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Vasubandhu and the Vyākhyāyukti Literature

Justly famed for his Abhidharmakośa, for his Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi, and other works, Vasubandhu looms large in the history of Indian Buddhism. But despite his fame one of his most important works is scarcely known to modern scholarship. This is the Vyākhyāyukti, or “Principles of Exegesis”, preserved in Tibetan translation. The work was enormously influential, both in India and Tibet. Its importance in India may be seen, for example, in the Nibandhana on the Arthaviniścayasūtra composed by Vīryaśrīdatta at Nālandā during the reign of Dharmapāla (later half of the eighth century), or in the work of Vīryaśrīdatta’s contemporary Haribhadra. At the same time the Vyākhyāyukti played a key role in the formulation of the theoretical principles adopted for the great task of translating Indian texts from Sanskrit into Tibetan, as attested by the sGra sbyor bam po gniś pa (Madhyavyutpatti). The earliest manuscript witnesses of the Vyākhyāyukti are in the collections of Dunhuang (ca. 9th-11th century) and Tabo (ca. 11th-13th century). In Tibet its continued influence may be seen in the Entrance Gate for the Wise (mKhas pa 'jug pa'i sgo) composed by Sa-skya Paṇḍita (1182-1251/2), in Bu-ston’s History of Buddhism (Chos 'byun, composed in 1321), and in written and oral teachings up to the present day.

I. The Problem of Authorship: The Works of Vasubandhu the Kośakāra

Numerous works are attributed to a Vasubandhu in the colophons of Sanskrit manuscripts, in Tibetan and Chinese translation, or by historical traditions.1 Debate continues as to whether Vasubandhu the Kośakāra –

References to the Pāli canon are to the editions of the Pali Text Society. References to the Pāli commentaries are to Nālandā or Mahāmakuṭa editions, as specified. P = Daisetz T. Suzuki (ed.), The Tibetan Tripiṭaka, Peking Edition, Tokyo-Kyoto (“Otani Reprint”). BST = Buddhist Sanskrit Text Series, Mithila Institute, Darbhanga. Sigla and references for the Vyākhyāyukti texts are given in Appendix 8. I am grateful to Cristina Scherrer-Schaub and Christoph Cüppers for their valuable comments.

1. See Hajime NAKAMURA, Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes, Tokyo 1980, pp. 268-73 for a list, with detailed bibliography, of works attributed to Vasubandhu.
the author of the *Abhidharmakośa* – later “converted” to the Mahāyāna, and composed the Vijñaptivādin and Mahāyāna works ascribed to him by tradition, or whether the latter were composed by another, earlier Vasubandhu. I do not intend here to rehearse the theses and countertheses that have been proposed, or to discuss all of the works attributed to Vasubandhu, or to wrestle with the problem of his date. Rather, I will only deal with a group of twelve works for which I believe there to be sufficient internal or external evidence to assert that they were composed by the Kośakāra. I use two main criteria. The first is cross-references in the works of Vasubandhu himself or those of his commentators. These establish that the works are related: that they were known to and accepted by Vasubandhu, or held by representatives of his lineage to be his own compositions. The second criterion is style. Vasubandhu’s prose style is distinctive: it is confident and learned, replete with citations and allusions to canonical and other literature, and to the opinions of different teachers or schools. It often employs debate: an “opponent” raises an objection, which is resolved through recourse to reasoning or scripture. Vasubandhu’s prose cannot be mistaken for that of, say, Asaṅga or Candrakīrti. His verse is terse: compact, concise, mnemonic,

it could not be mistaken for that of Nāgārjuna or Śāntideva. Applying these criteria I classify the works into two groups:

(1) Works shown to be by the Kośakāra on the evidence of internal cross-references or references by Vasubandhu’s commentators, and confirmed by style, sources used, methodology, and development of ideas: the Vyākhya-yukti, the Karmasiddhiprakarana, the Pratītyasamutpādādīvibhaṅganirdeśa, and the Pañcaskandhaprakarana;

(2) Works that may be accepted as by the Kośakāra on the evidence of style, sources used, methodology, and development of ideas: the Gāthā-saṃgraha texts (and their excerpt, the Ekagāthābhāśya), the Viṃśatikā, the Trīṃśikā, and the Trīsvabhāvanirdeśa.3

(1) Vyākhya-yukti and (2) Vyākhya-yuktisūtrakhaṇḍaśata

The Vyākhya-yukti and the Vyākhya-yuktisūtrakhaṇḍaśata are interdependent. Without reference to the Vyākhya-yukti, the Vyākhya-yuktisūtra-khaṇḍaśata is a random collection of brief passages from the scriptures. Without reference to the Vyākhya-yuktisūtrakhaṇḍaśata, the Vyākhya-yukti is incomplete, since the latter gives the extracts in abbreviation. Given this interdependence, there is no reason to doubt that the two works are indeed by the same author – Vasubandhu, according to the colophons.

External evidence – the evidence of authors within the commentarial tradition of Vasubandhu’s works – supports the claim that the Vasubandhu of the Abhidharmakośa is that of the Vyākhya-yukti. Yaśomitra,

3. That I do not mention other works ascribed to Vasubandhu, such as the commentaries on the Madhyāntavibhāga and the Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra, etc., does not mean that I attribute them to a “second Vasubandhu”, but simply that I have not had the leisure to examine them thoroughly. For a proposal that the author of the commentary on the latter was not Vasubandhu but Asaṅga, see Alex WAYMAN, “Doctrinal Affiliation of the Buddhist Master Asaṅga,” in Amalā Prajñā (see n. 2), pp. 202-03. For a careful assessment of the authorship of the Aksayamatinirdeśa-sūtra, see Jens BRAARVIG, Aksayamatinirdeśa-sūtra, Vol. II, The Tradition of Imperishability in Buddhist Thought, Oslo 1993, pp. cxvii-cxxx. For the *Sukhāvatīvyūhāpadeśa, a treatise on the Pure Land attributed to Vasubandhu and preserved only in Chinese, see Minoru KIYOTA, “Buddhist Devotional Meditation: A Study of the Sukhāvatīvyūhāpadeśa,” in Minoru KIYOTA (ed.), Mahāyāna Buddhist Meditation: Theory and Practice, Honolulu 1978, pp. 249-96; Jean ERACLE: Aux sources du Bouddhisme Mahāyāna: Trois sūtras et un traité sur la Terre Pure, Geneva 1984, pp. 293-323; Hisao INAGAKI: Ōjōronchū: T’an-luan’s Commentary on Vasubandhu’s Discourse on the Pure Land: A Study and Translation, Kyoto 1998.
in his Vyākhya on the Abhidharmakośa, discusses the case taken by the verb namaś-kṛ, and states anenaiva acāryena vyākhyāyuktau “namaś-kṛtya muninī mūrdhnā” iti.4 The citation is from line d of the first of the opening verses of the Vyākhyāyukti (32a1), thub la spyi bos phyag ’tsal te. Anenaiva acāryena, “this same master”, refers to Vasubandhu as author of the Abhidharmakośa, and credits him with the authorship of the Vyākhyāyukti.

Beyond this, Vasubandhu himself refers to the Vyākhyāyukti in his Karmasiddhīprakaraṇa:5

rnam par bsd pa’i rigs pa las kyi lden san mdo sde thams cad ni mi snaṅ ges bsgrubs te.

It has been proven in the Vyākhyāyukti that “the complete [corpus] of sūtras is today no longer extant”.

The reference is to Vyākhyāyukti 114b1 foll., which deals with “the lost portions of the canon”. While it establishes that Vasubandhu knew the Vyākhyāyukti and held it to be authoritative in at least this case, the reference does not absolutely establish common authorship. However, the style of the reference is unusual in Vasubandhu’s works, and to me suggests a cross-reference to one of his own works.6 In the Vyākhyāyukti itself (124b4), Vasubandhu refers back to the same subject with similar phrasing:

san s rgyas kyi gsun mtha’ dag ni lden san m snaṅ no žes de skad kyi bstan zin to.

That the complete teachings of the Buddha are today no longer extant has already been explained.


6. Traditional sources ascribe a certain vanity to Vasubandhu, and it strikes me as rather rare for him to refer favourably to another śastra – outside of the canon – as having established anything.
Another of Vasubandhu’s works, the *Pratītyasamutpādādīvibhaṅga-nirdeśa* (23b2), contains a reference to the *Abhidharmakośa*:

\[
\text{de dag ji ltar rdzas su yod pa ma yin pa ni chos m ön pa'i mdzod las śes par bya'o.}
\]

How [the *viprayuktasaṃskāras*] are not substantial entities (*dravya*) may be known from the *Abhidharmakośa*.

Asaṅga makes cross-references to sections of his *Yogācārabhūmi*, as does Buddhaghosa to his *Visuddhimagga* in his *Āṭṭhakathā*. It is natural that Vasubandhu – like any prolific writer – should do the same.

Explaining the phrase “listen, and bear well and carefully in mind” (*śṛṇu sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca manasi kuru*) – an injunction with which the Buddha frequently opens a discourse – the *Vyākhyaśūkti* (135a3-7) gives three similes for the “faults of a listener”:

1. an overturned pot: even though it rains, it will not collect water;
2. a dirty pot: water added to it will become polluted;
3. a leaky pot: it will not hold the water.

The same similes (the first of which occurs at *Aṅguttaranikāya* I 130,5 foll.) are given in the *Pratītyasamutpādādīvibhaṅganirdeśa*, both in its Tibetan version and in a surviving Sanskrit fragment, and in the *Gāthārthaśaṁgrahaśāstra*. In his *Abhisamayālaṃkāralokā*, Haribhadra, commenting on the same phrase, gives the similes, concluding with *evam hi śravanaṁ saphalam ity ācārya vasubandhuh*: “thus is listening [to the Dharma] fruitful: so says Ācārya Vasubandhu”.

11. U. WOJIGARA (ed.), *Abhisamayālaṃkāralokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā the Work of Haribhadra*, The Toyo Bunko, Tokyo, [1932] 1973, pp. 137,26-138,6. It is not clear from which of Vasubandhu’s works Haribhadra has taken the similes – if he is not paraphrasing – since his citation does not agree exactly with any of the three works of Vasubandhu that give them.
Similes are given in the Arthaviniścayasaūtranibandhana and the Arthaviniścayaṭīkā. In Tibet they have enjoyed an enduring popularity, from the time of sGam po pa and Bu ston, both of whom cite them, up to the present, having become part of the standard instruction on how to listen to the Dharma.

On the basis of the evidence presented above – that of Vasubandhu himself, of Yasomitra, and of style and thought – I conclude that the Vyākhyāyuktī was composed by the Kośakāra, and that it preceded his composition of the Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa.

(3) Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa

The common authorship of the Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa and the Abhidharmakośa was accepted by LAMOTTE, who edited the Tibetan and translated it into French. Since the Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa is posterior to the Vyākhyāyuktī, which contains a brilliant defence of the Mahāyāna, LAMOTTE’s conclusion that the former is not a Mahāyāna work (pp. 175-79) cannot be sustained. Internal evidence, of which LAMOTTE was aware but chose to interpret differently, also supports its affiliation with the Mahāyāna: Vasubandhu’s citation of the Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra

12. N.H. SAMTANI (ed.): The Arthaviniścaya-sūtra & its Commentary (Nibandhana), K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna 1971 (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series XIII); 83,6-13; Arthaviniścayaṭīkā, P5852, Vol. 145, 10a4-10b4.


as “spoken by the Blessed One”, his presentation of the Yogācāra classification of the “store consciousness” (ālayavijñāna, p. 197,8 foll.), and (perhaps) his closing verse (p. 204,33) with the dedication of merit in order that the world may realize Buddhahood. I conclude that the Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa was composed by Vasubandhu as an advocate of the Mahāyāna, but addressed primarily to adherents of the Śrāvakayāna.

(4) Pratītyasamutpādādivibhaṅganirdeśa

The Pratītyasamutpādādivibhaṅganirdeśa is preserved in Tibetan translation (P5496, Vol. 104) and in a few Sanskrit fragments from Nepal, published by Tucci who accepted its common authorship with the Kośa. Like the Vyākhya and Gāthārthaśaṃgrahaśāstra it depends on the sūtra literature, in this case on the Pratītyasamutpādādivibhaṅga-sūtra, upon which it is a commentary. Mainly in prose, it also contains saṃgrahaśloka (8a2) and summarizing verses introduced as gāthā (17a2, 18a3, 20a5, etc.). It resembles the other works of Vasubandhu in style and methodology; it cites or refers to many of the same sūtras, and contains many of the same ideas or arguments. Like the Vyākhya and the Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa, it refers to the Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra (25b5); like the Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa and the Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa (see following) it accepts the ālayavijñāna (24b2 foll.). Its defence of that concept is couched in similar terms to that of the Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa. It also refers to the Yogācārabhūmi (5b2, 13a1, 25b4), in one place citing it at length on the definition of ignorance (avidyā).


Again like the Vyākhya-yukti, it was commented upon by Guṇamati (see below). I have not found any indications of its chronology relative to the Vyākhya-yukti and the Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa.

(5) Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa

The short prose Treatise on the Five Aggregates (P5560, Vol. 113; = PSP) deals with the ālayavijnāna when discussing the vijnānaskandha. Yaśomitra cites the treatise four times in his Kośavyākhyā:

1. Kośavyākhyā 1:33ab, p. 89,23-25 (P5593, Vol. 116, 68b2-4) = PSP 16a3-4: tathā hy anena pañcaskandhake uktam: vitarkaḥ katamaḥ ... ;
3. Kośavyākhyā 3:32b, p. 477,25-478,14 (P5593, Vol. 116, 346a7-346b3) = PSP 14a3-5: yathā pañcaskandhake likhitam ... chandaḥ katamaḥ ... ity evam ādiḥ pañcaskandhakagraṇthe draṣṭavyah;
4. Kośavyākhyā 3:32b, p. 478,14-16 (P5593, Vol. 116, 346b3-4) = PSP 14a1: tatra hy uktam: pañca sarvatraga. ...

In the first two references, Yaśomitra attributes the work to the Kośa-kāra (anena ... uktam; anenaivācāryeṇa likhitam).

Three commentaries on the Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa – by Sthiramati (P5567, Vol. 114), Guṇaprabha (P5568, Vol. 114), and Prthivībandhu (P5569, Vol. 114) – are preserved in Tibetan translation. At the beginning of his commentary (sems tsam, hi, 67b2), Guṇaprabha states that one should open a treatise (sastra) by paying respect (mchod par brjod pa) to one’s teacher [the Buddha]. There is, however, no such statement in the Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa. Guṇaprabha explains the omission:

mchod par brjod pa ni mdzod kyi bstan bcos (corr. from bstan chos) la sogs pa de ŋid 'dir blta bar bya ste, bsam pa des na slob dpon gyis 'dir mchod par brjod pa ma byas so.

[Since there is no such opening in the Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa,] the statement of homage given in the Kośaśāstra (mdzod kyi bstan bcos), etc., should be supplied here: with this in mind, the Ācārya [Vasubandhu] did not compose [a new] statement of homage here [in the Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa].

Gunaprabha cites kārikās from the Kośa as authoritative (67b7 = kārikā 1:3ab; 93b8 = kārikā 1:17ab), cites sūtras as cited in the Kośa, and paraphrases the Kośabhāṣya.

Prthivibandhu also deals with the subject of homage at the beginning of his commentary (sems tsam hi, 101b2):

\[
\text{de la gtsug lag 'di yan mñoñ pa'i chos mdzod la 'jug pa'i sgo lta bur gyur pa dañ de 'i yan lag tu gtogs la, bstod pa'i cho ga ni mñoñ pa'i chos mdzod kyi mgor gleñs zin pas, der 'dus pa'i phyir 'dir logs šig tu ma bśad do.}
\]

This treatise [the Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa] is like a gateway to the Abhidharma-kosa and is counted as a supplement to or part of (yan lag = aṅga) that work. The rite of homage has been spoken at the beginning of the Abhidharma-kosa; since the former [the Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa] is included in the latter [the Abhidharma-kosa], it is not given separately.

Prthivibandhu states that the Kośa is addressed to one who understands a developed exposition (vipañcitajña), the Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa to one who understands a condensed exposition (udghaṭitajña) (102a3):

\[
\text{de la spros pas śes pa ni gśuñ žib tu bśad na don rtogs par 'gyur ba ste; de dag gi don du ni mñoñ pa'i chos mdzod la sogs pa yan dgos par 'gyur ro. gleñs pas śes pa ni mād tsam du bstan na don mān du khoñ du chud par 'gyur ba ste; de 'i phyir gtsug lag 'di brtsams pa don med par ma yin te.}
\]

Thus both Gunaprabha and Prthivibandhu, like Yaśomitra, attribute the Kośa and the Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa to the same Vasubandhu, and treat the latter as a natural continuation of the former. LA VALLEE POUSSIN’s notes show other places in which alternate definitions proposed by the Kośakāra reappear in the Pañcaskandhaka.20 DANTINNE (op. cit., pp. xxiii-xxiv) has noted the relationship between the Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa and the Abhidharma-kosa, Asaṅga’s Abhidharma-samuccaya, and the Trimsīkā-kārikās.

(6) Gāthāsaṃgrahaśāstra, (7) Gāthārthaśaṃgrahaśāstra, (8) Ekagāthā-bhāṣya21

What we may call the “Gāthāsaṃgraha literature” is similar to the “Vyākhyāyukti literature” in that it consists (primarily) of two inter-


dependent works: the Gāthāsamgrahaśāstra (P5603) — a collection of 21 verses drawn from canonical Śrāvakayāna texts such as the Udana-varga — and the Gāthārthasamgrahaśāstra (P5604), a prose commentary on the verses. The latter cites, without naming them, the Abhidharmakośa (Kārikā and Bhāṣya), cites sūtra passages identical to those of the "Hundred Extracts", and contains several passages common to the Vyākyāyukti and the Pratītyasamutpādādīvibhaṅganirdeśa. It also adopts a number of explanations from works of Asaṅga such as the Abhidharmasamuccaya. The definition of Vaipulya in the Gāthārthasamgrahaśāstra (246a3), unlike that in the Vyākyāyukti, does not mention the Mahāyāna:

śīr tu rgyas pa'i sde ni don rgyas par ston pa'o. gzan dag ni gzan dag tu brjod de, 'phags pa dge 'dun phal chen sde pa rnams kyi 'don pa kho na lta bu'o žes so.

The Vaipulya explains a topic at length. Others define it differently as "[scriptures] recited by the Ārya Mahāsāṃghikas".

The Gāthārthasamgrahaśāstra does not cite or refer to any Mahāyāna texts or contain any uniquely Mahāyāna ideas, but it does resort to Asaṅga’s Abhidharmasamuccaya as a major source. Until a complete study has been made, I would tentatively describe it as anterior to the Vyākyāyukti. At any rate, since it relies heavily on the Abhidharmakośa, it cannot be by the “elder Vasubandhu".

The first verse of the Gāthāsamgrahaśāstra (240a2-3), along with its commentary from the Gāthārthasamgrahaśāstra (241a7-242b4), occurs as a separate work in the Tanjur under the title Ekagāthabhāṣya (Tshigs su bcad pa gcig pa'i bṣad pa, P5488, Vol. 104), also ascribed to Vasubandhu. The Ekagāthabhāṣya may therefore be classed with the


"Gāthāsamgraha literature". The verse, from the Virūpa-avadāna of the Avadānaśataka, is also cited in the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya.

A commentary, the Ekagāthāṭikā (P2063, Vol. 46) is ascribed to Dignāga, who also composed a brief commentary on the Abhidharmakośa, the Marmapradīpa. Dignāga’s authorship of the latter and his connection with Vasubandhu has been questioned by some scholars; the Ekagāthāṭikā may be added to evidence in favour of the tradition.

I hope to have demonstrated so far that these six works were composed by Vasubandhu the Kośakāra. From these works we can extract doctrinal criteria that can be used to determine the authenticity of other works attributed to Vasubandhu. Three of them expound the theory of the ālayavijñāna; three of them cite or refer to the Sāṃdhinirmocanasūtra as authoritative. Since that sūtra is the main source for the theory of the three svabhāvas, we may assume that Vasubandhu accepted that theory.

Works traditionally attributed to Vasubandhu that deal with these subjects in a style similar to that of the above-mentioned works can be accepted as by the Kośakāra.

(9) Viṃśatikākārikā and (10) Viṃśatikābhāṣya

Like the Vyākhya-yukti, the Pratītyasamutpādādivibhaṅganirdeśa, and the Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa, this is a Mahāyāna work addressed primarily to adherents of the Śrāvakayāna. The prose auto-commentary resembles


these works stylistically, and its arguments are based on the doctrines and lore of the Śrāvakayāna, from the canon of which a number of sūtras are cited. ALYASWAMI Sastrin (pp. iii-v) has noted the relationship to the Kośa, particularly the “debate” on the existence of the atom.

(11) Trimsīkā-kārikās

This work deals with the ālayavijñāna and the three svabhāvas, and gives some of the classifications of the prose Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa in verse. At times the relationship to that text is so close that the two could easily be combined: the verses of the Trimsīkā followed by the prose of the Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa.

(12) Trisvabhāvanirdeśa

I have noted that Vasubandhu accepted the Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra, the main source for the “three svabhāva theory”, as authentic, and that the three svabhāva are mentioned in the Trimsīkā-kārikās. P.S. JAINI has shown that the author of the Vibhāṣāprabhāvrtti on the Abhidharmadīpa accuses the Kośakāra of accepting and, according to Jaini’s interpretation, writing on this theory.


Lambert SCHMITHAUSEN reached a similar conclusion about the authorship of most of the works discussed above: “I use the expression ‘(works of) Vasubandhu the Kośakāra’ when referring to (the author of) Abhidharmakośaśāśya, Vyākhyaśāśya, Karmasiddhi, Pratītyasamut-pādavyākhyā, Pañcaskandhaka, Viṃśatikā and Triṃśikā, because I find that there are good reasons for taking the author of these works to be one and the same person”.  

29 Bhikkhu PĀSĀDIKA remarks that “Schmithausen does not enter into details regarding the Vasubandhu controversy but refers to publications by Kazunobu Matsuda and Gijin Muroji through whose observations he finds his own conclusions corroborated”. PĀSĀDIKA also refers to similar conclusions reached by Christian LINDTNER: “Lindtner speaks of Vasubandhu as ‘the author of the Viṃśatikā, the Triṃśikā, Karmasiddhi, Abhidharmakośa, and Vyākhyaśāśya, etc.’”.  

30 Accepting a common authorship of the works discussed above, and accepting the tradition that the Kośa was Vasubandhu’s first work, we may suggest the following tentative chronology, dividing his activity into two main perspectives:  

“Sautrāntika perspective”  
Abhidharmakośa (Kārikā and Bhāṣya)  
Gāthāsāṁgrahaśāstra and Gāthārthasaṁgrahaśāstra [plus Ekāgathabhāṣya]  

31. I must emphasize that this approach is provisional. Vasubandhu’s presentation of Mahāyāna ideas by no means entails a rejection of Sautrāntika thought, or its wholesale replacement by some sort of ready-made Mahāyāna package. It is quite possible that Vasubandhu’s profound study of the Śrāvaka scriptures led him directly to the ideas expressed in the Vyākhyaśāśya. The oft-repeated story of Vasubandhu’s conversion by his brother Asaṅga is given only in later biographies. There is no reason why Vasubandhu should not have composed the Kośa as a Mahāyānist, without advocating or mentioning the Mahāyāna since this would not be relevant. Indeed, Robert KRITZER, in his Rebirth and Causation in the Yogācāra Abhidharma (Vienna 1999, p. viii) writes that Vasubandhu’s “Sautrāntika’ opinions ... can generally be traced to the Yogacārabhūmi,” leading him to suspect “that Vasubandhu already accepted Yogācāra doctrine when he wrote the Abhidharmakośaśāśya”.

SKILLING 309
“Mahāyāna perspective”

Vyākhya-yukti and Vyākhya-yuktisūtrakhaṇḍaśata
Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa
Praṇītyasamutpādādivbhāṅganirdeśa
Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa
Vimśatikā, Kārikā and Bhāṣya
Trimsīkā-kārikās
Trisvabhāvanirdeśa.

From Yaśomitra’s reference to the Kośakāra as the author of the Mahāyānist Vyākhya-yukti and of the Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa, and from Vasubandhu’s cross-reference to the Vyākhya-yukti in his Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa we may suggest that Vasubandhu the Kośakāra became an energetic proponent of the Mahāyāna. This suggestion is corroborated by the unknown author of the Abhidharmadīpa, who severely chides the Kośakāra for his sympathy with the Mahāyāna. Furthermore, the Vyākhya-yukti, the Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa, and the Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa show the influence of the Yogācāra school and of Asaṅga, as does the Gāthārthasamgrahaśāstra, while the Vimśatikā, the Trimsīkā, and the Trisvabhāvanirdeśa are devoted to the exposition of specific Viśṇaptivādin doctrines.

We may now attempt to sketch a broad outline of the Kośakāra’s career.

Vasubandhu mastered the scriptures and doctrines, the Tripitaka and Abhidharma, of the (Mula)Śarvāstivādin school, specifically according to the tradition of the Vaibhāṣikas of Kashmir, and also studied the Tripitaka and Abhidharma of other schools. The result of these studies was his Abhidharmakosa, which summarized the tenets of the Vaibhāṣikas of Kashmir in its kārikās, but subjected them to a critique in its prose Bhāṣya. In this work he shows sympathy for the thought of the Sautrāntikas, but also maintains the intellectual independence which would be a hallmark of his work. At an uncertain point in his career – before or after the composition of the Kośa? – he was deeply influenced by Yogācāra thought as exemplified by Asaṅga and the Saṁdhinirmocanasūtra. He retained, however, his independent and critical attitude, and retained or refined many of the ideas and arguments already presented in his Abhidharmakośa. He was prolific, and composed works on various subjects.

32. This is provisional, since it does not take into account some of the important works attributed to Vasubandhu.
This career, based entirely upon (originally) Indian literary sources, either those of the Kośakāra himself or those of his commentators, agrees in outline with that given in Paramārtha’s biography of Vasubandhu. I would like to stress that these commentators worked within the same tradition and lineage of thought, and were connected with Vasubandhu if not directly then by succession. We find the same commentators, connected with each other by tradition, associated with texts attributed to Vasubandhu. Their testimony, which goes back to an Indian tradition in the direct lineage of succession of disciples of Vasubandhu, cannot be lightly dismissed.

I will not attempt a detailed refutation of FRAUWALLNER’s conclusions, which are based primarily on Chinese sources, especially the life of Vasubandhu by Paramārtha, whom he describes as the authority “who carries the greater weight by far”, “the chief witness” (both on p. 11), and “our oldest and best authority (p. 13)”. My own evidence is based rather on the works of Vasubandhu himself, and those of the commentators within his tradition.33 FRAUWALLNER’s “revised” biography of the second, younger or later Vasubandhu contains only one salient literary event: his composition of the Abhidharmakośa. Since the evidence presented above proves that the Kośakāra did indeed advocate the Mahāyāna, it undermines the greater part of FRAUWALLNER’s arguments. The career outlined above does the reverse of what FRAUWALLNER set out to do: it identifies Vasubandhu the Kośakāra with Vasubandhu the Mahāyānist, and thereby robs FRAUWALLNER’s earlier Vasubandhu of a biography.

This said, the problems of chronology remain. FRAUWALLNER’s treatment of the dates of the two Vasubandhus is rather shaky, since it is based on his own conclusions about the date of the Buddha employed by

33. I find it extraordinary that FRAUWALLNER – who appeals to “the rules of sound criticism” (op. cit., p. 30) and “scientific logic” (p. 31) – should reach such firm conclusions without taking into account many of the major works attributed to Vasubandhu, or giving any serious consideration to his thought. He creates more confusion than that he claims to have been created by his sources, which he treats in a cavalier manner. He repeatedly describes Paramārtha as trustworthy, but, it turns out, only for the date of Vasubandhu: otherwise he chops Paramārtha’s biography up into parts, and ascribes anything that goes against his thesis to Paramārtha’s pupils (pp. 18-20). I do not think FRAUWALLNER’s monograph is a good starting point for the study of Vasubandhu, and hope that the Chinese evidence will be assessed anew, in the light of the thought of Vasubandhu based on a thorough examination of the works attributed to him.
his Chinese sources. I confess here to a pessimistic conclusion that the dates given in the Chinese sources utilized by FRAUWALLNER are either hopelessly confused, or, even if accurate, they cannot be resolved because of uncertainty about the date of the Nirvana upon which they are variously based.\textsuperscript{34}

Beyond this, there are Yaśomitra’s references to an earlier Vasubandhu, which I cannot dismiss as lightly as has Stefan ANACKER.\textsuperscript{35} In addition to these well-known references, there is one in Sthiramati’s commentary on the Kośa:\textsuperscript{36} slob dpon dbyig gñen sña ma = pūrvācārya Vasubandhu, parallel to the vrddhācārya Vasubandhu at Yaśomitra 1:13d, p. 45, bottom.\textsuperscript{37} This reference is not a simple borrowing from Yaśomitra, since Sthiramati gives a direct citation in several lines of the view of this “earlier Vasubandhu”, not given by Yaśomitra. The references deal with points of interpretation of the Abhidharma. All that can be said is that there was indeed an earlier Vasubandhu, who worked within the (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin or Vaibhāṣika tradition. Considering the lack of references to him elsewhere, he seems to have been a relatively minor figure in the history of Indian Buddhist thought. There is no reason whatsoever to suppose that he turned later to the Mahāyāna, as did (according to the biographies) the Kośakāra.

The Kośakāra was clearly influenced by the Yogācāra and by Asaṅga. I do not care to conclude whether or not he was the latter’s brother, or half-brother, but simply note that both Chinese and Tibetan tradition,

\textsuperscript{34} There seems to me to be a serious flaw in FRAUWALLNER’s conclusion (p. 10) that the earlier date belongs to the earlier Vasubandhu, brother of Asaṅga and a person other than the Kośakāra. The “elder Vasubandhu” mentioned in the commentaries on the Kośa (and, it seems, nowhere else) does not appear to have been sufficiently well-known for his date or biography to have enjoyed a “wide diffusion”. The points attributed to this “elder Vasubandhu” are fine points within the Abhidharma tradition of, presumably, the Vaibhāṣikas, and have nothing to do with the Mahāyāna. Thus there is no evidence to connect this elder Vasubandhu with the Mahāyāna or with the story of Asaṅga’s brother who “converted” to the Mahāyāna.

\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Op. cit.}, pp. xii-xiii.

\textsuperscript{36} \textit{Abhidharmakośabhāṣyaṭīkā-tattvārtha-nāma}, P5875, Vol. 146, nö mtshar bstan bcos, to, 71a1.

\textsuperscript{37} The Tibetan of Yaśomitra (P5593, Vol. 116, \textit{mdzod 'grel}, cu, 37a5, also has \textit{sña ma}, as at 39a7. I have not been able to trace parallels to Yaśomitra’s other references in Sthiramati. For the references see AIYASWAMI Sastrin, \textit{op. cit.}, p. vi.
based on different sources from different periods, agree that the two
great scholars were related. A tradition current in Tibet at the time of
Tāranātha, but rejected by him, was that the two were “spiritual
brothers”. Given the lack of evidence it seems to me more fruitful to
try to determine the relationship between the known works of
Asaṅga and the known works of the Kośakāra than to worry about their
genealogy.

A note on Guṇamati

LA VALLEE POUSSIN notes that Yaśomitra refers to Guṇamati four
times in his Vyākhyā on the Abhidharmakośa. The first reference
occurs in Yaśomitra’s opening verses, wherein he states that Guṇamati
and Vasumitra had composed commentaries on the Kośa. In the
remaining three references Yaśomitra registers his disagreement with
Guṇamati’s interpretations; in two of them he refers to a Vasumitra as a
student (śiṣya) of Guṇamati. Tāranātha describes Guṇamati as a
disciple of Gunaprabha and “a master of the Abhidharma”. Tibetan
tradition describes Gunaprabha as a direct disciple of Vasubandhu.

This suggests a tentative succession:


Guṇamati’s commentary on the Kośa has not been preserved. His
commentary on another of Vasubandhu’s works, the Pratītyasamutpāda-
divibhaṅganirdeśa (P5496), is preserved in Tibetan translation under the
title Pratītyasamutpādādivibhaṅganirdeśatākā (P5497). He is also said to
have composed a commentary, no longer extant, on Nāgārjuna’s
Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikās. Hajime NAKAMURA suggests a date of

38. Antonius SCHIEFNER: Tāranāthae de Doctraene Buddhicae in India
Propagotione, St. Petersburg 1868, p. 92,19; translation in Debiprasad
CHATTOPADHYAYA (ed.): Tāranātha’s History of Buddhism in India, Calcutta


41. SCHIEFNER, op. cit., p. 122,18: yon tan ‘od kyi slob ma mnon pa pa yon tan blo

42. Bu ston (OBERMILLER) II 160; Tāranātha in SCHIEFNER, op. cit., p. 100,10,
CHATTOPADHYAYA, op. cit., p. 179.

43. David SEYFORT RUEGG: The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of
circa CE 420-500 for Guṇamati, and states that he was a contemporary of Dignāga and that Sthiramati was his disciple.44

II. A Survey of the Vyākhya-yukti Literature

What I describe as the “Vyākhya-yukti literature” consists of three texts, two by Vasubandhu and one by Guṇamati. Originally composed in Sanskrit, they survive only in Tibetan translations made about 800 CE. They are preserved in the “Mind Only” (sems tsam) division of the Tanjur, the collection of treatises and commentaries translated into Tibetan:45

(1) Vyākhya-yuktisūtrakhaṇḍāsata (VyY-sū), rNam par bṣad pa’i rigs pa’i mdo sde’i dum bu brgya: One Hundred Extracts from the Discourses for the Principles of Exegesis by Vasubandhu (dByig gñen), translated by Viśuddhasimha, Sarvajñadeva, Devendrarakṣita, and Mañjuśrīvarman.

(2) Vyākhya-yukti (VyY): rNam par bṣad pa’i rigs pa: The Principles of Exegesis by Vasubandhu (dByig gñen), translated by Viśuddhasimha, Śākyasimha, and Devendrarakṣita.

(3) Vyākhya-yuktiṭīkā (VyY-t): rNam par bṣad pa’i rigs pa’i bṣad pa: Commentary on the Principles of Exegesis by Guṇamati (Yon tan blo gros), translated by Viśuddhasimha, Śākyasimha, and Devendrarakṣita.

Structure: the Vyākhya-yuktisūtrakhaṇḍāsata

The Vyākhya-yuktisūtrakhaṇḍāsata is a collection of extracts or partial citations of sūtras, of varying brevity. They are presented without any introduction, classification, or comment, separated simply by ʿēṣ bya ba dan = * iti ca, and without any indication of source or title. As is often the case in Indian literature, the “Hundred” of the title is a conventional round number: counting each passage separated by the phrase ʿēṣ bya ba dan as one extract, there are one hundred and nine.46 In the Vyākhya-yukti, Vasubandhu’s initial citation of an extract is usually followed by

44. Indian Buddhism, A Survey with Bibliographical Notes, Osaka 1980, p. 280.
45. Bibliographical notices are given in Appendix 8.
46. This is the figure that I have arrived at. The extract numbers (signified by §) in the present article are my own: they are not assigned numbers in the text. Others might enumerate the extracts differently. The exact number of extracts, and various other points about the three Vyākhya-yukti texts, can only be determined when critical editions are prepared.
the phrase ḏes bya ba ni mdo sde'i dum bu'o = *iti sūtrakhaṇḍaḥ, or a variant thereof. The term sūtrakhaṇḍa does not occur in the Abhidharma kośa, but occurs in another work attributed to Vasubandhu, the Gāthārthaśāmaṃgraḥaṣastra, and in Guṇamati’s Tīkā on Vasubandhu’s Pratītyasamutpādādīvibhaṅganirdeśa. The Sanskrit is attested in the Abhidharmasamuccayaṃabhāṣya.

It will be seen below that the “Hundred Extracts” serves simply as a collection of sources for the Vyākhyāyukti itself. It is not an independent work.

Structure: the Vyākhyāyukti and its Tīkā

The Vyākhyāyukti, and, following it, the Tīkā, is divided into five untitled chapters (le'ur bcos pa):

| Chapter 1: | VyY (P) 32a1; (D) 29a2 | VyY-t (P) 1a1; (D) 139b1 |
| Chapter 2: | VyY (P) 45b4; (D) 40a7 | VyY-t (P) 19b7; (D) 155a6 |
| Chapter 3: | VyY (P) 98a7; (D) 83b4 | VyY-t (P) 125b3; (D) 248a1 |
| Chapter 4: | VyY (P) 113a8; (D) 96b7 | VyY-t (P) 146b4; (D) 265a3 |
| Chapter 5: | VyY (P) 133a4; (D) 114a7 | VyY-t (P) 164a1; (D) 278a7 |

Style: the Vyākhyāyuktiśūtrakhaṇḍaśata

The “Hundred Citations” are all in “canonical” prose, with the exception of §§ 29 and 39, which are in verse. Most of the extracts have parallels in the Pāli canon.

Extract § 29 (21a7), on the subject of suffering (duḥkha), is close to a verse cited in the Abhidharma kośaśāstra (6:3, Pradhan p. 331,20) and the Arthatviniścayasiśuṭrāibandhana (Samtani, p. 127,9): saṃskārāniya-tām jñātvā, atho viparıṇāmataṃ, and so on, with a variant in line a (‘du byed sdug bsñal ņid dan ni = saṃskāra-duḥkhhatāṃ). Extract § 39 (22a2), a verse of six lines listing conditions connected with concentration

47. Several extracts from the VyY-sū are not, however, called sūtrakhaṇḍa in the VyY: § 19, VyY 55b5; § 29, VyY 57b8; § 93, VyY 88b2. I doubt whether this affects their status, or the total number of extracts: § 1 (32a3), for example, is not called a sūtrakhaṇḍa when first introduced, but is later referred to as “the first sūtrakhaṇḍa” (36a3). At any rate, more than one hundred are described as sūtrakhaṇḍa in the VyY.


(samādhi) and calming (samatha), is described at Vyākhyāyukti 61b4 as a “verse summary” (sdom gyi tshigs su bcad pa = uddānagāthā). No accompanying prose is given in either the “Hundred Extracts” or the Vyākhyāyukti. Another four line uddāna (sdom) occurs at the end of the longest citation, § 66, on the benefits of “the notion of impermanence” (anityasamjñā, 25a4): in this case it is to be counted with the preceding prose. Such “verse summaries” were composed by the editors of the Tripiṭaka, originally during the period of oral transmission, although there is no guarantee that they were not altered or added to by the editors of later written recensions. The present examples most probably belong to either the Samyuktāgama or the Ekottarāgama of – as will be seen below – the (Mūla)Sarvāstivādins. (A single line of another uddāna, possibly from the Samyuktāgama, is cited at Vyākhyāyukti 41a7. A complete uddāna is cited at Abhidharmakośa 3:12d, p. 122,23.)

Most of the extracts are spoken by the Buddha to the monks in general, or, in a few cases, to specific monks, or to brahmans and “wanderers”. Two extracts from the Arthavistarasūtra (§ 67, 25a5; § 68, 25a8) are spoken by Śāriputra to the monks. A number of extracts are addressed to the Buddha, such as § 4 (19b1), which is most probably spoken by King Prasenajit, as is a similar passage in the Pāli Aṅgulimālasutta (see Appendix 1, extract [4]).

**Style: the Vyākhyāyukti**

The Vyākhyāyukti is mainly in “śāstra prose". Apart from citations from canonical verse texts, such as the Udana-varga, which is frequently cited under the name gāthā (see Appendix 5.1), the Vyākhyāyukti contains many verses in a non-canonical style. These may be classed under three headings:

51. Wrongly given in the printed editions as udānagāthā: both the Tibetan and the style of the verse confirm that the correct form is uddāna-. For the source, cf. Bhikkhu PĀSĀDIKA, Kanonische Zitate im Abhidharmakośabhāṣya des Vasubandhu, Göttingen 1989, p. 53, § 168.

52. That is to say the original would have been in a form of “standard” Sanskrit, similar in style to treatises (śāstra) such as Vasubandhu’s Abhidharmakośabhāṣya or Vīryasīridatta’s Arthaviniścayasūtranibandhana (which, it will be shown below, is heavily indebted to the Vyākhyāyukti and other works of Vasubandhu).
(1) Terse “verse summaries” (bsduś pa’i tshigs su bcad pa = saṃgrahaśloka), found in all chapters. These are listed in Appendix 2.1. In most cases the saṃgrahaśloka follow the prose treatment of the subject that they summarize.

(2) Verses introduced by phrases like “furthermore, in this context, it is said”, listed in Appendix 2.2. In some cases (e.g. 33b5, 34a1) these verses follow the prose that they summarize, and thus seem to be identical in function to the saṃgrahaśloka. In other cases (e.g. 48a8, 50a7, 104a5) they introduce independent ideas, without any accompanying prose.

(3) Verses without any introduction, listed in Appendix 2.3. There are many such verses in Chapter 5.

The authorship of these verses and their relationship to the work as a whole remains to be determined. Since Vasubandhu is well-known as an accomplished verse writer, it is possible that he composed at least some of the verses of the Vyākhyāyukti. In addition, verses in a “non-canonical” style are cited as Āgama. These will be discussed below.

Style: the Vyākhyāyuktiṅkā

Guṇamati’s prose Tiṅkā clarifies the root-text by paraphrasing Vasubandhu’s ideas and by expanding his often terse statements. In style it resembles Guṇamati’s Tiṅkā on Vasubandhu’s Pratītyasamutpādādīvibhaṅganirdeśa.

Contents of the Vyākhyāyukti

The Vyākhyāyukti opens with two verses (32a1-2): the first pays homage to the Buddha, while the second announces that the work has been composed for the benefit of “those who wish to explain the sūtras” (mdo rnams ’chad ’dod). The phrase mdo rnams ’chad ’dod of the verse occurs in prose as mdo nam par ’chad par ’dod pa at 32a2; the Sanskrit

53. For the rather complex problem of the saṃgrahaśloka, see Katsumi MIMAKI, “Sur le rôle de l’antaraśloka ou du saṃgrahaśloka”, in Indianisme et Bouddhisme, Mélanges offerts à Mgr Étienne Lamotte, Louvain-la-Neuve 1980, pp. 233-44. The use of the saṃgrahaśloka is characteristic of Vasubandhu’s works. MIMAKI (p. 233) notes two in the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya, and the present article shows that they occur in the Vyākhyāyukti and the Pratītyasamutpādādīvibhaṅganirdeśa.
is probably sūtraṃ vyākhyaṭukāma, as at Arthaviniścayasūtranibandhana 72,1. The phrase mdo rnam par bṣad pa occurs at 33b4.

Vasubandhu lists the main topics that he will deal with near the beginning of his work (33b4):

How are the sūtras to be explained? By five methods:
(1) according to the purpose of the sūtra (mdo sde'i dgos pa = sūtrāntaprayojana), defined and discussed in Chapter 1, 34b3-36b5;
(2) according to the summarized meaning (bsdus pa'i don = piṇḍārtha), defined and discussed in Chapter 1, 36b5-37a2;
(3) according to the sense of the words (tshig gi don = padārtha), defined and discussed Chapter 1, 37a2-45b3 (end), in Chapter 2, throughout (45b3-98a6), and in Chapter 3, 98a7-98b8;
(4) according to sequence or connection (mtshams sbyor ba = anusāmdhi), defined and discussed in Chapter 3, 99a1-100b3;
(5) according to objections and responses [to objections] (brgal ba dan lan = codyaparihāra), defined and discussed in Chapter 3, 100b3 foll.

Vasubandhu notes that the fifth topic is to be counted as one since it means “the resolution of objections” (brgal ba'i lan gdab pa). He then discusses the relationship of the five topics to each other and their subdivisions (33b7-34b3); with (1) sūtrāntaprayojana (34b3-36b5); with (2) piṇḍārtha (36b5-37a2); and with (3) padārtha (37a2 foll.). He deals with topics (4) and (5) in Chapter 3. The five topics provide the basic structure of the Vyākhyaṣyukti, and are dealt with in the first four chapters. The fifth chapter, as will be seen below, is an “appendix” on the benefits of listening to the dharma.

A citation of the summarizing verse by Haribhadra in his Abhisamayālaṃkārāloka gives us the Sanskrit technical terms: 54

(Haribhadra) tatra:
prayojanam sapinḍārtham padārthah sānusāmdhikah,
sacodyaparihārāś ca vācyaḥ sūtrārthaśavādibihīḥ.
iti pañcabhir ākāraḥ sūtraṃ vyākhyaṭavyam iti vyākhyaṣyuktau nirṇītam.

(Vyākhyaṣyukti 33b5) 'dir smras pa:
mdo don smra ba dag gis ni, dgos pa bsdus pa'i don bcas daṇ, tshig don bcas daṇ mtshams sbyor bcas, brgal lan bcas par bṣṇad par bya.

54. WOGIHARA 15,23. See below for the relationship between Haribhadra’s Āloka and the Vyākhyaṣyukti. The verse is also cited at Bu ston (OBERMILLER) I 71, and Sa-skya Paṇḍita adapts the five topics in his mKhas pa la 'jug pa'i sgo (David P. JACKSON: The Entrance Gate for the Wise (Section III): Sa-skya Paṇḍita on Indian and Tibetan Traditions of Pramāṇa and Philosophical Debate, 2 Vols., Vienna 1987: I 195-96).
A slightly different list is given in the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* (142,11) under the heading *vyākhyāsanāgrahāmukha: sūtrasāyotpattiprāyojana, padārtha, anusandhi, abhiprāya, codya, parihāra.*

A secondary structure is based on the “Hundred Extracts”. The first two chapters of the *Vyākhya-yukti* deal systematically with the “Hundred Extracts” in order of occurrence: Chapter 1 opens with the first extract, while Chapter 2 opens with the second and closes with the last. Although the extracts are thus relevant to only the first two chapters, the last extract (§ 109) sets the stage for Chapters 3 and 4. Vasubandhu usually gives abbreviated citations; Guṇamati usually repeats the extract in full. Vasubandhu classifies the first ten extracts by subject matter; after that, he introduces them without classification. A concordance of the first ten extracts and their headings is given as Appendix 1.

**Chapter 1**

Chapter 1 opens with the statement (32a2) that “from the very start (*ādim eva*), one who wishes to explain the sūtras (*sūtram vyākhyātu-kāma*) should have listened to many [teachings] (*thos pa maṅ ba = bahuśruta*), should be endowed with the basis of listening to [teachings] (*thos pa’i gzi can*), and should accumulate [teachings] that have been listened to (*thos pa bsag par bya’o*).” Vasubandhu then refers to and explains the first sutra extract.

In dealing with *padārtha* (*tshig gi don*), Vasubandhu gives thirteen examples of one word having diverse meanings (*VyY* 38b3, *tshig gcig la don du ma*). Each example opens with a verse of up to four lines listing the several meanings, each of which is then illustrated by a brief citation from scripture. For example, the treatment of the first term, *rupa*, opens with two lines of verse:

> gzugs šes bya ba [1] gzugs phun dan,


A list of the thirteen terms is given as Appendix 3.

---

55. The same term occurs in Guṇamati’s *Pratityasamutpādādivihangādinirdesṣaṭikā, chi* 112a5: *sgar gcig la don du ma*. 
Vasubandhu then deals with three types of meaning (42b3):

1. so so re re la brjod par bya ba'i don;
2. bsdus pa'i don (pinḍārtha);
3. dgos pa'i don (prayojanārtha).

Under the latter, he discusses the purpose of “numerical teachings” (graṅs gsunṣ pa, 43b2). The chapter concludes with seven reasons why the Buddha travelled from place to place; fifteen reasons why the bhikṣus travelled from place to place; reasons why the Buddha remained in seclusion and refrained from teaching for periods of a fortnight and of three months; and fifteen reasons for going into the presence of another. The verse summaries for the first three topics are cited without attribution by Haribhadra in his Abhisamayālaṁkārāloka.56

Chapter 2

Chapter 2, the longest, deals with the remaining extracts. It opens with “four extracts in praise of the Buddha”, which are followed by “three extracts in praise of the Dharma” and “one extract in praise of the Saṅgha” (see Appendix 1).

Vasubandhu follows more or less the same technique in his treatment of the individual extracts. First he gives an abbreviated citation, for which the reader must refer to the “Hundred Extracts” for the full passage. He then explains or glosses the passage phrase by phrase in order of occurrence (go rims bzin, 32b5, 33b1, etc.). He often supplies alternate explanations, introduced by gzan yan (46a2, 5, 8) or rnam graṅs gzan yan (35b6, etc.).

The last extract, at the end of the chapter (96b8), defines a monk who “knows the Dharma” (chos ses pa = dharmajña) as one who knows the twelve aṅgas, the “classes” or “genres” of the Buddha’s teaching. The citation is parallel to Anguttaranikāya IV 113,12-16, which lists the nine aṅgas of the Theravādin tradition. Vasubandhu defines each of the aṅgas in turn; when he comes to the Vaipulya (97a8), he mentions the Mahāyāna for the first time:

The Vaipulya aṅga is the Mahāyāna: the instruction through which bodhisattvas, by means of the ten perfections (daśapāramitā), accomplish the ten stages

56. For an edition, study, and translation of these passages, see PRAPOD Assavavirulhakarn & Peter SKILLING, “Vasubandhu on Travel and Seclusion,” Manusya: Journal of Humanities 2.1 (Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, March 1999), pp. 13-24.
(daśabhūmi) and attain Buddhahood, the foundation of the ten powers (daśabalaśraya).  

At 97b5, Vasubandhu explains the terms Vaipulya and Mahāyāna. The latter is so called because it is “an extensive vehicle”, because it possesses “seven greatnesses”, which Vasubandhu lists. Chapter 2 ends with the statement that the one hundred extracts have been explained in part; using this part as an example, the wise may investigate the meaning of other phrases [from other sūtras] (98a5).

**Chapter 3**

Chapter 3 (98a7) opens with:

Furthermore, the meaning of terms (tshig gi don = padārtha) is to be understood in four ways:

1. through synonyms (rnam graṇs = paryāya);
2. through definitions (mtshan ṅid = lakṣaṇa)
3. through derivation (ṇes pa’i tshig = niruktī)
4. and through classification (rab tu dbye ba = prabheda).

Vasubandhu gives a definition and a canonical example for each, noting that the Buddha “employs one or the other after taking into account the specific needs of the [person to be] trained” (‘dul ba’i khyad pa, 98b2). This concludes the third topic, padārtha (99b8), which is followed by an explanation of the fourth topic, anusamdhī (99a1-100b3).

Vasubandhu then deals with the fifth topic, “raising an objection” (brgal ba = codya), which is of two types: “objection to the wording” (sgra la brgal ba, 100b4-101a5) and “objection to the meaning” (don la brgal ba). The latter is also of two types: sna phyi ’gal bar brgal ba (101a5), “raising the objection that there is an inconsistency of ‘before and after’ (contextual inconsistency?)” and rigs pa dañ ’gal bar brgal ba (101b5), “raising the objection that there is a logical inconsistency”. “Logic” (rigs pa = yukti) is defined as the three pramāṇa: pratyakṣa, anumāna, and āptāgama (102b6 mdor na rigs pa ni ’dir tshad ma rnam pa gsum po mṅon sum pa dañ rjes su dpag pa dañ yid ches pa’i gsum ni).


59. The passage is cited at Bu ston (OBERMILLER) I 72.
The discussion of the fifth topic takes up the entire chapter, and is divided into two parts. The first (100b3-104a4) raises various objections by citing passages from sūtras that apparently contradict each other. Only the objections are given, without response. For example, under sīna phyi 'gal bar brgal ba (101b2):

In some places “the four truths of the noble” are taught. In some places “the three truths of the brahmans” are taught. In some places it is taught that “there are two truths: conventional truth (samvṛtisatya) and ultimate truth (paramārtha-satya)”; in some places it is taught that “There is only one truth: there is no second”.

The final objection to be raised (103b2) refers back to Vasubandhu’s definition of the Vaipulya anāga as the Mahāyāna: the Vaipulya anāga cannot be the Mahāyāna, which cannot be the teaching of the Buddha, since it is inconsistent with the teaching of the Buddha well-known to all schools (sarvanikāya). Passages from Mahāyāna sūtras – “all dharmas are without inherent nature (nihsvabhāva), are unborn (ajāta), are undestroyed (aniruddha); all dharmas are from the beginning calm (ādiśānta), by nature in complete nirvāṇa (parinirvṛta)” – are set against passages from the canon of the Śrāvakas – “In dependence upon the eye and visible form, visual consciousness arises”; “Alas – conditioned things are impermanent: they have the nature to arise and cease” (Udānavarga 1:3).

In the second part (from 104a4), Vasubandhu answers the objections one by one, in order of occurrence. All but the last objection – that the Vaipulya anāga cannot be the Mahāyāna, which is taken up in Chapter 4 – are dealt with in the remainder of the chapter.

In several cases Vasubandhu brings in the important concept of dgongs pa = abhiprāya, the intention of a specific teaching, a theme fundamental to many of his works. For example, replying to the objections cited above, he states: “The various enumerations by which truth is taught to be fourfold, threefold, twofold, or single do not contradict each other, since they [were spoken with] different intentions (dgongs pa lha dad pa'i phyir, 109b8).”

60. Cp. Samyuttanikāya V 425,14, etc.
61. Cp. Anguttaranikāya II 176,26, which gives four.
62. Suttanipāta 884a; Nalinaksha DUTT (ed.): Bodhisattvabhūmiḥ (Being the XVth section of Asaṅgapāda’s Yogācārabhūmiḥ), Patna 1978, p. 198,15.
Chapter 4

Chapter 4 is devoted entirely to a debate on and a defence of the authenticity of the Mahāyāna. It opens (113a8) with the last objection raised in the first section of Chapter 3, repeating the challenge: "Because it is inconsistent with the well-known teachings of the Buddha, the Mahāyāna cannot be the word of the Buddha. Therefore [your] statement that ‘the Vaipulya is the Mahāyāna’ contradicts the scripture (āgama)." Vasubandhu turns the objection back upon the "opponent": "If this is so, then what for you is ‘the well-known teaching of the Buddha’ is equally not the word of the Buddha, because it is self-contradictory". He then cites a number of contradictory sūtra passages: "There are three feelings: pleasant, unpleasant, and neutral"; 63 "Whatever feeling there may be is suffering"; 64 "Pleasant feeling should be viewed as suffering"; 65 "To perceive suffering as pleasure is a misapprehension (viparyāśa)"; 66 and so on. 67

Vasubandhu then makes the statement that "in the Śrāvakayāna, the teaching of the Buddha is not extant in its entirety" (114b2), which he backs up with citations from and references to the sūtras. He maintains that the canon of the Śrāvakas is incomplete, since Ānanda did not know all the sūtras, and that there is in fact no "teaching of the Buddha well-known to all schools" since the canon is arranged differently by different schools, and since some schools reject certain sūtras accepted by other schools. Other topics dealt with include "final" and "provisional" meaning (nītārtha, neyārtha), "teaching with a specific intention" (abhiprāya), and "literal interpretation" (yathārūta).

The longest citation of a Mahāyāna sūtra, which takes up six folios, is from Chapter 2 of the Mahāyānaprasādaprabhāvanāsūtra (P812) on the twenty-eight unwholesome views that arise "when a bodhisattva analyses the Dharma in a literal (yathārūta) and incorrect (ayoniśas) manner". A similar citation, with some variants, is given by Asaṅga in his Abhi-

63. Saṁyuttanikāya IV 204, etc.
64. Majjhimanikāya III 208,27; Saṁyuttanikāya II 53,20; IV 216,17 foll.
65. Saṁyuttanikāya IV 207,6.
67. The last three passages are cited together at Abhidharmakośabhāṣya 6:3, (PRADHAN) 330, 11-13, (DWARIKADAS) 880,2-4.
dharmasamuccaya as from the Mahādharmaśadharmaśaparyāya.\textsuperscript{68}

Otherwise, the sūtra and the passage seem little known.\textsuperscript{69}

The final topic dealt with is whether Śākyamuni Buddha was an emanation (nirmāna, 129b4 foll.). This brings up various points connected with Śākyamuni’s career as a bodhisattva and a Buddha, and the subject of his past unwholesome deeds that gave rise to negative effects in his final life (karmaploti, 131a6). Vasubandhu refers to the Upāyakausālysūtra and the Lokottaraparivarta for the correct interpretation of the latter.\textsuperscript{70} At the mention of the Upāyakausālysūtra, the “opponent” states that it is not authoritative, since it allows a bodhisattva to kill.\textsuperscript{71} Vasubandhu then explains under what circumstances and with what intention it is permissible for a bodhisattva to do so (131b7 foll.).

From this brief summary, it may be seen that the chapter is extremely interesting in that it contains many arguments not seen elsewhere.

\textsuperscript{68} Pralhad PrADHAN (ed.), Abhidharma Samuccaya of Asaṅga, Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan 1950 (Visva-Bharati Studies 12) 84,3-10. The Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya (112,18) gives the same title, as does the Tibetan of the Abhidharmasamuccaya, P5550, Vol. 112, sms tsam, li, 124a4: chos kyi me lon chen po'i chos kyi rnam granis. The Peking Kanjur title is (‘Phags pa) Theg pa chen po la dad pa rab tu sgom pa zes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo. At the end of the sūtra itself (37a3-5), the Buddha givesĀnanda four alternate, “internal” titles, according to a traditional formula; all four contain the element mahāyāna-prasāda-, and none of them dharmādāra. Kazunobu Matsuda has written (in Japanese) about the sūtra with reference to the Abhidharmasamuccaya and Vyākhyāyukti in his “On the two unknown Sūtras adopted by the Yogacāra School, based on a passage found in the writings of Bu ston and Blo gros rgyan mtshan,” in Zuihō Yamaguchi (ed.): Buddhism and Society in Tibet, Tokyo 1986, pp. 269-89.

\textsuperscript{69} Edgerton (BHSD 425a), for example, gives only one reference under the “Kanjur title,” to Mvy § 1365, and none for Mahādharmaśadharmaśa. The opening of the passage cited by Vasubandhu is given under the “Kanjur title” by Bu ston in his “Treatise on the Tathāgatagarbha”: see David Seyfort Ruegg, Le Traité du Tathāgatagarbha de Bu Ston Rin Chen Grub, Paris 1973, p. 84.


\textsuperscript{71} See A Treasury of Mahāyāna Sūtras, pp. 456-57; TatZ, pp. 73-74.
Chapter 5

On the whole, Chapter 5 leaves controversy behind. In the main it deals with how and why one who explains the sūtras should generate respect in his audience. It contains numerous similes, including a number of "numerical" similes, some of which are common to the Gāthārtha-samgrahaśāstra:

Like water the Dharma bestows five benefits; 72
Like fire it has four functions; 73
Like a pleasant beach it is resorted to for five reasons; 74
As for three reasons a cloth does not take drawings, so for the "pictures" of jñāna on the cloth of the mind; 75
Like a monkey the mind is agitated in two ways; 76
Like the sun rising in the sky, the Buddhavacana performs five functions; 77
As there are five benefits from relying on a competent guide, so for relying on a competent teacher; 78
As leather becomes workable for three reasons; 79
As three strengths enable travellers to safely traverse a jungle path. 80

Similes of limestone (142b6), a sentinel (142b8), musicians and a blind man with a lamp variously illustrate the dangers of having listened to many [teachings] (bahusṛuta) but knowing only the words and not the meaning (artha). 81 Examples are given of how even a little listening to the Dharma brings great benefit. 82 Ten distinctions that make good stronger than evil are listed (146a5).

Vasubandhu lists ten reasons why the Dharmavinaya is well-taught (legs par gsuns pa = svākhyaṭa, 135a3). He defines the seventh (137b6),

72. Vyākhyaḥyukti 141a4; Gāthārthasaṃgrahaśāstra 260b8; Bu ston (OBERMILLER) I 10.
73. Vyākhyaḥyukti 141a4; Gāthārthasaṃgrahaśāstra 260b5; Bu ston (OBERMILLER) I 11.
74. Vyākhyaḥyukti 141b3; Gāthārthasaṃgrahaśāstra 261a3; Bu ston (OBERMILLER) I 11.
75. Vyākhyaḥyukti 141b7; Gāthārthasaṃgrahaśāstra 261a7.
76. Vyākhyaḥyukti 142a6.
77. Vyākhyaḥyukti 142b2; Gāthārthasaṃgrahaśāstra 262b3.
78. Vyākhyaḥyukti 143a6.
79. Vyākhyaḥyukti 146a1; Bu ston (OBERMILLER) I 80.
80. Vyākhyaḥyukti 146a3; Bu ston (OBERMILLER) I 80.
81. All are cited at Bu ston (OBERMILLER) I 82-83.
82. Vyākhyaḥyukti 143b2 foll.; Bu ston (OBERMILLER) I 81.
“because it brings about comprehension” (go bar mdzad pa ŋid) by “with a single utterance [the Buddha] brings understanding to world-systems without end” (dbyanś gcig gis ’jig rten gyi khams mtha’ yas par go bar mdzad pa). Under the tenth, “because it comprises [all] qualities”, he cites the Tathāgataguhya on the sixty qualities of the Buddha’s voice.

At folio 143a4, Vasubandhu gives a definition of the term “treatise” (śāstra), and cites, without attribution, a verse:

ñon moṅs dgra rnams ma lus ’chos pa daṅ,
ṅan ’gro srid las skyob pa gaṅ yin te,
’chos skyob yon tan phyir na bstan bcos te,
gnīs po ’dī dag gzan gyi lugs la med.

The same verse is cited by Candrakīrti in his Prasannapadā: 83

yac chāsti vah kleśarīpūn aśeṣān, samārāyate durgātito bhavāc ca,
tac chāsanāt trāṇagunāc ca śāstraṁ, etad dvayaṁ cānyamateṣu nāsti.

It is also cited by Guṇaprabha in his Pañcaskandhavivaraṇa, which is a commentary on Vasubandhu’s Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa. 84 Guṇaprabha ascribes it to Ācārya Āryadeva (slob dpon ’Phags pa lha).

Vasubandhu cites the Arthavistara, an important sūtra of the (Mūla-) Sarvāstivādins, three times (140a8; 134b6; 134a3). 85 At folio 144b5, he cites and explains a verse on how the Dharma is no longer properly explained, and refers to two losses: the loss of the letter and spirit of the Āgama, and the loss of understanding. Similar sentiments are expressed in the final verses of the Abhidharmakośa (8:39, 41).


84. P5568, Vol. 114, sens tsam, hi, 68a8. The verse is also cited at Bu ston (OBERMILLER) I 42.

85. J.-U. HARTMANN has identified Sanskrit fragments of this text from Central Asia, and demonstrated that it belonged to the Śaṣṭiṣṭhakanipāta: see his “Fragments aus dem Đirghāgama der Sarvāstivādins” in ENOMOTO, HARTMANN, and MATSUMURA: Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen, Göttingen 1989, pp. 40-46.
III. Sources of the Vyākhyyayukti

Citations from the canon of the Śrāvakas

All of the “Hundred Extracts” are culled from the scriptures of the Śrāvakayāna. In addition to the “Hundred Extracts”, in the Vyākhyyayukti Vasubandhu cites briefly or refers to numerous other sūtras. Those referred to in Chapters 1 and 2 belong exclusively to the canon of the Śrāvakas; those cited or referred to in Chapters 3, 4, and 5 belong to both the canon of the Śrāvakas and to the Mahāyāna. Chapter 5 has relatively few citations. As a whole, most of the citations and references are from the scriptures of the Śrāvakayāna. Most citations are in prose. As in his Abhidharmakośabhāṣya, Pratityasamutpādāvimśaṁghanaṁyānaṁvālaṁ, and Gāthārthasamgrahaṁyānaṁvāla, Vasubandhu cites verses under the rubric gāthā.

The specific source of the “Hundred Extracts” and the other citations, with a very few exceptions, is the canon of the (Mūla)Sarvāstivādins. This can be established by their phraseology. For example, extract § 2, on the Buddha’s declaration of his enlightenment, corresponds to a passage in the Mūlasarvāstivādin Saṁghaḥedavastu, as does the citation from the *Cetāhparyāyābhijñānāṁyānaṁvidaṁ (see Appendix 5.1) as amplified by Guṇamati.86 Furthermore, Vasubandhu cites by title a number of sūtras which, so far as I know, are unique to the (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin tradition, such as the Arthavistara, the *Jaṭila, the Paramārthaśūnyatā, the Māyājāla, and the Hastatādopama Sūtras.87 The Paramārthaśūnyatā, the Hastatādopama, and the *Jaṭila (under the title Bimbisāra) Sūtras are also cited by Vasubandhu in his Abhidharmakośabhāṣya, as are many of the sūtras cited without title. The (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin affiliation also holds for the citations in Guṇamati’s Ţīkā, since Guṇamati simply amplifies the references given by Vasubandhu. It also holds for the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya88 and the other works of Vasubandhu to be mentioned below.

86. I suspect that this is a reference to a section of a larger work (whether sūtra or vinaya), rather than the title of an independent work.

87. For the Jaṭilasūtra (known also as the Bimbisāra- or Bimbisārapratyudgamana-sūtra), see Peter SKILLING, Mahāsūtras: Great Discourses of the Buddha, Vol. II, Parts I & II, Oxford 1997, pp. 267-333 (for the title Jaṭilasūtra, see p. 278). For the Māyājālasūtra see ibid., pp. 227-65.

The “few exceptions” are citations from the recensions of other schools. As in his *Abhidharmakosabhāsya* and *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa*, in such cases Vasubandhu usually, but not always, names the school in question (see Appendix 5.2). An interesting example is at folio 33al, where, after analysing the phrase *svaṛtham suvyanjanam*, Vasubandhu notes that “some recite *sa-arthaṁ sa-vyanjanam*” (*kha cig ni don daṅ ldam pa daṅ, tshig ’bru daṅ ldam pa žes ’don te*). Here neither Vasubandhu nor his commentator Gunamati say who these “some” are, but the reading agrees with that of the Theravādin tradition, *saṭṭhaṁ savyaṅjananam* (*Majjhimanikāya* I 179,7, etc.).

**Citations from the scriptures of the Mahāyāna**

A list of Mahāyāna scriptures cited by title is given in Appendix 6. In addition, Vasubandhu cites several without title. The *Samdhinirmocana* is also cited by Vasubandhu in his *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa* and referred to in his *Pratīyāsamutpādādivibhaṅganirdeśa*.

**Sources of Vasubandhu’s methodology**

It is probable that Vasubandhu derived most of his terminology and methodology from earlier works, and that his originality lay in his arrangement and use of traditional material. He makes frequent references to *āgama* (*luṅ*: see Appendix 5.1), sometimes in verse; in most cases the style and phrasing of the citations shows that he does not mean the canonical *Āgamas*, but is referring to an unidentified exegetical tradition. As is common in Buddhist *sāstra* literature, Vasubandhu occasionally refers to the opinions of “some” (*kha cig = kecit*: 67a6; 95b8) or “others” (*gzan dag = anya*: 80b8, in verse; 112b4). As noted above, the *Vyākhyāyukti* contains many other verses in a non-canonical style; whether any of these were composed by Vasubandhu remains to be determined.

As a manual of exegesis, the *Vyākhyāyukti* may be compared with the Pāli *Nettipakaraṇa* of the pre-Buddhaghosa Theravādin tradition, so far as I know the only other major treatise devoted to this subject that has come down to us. Apart from the occasional use of similar terms, such as *saṃklesabhāgīya*, and a similar interpretation of the *mahāpadesa*, which might derive from a common source, I have not noticed any striking correspondences between the two texts (but a thorough study remains to be made). Exegesis is also dealt with by Asaṅga in his
Yogācārabhūmi⁸⁹ and in the Sāṃkathyaviniścaya, the last chapter of his Abhidharmasamuccaya.⁹⁰ A passage in the latter employs categories similar to those of the Vyākhya⁹¹ Only a thorough comparison of these texts will reveal their relationship.

IV. Translators and Translation

Since more or less the same team of translators rendered all three works into Tibetan, we are presented with a unified body of work. The works are listed in the lDan (or Lhan) dkar Catalogue of the early 9th century.⁹² Viśuddhasimha and Devendrarakṣita were also responsible for the Tibetan version of Vasubandhu’s Karmasiddhiprakarana (P5563; KSP pp. 174-75) and the accompanying Tīkā by Sumatiśila (P5572; KSP p. 175), as revised by Śrīkūṭa (dPal brtsegs).

I have not been able to find any biographical information for any of the translators, who also worked on the following texts:⁹³

Viśuddhasimha et al.: P166 (dhāraṇī); 351 (id.); 831; 855; 856; 874; 973
Viśuddhasimha, Sarvajñadeva, Prajñāvarman, Ye šes sde, dPal brtsegs: P767
Viśuddhasimha, dPal brtsegs: P5593 (Yaśomitra’s Abhidharmakosavyākhyā)
Śākyasimha, Devendrarakṣita: P940
Viśuddhasimha, Devendrarakṣita: P935
Devendrarakṣita: P994
Devendrarakṣita, Jinamitra, et al.: P827
Devendrarakṣita, Vidyākaraprabhā:⁹⁴ P141 (dhāraṇī), 508 (id.)
Māñjugrīvarman et al.: P367 (dhāraṇī)
Sarvajñadeva, dPal brtsegs: P891; 896; 923; 999; 1013
Sarvajñadeva et al.: P1030 (Vinayavastu); 1034 (Bhiksunīvinayavibhaṅga).

⁹³. For this list I have used the catalogue volumes of the Otani reprint of the Peking Kanjur and Tanjur.
The corpus of their work shows that the translators collaborated with the well-known Jinamitra, Prajñāvarman, dPal brtsegs, and Ye şes sde on the translation of Dhāraṇī and Sūtra, the latter both of the Mahāyāna and Śrāvakayāna (and, in the case of Sarvajñadeva, on the Vinaya). Their activity belongs the period of intensive translation during the “First Propagation” (sna dar) of Buddhism in Tibet, in about the beginning of the 9th century. Their familiarity with the thought of Vasubandhu shows itself in a lucid rendering, equal to the best standards of Tibetan translation.

V. The Influence of the Vyākhyāyukti

Influence in India (1): The Tarkajvalā of Bhavya

The Tarkajvalā is an encyclopaedic work composed by Bhavya (circa 500-70?) as a commentary on his Madhyamakahrdayakārikās. It contains an important defense of the Mahāyāna, which in some cases seems to rely on the Vyakhyāyukti. At one point Bhavya cites a verse list of sūtra titles that appears to be from the Vyakhyāyukti:

\[
\begin{align*}
(VyY 114b3) & \quad (Tarkajvalā 180a5) \\
bla ma kun dga' 'od sel dan, & bla ma kun dga' pa ta li, \\
sdüg bsñal phun ston sa ston dan, & 'char byed skyod pa 'chañ ba dan, \\
'char ka ston niid chu las skyes, & gan po sa pañs par ma pa dan, \\
gan po sa mtsho chu śiṅ dan, & mya 'nan 'das dan yul 'khor sruñ, \\
mya 'nan 'das dan yul 'khor sruñ, & phro ba'i mdo dañ de bžin gžan, \\
'phro ba'i mdo dañ de bžin gžan, & 'char byed skyod pa 'chañ ba dan, \\
yan dag bsdu pa'i gzi niams phyir, & gan po sa pañs par ma pa dan, \\
mtsha' dag min par rtogs pa yin, & rgyas pa min par rtogs par bya.
\end{align*}
\]

Influence in India (2): The Arthaviṇīśayuṇanibandhana

The Arthaviṇīśayuṇanibandhana (Arthav-n) is a commentary on the Arthaviṇīśayuṇa, a long compendium of many of the basic terms and categories of Buddhism. The Nibandhana, composed by Vīryaśrīdatta at

95. For references to Bhavya and his date and work, see Peter SKILLING, “A Citation from the *Buddhavamsa of the Abhayagiri School,” Journal of the Pali Text Society XVIII (1993), pp. 168-69.

96. It is possible that some of Bhavya’s material is taken from a common source, rather than directly from Vasubandhu. The extent of his debt to Vasubandhu can only be judged when the two works have been properly edited.

97. PS256, Vol. 96, dbu ma, dza.
Nālandā during the reign of King Dharmapāla (latter half of the 8th century),98 cites or paraphrases the Vyākhyaũykti a number of times. Vīryaśrīdatta cites three verses from the Vyākhyaũykti, without naming his source:

(1) (Arthav-n 72,4) tathā ca āha:
śrutiṁ śūrasya māhāmyaṁ śrotur ādarakāritaṁ,
śravanodgraṇaṁ syād ity ādau vācāṁ prayojanaṁ.

(VyY 34a1) 'dir srmas pa:
mo don che ba ŋid thos na,
ñan pa daṅ ni 'dzin pa la,
ñan pa po ni gus byed pas,
thog mar dgos pa brjod par bya.

(VyY 133a7) snar:
mo sde'i che ba ŋid thos na,
mīan pa daṅ ni bzuṅ ba la,
ñan pa po ni gus byed 'gyur,
de phyir thog mar dgos (corr. from dgoṅs)
pa brjod. ces bston pa yin.

This verse is cited by Bu ston (OBERMILLER) I, p. 17.

(2) (Arthav-n 77,2) yathoktam:
aśvaryasya samagrasya rūpasya yaśasah śriyāḥ,
janāsyātha prayatnasya saṃnāṁ bhaga iti śrutih.

(VyY 46b7) 'dir bṣad pa:
dbaṅ phyug daṅ ni gzugs bzaṅs daṅ,
brtson 'grus phun sum ldan pa yi,
grags daṅ dpal daṅ ye śes daṅ,
drug po dag la bcom ṣes bṣad.

This verse is also cited by Haribhadra in his Abhisamayālaṁkārālōka.99

(3) (Arthav-n 247,5 – in verse?) padāṇāṁ punah pindārthah:
bhaṅktvā vibhandham sāśrivasampadāṁ yaṁ hi yena saḥ,
yathāgataḥ sāśrkarma yaḥ ca yaiś ca parigrhaḥ. ity etat paridīpitaṁ iti.

(VyY 45b7 – prose) tshig rnam s kyis bsdus pa'i don de ni bgegs bcom nas ston
pa phun sum tshogs pa gaṅ du gaṅ gis, ji ltar gšogs pa daṅ, ston pa'i phrin las
gaṅ yin pa daṅ, gaṅ dag gis yons su gzun ba ṣes bya ba 'di yoṅs su bston to.

Several prose passages, such as those sections dealing with the four brahmavihāra100 and with the four srota-āpattyanga101 are based on the Vyākhyaũykti. Otherwise, Vīryaśrīdatta relies heavily on the Abhi-

98. See Arthav, introduction, pp. 133-36; Arthav-n 312,3-6. I have not been able to trace any references to Vīryaśrīdatta in Tāranātha.
101. Arthav-n 240-59. Since the VyY does not deal with this subject, the parallels are scattered here and there and do not follow the same order. Cp., for example, Arthav-n 248, 5-249,5 (on the Dharma) with VyY folios 49a, 49b, and 50a; Arthav-n 250, 5-252,2 (on the Samgha) with VyY folio 51a; Arthav-n 256, 6-258,6 (on śīla) with VyY folio 82b.
dharmakosabhāṣya and Yaśomitra's Vyākhyā (as shown by Samtani in his notes).\textsuperscript{102} For his interpretation of pratītyasamutpāda, he uses Vasubandhu's Pratītyasamutpādādīvibhāṅganirdeśa.\textsuperscript{103} Other passages may be traced to the Gāthārthasaṃgrahaśāstra, and to the commentaries on Vasubandhu's Pañcaskandhapraṇakaraṇa by Guṇamati and Prthividbahu. Thus Vīryaśrīdatta's work may be described as a compendium of the thought of Vasubandhu as applied to the interpretation of the Arthaviniścayasūtra. Its intrinsic value is enhanced by the fact that it supplies us with examples of the Sanskrit terminology and phraseology of the Vyākhyāyukti and the Pratītyasamutpādādīvibhāṅganirdeśa. Conversely, since there is no Tibetan or Chinese translation of the Nibandhana, doubtful readings or difficult passages in that text can be clarified by consulting Vīryaśrīdatta's sources in Tibetan translation.\textsuperscript{104}

(A second and quite different commentary on the Arthaviniścayasūtra, the anonymous Arthaviniścayatīkā [P5852], which is preserved only in Tibetan translation, takes a quite different approach. A casual study shows a preference for the interpretations of Asaṅga. The only parallel to the Vyākhyāyukti that I have traced is the mention of the three types of pot, discussed above.)

\textit{Influence in India (3): The Abhisamayālaṅkārāloka}

The Abhisamayālaṅkārāloka was composed by Haribhadra, who resided at the Trikūṭa Vihāra during the reign of King Dharmaśāla, and hence was roughly contemporary to Vīryaśrīdatta. Haribhadra gives five citations of verse from the Vyākhyāyukti. The first, which is also cited in the Arthaviniścayasūtranibandhana (see above), is introduced without title by the phrase atha vā. The second, which names the source as the Vyākhyāyukti, lists the five methods by which the sūtras are to be explained.\textsuperscript{105} Haribhadra also cites kārikās from the Kośa.\textsuperscript{106} In his

\begin{footnotes}
\item[102] See also SAMTANI's introduction, pp. 134-35.
\item[103] A reference to the Sanskrit fragments edited by TUCCI has been noted by SAMTANI. In addition there are numerous parallels to the complete Tibetan version.
\item[104] For example, the variant sunirjita for Arthav-n 194,1, nirjita-vipakṣatvat, is confirmed by VyY 66a4, \textit{mi mthun pa'i phyogs śin tu thul ba'i phyir}.
\item[105] See above, n. 54. For the other three citations see PRAPOD & SKILLING, "Vasubandhu on Travel and Seclusion" (above, n. 56).
\item[106] WOGIHARA 220,23; 222,2-26; 224,2; 225,7.
\end{footnotes}
Sphuṭartha Abhisamayālaṅkāravṛtti, Haribhadra cites the Kośa and the Viṃśatikā.¹⁰⁷

These references show that the Vyākhya-yukti was studied (along with the other works of Vasubandhu) in the great monasteries of Northern India during the reign of Dharmapāla. Tibetan tradition records that Sa skya Pañḍita studied the Vyākhya-yukti under Indian pañḍitas,¹⁰⁸ which shows that the work retained its importance in India up to the 12th century. Since, however, the work has not been edited, translated, or analyzed to date, the full extent of its influence upon Indian śāstra literature has yet to be determined.

Influence in Tibet (1): Sa skya Pañḍita and the Vyākhya-yukti¹⁰⁹

The Vyākhya-yukti was one of the sources used by Sa skya Pañḍita Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan (1182-1251/2) for his mKhas pa 'jug pa'i sgo, which “described for the first time to Tibetans the literary values and scholastic methods of Indian Buddhists”, and set forth “the three main activities of a traditional scholar: composition, teaching, and debate”. The Vyākhya-yukti, cited by Sa pañ, lends its structure to the second part on exposition.¹¹⁰

Influence in Tibet (2): Bu ston and the Vyākhya-yukti

Bu ston, in his renowned History of Buddhism (Chos 'byuṅ) classes the Vyākhya-yukti among the “Eight Treatises” of Vasubandhu (OBER-MILLER, I 56-57), and describes it as “teaching the proper [method] of exposition and hearing [of the the Dharma in the light of the doctrine

¹⁰⁷. Bhikṣu SAMDHONG Rimpoche (ed.): Abhisamayālaṅkāravṛtti Sphuṭartha, Sarnath 1977, Tibetan text, p. 118,1, 118,12-13, respectively.

¹⁰⁸. See following section for reference.

¹⁰⁹. The information and quotations in this section are from David JACKSON’s foreword to Mkhas pa la 'jug pa'i sgo, An introduction to the principles and concepts of Indo-Tibetan scholasticism, Sakya Centre, Dehra Dun 1983. See also JACKSON’s The Entrance Gate for the Wise (Section III): Sa-skya Pañḍita on Indian and Tibetan Traditions of Pramāṇa and Philosophical Debate, 2 Vols., Vienna 1987.

¹¹⁰. JACKSON (1987), Part I, pp. 195-96: bṣad pa la 'jug pa'i le'u, p. 28, rnam bṣad rigs pa las. See also Part II, Appendix I, for Glo bo mkhan chen’s outline of the section.
of mind only”. His citations begin at the very beginning of his work (OBERMILLER, I 9), with a verse which he attributes to the Bodhisattvapiṭaka, also found in the Udanaavarga and cited by Vasubandhu in both the Vyākhyaṭukti and the Gāthāsaṃgraha. He then cites at length the interpretation of the verse from the Vyākhyaṭukti (a similar explanation is given in the Gāthārthasaṃgrahaśāstra), followed by several further citations. In his History he cites the Vyākhyaṭukti by name 22 times, and cites Guṇamati’s Tiṅkā once. There are also several unattributed citations (I 38 = 97b5; I 81 = 140b7-141a1).

The Vyākhyaṭukti and modern scholarship

The Vyākhyaṭukti has been neglected by modern scholarship, perhaps in part because it is not available in Sanskrit or in Chinese translation. Although much has been written about Vasubandhu, the Vyākhyaṭukti is scarcely mentioned. The only early scholar who seems to have consulted it extensively was OBERMILLER, who, in his translation of Bu ston’s History (see above), meticulously traced the Vyākhyaṭukti references. LAMOTTE, in the introduction to his Le Traité de l’Acte (p. 176) describes the Vyākhyaṭukti as “un ouvrage lexicologique”, while

111. de Itar yin yan bṣad ŋan 'thad par ston pa rnam bṣad rigs pa: Bu ston rin chen grub, Bu ston chos 'byun, Gaṅs ljoṅs šes rig gi ŋiṅ bcud, Kruṅ go bod kyi šes rig dpe skrun khaṅ 1988, p. 31,20.


113. See OBERMILLER’s Index, Part II, p. 230.

114. A study of the influence and application of the Vyākhyaṭukti and its principles in the Land of Snows is a chapter of Tibetan intellectual history that remains to be written, lying beyond the range of this already bloated monograph and the competence of its author. Suffice to add here that it was regularly cited by the great 19th century scholar Jamgon KONGTRUL (Koṅ sprul Blo gros mtha’ yas, 1813-99) in his Šes bya miha’ yas pa’i rgya mtsho: see for example Jamgön KONGTRUL Lodrö Tayé, Myriad Worlds: Buddhist Cosmology in Abhidharma, Kālacakra and Dzog-chen, translated by the International Translation Committee of Kunkhyab Chöling founded by the V.V. Kalu Rinpoché, Snow Lion Publications, Ithaca (New York) 1995, pp. 88-89; Buddhist Ethics, translated by the International Translation Committee founded by the V.V. Kalu Rinpoché, Snow Lion Publications, Ithaca (New York) 1998, pp. 68, 76, etc.
ANACKER calls it a “history of the Buddhist Canon”.\textsuperscript{115} Both descriptions are inaccurate. A better one is offered by Hajime NAKAMURA: the Vyākhya-yukti “teaches how to interpret and explain the content of a sūtra. In the fourth chapter of this work the assertion that Mahāyāna cannot be considered as Buddhism is set forth and Vasubandhu refuted it”.\textsuperscript{116}

Exceptions to the neglect include an article by José Ignacio CABELÓN, “Vasubandhu’s Vyākhya-yukti on the Authenticity of the Mahāyāna Sūtras”\textsuperscript{117} and the work of Kazunobu MATSUDA and other Japanese scholars.\textsuperscript{118}

VI. Conclusions: The Importance of the Vyākhya-yukti

As a source for Āgama studies and sūtra citations

In the “Hundred Extracts”, we have 109 citations from the (Mūla)-Sarvāstivādin scriptures, selected for their significance by Vasubandhu himself. Most of them are repeated in full in Guṇamati’s Tīkā. In the Vyākhya-yukti, there are many other citations; though generally these are very brief, they are frequently amplified by Guṇamati. In addition, the Vyākhya-yukti contains numerous references to sūtra titles or to personages; in some cases where Vasubandhu gives only the title, Guṇamati supplies a citation which helps us to identify the sūtra. A number of the citations are not found in the Abhidharmakośa or other works of either Vasubandhu or the Vaibhāṣika tradition. In addition, there are occasional references to the scriptures or interpretations of other schools, and references to and citations of Mahāyāna scriptures.

As a source for Mahāyāna studies

The study of the origins of the Mahāyāna and its relationship to the Śrāvakayāna is one of the most important and challenging fields of

\textsuperscript{115} ANACKER, op. cit., p. 1; p. 155, n. 62.

\textsuperscript{116} NAKAMURA, Indian Buddhism, p. 271.

\textsuperscript{117} In Jeffrey R. TIMM (ed.): Texts in Context: Traditional Hermeneutics in South Asia, Albany 1992, pp. 221-43.

Buddhist studies. The *Vyākhyāyukti* is one of the few Indian works extant that treats at length with the validity of the Mahāyāna and its relationship to the Śrāvakayāna scriptures, in the form of a highly literate debate.\(^\text{119}\) It is thus a primary source for studies on this subject.

**As a source for “Vasubandhu studies”**

On the evidence of his *Abhidharmakośa* alone, Vasubandhu has been rated one of the most learned and interesting Buddhist thinkers of all time. Since the *Vyākhyāyukti* is a mature, confident, and comprehensive work, it cannot be ignored in future studies on Vasubandhu. As noted above, controversy remains about who he was, when he lived, his relationship to Asaṅga and the Mahāyāna, and to the “Elder Vasubandhu”. The present study shows that the works of Vasubandhu’s later period are all interrelated, and that they are related to his earlier *Kosabhāṣya*. In order to gain a deeper insight into the development of Vasubandhu’s thought, we need proper critical editions of these works, and – since they cannot be fully appreciated in isolation – a thorough concordance. This would put “Vasubandhu studies” on a firm footing.\(^\text{120}\)

**As a manual of exegesis**

The three points listed above should be sufficient to establish the importance of the *Vyākhyāyukti*. But they must be subordinated to the purpose (*prayojana*) of the text itself.\(^\text{121}\) The *Vyākhyāyukti* sets out the principles of exegesis or hermeneutics. Needless to say, the principles of exegesis described by Vasubandhu may be applied not only to the sūtras that he cites, but to Buddhist literature in general.

On the basis of these points, I venture to state that the *Vyākhyāyukti* can no longer be safely ignored, and that it is one of the most important Buddhist works remaining to be studied.

---

119. Another is Bhavya’s *Tarkajvalā*, which depends for some of its ideas on the *Vyākhyāyukti*.

120. I am preparing a critical edition of the three works of the “*Vyākhyāyukti* literature”.

121. We might say that while the emphasis of the *Kośa* is the clarification of categories and classifications (by nature of its being an Abhidharmak text), the emphasis of the *Vyākhyāyukti* is meaning and interpretation (*dgoṅs pa, abhiprāya*).
Appendices

Appendix 1: Concordance of the first ten extracts

Chapter 1
[1] VyY-sū 19a3-6; VyY 32a3 foll.; VyY-t 2b1
On hearing and realizing the Dharma; parallel to Aṇguttaranikāya V 6, 1-6, on sutadhana.

Chapter 2
Four extracts “in praise of the Buddha” (VyY 45b5, sans rgyas kyi bsñags pa las brtsams nas ni ... mdo sde’i dum bu bži dag ste):
[2] VyY-sū 19a6-7; VyY 45b7; VyY-t 20a1
The “ten epithets of the Buddha” = Arthaviniścasūtra 45,9-11
[3] VyY-sū 19a7-19b1; VyY 47a1-48a3; VyY-t 22b5
On the Buddha’s proclamation of his enlightenment = Saṃghabhedavastu I 136,9-13
[4] VyY-sū 19b1-3; VyY 48a3-b5; VyY-t 23b7
On the Buddha as “tamer of the untamed”; parallel spoken by King Pasenadi in the Aṇgulimālasutta, Majjhimanikāya 86, II 102,19.
[5] VyY-sū 19b3; VyY 48b5-49a5; VyY-t 26a3
Three extracts “in praise of the Dharma” (VyY 49a5, chos kyi bsñags pa las brtsams na[s] ni ... mdo sde’i dum bu gsun ste):
[6] VyY-sū 19b3-4; VyY 49a7-50a3; VyY-t 27a5
Stock description of the Dharma = Arthaviniścasūtrasa 45,12-46,1
[7] VyY-sū 19b5-6; VyY 50a3-50b2; VyY-t 28a2
[8] VyY-sū 19b6-7; VyY 50b2-8; VyY-t 30a2
One extract “in praise of the Saṃgha” (VyY 50b8, dge ’dun gyi bsñags pa las brtsams nas ni ... mdo sde’i dum bu ste):
[9] VyY-sū 19b7-8; VyY 50b8-51b2; VyY-t 30b3
Stock description of the Saṃgha = Arthaviniścasūtrasa 46,3-4
One extract on “the side of defilement” (samklesapakṣa) (VyY 51b2, kun nas ŋon moṅs pa’i phyogs las brtsams nas ni ... mdo sde’i dum bu ste):
[10] Vy-sū 19b8-20a5; VyY 51b2-52a2; VyY-t 31a4

Appendix 2: Verses in the Vyākhyāyukti

Appendix 2.1. Saṃgrahaśloka

Chapter 1: 44b6; 45a5
Chapter 2: 50b6; 80b3; 80b7
Chapter 3: 100b2; 109b5
Chapter 4: 123a8
Chapter 5: 134a2; 146b6; 148b6; 152a5; 152b5.

Appendix 2.2. Introductory phrases to verses

’di ltar smras pa: 34a1 (= Arthaviniścasūtranibandhana: see above)
’dir smras pa: 33b5 (= Abhisamayālaṃkārāloka: see above); 34a5; 59b5; 60b1
Appendix 2.3. Verses without introduction:

45b2; 104a5; 106a5; 142a7; 144a3; 144a5; 144bl, 2, 3; 144b5; 145a7; 147a3, 5; 147b1, 4; 148a1; 148b7; 149a5, etc.

Appendix 3: Thirteen terms with diverse meanings

[1] VyY 38b4: gzugs = rūpa
[2] VyY 38b6: mtha' = anta
[3] VyY 39a2: mchog = agra
[4] VyY 39a8: 'jig rten = loka
[6] VyY 39b7: 'byun ba = bhūta
[7] VyY 40a4: pā da = pada
[8] VyY 40b2: chos = dharma (cited at Bu ston I, p. 18)
[9] VyY 41a2: span s pa = prahāna
[10] VyY 41a6: tshul = nyāya
[12] VyY 42a2: phun po = skandha
[13] VyY 42a5: bsdu pa = saṃgraha

Appendix 4: Concordance of Pāli and Sanskrit Titles

Titles are given only when the correspondence between versions is certain, in traditional order of Pali Nikāyas, by Sutta number for Dīghanikāya (DN) and Majjhimanikāya (MN), by Pali Text Society volume and page numbers for Samyuttanikāya (SN) and Aṅguttaranikāya (AN). When possible a restored Sanskrit title is given (otherwise unattested or tentative titles being preceded by an asterisk). Further details can be found under the appropriate titles in Appendix 5.

Dīghanikāya

DN 16 Mahāparinibbāna-su = Mahāparinirvāṇa-sū
DN 17 Mahāsudassanā-su = Mahāsudarśana-sū
DN 34 Dasuttara-su = Daśottara-sū
### Majjhimanikāyā

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Tibetan Title</th>
<th>Sanskrit Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MN 13</td>
<td>Mahādukkhakkhandha-su</td>
<td>*(Prathama-)*Duhkhaskandhika-sū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN 14</td>
<td>Cāludukkhandha-su</td>
<td>*Duhkhaskandha-nirdeśā (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN 28</td>
<td>Mahāhathipodopama-su</td>
<td>Hastipodopama-sū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN 61</td>
<td>Ambalaṭṭhikā-rāhulovāda-su</td>
<td>Rāhula-sū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN 78</td>
<td>Saṃānandaṃḍikā-su</td>
<td>*Pañcāṅgasthapati-sū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN 82</td>
<td>Raṭṭhapālā-su</td>
<td>Rāṣṭrapālā-sū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN 107</td>
<td>Gānakamoggallāna-su</td>
<td>*Ganaka-sū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN 108</td>
<td>Gopakamoggallāna-su</td>
<td>*Gopaka-sū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN 115</td>
<td>Bahudhātuka-su</td>
<td>Bahudhātuka -sū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN 121</td>
<td>Cūlasuññatā-su</td>
<td>Śūryatā-sū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN 139</td>
<td>Aranaṃvibhānga-su</td>
<td>*Araṇa-sū</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Samyuttanikāyā

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Tibetan Title</th>
<th>Sanskrit Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN III 65-66</td>
<td>Sammāsambuddha-su</td>
<td>Arhat-sū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN III 86</td>
<td>Khajjanīya-su</td>
<td>bZa’ ba lta bu’i mdo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN III 105-6</td>
<td>Ananda-su</td>
<td>Pūrṇa-sū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN V 154-58</td>
<td>Bhikkhunivāsaka-su</td>
<td>Bhiksuniś-sū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN V 320-22</td>
<td>Vesāli-su (also Vin III 68)</td>
<td>Ri dags zlog gi mdo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aṅguttaraniikāyā

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Tibetan Title</th>
<th>Sanskrit Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AN I 229</td>
<td>Gadrabha-su</td>
<td>*Gardabha-sū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN IV 402-5</td>
<td>Silāyūpa-su</td>
<td>*Acandrikāputra-sū (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN IV 162-66</td>
<td>Uttarā-su</td>
<td>Uttarā-sū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN IV 100-6</td>
<td>Suriya-su</td>
<td>Saptasūryodaya-sū</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 5. Šrāvakayāna sources and references

Conventions: In Appendices 5 and 6 references are given in the order VyY-sū, VyY, VyY-ṭ. References without any preceding siglum are to the primary text, VyY. References are given first by known or restored (indicated by preceding asterisk) Sanskrit title, followed by Tibetan title for those for which the Sanskrit is unknown. When the source of a citation is known but not given by title in the text, the title is enclosed within brackets. Secondary elements of titles (Prathama-, Ārya-, etc.) are placed in parentheses. Further: -[sū] indicates that -sūtra is not included in title as cited; (vs) = verse; (?) indicates a doubtful restoration or possible parallel, etc.; anīga indicates one of the twelve anīgas of the Buddha’s teaching; = indicates parallels rather than exact equivalents. When minor corrections have been made to the Tibetan of the Peking edition, the original reading follows the corrected form in curling brackets: { … }.

### Appendix 5.1. Literary references

*Acandrikāputra-sū (?)*: Ma zla ba’i bu mo’i mdo (VyY-ṭ Ma zla ba’i bu mo’i bu)

= AN IV 402-5, Silāyūpa-su, in which a Candikāputta plays a role

37a3; VyY-ṭ 10b6, 7

Abdhutadharma, anīga: rMad du byuṅ ba’i chos kyi sde

VyY-sū 31b6; VyY 97b1; VyY-ṭ 122b5; 124b1 (def.)

122. Title from Syāmaraṭṭhassa Tepiṭakam, Vol. 20, p. 308 penult.
(Prathama-)Adbhuta-sū: rMad du byun ba dañ po’i mdo
   127b6 (= DN II 109; AN IV 307); VyY-ṭ 159a4
*Anāgāmi-sū: Phyir mi ‘ohn ba’i mdo
   VyY-ṭ 153a2
Abhidharma: Chos mñon pa
   VyY-sū 25b8; VyY 77a4; 97b3; 124b1; VyY-ṭ 86a1; 124b5, 7; 162a7
Abhidharmakośa: Chos mñon pa’i mdzod
   VyY-ṭ 181a8
Abhivinaya: ‘Dul ba mñon pa
   VyY-sū 25b8; VyY 77a4; VyY-ṭ 86a1; 162a7
Araṇa-sū: Ņon moňas pa med pa’i mdo = MN 139, Araṇavibhaṅga-sū
   74a8; VyY-ṭ 79a5 = MN III 230,15-17
Arthavistara: Don rgyas pa = P984, Vol. 39
   134b6; [43a8 (= P984, Vol. 39, mdo, śu, 198a2); 74a2 (= VyY-sū no. 67);
   134a3; 140a8]; VyY-ṭ 166a7
Arhat-sū: dGra bcom pa’i mdo = SN III 65, Sammāsambuddha-su
   127b1; VyY-ṭ 157a8; 158a5
Avadāna, ānga: rTogs pa brjod pa’i sde
   VyY-sū 31b5; VyY 97a6; 141a1 (see Nanda, Gopāla); VyY-ṭ 122b5; 123b8
   (def.). See also Dirghala-.
Āgama: Luṅ
   33b2; 34b1; 36a6; 36b5; 44a1; 48b2; 49b8; 51a8; 54a5; 55b4; 57a3; 58a1; 60b2
   (vs); 62b4 (vs); 65b6; 69b6 (vs); 74b6; 76a1; 76b5; 77b7; 79a4; 81b4; 87b1
   (vs); 103a8; 104a4; 112b7; 116b2, 3; 125b1; 145a3, 7; VyY-ṭ 6a3; 58a6; 92b8;
   93a1; 94a6; 133b4; 134a1, 3, 6; 147b8; 148a1, 2
Ānanda-sū: Kun dga’ bo’i mdo
   114b3; 114b7
Āyuḥparyanta-[sū]: Tshe’i mtha’ = P973, Vol. 39
   116b4
Āryasatya-sū: ’Phags pa’i bden pa’i mdo sde
   124b8; VyY-ṭ 153b4 (= SN V 425,14-17, etc.)
Itivṛttaka, ānga: De ltu bu byun ba’i sde
   VyY-sū 31b6; VyY 97a7; VyY-ṭ 122b5; 124a5 (def.); 124b5
Uttara-sū: bLa ma’i mdo = AN IV, Uttara-su (cf. uddāna p. 172,15, Uttaro)
   114b3; 114b4 (= AN IV 166,7-10); 115a3
Udāna, ānga: Ched du brjod pa’i sde
   VyY-sū 31b5; VyY 97a4; VyY-ṭ 122b5; 123b6 (def.)
[Udānavarga][123]
   36a8 (= Uv 27:25ab, 26ab); 40a5 (= Uv 26:29b); 40a7 (= Uv 4:1ab); 103b7
   (=Uv 1:3); 40b1 (= Uv 29:25ef, 27ef, 29ef, 31ef); 53a8 (= Uv 28:21); 104a1 (=
   Uv 26:9); 113b7 (= Uv 23:17); 114a1 (= Uv 29:24); 118a2 (= Uv 29:24a);
   118a2 (= Uv 29:23a); 125a4 (= Uv 29:24a); 136b3 (= Uv 22:6). See also Gāthā.
Udāyi-sū: ’Char ka’i mdo
   114b3; 115b1 (cp. SN IV 224,29-30?); VyY-ṭ 162a6; 163a4

123. References are to Franz BERNHARD (ed.): Udānavarga, Göttingen, Vol. I, 1965,
Uddāna: sDom
VyY-sū 25a4
-gāthā: - gyi tshigs su bcad pa 41a7; 61b5; VyY-ṭ 51a6
Upadeśa, anga: bsTan la dbab pa bstan pa’i sde
VyY-sū 31b6; VyY 97b2; VyY-ṭ 122b5; 124b7 (def.)
Upāli-sū: Ny bar ’khor [ba’i] mdo sde
VyY-ṭ 147b7
Ekottara: gCig las ’phros pa
116b5
*Kadali-sū: Chu śīṅ gi mdo
114b3; 115b8
*Kapiṇjala-jātaka: Goṅ ma sreg gi skyes pa’i rabs (cf. Mahāvyutpattī [Sakaki] 4892)
VyY-ṭ 124a6
*Gaṇaka-sū: rTsis mkhan [gyi] mdo = MN 107, Gaṇakamoggallāna-sū
VyY-ṭ 171a8
*Gati-sū: ’Gro ba’i mdo
114b3; 116a5; VyY-ṭ 153a2, 3
*Gardabha-sū: Luṅ boon gi mdo = AN I 229, Gadrabha-sū
51b5; VyY-ṭ 31a7 (= AN I 229,11-25)
Garbāvakrānti [-sū]: mṅal {mal} du ’jug pa
116b3; VyY-ṭ 153a2
Gāthā: Tshigs su bcad pa
33a6 (see Māroktā-); 51b6; 68b7 (= Uv 26:10d); 73a1 (= Uv 30:33); 73a5; 84a4;
114a7; 118a2 (= Uv 29:24a); 118a2 (= Uv 29:23a); 123b5; 125a4 (= Uv
29:24a); 128a7 (dGe ’dun phal chen sde pa: Mahāsāṃghika); 144b6; 150b1
VyY-ṭ 48b8; 75a8 (yathoktaṃ sthavrāniruddhena); 100b1, 3; 130a7; 148b3
-ānga: - pa’i sde: VyY-sū 31b5; VyY 97a3; VyY-ṭ 122b4; 123b5 (def.)
Geya, anga: dByaṅs kyis bsniad pa’i sde
VyY-sū 31b5; VyY 40b7; 97a1, 2; 140a4; VyY-ṭ 122b4; 122b7 foll. (def.)
*Gopaka-sū: Sa mtsho’i mdo (cf. Mahāvyutpattī 1071, Gopi [pa] = Sa ’tsho ma)
= MN 108, Gopakamoggallāna-sū
114b3; 115b6 (= MN III 13,26-32); cf. Śamathadeva, mṅon pa’i bstan bcos, thu,
111b4
*Cetaḥparyāyābhijñā-nirdeśa: Sems kyi rnam graṅs mṅon par šes pa bstan pa
37a8 (cf. Saṅghabhādavastu [Gnoli] II 248,21); VyY-ṭ 10a7
Jaṭila-sū: Raḷ pa can gyi mdo sde = Bimbisārapratyudgamaṇa-sū, P955, Vol. 38
[VyY-sū 20b5]; VyY 55b5
Jātaka, anga: sKyed pa’i rabs kyi sde
VyY-sū 31b6; VyY 97a8; VyY-ṭ 122b5; 124a6 (def.). See also Kapiṇjala-, Sunetra-.
Tripitaka: sDe snod gsum
VyY-ṭ 124b5, 7
Daśottara[-sū]: bCur bskyed pa = DN 34, Daśuttara-sū
44a4
Dirghala-avadāna: Raṅ po len gyi rtogs pa brjod pa
97a7; VyY-ṭ 124a2
*Duḥkhaskandha-nirdeśa (?): sDug bsñal gyi phun po ston pa [bstan pa?]
   = MN 14, Cūḷadukkhhakṣhhandha-su
   115a6 (= MN I 92.26)
*(Prathama-)Duḥkhaskandhika-sū: sDug bsñal gyi phun po can gyi mdo dañ po
   = MN 13, Mahādukkhhakṣhhandha-su
   88b3; VyY-ṭ 108a5 (= MN I 85,22-29); 108b1 (= MN I 88,6-13)
*Devatā-sū: Lha'i mdo
   73a8; VyY-ṭ 75b3
Dharmamudrā-sū: Chos kyi phyag rgya'i mdo
   VyY-ṭ 153a3
*Nandaka[-sū]: dGa' byed
   116b3
Nidāna, anga: Glen gzi'i sde
   VyY-sū 31b5; VyY 97a5; VyY-ṭ 122b5; 124b5, 6
Nīpāta: Le'u
   116b3; VyY-ṭ 1481, 2
*Nyagrodha-sū: Nya gro da'i mdo
   48b1; 137a7; VyY-ṭ 248b; 168a2; 171a7
*Pañcāṅgasthapati-sū: Yan lag lna pa'i phya mkhan gyi mdo = MN 78,
   Samapamapāṇḍikā-sū
   37a6 (= MN II 27,5-10); VyY-ṭ 11b2 (= MN II 26,16-22)
Paramāṁthaśūnyatā[-sū]: Don daṁ pa ston pa niid
   124a7; 127b7; VyY-ṭ 159b6
Pūrṇa-sū: Gaṅ po'i mdo = SN III 105-6, Ānanda-su
   114b3; 115b5 (= SN III 105,10-11)
Praññītyasamutpāda-sū: rTen ciṅ 'brel bar 'byuṅ ba'i mdo
   98b2 [98b4, de niid las; 98b7]
Pravacana, dvādāśāṅga: gSuṅ rab, yan lag bcu gñis po
   VyY-ṭ 124b5
Bahudhāṅtuka[-sū]: Khams maṅ po pa = P963, Vol. 38 = MN 115, Bahudhāṅtuka-su
   127b1; VyY-ṭ 157a8
Bimbisārāpratyudgamana-sū: gZugs can sīṅ po bsu ba'[i] mdo = P955, Vol. 38
   VyY-ṭ 152b8
Bhikṣuṇī-sū: dGe sloṅ ma'i mdo sde = SN V 154-58, Bhikkhunīvāsaka-su
   43a3 (spoken to Ānanda); VyY-ṭ 68b6
Mahāparinirvāṇa-sū: Yons su mya ṅan las 'das chen po'i mdo
   = DN 16, Mahāparinibbāṇa-su
   114b3; 116a1 (= MPS 42:17, p. 396); 116a8; VyY-ṭ 147b6
Mahāsudarsana-sū: Legs mthon chen po['i] mdo sde = DN 17, Mahāsudassana-su
   VyY-ṭ 147b7
Mātrikā: Ma mo
   97b3; VyY-ṭ 124b3
Māṇusyaka-sū: Mi'i mdo
   VyY-ṭ 123b5; 153a1
Māyājala[-sū]: sGYu ma'i dra ba
   126b1; VyY-ṭ 155b7
*Māroka-gāthā: bDud kyis smras pa’i tshigs su bcad pa
33a6 (= SN I, Mārasaṃyutta, p. 108); VyY-ṭ 4a5
Rāṣṭrapāla-sū: Yul ’khor skyoṅ [gil] mdo) = MN 82, Rāṭhapāla-su
114b3; 116a3 (cf. MN II 68,15 foll.)
Rāhula-sū: sGra gcen zin gyi mdo sde = MN 61, Ambalaṭṭhikā-rāhulovāda-su
71a8; VyY-ṭ 71a4 (= MN I 415,30-416,6); 71a7 (= MN I 416,35-417,1);
71a8 (= MN I 417,6-7)
Vārṣākāra-sū: dByar tshul [gyi] mdo sde
VyY-ṭ 147b7
Vinaya: ’Dul ba
97a5; 124b1 foll.; 129b7; VyY-ṭ 124a5; 124b6; 153a6 foll.
Vibhāṣā: Bye brag tu bṣad pa
108b5; VyY-ṭ 129b4
Veda: Rig byed
105b2
Vaitulya, āṅga: mTshuṅs pa med pa’i sde
VyY-ṭ 125a7
Vaipulya, āṅga: Śīn tu rgyas pa’i sde
VyY-sū 31b6; VyY 97a8; 97b5; 98a3; 103b2; 104a4; 113b1; 133a3
VyY-ṭ 122b5; 124a6 (def.); 124b8
Vyākaraṇa, āṅga: Luṅ du bstan pa’i sde
VyY-sū 31b5; VyY 97a3; VyY-ṭ 122b4; 123a6 foll. (def.)
Vyākaraṇa: Byā ka ra na (non-Buddhist grammatical work)
105a8; 105b1, 2, 6, 7; VyY-ṭ 135b7; 136a5
Śāstra: bSタン bcos
143a4 (def.; see Bu ston I 42)
Śūnyatā-sū: sToṅ pa niṅ kyi mdo = P956, Vol. 38 = MN 121, Cūḷasūṅṅatā-su
114b3; 115b2 (= MN III 104,7-11); VyY-ṭ 152b8
Śrṇa-sū: Gro bzin skyes kyi mdo
94b6
Saṁyuktāgama: Yaṅ dag pa’i luṅ
36b5; VyY-ṭ 9a8 (cp. SN III 51)
Saptabhaṇa-nāma-sū: Srid pa bdun žes bya ba’i mdo
VyY-ṭ 153a1
Saptasūryodaya-sū: Ňi ma bdun ’char ba’i mdo sde = AN
VyY-ṭ 126b1, 2
Sujāta-sū: Legs skyes kyi {kyis} mdo
VyY-ṭ 122b8
Sunetra-jātaka: sPyan legs kyi skyes pa’i rabs
99a8; VyY-ṭ 126b1, 3. See also Sunetra.
Sūtra, āṅga: mdo’i sde
VyY-sū 31b5; VyY 40b7; 97a1, 2; 140a4; VyY-ṭ 122b4, 6 (def.)
[Piṭaka] VyY-ṭ 124b6, 7
Hastatādopama[-sū]: Lag pa rdob pa lṭa bu
102b6; 111a2; VyY-ṭ 132b2; 143b8
Hastipadopama[-sū]: gLaṅ po che’i stabs lṭa bu = MN 28, Mahāhatthipadopama-su
109b3 (= MN I 191,18-19)
Katya’i bu mo’i mdo
VyY-ṭ 78b2
sKye mched so so ba’i mdo (sde)
102b5; 109a2; 109a5; 109b6; 111a1; VyY-ṭ 132a4, 5; 140b5; 143b4
rGyan can gyi bu’i mdo sde
81a7
Cañ mi smra ba’i mdo
116a6
Ci žig gsuñ ba’i mdo
131b5; VyY-ṭ 162a6, 7
Chu las skyes pa’i mdo (see Mahāvyutpatti 6142, Jalaja?)
114b3; 115b4
Ñan thos la bsad pa’i mdo sde gnis
41a6; VyY-ṭ 14b8
rTa cañ şes bston bzañs kyi chos kyi rnam grañs
115a6
gNas pa’i mdo
116a7
Mig chuñ gi mdo sde
VyY-ṭ 147b7
dMag ldan gyi mdo
VyY-ṭ 69a7
bZa’ ba lta bu’i mdo = SN III 86, Khajjaniya-su
98b6 (= SN III 86); VyY-ṭ 126a1
’Od sel gyi mdo
114b3; 115a5
Ri dags zlog gi mdo
132b7 (= Vinaya III 68, SN V 320). Ri dags (= mrga) zlog is a proper name equivalent to the Pali Migalañḍikā samanakuttaka at Vinaya III 68,22 foll. It also occurs at Vinayavibhaṅga (P1032, Vol. 42, 119a7 foll. as ri dags zlog dge sbyoṅ sbed.
Sa ra’i mdo
49b1
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Aṅgulimāla: Sor phreñ 46b4; 113b8 (= MN II 99)
*Acandrikāputra (?): Ma zla ba’i bu mo’i bu VyY-ṭ 10b7
Ajitakesakambala: Mi pham skra’i la ba can VyY-ṭ 69a5
Anāthapindāda: mGon med zas sbyin
116a5; 131a7
(grhāpati: khyim bdag = Saṅghabhedaṅavastu [GNOLI] I 167,1); VyY-ṭ 147b2
Aniruddha: Ma ’gags pa
āyusmant: tshe daṅ ldan pa 116a2
(from Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra) ārya: ’phags pa 129b7
sthavira: gnas brtan VyY-ṭ 75a7
Aśvajit, āyusmant: r’Ta thul, tshe daṅ ldan pa 84a4
Ācārya: Slob dpon VyY-ṭ 131a4, 7; 135b5, 7; 136b2, 3, 8; 138a2; 146a8
Nanda: dGa’ bo
kulaputra: rigs kyi bu
Nandaka, ayusmant: dGa’ byed, tshe dan ldan pa
Nikāya: sDe pa sarva-: - thams cad
aṣṭādaśa:- - bco brgyad
Nirgrantha: gCer bu pa
Nirgrantha Jñātiputra: gCer bu pa gañ gyi bu
Nyagrodha: Nya gro dha
Parivrajaka: Kun tu rgyu (dag) Bāhyaka: Phyi rol pa
Brahma: Tshaṅs pa
-loka: 'jig rten
Brahmadatta: Tshaṅs pas byin (past King of Kāśī)
Bhadravargiya, śaṣṭi: bZan po'i sde pa drug cu dag Mathurā: Yul bcom brlag
Maskaṟī Gosālīputra: Kun tu rgyu gnag lhas kyi bu
Mahākāśyapa: 'Od suṛuṇs chen po
Mahākāśyapa: 'Od suṛuṇs chen po
Mahākauśṭhila, ayuṣmant: gSus po che chen po, tshe dan ldan pa
Mahānāma, Śākya: Miṅ chen {can}, Śākya-
Parivrajaka: Kun tu rgyu (dag)
Pūrṇa-maitrāyaṃputra: Byams ma’i bu gañ po

See also Nyagrodha-sū.

See also Nyagrodha-sū.

Bāhyaka: Phyi rol pa 32b5, 6; 37a6; 46b2; 47b1, 4, 6; 48a8; 49a7; 49b3; 50a3, 4; 50b7; 67a2; 68a3
Brahma: Tshaṅs pa VY-yu 19a7; VY-yu 47a4; 47b1
Brahmadatta: Tshaṅs pas byin (past King of Kāśī)
Bhadravargiya, śaṣṭi: bZan po'i sde pa drug cu dag Mathurā: Yul bcom brlag

106b7; VY-yu 137b3, 4

Maskaṟī Gosālīputra: Kun tu rgyu gnag lhas kyi bu VY-yu 68b8, 69a4
Mahākāśyapa: 'Od suṛuṇs chen po

115b5 = SN III 105,10.

See also Pūrna-sū.

Mahānāma, Śākya: Miṅ chen {can}, Śākya-

(= MN I 92,26; cf. *Dūkhkhandha-nīrdeśa)

Mahārāja: rGyal po chen po 36a7; 115b4

Mahāśaṃghikā-nikāya: dGe ’dun phal chen sde pa 128a6 (verses of)
Mahāśudarśana, Rāja: Legs mthon chen po, rgyal po VY-yu 28b2; VY-yu 86b5
Mahāśaṅkha-nikāya: Sa ston pa’i sde 124a8; VY-yu 153a2
Mahāśaṅkha-sūtra (?): Sa ston gyi mdo 14b3; 115a8
Mahendrasena, rāja: dBaṅ chen sde, rgyal po VY-yu 192a5
Māra: bDud VY-yu 19a7; 20a5, 6; VY-yu 33a6; 45b8; 47a1, 4; 52b3, 4, 5
Muni: Thub (vs) 32a1
Maudgalyāyana: Maud gal gyi bu 116a7; VY-yu 147b4; 162b4
Rājāgrha: rGyal po’i khab 115a7, 8; VY-yu 192a2
Rāhula: sGra gcen zin VY-yu 74a4 foll. See also Rāhula-sū.
Varṣākāra: dByar tshul 115b6. See also Varṣākāra-sū.
Vāraṇāśi: Ba ra ṇa si VY-yu 161a3
Vinaya-dhara: 'Dul ba ’dzin paVy-yu 124a5
Vinaya-vaibhāṣika: 'Dul {gdul} ba’i bye brag tu smra ba (rnams) VY-yu 133b2
Vinaya-saṅgītī: 'Dul ba yaṅ dag par bsdus pa 116b3, 4; 124b7
Vipulapārśva-parvata: Ri ṇos yaṅs 129b6; 130a3; 132b8; VyY-ṭ 163a8
Vaibhāṣīka: Bye brag tu smra ba (dag) 43b6; 100b4; VyY-ṭ 11a2
Śakra, Devānām-indra: brGya byin, lha mams kyi dbaṅ po 134a3; 134a3 (from Arthavistara-sū);
(from Uttara-sū)
Śākya: Śā kya 115b2
Śākyamuni: Śā kya thub pa 115b2
Śāriputra: Śā ri’i bu VyY-sū 29b8; VyY 84b4; VyY-ṭ 112b3; 113a1; 162b4
āyuṣmant: tshe daṅ ldan pa - 84a3; 134a3 (from Arthavistara-sū);
ārya: 'phags pa - 134b6 (id.); 140a8 (id.); 143b3; VyY-ṭ 100a8; 166a7
bhikṣu: dge sloṅ 114b2; 116b1; 120b6, 8; 125b4; 127b1; 129b5, 6; 130a7
Śāradvatiputra: Śa ra dvā ti’i bu VyY-ṭ 123a5
Śrāvakāyāna: Ñan thos kyi theg pa VyY-sū 21b3, 4; 29b1, 2; VyY 59a6; VyY-ṭ 45b2, 3; 109a6, 7
Śrāvastū: mNyān yod VyY-ṭ 117b1
Śrōṇa: Gro bzin skyes VyY-ṭ 147b8
ārya-: 'phags pa - VyY-ṭ 126a7
brāhmaṇa: bram ze VyY-sū 21b3, 4; 29b1, 2; VyY 59a6; VyY-ṭ 45b2, 3; 109a6, 7
see also Śrōṇa-sūtra
Śvetaketu, devapatra: Tog dkar po, lha’i bu (Śākyamuni as bodhisattva in Tuṣita) VyY-sū 30b4; VyY-ṭ 117b1
Śaṅgītī: Yaṅ dag par bsdus pa VyY-ṭ 161a1
-kāra: - sduṅ par byed pa 76a8; 115a4; 124b5; VyY-ṭ 84b8
-pa’i gzi po 116b2; 124b6; VyY-ṭ 147b8
see Vinaya-
Śaṅjayl Vairāḍiputra: sMra ’dod kyi bu mo’i bu yaṅ dag rgyal ba can VyY-ṭ 69a4
(Ārya-)Sammatṭīya-nikāya: 'Phags pa kun gyis bkur ba’i sde pa 124a7
Sarvārthasiddha, bodhisattva VyY-ṭ 161a1
Don thams cad grub pa, byaṅ chub sems dpa’ 99a4; VyY-ṭ 126b1, 3
See also Sunetra-jātaka.
Sthapati: Phya mkhan. VyY-ṭ 11b3

****

Ka tya’i nu mo smyug ma can 74a3 (Cf. Mvy 3798 smyug ma mkhan = veṇukāra)
sGra sprogs 115b7
sTen {rten} lna (dge sloṅ ... rnam) 115b8; VyY-ṭ 147b1, 2 (= Pañcabhadravargiya)
dMag ldan VyY-sū 23b6; VyY 36b1; 70b3; VyY-ṭ 69a5, 8; 69b1; 85b4
sMra mkhas, khyim bdag VyY-ṭ 123b1, 4
'Dzambu’i griḥ ma can = Pali Jambukhādaka VyY-sū 29b8; VyY-ṭ 112b3; 113a2, 6 (= SN IV 252-53)
’Od sel: name of monk VyY-ṭ 115a5; see - gyi mdo
Ol ma se can (?) 115b7
Zas gtsaṅ ma’i sras 129b6; VyY-ṭ 17b4 (Śākya-); 161a1 (cf. Mvy 24)
Sa ga, tshe daṅ ldan pa VyY-sū 25b5; VyY 76b8; VyY-ṭ 15b8 foll. (= MN I 301)
Appendix 6. Mahāyāna sources and references

Appendix 6.1. Literary references

Aṣṭasāhasrīkā Prajñāpāramitā: Šes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa brgyad ston pa
122a8 (= Vaidya, p. 165.14-20)

Upāyakausalya-sū: Thabs la mkhas pa'i mdo sde
131b6, 7; 132a5; VyY-t 162b5

Gāthā: Tshigs su bcad pa
128b5 (from Bhavaśaṃkrānti, P 892, Vol. 35, mdo, tshu 186b2

Tathāgataguhyaka: De bzin gsègs pa'i gsan ba
138a1 (= cit. in Mahāyānasūtraśālamkāra, ed. S. Bagchi, Darbhanga, 1970, pp. 78,5 foll.)

Tathāgatotpatti-nirdeśa-sū: De bzin gség pa skye ba bstan pa'i mdo
VyY-t 163b2; 173b6

*Mahāyānasūtraśāla-samgraha: Theg pa chen po'i mdo sde bsdu pa
134a6

Prajñāpāramitā: Šes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa
116b7; (de nid las) 116b8 (= Dutt 21.11-19); 117a4 (= ibid. 23.3-5); 117a5 (= ib. 25.4-9); 117a7 (= ib. 29.14-18); 117b1 (= ib. 30.3-5); 117b2 (= ib. 32.4-15
VyY-t 133b6

[Bhavaśaṃkrānti-sū: see Gāthā]

Mahāprāśādaprabhāvanā-mahāyāna-sū:
Dad pa chen po skye ba, theg pa chen po'i mdo (P812)
119a7

Lokottaraparivarta: 'Jig rten las 'das pa'i le'u
131b7; VyY-t 162b5

(Ārya-)Vimalakīrtinarīdeśa: ('Phags pa) Dri ma med par grags pas bstan pa
119a2 (LAMOTTE, p. 106, vs 4)

Śatasāhasrīkā [Prajñāpāramitā]: sTon phragn brgya pa
97b6

Samdhinirmocana-sū: dGoṇs pa ŋes par 'grel ba'i mdo
123b2 (LAMOTTE p. 67); 123b4 (= LAMOTTE p. 80); 129a7 (= LAMOTTE p. 35)

*Samantāloka-sū: Kun tu snaṅ ba'i mdo sde
119a4

Sarvapunyasamuccaya[-sū]: bSod nams thams cad bsags pa'i mdo
123a1

Sūtrālaṃkāra: mDo sde'i rgyan
155b3
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Brahma: Tshaṅs pa
118b2, 5

Mahāyāna: Theg pa chen po
97a8 (= Vaipulya); 97b5 (id.); 97b6 (def.); 98a3; 103b3; 104a3, 4; 113a8; 113b1, 2; 114a8; 116b5; 118b6, 8; 119a8;120a7; 122a6, 7; 122b5; 123a6, 7;123b1; 124a5, 6; 125a2, 3; 126b3; 128a8; 128b5 (vs); 129b4; 130a8; 132b7, 8; 133a3; VyY-t 152b8; 153b8; 156a4; 163b7
Appendix 7. Sources of the verses of the Gāthāsamgraha\textsuperscript{124}

1) Avadānaśataka (BST 19) 251; Kośabhāṣya 4.112 (Pradhan 267). Cf. Daśabala-
śrīmitra (Sanskṛtāṃśkṛtviniścaya; P5865, Vol. 146), no mtshar bstan bcos, 
ño, 37b8; Bu ston (OBERMILLER) 103.


3) Udānavarga 28:40.

4) Saṁyuttanikāyā I 133, Therīgāthā 200, 201; Mahāvastu I (BST 14) 23-24.

5) Divyāvadāna (BST 20) 103; Kośabhāṣya 7:34 (PRADHAN 416) 1099; Daśabala-
śrīmitra, no mtshar bstan bcos ño, 268a4; Śamathadeva, Abhidharmakośa-
upāyaikātikā, P5595, Vol. 118, mñon pa’i bstan bcos, thu, 103a3.

6) Cf. Saṁyuttanikāyā I 5, Araṇīasutta.

7) Udānavarga 32:8.


10) Udānavarga 22:6; Śamathadeva, mñon pa’i bstan bcos tu, 51b2; Vyākhya-yukti, 
sems tsam si, 36b3; Bu ston (OBERMILLER) I 9; Bodhisattvavipātaka, Chap. XI
(Ulrich PAGEL: The Bodhisattvavipātaka: Its Doctrines, Practices and their 
Position in Mahāyāna Literature, Tring (UK) 1995 (Buddhica Britannica Series
Continua V), pp. 341, 344.

11) Udānavarga 28:1; Śamathadeva, mñon pa’i bstan bcos tu, 242a6; Ta chih tu lun 
= Étienne LAMOTTE: Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna 


13) Udānavarga 20:16; Madhyāntavibhāgaśīkā (ed. Susumu YAMAGUCHI, Nagoya, 
1934, p. 150.13; ed. R.C. PANDEYA, Delhi 1971, p. 114; c, d in Prajñā-
ṣamutpādādvibhaṅganirdeśa (P5496, Vol. 104), mdo tshogs ’grel pa, chi, 30b8
(gāthā).

14) Udānavarga 30:11; a in Prajñāṣamutpādādvibhaṅganirdeśa, mdo tshogs ’grel 
pa, chi, 26b2 (gāthā).

15) Udānavarga 28:2 (var. in d).

16) Udānavarga 33:2.

17) Udānavarga 10:1.

18) Udānavarga 1:5; Divyāvadāna (BST 20) 561.8-9.

\textsuperscript{124} The enumeration follows the commentary, the Gāthārthasamgraha-śāstra, 
which treats some as groups. It is therefore different from the numbering in 
ROCKHILL & SCHIEFNER. For further occurrences of the verses consult the 
appropriate verse in BERNHARD’s Udānavarga.
19) Udānavarga 1:3.
20) Udānavarga 1:22.
21) Not traced.

Appendix 8: Sigla and references for the Vāyākyāyukti texts

(1) Vāyākyāyukti = rNam par bṣad pa'i rigs pa, by Vasubandhu, translated from Sanskrit into Tibetan by Viśuddhasimha, Sarvajñadeva, and Devendrarakṣita:
P: Peking Tanjur 5562, sems tsam si, 31b8-156a5 (Repr. Vol. 113, 244.5.8-294.4.5)
D: Derge Tanjur 4061, sems tsam śi 29a2-134b2
G: Golden (Ganden) Tanjur, sems tsam si (Repr. Vol. 66, A22-99)

(2) Vāyākyāyuktisūtrakhaṇḍaśāta = rNam par bṣad pa'i rigs pa'i mdo sde'i dum bu brgya, by Vasubandhu (dByig gnen), translated from Sanskrit into Tibetan by Viśuddhasimha, Sarvajñadeva, Devendrarakṣita, and Mañjuśrīvarman:
P: Peking Tanjur 5561, sems tsam śi, 19a2-31b7 (Repr. Vol. 113, 239.5.2-244.5.7)
D: Derge Tanjur 4060, sems tsam śi, 17b1-29a2
G: Golden (Ganden) Tanjur, sems tsam si (Repr. Vol. 66, A12-21)
N: Narthang Tanjur, mdo si, 18a1-29a1

(3) Vāyākyāyuktiṭākā = rNam par bṣad pa'i rigs pa'i bṣad pa, by Guṇamati (Yon tan blo gros), translated from Sanskrit into Tibetan by Viśuddhasimha, Śākyasimha, and Devendrarakṣita:
P: Peking Tanjur 5570, sems tsam i, 1a1-194a6 (Repr. Vol. 114, 95.1.1-173.5.6)
D: Derge Tanjur 4069, sems tsam si, 139b1-301a7
G: Golden (Ganden) Tanjur, sems tsam i (Repr. Vol. 66, C1-120)

Colophon

Although the product of over twenty years of devotion to the Vāyākyāyukti literature, the present article is a compilation of information culled at various times for various reasons, rather than a thorough and comprehensive study. Thus I feel more like one who has periodically plundered an ancient, overgrown stūpa of a part of its treasures than a careful archæologist who has systematically laid bare its structure in full detail. I aver without reluctance that the Vāyākyāyukti is Vasubandhu's most brilliant work, far surpassing the already brilliant Abhidharmakośa, and that for historical, philological, and philosophical purposes it is the most important single and compact Indian śāstra in Tibetan translation awaiting study and translation. It is with this somewhat missionary zeal that I put forward this paper, incomplete and imperfect as it is, in the hope that it will generate interest in the important but hitherto ignored work, and serve as a guide to at least some of its treasures.

125. I have used these two adjectives to exclude that other mine of treasures, the vast Yogaśārārabhūmi literature associated with Asaṅga, which equally deserves a full study and translation.