sāhrīkyam* (TrBh: *tasmīn karmany ātmanam ayogyam*  
*manyamāṇasyāpi yāvadyenālajjā sāhrīkyam hrīvipakṣabhūtam*) //

(TrBh adds: *anapatrāpyam parato 'vadyenālajjā* /) *apatrapate*

'*nayety apatrāpyam / tadviparītam anapatrāpyam / lokaśāstra-  
viruddham etan mayā kriyata ity evam avagacchato 'pi yānayā*  
(TrBh: *yā tayā*) *pāpakriyāyālajjā, \*sānapatrāpyam* (TrBh:  
*sāpatrāpyavipakṣabhūtam anapatrāpyam*) / *etac ca dvayam api*  
*sarvakleśopakleśasāhāyyakarmakam / rāgadveṣamohaprakāreṣu*  
*sarvāsatkāryaprasavahetuṣu* (TrBh: *-prabhavahetuṣu*) *rāgadveṣayor*  
*ayaugapadyād yathāsambhavaṃ prajñāpyate, na \*svatantrē sta*  
(TrBh: *tu svatantram asti*) *iti //*

*styānaṃ \*cittākarmaṇyatā* (TrBh: *cittasyākarmaṇyatā staimityaṃ*) /  
*paryāyāntareṇa vyācaṣṭe – staimityam iti / stimitabhāvaḥ* (TrBh:  
*stimitasya bhāvaḥ*) *staimityam, yadyogāc cittaṃ jaḍībhāvāt* (TrBh:  
*-bhavati*) *stimitam iva bhavati, nālambanaṃ pratipattum utsahate*  
(TrBh: *samutsahate*) / *etac ca sarvakleśopakleśasāhāyyakarmakam /*  
*mohāṃśe prajñaptatvāc ca prajñaptita \*eva, na dravyataḥ* (TrBh:  
*mohāṃśīkam eva na prthag vidyate*) //

*auddhatyaṃ cittasyāvyaupāśamaḥ / vyupāśamo hi śamathaḥ / tad-  
viruddho 'vyupāśamaḥ / sa \*punā* (TrBh: *punar eṣa*) *rāgānukūlah*  
(TrBh: *-ānukūlaṃ*) *pūrvahasitaramitakrīḍitādya anusmarato*  
*rāgāṃśīkaś cetaso 'vyupāśamahetuḥ / śamathaparipanthakarma-  
kam* (TrBh: *-karmakaḥ*) //

(TrBh adds: *āśraddhyaṃ karmaphalasarvatneṣv anabhisam-  
pratyayaḥ śraddhāvīpakṣa* *iti / śraddhāstitvaguṇavattvaśakyatveṣv*  
(TrBh: *śraddhā hy astitva-*) *abhisampratyayaḥ prasādo 'bhilāṣaś ca*  
*yathākramam / āśraddhātadviparyayaṇāstitvaguṇavattvaśakyatveṣv*  
*asampratyayo* (TrBh: *anabhisampratyayo*) *'prasādo 'nabhilāṣaś ca*  
*/ kauśīdyasanniśrayadānakarmakam / āśraddhadhānasya prayoga-  
cchandābhāvāt kauśīdyasanniśrayadānakarmakatvam //*

(TrBh adds: *kausīdyam kuśale cetaso 'nabhyutsāho vīryavīpakṣaḥ /*  
*kuśale kāyavāñmanaḥkarmaṇi nidrāpārśvaśayanasukham āgamyā*  
*yo mohāṃśīkaś cetaso 'nabhyutsāhaḥ, sa kauśīdyam / kutsitaṃ sī-*  
*datīti kuśidaḥ / tadbhāvaḥ kauśīdyam, vīryavīpakṣaḥ / vīryavīpakṣa*  
*iti / vīryaṃ hi kuśalapakṣaprayoge cetaso 'bhyutsāhaḥ, tadvīpakṣa-*  
*tvāt kauśīdyam / etac ca kuśalapakṣaprayogaparipanthakarmakam //*

(TrBh adds: *pramādo yair lobhadveṣamohakausīdyaiḥ kleśād*  
*rāgadveṣamohādīkāc cittaṃ na rakṣati kuśalañ ca tatprati-*  
*pakṣabhūtaṃ na bhāvayati / teṣu*) *lobhadveṣamohakausīdyeṣu*

*pramādaḥ prajñapyate*, yathāvyākhyāteṣu / *ayaṃ cākuśalavṛddhi-kuśalaparihāṇisaṃniśrayadānakarmakaḥ* //

*muṣitasmr̥titā* (TrBh: *muṣitā smṛtiḥ*) *kliṣṭā smṛtiḥ* / *kliṣṭeti kleśa-samprayuktā* / *kuśalasyānābhilapanateti* – na hi kleśasamprayuktā *smṛtiḥ kleśēnābhinnaviṣayatvāt kuśalam abhilapitum samarthā* / *iyam ca vikṣepasanniśrayadānakarmikā* //

(TrBh adds: *vikṣepo rāgadveṣamohāṃśikaś cetaso visāraḥ* /) *vividhaṃ kṣipyate 'nena cittam iti vikṣepaḥ* / *yai rāgadveṣamohaiś cittam samādhyālanānād bahir visāryate* (TrBh: *kṣipyate* instead of *visāryate*), *teṣu yathāsambhavam upakleśātmako vikṣepaḥ prajñapyate* / *eṣa ca vairāgyaparipanthakarmakaḥ* //

*asamprajanyaṃ kleśasamprayuktā prajñā* / *yayāsamviditā kāyavākcittacaryābhikramapratikramādiṣu pravartate* (TrBh: *vartate*) / *karaṇīyākaraṇīyājñānāc* (TrBh adds: *etac*) *cāpattisanniśrayadānakarmakam* //

*kaukr̥tyaṃ cetaso vipratisāraḥ* / *kutsitaṃ kṛtam iti kukṛtam* / *tad-bhāvaḥ kaukr̥tyam* / (TrBh adds: *iha tu*) *kukṛtaviṣayaś cetaso vilekhaḥ kaukr̥tyam ucyate, caūtasikādhikārāt* / *abhipretam anabhipretam kuśalam akuśalam avyākṛtam kāle 'kāle yuktam ayuktam ca kṛtvākṛtvā vā mohāṃśikaś cetaso vipratisāraḥ kaukr̥tyam* / *tac* (TrBh: *etac*) *ca cittasthitiparipanthakarmakam* / *abhīratipūrvakaṃ yat kriyate, tad abhipretam* / *anabhipretam punaḥ parair balād avaṣṭabhya yat kāryate, kleśābhībhavād vā yat karoti* / *kālo yāvan na viramati, akālas tadūrdhvam* / *yuktam sthāne, ayuktam asthāne* / *tac cāpi trividham, kuśalam akuśalam avyākṛtam ca* / *mohāṃśikam ity upakleśasaṅgr̥hītam atra gṛhyate* //

*middham asvatantravṛttiś cetaso* (TrBh: *-vṛtticetaso*) *'bhisāṅkṣepaḥ* / *vṛttir ālambane pravṛttiḥ* / *sāsvatantrā cetaso yato bhavati, tan middham* / *kāyasandhāraṇāsamarthā vā vṛttiś cetaso 'svatantrā, sā yato bhavati, tan middham* / *anyato 'py asvatantrā vṛttiś cetaso bhavati* ity āha – *cetaso 'bhisāṅkṣepa iti* / *anyato 'py abhisāṅkṣepaś cetasa ity asvatantravṛttiś cetasa ity āha* / *abhisāṅkṣepaś cetasaś cakṣurādīndriyadvāreṇāpravṛttiḥ* / *sa punaḥ kuśalo 'kuśalo 'vyākṛtaś ca* / *middhanimittam daurbalyaśramakāyagauravāndhakāranimittamanasikaraṇādīkam āgamyā mohāṃśiko bhavati* / (TrBh adds: *etac ca mohāṃśe prajñapanān mohāṃśikam*) *kṛtyāti-*



*pattisanniśrayadānakarmakam* (TrBh adds: *ca*) / *atra cākuśala eva mohāṃśīkah, nānyah* //

*vitarkah paryeṣako manojalpaś cetanāprajñāviśeṣah* (TrBh: *prajñācetanāviśeṣah*) / *paryeṣakah kim etad iti nirūpaṇākārapravṛttah* / *\*manahsvabhāvo* (TrBh: *manaso*) *jalpo manojalpaḥ* / *jalpa iva jalpo* (TrBh adds: / *jalpo*) *’rthakathanam* / *cetanāprajñāviśeṣa iti cetanāyās cittapariśpandātmakatvāt prajñāyās ca guṇadoṣa-vivekākārāt* / *tadvaśena citta-pravṛtteḥ kadācic cittacetanayor vitarkaprajñaptiḥ, kadācit prajñācetasoḥ, yathākramam abhyūhānabhyūhāvasthāyoḥ* (TrBh: *anabhyūhābhyūhāvasthāyoḥ*) / *athavā cetanāprajñayor eva vitarkaprajñaptiḥ, tadvaśena citta-sya tathā pravṛttatvāt* / *eṣa ca nayo vicāre ’pi draṣṭavyah* / *\*cittasyaudārikateti* (TrBh: *sa eva cittasyaudārikatā* / *audārikateti*) *sthūlatā vastumātraparyeṣaṇākārāt* //

(TrBh adds: *eṣa ca nayo vicāre ’pi draṣṭavyah*) *vicārah* (TrBh adds: *’pi hi cetanāprajñāviśeṣātmakah* /) *pratyavekṣako manojalpaḥ* (TrBh adds: *eva*), *idaṃ tad iti pūrvādhigatanirūpaṇāt* / *\*tathaiva* (TrBh: *ata eva ca*) *cittasya sūkṣmateti* (TrBh: *cittasūkṣmateti*) / *tathaiveti cetanāprajñāviśeṣah* / *paryeṣaṇato vastupratyavekṣaṇākārāt* / *sūkṣma ucyate* / *etau ca sparsāsparśavihārasanniśrayadānakarmakau* / *anayoś caudārikasūkṣmavyavasthānāt* (TrBh: *-sūkṣmatayā vyavasthāpanāt*) *prthakkaraṇam* //

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

- AKBh *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (Vasubandhu), ed. by P. Pradhan, Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1967.
- AS *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (Asaṅga), ed. by V. V. Gokhale, “Fragments from the Abhidharmasamuccaya of Asaṅga,” *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 23 (1947): 13–38.
- AS\* Passages of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* retranslated into Sanskrit (from the Tibetan and Chinese translations) by P. Pradhan, Santiniketan: Visva-Bharati, 1950.
- AS(T) *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, Tibetan translation, Derge 4049.

- ASBh *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* (Buddhasiṃha or Jinaputra), ed. by N. Tatia, Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1976.
- ASBh(T) *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*, Tibetan translation, Derge 4053.
- D Derge Bstan 'gyur. New Delhi: Delhi Karmapae Chodhey Gyalwae Sungrab Partun Khang 1982–1986.
- Xianyang *Xianyang shengjiao lun* 顯揚聖教論, Taishō 1602.
- KSi *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa* (Vasubandhu), ed. by É. Lamotte in *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques* 4, 1935/36: 183–205.
- P Peking Bstan 'gyur. Kyoto/Tokyo: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute 1955–1961.
- PSk *Pañcaskandhaka* (Vasubandhu). See Li and Steinkellner 2008.
- PSkBh *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya* (author unknown, probably not \*Pṛthivī-bandhu), Derge 4068.
- PSkV *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* (Sthiramati), ed. by J. Kramer, Beijing/Vienna: China Tibetology Publishing House/Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2014.
- PSkV(T) *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* (Sthiramati), Tibetan translation, Derge 4066.
- PSkViv *Pañcaskandhavivaraṇa* (Guṇaprabha), Derge 4067.
- ŚrBh *Śrāvākabhūmi*, ed. by Alex Wayman, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961.
- TrBh *Triṃśikā(vijñapti)bhāṣya* (Sthiramati). See Buescher 2007.
- YBh *Yogācārabhūmi*, ed. by V. Bhattacharya, Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1957.
- YBh(T) *Yogācārabhūmi*, Tibetan translation, Derge 4035–4042.

## Secondary Sources

- Ahn, Sung-doo (2003). *Die Lehre von den kleśas in der Yogācārabhūmi*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Assmann, Jan and Gladigow, Burkhard, eds. (1995). *Text und Kommentar: Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation IV*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Bhattacharya, Ram Shankar (1955). “Kinds of Expositions in Sanskrit Literature.” *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 36: 123–132.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1991). “Two Literary Conventions of Classical India.” *Asiatische Studien* 45: 210–227.

- Brückner, Heidrun (1995). "Bewahren und Erneuern: Philosophische Kommentartraditionen im indischen Mittelalter." In: Assmann and Gladigow 1995: 237–247.
- Buescher, Hartmut (2007). *Sthiramati's Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya. Critical editions of the Sanskrit text and its Tibetan translation*. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.
- (2010). "Review Article: Vasubandhu's *Pañcaskandhaka*." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 53: 331–358.
- Cabezón, José Ignacio (2001). "Authorship and Literary Production in Classical Buddhist Tibet." In *Changing Minds: Contributions to the Study of Buddhism and Tibet in Honor of Jeffrey Hopkins*, Guy Newland (ed.), Ithaca: Snow Lion Publications, 233–264.
- Chimpa, Lama and Chattopadhyaya, Alaka (1997). *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. (First published in 1970.)
- Engle, Artemus B. (2009). *The Inner Science of Buddhist Practice: Vasubandhu's Summary of the Five Heaps with Commentary by Sthiramati*. Ithaca: Snow Lion Publications.
- Freschi, Elisa (2011). "Proposals for the Study of Quotations in Indian Philosophical Texts." *Religions of South Asia* 6 (2): 161–189.
- Ganeri, Jonardon (2011). *The Lost Age of Reason: Philosophy in Early Modern India 1450–1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Griffiths, Paul J. (1990). "Painting Space with Colors: Tathāgatagarbha in the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*-Corpus IX.22–37." In *Buddha Nature: A Festschrift in Honor of Minoru Kiyota*, Paul J. Griffiths and John P. Keenan (eds.), Reno: Buddhist Books International, 41–63.
- Hayashima, Osamu (1983). "Chos yoñs su tshol ba'i skabs or Dharmaparyeṣṭy Adhikāra: The XIth Chapter of the *Sūtrālaṅkāravṛttibhāṣya*, Sub-commentary on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*, Part V." *Bulletin of the Faculty of Education, Nagasaki University* 32: 11–23.
- von Hinüber, Oskar (2007). "Buddhistische Kommentare aus dem alten Indien: Die Erklärung des Theravāda-Kanons." In: Quisinsky and Walter 2007: 99–114.
- Houben, Jan E. M. (1997). "*Sūtra* and *Bhāṣyasūtra* in Bhartrhari's *Mahābhāṣya* Dīpikā: On the Theory and Practice of a Scientific and Philosophical Genre." In *India and Beyond: Aspects of Literature, Meaning, Ritual and Thought – Essays in Honour of Frits Staal*, Dick van der Meij (ed.), London: Kegan Paul International in association with International Institute for Asian Studies (Leiden), 271–305.
- (1999). "On Syntactic and Stylistic Evidence Regarding the Authorship of the *Vākyapadīya-vṛtti*." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 43: 167–197.

- de Jong, J. W. (1973). Review of Walpola Rahula, *Le compendium de la super-doctrine (philosophie) (Abhidharmasamuccaya) d'Asaṅga*. *T'oung Pao* 59: 339–346.
- Karmay, Samten (1988). *The Great Perfection (rDzogs chen): A Philosophical and Meditative Teaching in Tibetan Buddhism*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kramer, Jowita (2012). “Descriptions of ‘Feeling’ (*Vedanā*), ‘Ideation’ (*Sañjñā*), and ‘the Unconditioned’ (*Asaṃskṛta*) in Vasubandhu’s *Pañcaskandhaka* and Sthiramati’s *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*.” *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 65 (1): 120–139.
- (2013a). “A Study of the *Saṃskāra* Section of Vasubandhu’s *Pañcaskandhaka* (with Reference to Its Commentary by Sthiramati).” In *The Foundation for Yoga Practitioners: The Buddhist Yogācārabhūmi Treatise and Its Adaptation in India, East Asia, and Tibet*, Ulrich Timme Kragh (ed.), Harvard Oriental Series, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 986–1035.
- (2013b). “Notes on the *Rūpa* Section of the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*.” *China Tibetology* 21: 86–99.
- (2014). “Indian Abhidharma Literature in Tibet: The Section on *Vijñāna* in Sthiramati’s *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*.” In *Buddhism Across Asia: Networks of Material, Intellectual and Cultural Exchange*, Tansen Sen (ed.), Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 309–325.
- (forthcoming). “Some Remarks on the Proofs of the ‘Store Mind’ (*Ālaya-vijñāna*) and the Development of the Concept of *Manas*.” Forthcoming in *Text, Philosophy, and History: Abhidharma across Buddhist Scholastic Traditions* (Proceedings of the Conference “From Abhidhamma to Abhidharma,” Ghent 2013), Bart Dessein and Weijen Teng (eds.), Leiden: Brill.
- Krasser, Helmut (2011). “How to Teach a Buddhist Monk to Refute the Outsiders: Text-critical Remarks on Some Works by Bhāviveka.” *Journal of Rare Buddhist Texts Research Department* 51: 49–76.
- Lele, Vāmana Keśava (1981). *The Doctrine of the Tantrayukti-s*. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surabharati Prakashan.
- Li, Xuezhu and Steinkellner, Ernst (2008). *Vasubandhu’s Pañcaskandhaka*. Beijing/Vienna: China Tibetology Publishing House/Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.
- Manevskaia, Ilona (2008). “Preliminary Observations on Compositional Methods in Haribhadra’s *Ālokā*.” In *Papers of the 12<sup>th</sup> World Sanskrit Conference (Vol. 8): Buddhist Studies*, Richard Gombrich and Cristina Scherrer-Schaub (eds.), Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 97–117.
- Martin, Dan (2002). “Gray Traces: Tracing the Tibetan Teaching Transmission of the *Mñon pa kun btus (Abhidharmasamuccaya)* through the Early Period of Disunity.” In *The Many Canons of Tibetan Buddhism*:

*PIATS 2000, Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the Ninth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Leiden 2000*, Helmut Eimer and David Germano (eds.), Leiden: Brill, 335–357.

- Matsuda, Kazunobu (1984). “Vasubandhu ni okeru sankie no kitei to sono ōyō” Vasubandhu における三帰依の規定とその応用 (“Prescription for Taking Refuge in the Triratna and Its Application in Vasubandhu”). *Bukkyōgaku seminā* 仏教学セミナー (*Buddhist Seminar*) 39: 1–16.
- Most, Glenn W. (1999). *Commentaries – Kommentare*. Göttingen: Vadenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Nance, Richard F. (2012). *Speaking for Buddhas: Scriptural Commentary in Indian Buddhism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Oberhammer, Gerhard, ed. (1996). *Terminologie der frühen philosophischen Scholastik in Indien*. Vol. 2, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Olivelle, Patrick (2004). “Manu and the Arthaśāstra: A Study in Śāstric Intertextuality.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 32: 281–291.
- Preisendanz, Karin (2008). “Text, Commentary, Annotation: Some Reflections on the Philosophical Genre.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 36: 599–618.
- Quisinsky, Michael and Walter, Peter, eds. (2007). *Kommentarkulturen: Die Auslegung zentraler Texte der Weltreligionen – ein vergleichender Überblick*. Köln: Böhlau Verlag.
- Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli (1923). *Indian Philosophy*. Vol. 1, London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Raible, Wolfgang (1995). “Arten des Kommentierens – Arten der Sinnbildung – Arten des Verstehens: Spielarten der generischen Intertextualität.” In: Assmann and Gladigow 1995: 51–73.
- Schmithausen, Lambert (1969). *Der Nirvāṇa-Abschnitt in der Viniścaya-saṃgrahaṇī der Yogācārabhūmi*. Wien: Kommissionsverlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- (1987). *Ālayavijñāna: On the Origin and the Early Development of a Central Concept of Yogācāra Philosophy*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Schoening, Jeffrey (1995). *The Śālistamba Sūtra and Its Indian Commentaries*. Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.
- Skilling, Peter (2000). “Vasubandhu and the Vyākhyāyukti Literature.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 23 (2): 297–350.
- Slaje, Walter (2007). “Der Sanskrit-Kommentar.” In: Quisinsky and Walter 2007: 69–97.

- Sluiter, Ineke (1999). "Commentaries and the Didactic Tradition." In: Most 1999: 173–205.
- von Stietencron, Heinrich (1995). "Typisierung und Sitz im Leben: Anmerkungen zum Kommentar in Indien." In: Assmann and Gladigow 1995: 249–255.
- Tubb, Gary A. and Boose, Emery R. (2007). *Scholastic Sanskrit: A Handbook for Students*. New York: American Institute of Buddhist Studies at Columbia University.
- Verhagen, Pieter C. (2005). "Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Hermeneutics (4): The *Vyākhyāyukti* by Vasubandhu." *Journal Asiatique* 293 (2): 559–602.
- (2008). "Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Hermeneutics (6): Validity and Valid Interpretation of Scripture according to Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti*." In *Papers of the 12<sup>th</sup> World Sanskrit Conference (Vol. 8): Buddhist Studies*, Richard Gombrich and Cristina Scherrer-Schaub (eds.), Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 233–258.