On a Verse Quoted in the Tibetan Translation of the *Mahāyānasamgrahopānibandhana*

Noriaki Hakamaya

I

There are quite a few differences between the Tibetan and the Chinese (Hsüan-tsang's) translations of the *Mahāyānasamgrahopānibandhana*. These differences are classified into three groups:

- (1) The passages in both translations show differences in contents with each other.
- (2) The passages in the Chinese are not found in the Tibetan.
- (3) The passages in the Tibetan are not found in the Chinese.

As a result of our former considerations of the differences belonging to groups (1) (2), we have judged that most of them can be attributed to Hsüan-tsang's addition, and that the Tibetan is more faithful to the original¹⁾.

In this paper, we will take up an example from the differences belonging to group (3) and examine it.

II

Asaṅga defines the *nirvikalpañāna* in his *Mahāyānasamgraha*, Chap. VIII,

1) See my articles: "Hsüan-tsang's translation of the *Mahāyānasamgrahopānibandhana* (in Japanese)", *JIBS*, XVIII-1, (1969), pp. 140-141; "Some features of Asvabhāva's *Mahāyānasamgrahopānibandhana*, according to its Tibetan translation (in Japanese)", *JIBS*, XIX-1, (1970), pp. 439-444; "MAHĀYĀNASAMGRAHOPĀNIBANDHANA (I) —Its Tibetan and Chinese Texts—, Introduction", *Journal of the Faculty of Buddhism* XXXI, (Komazawa Univ., 1973), pp. 362-368. But the judgement is reserved for two examples which are treated in my third article.

§ 2 from the five points of view²⁾. Asvabhāva gives his following interpretation on the third definition of them. We are going to show this paragraph, comparing the Tibetan with the Chinese.

<p>3) 'hdu śes dan tshor ba h̄gog pa' śes bya ba la sogs pa yañ gal te h̄du śes dan tshor ba rnam par ši ba rnam par mi rlog pa yin na ni des na rnam par mi rlog paḥi ye śes ñid du mi h̄gyur te* sems med par sems las byuñ ba rnams mi h̄byuñ baḥi phyir rol h̄gog paḥi sñoms par h̄jug pa la sogs pa la yid kyi rnam par śes pas sems dan bcas pa ñid du h̄gal te sems las byuñ ba med par ni **sems ni nam kyañ*** mi h̄byuñ te **ñi ma dan ñi h̄od zer b̄sin **de dag ñid dan lhan cig h̄byuñ⁵⁾ śes ji skad**** b̄sad pa lta buḥo </p>	<p>4) 若想受滅是無分別智，此 智體相難可成立。無想等中， 離心無有諸心法故。由意識 滅，說彼無心，如前已說。</p>
--	---

III

The third definition by Asaṅga exposes that the *nirvikalpajñāna* differs from the state of *asaṃjñi-samāpatti* or *nirodha-samāpatti* about which Abhidharmists had discussed from early times whether it is *sacittaka* (a state with thought) or *acittaka* (a state without thought)⁶⁾.

2) É. Lamotte, *La somme du grand véhicule d'Asaṅga*, Tome I, p. 75; Tome II, pp. 233-234. The parallel passage very close to the five definitions of *nirvikalpajñāna* is also recognized in the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga* (Tib. trans., P. ed., No. 5523, Phi, 50b⁵⁻⁶ or No. 5524, Phi, 54a¹⁻²) and the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (Tib. trans., D. ed., No. 4049, Ri, 74a²⁻⁵).

3) P. ed., No. 5552, Li, 323a¹⁻³: D. ed., No. 4051, Ri, 266b⁴⁻⁶. * D. 'rnam par mi h̄gyur te'. ** P. om. 'l' or 'l/'. *** D. 'nams kyañ'. **** D. om. 'ji skad'.

4) Taisho ed., XXXI, p. 429c. Its French translation is given by É. Lamotte in his *op. cit.*, Tome II, p. 234.

5) I cannot trace the quotation in a verse form to its sources, but can recognize a passage very close to it in the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* (Nanjo ed., p. 227, ll. 13-15) which is as follows: "yaḥ punar Mahāmate tad-āśraya-pravṛtto vikalpaś citta-caitta-saṃśabdito yugapat-kālōdita āditya iva raśmi-sahito vicitra-lakṣaṇa-svabhāvo vikalpādharmaḥ sa Mahāmate svabhāvaḥ paratantra ity ucyate)".

(19) On a Verse Quoted in the Tibetan Translation of the *MSU* (N. Hakamaya)

Asvabhāva admits these two *samāpattis* as *acittaka* from the standpoint of the *Vijñaptimātrata* system. Therefore, he declares in his interpretation that there are not any *caittas* (functions of thought) without *citta*, and quotes a verse in order to prove the dependence of *caittas* upon *citta*.

However, the equivalent to the verse in the Tibetan cannot be found in the Chinese. Here the question is which one of these two translations is more faithful to the original.

If we suppose that the result of our former considerations can be adapted to this case and so that the Tibetan conserves the original form, it will be necessary to explain the reason why Hsüan-tsang (the Chinese) omitted the verse from its original.

The *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun* (成唯識論) by Hsüan-tsang on which the tradition of the Fa-hsiang school (法相宗) has been founded asserts that this work is written for the purpose to refute a certain advocator who adheres that there are not any *caittas* without *citta*⁶⁾.

The verse in the Tibetan shows the meaning which cannot be accepted by the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*. Therefore, it may be possible that Hsüan-tsang dared not translate it in order to conceal its meaning unfavourable to him⁸⁾.

6) Cf. the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, “Bhadanta-Vasumitras tv āha Pariprechāyām ‘yasyācittakā nirodha-samāpattis tasyāiṣa doṣo mama tu sacittakā samāpattir’ iti/ Bhadanta-Ghoṣaka āha tad idaṃ nōpapadyate/” (P. Pradhan ed. p. 72, ll. 21-22). Discussion of the same kind is treated in the *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa* (Tib. trans., S. Yamaguchi ed., p. 16: P. ed., No. 5563, Si, 162a) in which the same passage as the underlined above is shown, that is, “*btsun pa dbyig gses kyis yons su dris pa las* | ‘*gañ gi ltar na hgog paḥi sñoms par hjug pa sems med pa yin pa de la skyon de yod kyil kho boḥi ltar na hgog paḥi sñoms par hjug pa sems dan bcas pa ñid yin pas’ ses smras pa*’”.

7) “或執離心無別心所”。(Taisho ed., XXXI, p. 1a: Louls de la Vallée Poussin trans., p. 4). G. M. Nagao has already pointed out that this assertion by the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun* is peculiar to the tradition of the Fa-hsiang school (“The Writer’s Motive in “*Hsüan-chuang’s* (玄奘) *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*”, *The Tōhō Gakuhō*, IX, (Kyoto, 1938), pp. 197-217).

Chi (基) regards the early Vijñaptivādins (=上古大乘) who are based on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* as such an advocator (成唯識論掌中樞要, Taisho ed., XLIII, p. 617a).

IV

There is also a possibility that the Tibetan and the Chinese had been based on the recensions different from each other, in case our conjecture mentioned above is not accepted. Considering such a possibility, we will try to understand each paragraph cited above in context of both translations. In the Tibetan, we can recognize another paragraph with almost the same quotation as the verse in question, which is as follows:

9) 'sems tsam'* *ṣes bya ba la sogs pa la sems ni rnam par rig pa dañ don gcig go| tsam gyi sgras ni don sel bar byed de| de med pas ḥdsin pa yañ sel te| brtags paḥi phyir rol| de sems las byuñ ba med par mi ḥbyuñ baḥi phyir sems las byuñ ba rnams ni mi dgag ste| ji skad du sems las byuñ ba rnams med par sems nam yañ mi ḥbyuñ no*¹⁰⁾ *ṣes bya ba la sogs pa gsuñs pa lta buḥo|| ḥgog paḥi sñoms par ḥjug pa gañ yin pa deḥi sems** ji lta bu ṣe na| ḥdi ni phyogs can la ñes par ḥgyur rol| kho bo cag la ni de na sems gañ yod pa de mtshuñs par ldan pa dañ bcas par yod do|| de ni mtshuñs par ldan pa dañ bcas su med do*¹¹⁾||

We can understand from this paragraph that (1) *citta* comprises *caittas*,¹²⁾ (2) the same quotation as the former half of the verse in question is of great use in proving the dependence of *caittas* upon *citta* and (3) the subject of *citta* and *caittas* refers in general to *nirodhasamāpatti*.

According to this understanding, it is suitable for the Tibetan to show the verse in question in Asvabhāva's interpretation on the third definition of *nirvikalpajñāna* (which refers to *nirodhasamāpatti*).

Returning to the Chinese paragraph cited above, let us take notice of its phrase '如前已說 (it is just like as explained before)' which is not found in the

8) However, there is an example that Hsüan-tsang (= the *Ch'êng-shih-lun*) uses the quotation (which Commentaries trace to the *Lañkāvatāra*, cf. note 5) very close to the verse as the opposite evidence (Taisho ed., p. 37a: Poussin, op. cit., p. 396). Nevertheless, I believe that his usage departs from its original meaning.

9) It is in the interpretation on the *Mahāyānasamgraha*, Chp. II, § 7, P. ed., No. 5552, Li, 270b⁷-271a⁸: D. ed., No. 4051, Ri, 221a⁴⁻⁷.

* P. 'can'. ** P. om. 'sems'.

10) If one syllable is supplemented in the quotation underlined, it is the same as the former half of the verse cited above which is found in the Tibetan only.

(21) On a Verse Quoted in the Tibetan Translation of the *MSU* (N. Hakamaya)
Tibetan. It is important to consider the phrase in the Chinese context.

If we can suppose that Hsüan-tsang avoided to repeat quoting the verse in question by his insertion of the phrase, the phrase would indicate the quotation equivalent to that of the Tibetan which is almost the same as half of the verse in question.¹³⁾ However, it is impossible to think so in the Chinese context, because the phrase ‘如前已說’ is expected to indicate the passage that deals with the subject of ‘無心 (*acittaka*)’ by ‘意識滅 (the destruction of *manovijñāna*)’.

But as there are several passages which deal with such a subject in Asvabhāva’s interpretation, it is difficult to decide the place indicated by the phrase.¹⁴⁾ So far as I know, there are very few cases in which this sort of phrase ‘如前已說 (*yathā pūrvam uktaḥ.....*)’ is used in such a equivocation in the original Sanskrit, though the phrase is not unnatural within its Chinese context.

On the contrary, the original which is expected from the Tibetan with the verse in question seems to be more natural. So it seems to us that the Chinese paragraph with ‘如前已說’ is allowing some arrangement by Hsüan-tsang rather than to think it is based on another recension different from the Tibetan. }

(昭和 48 年度文部省科學研究費〔獎勵研究〕による研究成果の一部)

11) The Chinese equivalent to the above is as follows: “「唯有心」者，心識是一。「唯」聲爲遣所取境義。由彼無故，能取亦無。不遮心法，由彼與心不相離故。如說，若無心所有法，心未曾轉。若爾，滅定何故唯心。是彼宗過。我大乘宗，若處有心，必定亦有心相應法，若處無有心相應法，心亦定無。(Taisho ed., XXXI, p. 400b).

Both the translations agree with each other except that the Chinese omits the phrase equivalent to the Tibetan ‘*brtags paḥi phyir ro*’.

12) This interpretation agrees with that of the *Vijñaptimātratā* system such as Vasubandhu and Sthiramati. Cf. Michio Katano, “A Tradition of the Asvabhāva’s school —with the basis of a Tibetan Text—”, *Buddhist Seminar*, XVIII, (Otani Univ., 1973), pp. 67–81, in which the author tries to examine the historical position of Asvabhāva according to the critical approach that I have already claimed in my articles (cf. note, 1).

13) See the passage underlined in note 11.

14) For example, É. Lamotte indicates the place (Taisho ed., XXXI, p. 384c) with interpretation on the MS, Chap. I, § 7 in his French translation (op. cit., Tome II, p. 234c). It is also possible that the phrase indicates the place (Taisho ed., XXXI, p. 395c) with interpretation on the MS, Chap. I, § 52.