

## REVIEW ARTICLE

# Contributions to the Study of the Philosophical Vocabulary of Mahāyāna Buddhism

JONATHAN A. SILK

ALTHOUGH the study of any literature requires, of course, a good grasp of the vocabulary in which it is written, in the case of Buddhist philosophical texts, the present state of our understanding of that vocabulary is regrettably low. Therefore, any studies which contribute to an investigation of the language of such texts are, in principle, to be warmly welcomed. That said, some studies make a much greater contribution than others, and, happily rarely, some publications actually mark a step backwards. Here I would like to offer a few remarks on several recent publications, one of which is to be welcomed as a step forward, another pair of which, while not devoid of all merit, unfortunately cannot be judged a significant contribution to the field.

The *Abhisamayālamkāraloka Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā* is Haribhadra's great commentary on the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*, and at the same time on the root verses of the *Abhisamayālamkāra*. This text exists in its original Sanskrit, and in an excellent Tibetan translation (in the Derge Tanjur, Tōh. 3791). Now a complete index has been published of Unrai WOGIHARA's Sanskrit edition of Haribhadra's *Āloka*,<sup>1</sup> including the

<sup>1</sup> Unrai WOGIHARA, *Abhisamayālamkāraloka Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā*. Tōyō Bunko Publications Series D, 2 (Tokyo: The Tōyō Bunko, 1932–1935. Reprint: Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林, 1973).

*Aṣṭasāhasrikā* upon which it comments (presented integrally in WOGIHARA's edition).<sup>2</sup> This index thus serves as a guide not only to a large collection of the technical vocabulary of later Indian Buddhist philosophy, but in addition to the vocabulary of the Prajñāpāramitā sūtra literature, heretofore accessible primarily in the incomplete listing of Edward CONZE's *Materials for a Dictionary of the Prajñāpāramitā Literature*.<sup>3</sup> The vocabulary of the śāstra (*Āloka*) and sūtra (*Aṣṭasāhasrikā*) are conveniently kept distinct in the index by the use of bold type for sūtra references. The index will thus be of use to both students of Indian Buddhist philosophical literature and those whose interest is directed more toward the scriptural bases of that later exegesis. We should note in this regard that a nearly complete edition of the Sanskrit text of Haribhadra's shorter *Abhisamayālamkāra* commentary, the *Abhisamayālamkāra-kārikā-śāstra-vivṛti*, including a Sanskrit index, has just been published by Kōei (Hirofusa) AMANO;<sup>4</sup> it adds Tibetan equivalents based on the edition of the Tibetan translation previously established by AMANO.<sup>5</sup> Comparative studies of the *Vivṛti* and *Āloka* may now be carried out with many more tools than previously available.

Despite the excellence of the new *Āloka* index, and fully aware that it is somewhat unfair to criticize its compilers for not accomplishing what they did not set out to do, I think it is necessary to mention some ways in which the presentation of this material could have been much improved.

In the first place, surely the compilers are correct in having chosen the edition of WOGIHARA as their base text. In addition, they have included a number of corrections to this edition ("Corrigenda," pp. 1233–1260). These corrections however are virtually always trivial, such that anyone who could read the text in the first place would make the correction automatically: *pragoya* to *prayoga*, *bodhsaitva* to *bodhisattva* and so forth. While it is not entirely pointless to list such corrections, they are not emendations of the printed text, although emendations are also required. I will return to this issue below.

Again, although WOGIHARA's is certainly the best edition, it would have

<sup>2</sup> Ryusei KEIRA and Noboru UEDA, *Sanskrit Word-Index to the Abhisamayālamkāra-loka Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā* (*U. Wogihara edition*) (Tokyo: Sankibo Press, 1998).

<sup>3</sup> Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation, 1967.

<sup>4</sup> *Abhisamaya-alamkāra-kārikā-śāstra-vivṛti: Haribhadra's commentary on the Abhisamaya-alamkāra-kārikā-śāstra edited for the first time from a Sanskrit manuscript* (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 2000).

<sup>5</sup> *A Study on the Abhisamaya-alamkāra-kārikā-śāstra-vṛtti* (Tokyo: Japan Science Press, 1975).

been extremely helpful to many readers to have included a concordance collating the pages of WOGIHARA's edition to that of TUCCI,<sup>6</sup> which has something of an independent value, and that of VAIDYA, which although entirely free of any text-critical value, is nevertheless widely used and cited.<sup>7</sup> In addition, although WOGIHARA's edition itself contains within the text references to the corresponding pages of the Derge edition of the Tibetan translation, a table showing such collations would have been likewise very useful. In fact, although the compilers of the Index have not, at least explicitly, taken it into account, the value of a Tibetan translation for the study of a text such as the *Āloka* cannot be overestimated.

As an example of the utility of the Tibetan translation of the *Āloka*, and the need for emendations of the printed editions to arrive at a correct reading of the text, we may look at a passage near the beginning of the treatise printed as prose by all three Sanskrit editions:<sup>8</sup> *brūhi tvam hi mahāprajña | brūhi tvam sugatātmaja | dharmacakravartanam sūtram bhagavatā kutra bhāṣitam iti mahākāśyapavacanāvasāne . . .*

Here TUCCI (followed by VAIDYA) has printed *dharmacakrapravartanasūtram* in the place of WOGIHARA's *dharmacakravartanam sūtram*. However, as both WOGIHARA and TUCCI (but not VAIDYA!) report, the manuscripts read rather *dharmacakrakṛta[m] sūtram*. The Tibetan translation of the passage reads:<sup>9</sup> *chos kyi 'khor lo bskor pa'i mdo || bcom ldan 'das kyis gang du gsungs || shes rab chen po khyed kyis smos || bde gshegs sras po khyed smros shig | ces gsung chen pos smras pa'i tshig gi mthar . . .*

The Tibetan translation immediately suggests to us that we look for a verse here, and indeed, if we simply follow the manuscripts, we get one:<sup>10</sup>

*brūhi tvam hi mahāprajña brūhi tvam sugatātmaja |  
dharmacakrakṛtam sūtram bhagavatā kutra bhāṣitam ||  
iti mahākāśyapavacanāvasāne . . .*

<sup>6</sup> Giuseppe TUCCI, *The Commentaries on the Prajñāpāramitās. Volumen 1st: The Abhisamayālaṅkāraloka of Haribhadra, being a commentary on the Abhisamayālaṅkāra of Maitreyanātha and the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā*. Gaekwad's Oriental Series 62 (Baroda: Oriental Institute/London: Arthur Probsthain, 1932).

<sup>7</sup> P. L. VAIDYA, *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā: With Haribhadra's Commentary Called Āloka*. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 4 (Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute, 1960).

<sup>8</sup> I quote WOGIHARA's text, p. 6.8–10 (= TUCCI 7.18–20, and 568 = VAIDYA 271.5–6).

<sup>9</sup> Derge Tanjur 3791, *shes phyin, cha* 5b4.

<sup>10</sup> Metre *śloka, pathyā*; in d with *bhagavatā* we must read an initial resolution of ~ to ~. I confess that the surprising form *dharmacakrakṛta* is unattested elsewhere, but I cannot see any specific reason to reject it.

This occurs in the context of the story of Mahākāśyapa's appeal to Ānanda to recite the scriptures at the First Council, as Mahākāśyapa says:

Where did the Blessed One preach the Scripture on the Turning of  
the Wheel of the Teaching?  
Speak Mahāprajña! Speak, son of the Sugata!

It is of some interest here that the Tibetan translation, at least in the Derge edition,<sup>11</sup> does not attribute this verse to Mahākāśyapa, as does the Sanskrit: *iti mahākāśyapavacanāvasāne*, but to some “great speech/speaker,” *ces gsung chen pos smras pa'i tshig gi mthar*. I suspect that within the transmission of the text in Tibet an original \**ces 'od srung chen pos* became *ces gsung chen pos*. This possibility is supported by the occurrence of this very verse in other texts, preserved only in Chinese, where it is in fact attributed to Mahākāśyapa.

We may first refer to a passage in the \**Aśokarāja-sūtra*, *Ayuwang-jing* 阿育王經:<sup>12</sup>

Then Ānanda got up from his seat, and worshipped the Venerables in order. Having worshipped, he mounted the high seat and then thought as follows: “There are scriptures which I have heard directly from the Buddha, and there are scriptures which I have not heard directly from the Buddha. Now I will preach them all [saying] ‘Thus I have heard,’ and so on.” The Reverend Kāśyapa spoke to Ānanda saying: “Venerable, you should explain where the scriptures were preached.” And then he said in verse:

Great wise one, all entreat you.  
Son of the Buddha, you should explain  
In what place the Buddha's first scripture

<sup>11</sup> I regret I have been unable to check any other edition of the Tanjur, but I would not be surprised to see the correct reading preserved in one or more of them.

<sup>12</sup> T. 2043 (L) 151c15–24: 乃至長老阿難從上座次第作禮。禮已、即登高座而便思惟。有修多羅我親從佛聞。有修多羅不親從佛聞。我於今者悉說、如是我聞乃至。大德迦葉語阿難言、長老、應說修多羅在何處說。而說偈言。

大智皆勸請 佛子女當說 佛初修多羅 在於何處說。  
時、阿難答言、婆羅奈國爲五比丘初說修多羅。如是我聞一時世尊住婆羅奈國仙面鹿園。佛語諸比丘。此苦聖諦、乃至廣說。 Also trans. in Jean PRZYLUKI, *Le Concile de Rājagṛha: Introduction a l'histoire des canons et des sectes bouddhiques*. Buddhica, Première Série: Mémoires 2 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1926–1928): 41–42; cp. LI Rongxi, *The Biographical Scripture of King Aśoka*. BDK English Tripiṭaka 76-II (Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1993): 101.

Was preached.

Then Ānanda answered, saying: “[The Buddha] first preached a scripture in Benares for five monks. Thus I have heard: at one time the Buddha dwelt in Benares, in the deer park of R̥ṣipātana. The Buddha said to the monks: This is the Truth of Suffering,” and so on in detail.

Likewise in the *Da Zhidu-lun* 大智度論 we find the same verse spoken by Mahākāśyapa:<sup>13</sup>

You, great wise person, speak!  
You, son of the Buddha, should explain:  
Where did the Buddha first preach?  
Now you should make this widely known.

Ānanda then responds:

When the Buddha first preached the doctrine,  
At that time I did not see it.  
Thus have I heard it handed down by tradition:  
The Buddha was in Benares.  
For five monks the Buddha  
First opened the ambrosial gate.  
He explained the teaching of the Four Noble Truths,  
The Truths of suffering, its cause, its cessation and the path.

The same verse set is found again in the *Jiashejie-jing* 迦葉結經:<sup>14</sup>

Great wise one, [we] request you to explain it.  
Son of the Sugata, please make clear:  
Where was a scripture  
First preached by the Blessed One?

Ānanda then responds with the following verse:

<sup>13</sup> T. 1509 (XXV) 69b8–9: 汝大智人說 汝佛子當演 何處佛初說 今汝當布現. 69b12–15: 佛初說法時 爾時我不見 如是展轉聞 佛在波羅捺 佛爲五比丘 初開甘露門 說四真諦法 苦集滅道諦. Also trans. in PRZYLUKI: 69; Étienne Paul Marie LAMOTTE, *Le Traité de la grande Vertu de Sagesse I*. Bibliothèque du Muséon 18 (1944; Reprint: Louvain: Université de Louvain, Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 25, 1981): 101–102.

<sup>14</sup> T. 2027 (XLIX) 6c8–9: 大智願說之 安住子唯講 何所之經卷 世尊最先說. 6c13–14: 聞如是一時 佛遊波羅捺 仙人鹿苑說 具足法輪經. Also trans. in PRZYLUKI: 18.

I heard thus: at one time  
 The Buddha wandered in Benares,  
 In the deer park of the R̥ṣipatana, and preached  
 The complete Wheel Rolling scripture.

The *Āloka* then provides us, first of all, with what is almost certainly the original Sanskrit form of this verse, otherwise preserved only in Chinese.<sup>15</sup> This passage also gives us an object lesson in the strengths and weaknesses (in the apparent confusion of 'od srung with gsung) of the Tibetan translation of the *Āloka* for text criticism. Finally, this example allows us to suggest that the entry in the index which refers to this passage for the term *dharmacakravartanam* should be replaced by an entry for *dharmacakrakṛtam*. I have no doubt that there are a number of other similar examples to be found in the text, in which emendations of the printed editions will be required. One of the most powerful aids in such critical reading must be the Tibetan translation.

Actually, the compilers of the index are clearly aware, as they explicitly state in their Preface, that the published text of the *Āloka* requires emendation. However, given this, we may wonder whether the publication of an index in the present form is not premature. The index was compiled on the basis of computerized data of the Sanskrit text. Would not it have been more helpful to many scholars at this point to have simply published the computerized data itself, perhaps making available a combined edition, and then separate editions of the *Āloka* and *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, along with search tools? This would have allowed the compilers to make available the fruits of their labors so far, while stressing its preliminary status as a tool in progress. Without a thorough examination of the Tibetan translation, and if possible and ideally a reexamination of the available manuscript materials, a published index seems to be setting the cart somewhat before the horse. On the other hand, this is not to say that we must always wait for a definitive edition to publish an index. To so insist would lead to the nearly complete absence of indices, since it is hardly much of an exaggeration to lament that no Indian Buddhist text has yet been really satisfactorily edited. As a tool, a multi-lingual index can be a fine aid in the study and even the emendation of the text of a scripture. The index to the KERN-NANJIO edition of the

<sup>15</sup> By saying this I do not mean to preclude the possibility that at some time there existed an older Middle Indic version; but no trace of such is known to exist.

*Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* and HIRAKAWA's *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* index are cases in point. The weaknesses of the KERN-NANJIO edition are well known, but the index,<sup>16</sup> carefully compiled on the basis of the published Sanskrit text, the Peking edition of the Tibetan Kanjur, and the Taishō text of Kumārajīva's translation, is an excellent tool for the study of the text as it is available in commonly used versions. One of its best features is the frequent presentation of the context within which a word appears—in all three languages. At some point surely this index too will have to be revised, but this will not happen anytime soon. The *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* index, also a comprehensive trilingual work, in fact includes an extensive section of suggested textual emendations.<sup>17</sup> Of course, both of the latter works are the fruits of team efforts, but they were also the result of many years of effort and careful study of the texts they report. It is certainly to be hoped that the eventual production of a bilingual index of a critically established text of the *Āloka* will not be adversely affected by the perhaps somewhat premature appearance of the present work.

While the *Āloka* index, then, is not all it could have been, it is nevertheless highly reliable and comprehensive as an index which records the text as established by WOGIHARA. Every word in the printed edition is precisely listed, in an absolutely accurate manner. In that respect the work cannot be faulted, and one may use it with utmost confidence. Students of later Indian Buddhist thought and of the Perfection of Wisdom literatures will find it valuable. Most unfortunately, the same cannot be said for the two volumes of indices to the *Yogācārabhūmi* recently published by the same publishing house, Sankibō, a Chinese-Sanskrit-Tibetan "Index"<sup>18</sup> and a "Dictionary"<sup>19</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Yasunori EJIMA, et al., *Index to the Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra: Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese* (Tokyo: The Reiyukai, 1985–1993).

<sup>17</sup> Akira HIRAKAWA, et al., *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya (P. Pradhan Edition)* (Tokyo: Daizo Shuppan, 1973, 1977, 1978).

<sup>18</sup> Kōitsu YOKOYAMA 横山紘一 and Takayuki HIROSAWA 廣澤隆之, *Index to the Yogācārabhūmi (Chinese-Sanskrit-Tibetan) / Kanbonzō Taishō Yugashijiron Sōsakuin 漢梵藏對照瑜伽師地論總索引* (Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin Publishing, 1996). A computer file of this work without references (that is, just a list of Chinese-Sanskrit-Tibetan terms) is available for free download at <http://www.buddhist-term.org/yoga-table/>.

<sup>19</sup> Kōitsu YOKOYAMA and Takayuki HIROSAWA, with the assistance of Hakumyō NIISAKU 新作博明, *Sanskrit-Tibetan-Chinese & Tibetan-Sanskrit-Chinese Dictionary of Buddhist Terminology based on Yogācārabhūmi / Yugashijiron ni motozuku Bonzōkan Taishō - Zōbonkan Taishō Bukkyōgo Jiten 瑜伽師地論に基づく梵漢藏對照・藏梵漢對照佛教語辭典* (Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin Publishing, 1997).

compiled by Kōitsu YOKOYAMA and Takayuki HIROSAWA.

The sine qua non of any such work must be its accuracy. Does it do what it claims to do? In this respect, first of all, the “Index” and “Dictionary” must be judged as failures. There are any number of cases in which substantive words in the text are simply not to be found in its index. The causes of these lapses are sometimes hard to find, but in frequent cases the reason is obvious. The index does not take into account the best texts available, nor does it cover all (or even remotely all) of the Sanskrit sources in print. This however would not explain the omission even of terms from the Chinese and Tibetan translations. These weaknesses coupled with the organizational choices of the compilers make for a work the value of which is severely limited. In the following I will attempt to document these serious criticisms.

The *Yogācārabhūmi* is a massive text, 100 *juan* in the Chinese translation of Xuanzang 玄奘,<sup>20</sup> T. 1579 瑜伽師地論. Ignoring the problems concerning the exact nomenclature of its various parts, and their often complex subdivisions, according to its Tibetan translation the text is organized roughly in the following manner:<sup>21</sup>

I. Maulī Bhūmi, the “basic section,” 本地分 *bendi-fen*, in seventeen parts:

1. Pañcavijñānakāyasamprayuktā bhūmi 五識身相應地 *wushishenxiangying-di*
2. Manobhūmi 意地 *yi-di*
3. Savitarkā savicārā bhūmi
4. Avitarkā vicāramātrā bhūmi
5. Avitarkāvicārā bhūmi 有尋有伺等三地 *youxunyouxideng-sandi* (3–5)
6. Samāhitā bhūmi 三摩呬多地 *sanmoxiduo-di*
7. Asamāhitā bhūmi 非三摩呬多地 *feisanmoxiduo-di*
- 8–9. Sacittikā acittikā ca bhūmi 有心無心二地 *youxinwuxin-erdi*
10. Śrutamayī bhūmi 聞所成地 *wensuocheng-di*
11. Cintāmayī bhūmi 思所成地 *sisuocheng-di*

<sup>20</sup> Not “Xuan zang,” as is written in the English “Acknowledgments” and “Explanatory notes.” Monastic names, unlike most classical Chinese names, are to be read as units, thus Xuanzang 玄奘, Yijing 義淨 and so on, but Li Bo 李白, Du Fu 杜甫, etc.

<sup>21</sup> However, these parts do not necessarily actually occur in this order in the Tibetan Tanjur, nor is there any known manuscript in Sanskrit which contains or even might have contained the text as organized here.

12. Bhāvanāmayī bhūmi 修所成地 *xiusuocheng-di*
  13. Śrāvaka bhūmi 聲聞地 *shengwen-di*
  14. Pratyekabuddhabhūmi 獨覺地 *dujue-di*
  15. Bodhisattvabhūmi 菩薩地 *pusa-di*
  16. Sopadhikā bhūmi 有餘依地 *youyuyi-di*
  17. Nirupadhikā bhūmi 無餘依地 *wuyuyi-di*
- II. Viniścayasamgrahaṇī  
 III. Vastusamgrahaṇī  
 IV. Vinayasamgrahaṇī  
 V. Paryāyasamgrahaṇī  
 VI. Vivaraṇasamgrahaṇī

The Chinese translation is organized into five main parts, with a number of sub-divisions (which I omit here),<sup>22</sup> not all of which correlate neatly to the Tibetan translation, although overall almost exactly the same material is included:

1. 本地分 *bendi-fen* (Maulī bhūmi)
2. 攝決擇分 *shejueze-fen* (Viniścayasamgrahaṇī)<sup>23</sup>
3. 攝釋分 *sheshi-fen* (\*Vyākhyāsamgrahaṇī)
4. 攝異門分 *sheyimen-fen* (Paryāyasamgrahaṇī)
5. 攝事分 *sheshi-fen* (Vastusamgrahaṇī)

To attempt an overall bibliography of the classical text traditions and their modern treatments would take us far beyond the scope of the present short notes. However, it might be worthwhile listing here the portions of the text which are so far available in Sanskrit, along with their years of publication.

<sup>22</sup> I also do not list the sub-sub-divisions, which in the case of *Bodhisattvabhūmi* especially are quite numerous. I likewise entirely omit here any reference to the alternate Chinese translations of various parts, for example the numerous versions of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*. A thorough study of the textual bases of the *Yogācārabhūmi* would of course have to take these into account as well.

<sup>23</sup> The main subdivisions of this section are:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. 五識身相應地 <i>wushishenxiangying-di</i>  | 7. 聞所成慧地 <i>wensuochenghui-di</i>           |
| 2. 有尋有伺等三地 <i>youxunyouSIDENG-sandi</i> | 8. 思所成慧地 <i>sisuochenghui-di</i>            |
| 3. 三摩呬多地 <i>sanmoxiduo-di</i>           | 9. 修所成慧地 <i>xiusuochenghui-di</i>           |
| 4. 非三摩呬多地 <i>feisanmoxiduo-di</i>       | 10. 聲聞地 <i>shengwen-di</i>                  |
| 5. 有心地 <i>youxin-di</i>                 | 11. 菩薩地 <i>pusa-di</i>                      |
| 6. 無心地 <i>wuxin-di</i>                  | 12. 有餘依及無餘依二地 <i>youyuyi-ji-wuyuyi-erdi</i> |

(I ignore here the complex issues of what manuscripts are available, where each portion of text is to be found, and so on. I also omit mention of publications which, although they may contribute to the establishment of the text, do not present editions as such.)<sup>24</sup> I will return below to the question of why the years of publication are so important in the present context. Note that no effort is made in the following to judge the quality of the editions presented (—although in principle a more recent edition should be an improvement on an earlier one, this is not always so!).

- I.1-5: Vidhushekhara BHATTACHARYA, *The Yogācārabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga: The Sanskrit Text Compared with the Tibetan Version* (Calcutta: The University of Calcutta, 1957).
- I.6: A portion in Lambert SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna: On the Origin and the Early Development of a Central Concept of Yogācāra Philosophy*. *Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series 4* (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1987): 276, n. 146.<sup>25</sup>
- I.7: Yasuo MATSUNAMI 松濤泰雄, “Bonbun Shōmonji (jūichi): Honjibunchū Hisammakitaji, Monshojōji (1), wayaku, kamon” 梵文声聞地 (十一) 本地分中非三摩咽多地・聞所成地 (1), 和訳・科文 [Asamāhitā bhūmiḥ and Buddhavacanajñeya section (I)]. *Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 大正大学総合仏教研究所年報 14 (1992): 15–39 (212–188); text 20–23 (207–204).
- I.8-9: Alex WAYMAN, “The Sacittikā and Acittikā Bhūmi and the Pratyekabuddhabhūmi (Sanskrit texts).” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 8/1 (1960): 379–375. Reprinted in George R. ELDER, ed., *Buddhist Insight: Essays by Alex Wayman*. *Religions of Asia Series 5* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984): 327–331. SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna* (1987): 221–222.
- I.10: Yasuo MATSUNAMI, “Asamāhitā bhūmiḥ and Buddhavacanajñeya section (I).” *Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 14 (1992): 15–39 (212–188); text 24–39 (203–188). Yasuo MATSUNAMI, “Bonbun Shōmonji (jūni):

<sup>24</sup> It goes without saying that I omit mention of “reconstructions” into Sanskrit. I place an asterisk in front of the names of authors whose publications I have not yet seen.

<sup>25</sup> A critical edition of this bhūmi is being prepared by Martin DELHEY in Hamburg under the guidance of SCHMITHAUSEN.

Honjibunchū Monshojōji (2): Shishojōji, wayaku, kamon” 梵文声聞地（十二）本地分中聞所成地（2）・思所成地，和訳・科文 [Buddhavacanajñeya section (II), Cikitsāvidyā, Śabdavidyā and Śilpakarmavidyā sections.] *Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 15 (1993): 1–49 (334–286); text 8–27 (327–308).

\*Jagadīshwar PANDEY, “Bauddhācārya Asaṅgakṛta Yogācārabhūmiśāstra meriḥ Hetuvidyā.” In P. N. OJHA, ed., *Homage to Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap* (Nalanda: Siri Nava Nalanda Mahavihara, 1987): 315–350 (text itself: 334–348). Karunesha SHUKLA, *Śrāvākabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga*. Part II. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 28 (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1991): Appendix III: pp. 14–25 of the Appendices. Hideomi YAITA 矢板秀臣, “Yugaron no Inmyō: Bonbun Tekisuto to Wayaku” 瑜伽論の因明: 梵文テキストと和訳: [Hetuvidyā in the Yogācārabhūmi: Sanskrit text and its Japanese translation]. *Naritasan Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 成田山仏教研究所紀要 15 (1992): 505–576.

Also Lambert SCHMITHAUSEN, “On Three Yogācārabhūmi Passages Mentioning the Three Svabhāvas or Lakṣaṇas.” In Jonathan A. SILK, ed., *Wisdom, Compassion, and the Search for Understanding: The Buddhist Studies Legacy of Gadjin M. Nagao* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2000): 245–263.

I.11: Kōshin SUZUKI 鈴木晃信, “Bonbun Shōmonji (jūni): Honjibunchū Monshojōji (2): Shishojōji, wayaku, kamon” 梵文声聞地（十二）本地分中聞所成地（2）・思所成地，和訳・科文 [Svabhāvaviśuddhi and Jñeyapraṇicaya sections.] *Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 15 (1993): 1–49 (334–286); text 28–49 (307–286).

*Paramārtha-gāthā*, with commentary, in Alex WAYMAN, *Analysis of the Śrāvākabhūmi Manuscript*. University of California Publications in Classical Philology 17 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1961): 163–185. *Paramārtha-gāthā* vss. 28–41 with commentary, in SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna* (1987): 228–241. *Paramārtha-gāthā* without commentary in Karunesha SHUKLA, *Śrāvākabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga*. Part II (1991): Appendix IV: pp. 26–29 of the Appendices.

*Ābhiprāyikārtha-gāthā* in George R. ELDER, ed., *Buddhist Insight: Essays by Alex Wayman*. Religions of Asia Series 5 (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984): 353–366. Portions of the *Ābhiprāyikārtha-*

*gāthā* in Karunesha SHUKLA, *Śrāvakabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga*. Part II (1991): Appendix IV: pp. 29–31 of Appendices. Takashi MAEDA 前田崇, “Yugaron Bonbun Kenkyū: Ābhiprāyikārthagāthānirdeśa (Shakuishugi gata)” 瑜伽論梵文研究 Ābhiprāyikārthagāthānirdeśa (釈意趣義伽他). *Bunka* 文化 55/1–2 (1991): 62–92 (101–71).

A few verses of *Śarīrārtha-gāthā* in Lambert SCHMITHAUSEN, “Beiträge zur Schulzugehörigkeit und Textgeschichte kanonischer und postkanonischer buddhistischer Materialien.” Being Heinz Bechert, ed. *Zu Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur* II. (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, III,2). Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge 154 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987): 382–387.<sup>26</sup> Complete *Śarīrārtha-gāthā* in Fumio ENOMOTO, “Śarīrārtha-gāthā: A Collection of Canonical Verses in the Yogācārabhūmi. Part 1: Text.” In F. ENOMOTO, J.-U. HARTMANN, H. MATSUMURA, eds., *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen*. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989): 17–35. First verse only in Karunesha SHUKLA, *Śrāvakabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga*. Part II (1991): Appendix IV: p. 31 of Appendices.

- I.13: Portions in Alex WAYMAN, *Analysis of the Śrāvakabhūmi Manuscript*. University of California Publications in Classical Philology 17 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1961). Karunesha SHUKLA, *Śrāvakabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 14 (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1973). A portion in Lambert SCHMITHAUSEN, “Die Letzten Seiten der Śrāvakabhūmi.” In L. A. HERCUS et al., eds., *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday* (Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies, 1982): 457–489. Another portion in Hidenori S. SAKUMA, *Die Āśrayaparivṛtti-Theorie in der Yogācārabhūmi*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 40 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1990), vol.

<sup>26</sup> Some verses were also already available in SCHMITHAUSEN’s “Zu den Rezensionen des Udānavarga.” *Weiner Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Sudasiens* 14 (1970): 47–124.

- 2.<sup>27</sup> The entire text is in the course of re-edition since 1981 by the members of the Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group of Taishō University (Taishō Daigaku Shōmonji Kenkyūkai 大正大学声聞地研究会), published serially in *Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 大正大学総合仏教研究所年報 from 3 (1981) onwards.<sup>28</sup> The first chapter has appeared further revised in book form: *Yugaron Shōmonji: Dai-ichi Yugasho: Sansukuritto-go Tekisuto to Wayaku* 瑜伽論声聞地 第一瑜伽処: サンスクリット語テキストと和訳 / *Śrāvakabhūmi: Revised Sanskrit Text and Japanese Translation: The First Chapter*. Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Kenkyū Sōsho 大正大学総合仏教研究所研究叢書 4 (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林, 1998).
- I.14: Alex WAYMAN, “The Sacittikā and Acittikā Bhūmi and the Pratyekabuddhabhūmi (Sanskrit texts).” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 8/1 (1960): 379–375. \*Jagadishwar PANDEY, “Pratyekabuddhabhūmi.” *Philosophical Essays: Professor Anatalal Thakur Felicitation Volume* (Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1987): 228–237. Yoshiyasu YONEZAWA, “Pratyekabuddhabhūmi: Sanskrit Text and Annotated Translation.” *Sankō Bunka Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 三康文化研究所年報 29 (1998): 9–25.
- I.15: A portion in Johannes RAHDER, *Daśabhūmikasūtra et Bodhisattvabhūmi: Chapitres Vihāra et Bhūmi* (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1926): Appendix pp. 1–28.<sup>29</sup> Unrai WOGIHARA, *Bodhisattvabhūmi: A Statement of [the] Whole Course of the*

<sup>27</sup> This also contains editions of a number of other short isolated passages from other parts of the *Yogācārabhūmi*.

<sup>28</sup> See *Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 3 (1981): 228–185 (1–44); 4 (1982): 286–260 (1–27); 6 (1984): 164–135 (1–30); 7 (1985): 196–161 (33–68); 8 (1986): 221–180 (60–101); 9 (1987): 221–168 (87–139); 10 (1988): 177–148 (58–87); 11 (1989): 344–260 (1–85); 12 (1990): 364–317 (1–48); 13 (1991): 336–292 (1–45); 16 (1994): 73–129 (288–234); 17 (1995): 19–71 (348–296); 18 (1996): 1–35. The project is ongoing. Note also Takayasu KIMURA 木村高尉, “Shōmonji Bonbun no Ketsuraku to sono Hoten” 声聞地梵文の欠落とその補填 [On an omission in the text of the *Śrāvakabhūmi* and its supplementation]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 40/2 (1992): 922–919.

<sup>29</sup> Also published with identical contents but with the following title page: *Daśabhūmikasūtra: Academisch Proefschrift ter Verkrijging van den Graad van Doctor in de Letteren en Wijsbegeerte aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht, op Gezag van den Rector-Magnificus Dr. J. Ph. Suyling, Hoogleeraaar in de Faculteit der Rechtsgeleerdheid, volgens Besluit van den Senaat der Universiteit Tegen de Bedenkingen van de Faculteit der Letteren en Wijsbegeerte te Verdedigen op Vrijdag 9 Juli 1926, des Namiddags te 3 Uuur door Johannes Rahder, geboren te Loeboeg Begalong (Sumatra). Leuven: J.-B. Istas.*

*Bodhisattva* (Being [the] Fifteenth Section of [the] *Yogācārabhūmi*) (1936; Reprint: Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Bookstore, 1971). Nalinaksha DUTT, *Bodhisattvabhūmi* [Being the XVth Section of *Asaṅgapāda's YOGĀCĀRABHŪMIḤ*]. Tibetan Sanskrit Works 7 (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1966; reissued 1978). The very beginning of the text is re-edited in Gustav ROTH, “Observations on the First Chapter of Asaṅga’s *Bodhisattvabhūmi*.” *Indologica Taurinensia* 3/4 (1975–1976): 403–412, reprinted in H. BECHERT and P. KIEFFER-PÜLZ, eds., *Indian Studies (Selected Papers) by Gustav Roth*. Bibliotheca Indo Buddhica 32 (Delhi: Sri Satguru, 1986): 165–174. First *yogasthāna*, chapter ten, *śīlapāṭala*, in Hakuyū HADANO 羽田野伯猷, et al., *Yugashijiron Bosatsuji* 瑜伽師地論 菩薩地. Chibetto Butten Kenkyū Sōsho チベット仏典研究叢書 II.1 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館, 1993).<sup>30</sup> Second, third and fourth *yogasthānas* (*anudharma-*, *niṣṭhā-*, *anukrama-*) in \*Hirofumi ISODA 磯田熙文 and Kōichi FURUSAKA 古坂絃一, *Yugashijiron Bosatsuji Zuihō, Kukyō, Shidai-yugasho* 瑜伽師地論 菩薩地 随法・究竟・次第瑜伽處. Chibetto Butten Kenkyū Sōsho チベット仏典研究叢書 III (Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館, 1995).

I.16-17: Lambert SCHMITHAUSEN, “*Yogācārabhūmi: Sopadhikā and Nirupadhikā Bhūmiḥ*.” In LI Zheng 李錚 et al., eds., *Ji Xianlin Jiao-shou Bashi Huadan Jinian Lunwenji* 季羨林教授八十華誕紀念論文集 / *Papers in Honour of Prof. Dr. Ji Xianlin on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday*, 2 volumes (Jiangxi: Jiangxi renmin chubanshe 江西人民出版社, 1991): II.687–711.

II. A small fragment in Kazunobu MATSUDA 松田和信, “*Darairama Jūsan-sei Kizō no Ichiren no Nepāru-kei Shahon ni tsuite: Yugaron ‘Shōketchakubun’ Bonbun Dankan Hakkenki*” *ダライラマ十三世寄*

<sup>30</sup> Keishō TSUKAMOTO 塚本啓祥, Yūkei MATSUNAGA 松長有慶, and Hirofumi ISODA 磯田熙文, *Bongo Butten no Kenkyū III: Ronjo-hen* 梵語仏典の研究 III 論書篇 [A descriptive bibliography of the Sanskrit Buddhist literature: Vol. III: Abhidharma, Madhyamaka, Yogācāra, Buddhist epistemology and logic] (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten 平楽寺書店, 1990): 322, n. 23 refer to an edition by HADANO, *Yugaron Bosatsuji* 瑜伽論菩薩地, published in Sendai in 1975 by the Chibetto Butten Kenkyūkai チベット仏典研究会. According to the kind information of Dr. Stephen HODGE (email, 26 August, 2000), it appears that this refers to a sample volume produced in only a very few copies in order to persuade the Ministry of Education to fund the project.

贈の一連のネパール系写本について:『瑜伽論』「撰決択分」梵文断簡発見記 [A Nepalese manuscript presented by the 13th Dalai Lama: the discovery of a Sanskrit fragment of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* of the *Yogācārabhūmi*]. *Nippon Chibetto Gakkai Kaihō* 日本西蔵学会会報 34 (1988): 16–20. A part of the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* in Kazunobu MATSUDA, “*Gejinmikkyō ni okeru Bosatsu Jūji no Bonbun Shiryō: Yugaron ‘Shōketchakubun’ no Katomandu Danpen yori*” 『解深密經』における菩薩十地の梵文資料:『瑜伽論』「撰決択分」のカトマンドウ断片より [Sanskrit materials on the ten Bodhisattva stages in the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra*: from a Kathmandu manuscript fragment of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* of the *Yogācārabhūmi*]. *Bukkyō Daigaku Sōgō Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 佛教大学総合研究所紀要 2 (1995): 59–77.

- V. A small portion in Kazunobu MATSUDA, “*Yugaron ‘Shōimonbun’ no Bonbun Dankan*” 『瑜伽論』「撰異門分」の梵文断簡 [Sanskrit fragments of the *Paryāyasamgrahaṇī* of the *Yogācārabhūmi*]. *Indotetsugaku Bukkyōgaku (Hokkaidō Indotetsugaku Bukkyō Gakkai)* 印度哲学仏教学(北海道印度哲学仏教学会) 6 (1994): 90–108.

Of course, some Sanskrit materials in addition to those listed above may also appear here and there as well; this list is not intended to be comprehensive or complete. But the point that can be made on the basis of the listing above is very simple: the index of the *Yogācārabhūmi* compiled by YOKOYAMA and HIROSAWA takes as the basis for its Sanskrit terminology precisely three of the above publications: BHATTACHARYA’s edition of I.1–5, SHUKLA’s edition of I.13, and DUTT’s edition of I.15. *Absolutely no other Sanskrit materials are taken into account.* How is this possible? YOKOYAMA, in his “Acknowledgments” to the “Index,” dated 1996, states that he began his work in the mid-1970s. But even if we make the boldest of assumptions that the editor ceased to notice any of the progress in his field after that time, what of WAYMAN’s editions of various other parts of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, one of which, his editions of I.8–9 and of I.14, was actually published in Japan in the country’s most widely distributed journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies? We cannot know why the compilers overlooked these materials because nowhere is there any explanation of the choices of materials indexed. We are simply told that Taishō 1579 (Xuanzang’s translation), the three Sanskrit editions just mentioned, and the Derge Tanjur version of the Tibetan translation (not Peking) were used. Does

the failure to take into account other available Sanskrit materials make a difference? What vocabulary could the compilers have included had they paid attention even to those portions of the text edited long ago by WAYMAN?

We do not have to go far to find an answer. The very word 有心地 which the “Index” (71b) notes is found in the Chinese text on 344c right at the beginning of section I.8 is not given any Sanskrit equivalent; this occurs not only in the first sentence but also in the very title of the section itself, Sacittikā Bhūmi. Needless to say, other technical terms, too numerous to mention but beginning directly afterwards in the next sentence with 地施設建立 (“Index” 371b), are likewise not given any Sanskrit equivalents whatsoever. The merest glance at WAYMAN’s edition provides the equivalent here, *bhūmiprajñāptivyavasthāna*.

Published corrections to the editions used were also evidently not consulted. Thus ROTH’s corrections of DUTT’s readings of the very beginning section of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* are not considered, which leads to the entry 建立 as equivalent at DUTT 1.11 to *pratiṣṭhāpayitavya*, although ROTH makes it clear that the correct manuscript reading here is *pratiṣṭhāya*. Such cases could be multiplied almost infinitely. There is also little point in listing the massive number of errors in SHUKLA’s edition of the *Śrāvaka bhūmi*, some hint of which was given already by J. W. DE JONG in his 1976 review,<sup>31</sup> and now confirmed by the recent Taishō University edition of the text.

As one example pointed out in DE JONG’s review, SHUKLA reads at 19.11–12 *akṣaṇopapannaḥ*<sup>32</sup> | *apramattaḥ* |. WAYMAN in his earlier edition, used by SHUKLA (!), gave the passage (p. 64) as *akṣaṇopapannaḥ kṣaṇopapannaḥ*<sup>33</sup> | *pramattaḥ apramattaḥ*. DE JONG quoted the Tibetan translation (Peking ed.) as *mi khom par skyes pa dang* | *khom par skyes pa dang* | *bag med pa dang ldan pa*, and noted that the Chinese 398c1–2 agrees with WAYMAN’s reading: 或生無暇、或生有暇、或有縱逸、或無縱逸. Now, the “Index” indeed lists 無暇 (1010b) = *a-kṣaṇa* / *mi khom pa*, with reference to this passage. However, there is no reference to *kṣaṇa* in the Sanskrit list in the “Dictionary,” and although 有暇 = *khom pa* is listed (62a) with reference to this passage (and *khom pa* = 有暇 in the “Dictionary”), no Sanskrit equivalent is quoted. Ironically, the most recent edition of the text, that published in 1998 by Taishō University (p. 30), prints the wrong reading *akṣaṇyopa-*

<sup>31</sup> *Indo-Iranian Journal* 18 (1976): 307–310, reprinted in *Buddhist Studies* by J. W. de Jong. Gregory SCHOPEN, ed. (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1979): 597–600.

<sup>32</sup> DE JONG misprints *akṣaṇopannaḥ*.

<sup>33</sup> Here again DE JONG misprints *kṣaṇopannaḥ*.

*pannaḥ kṣaṇyopapannaḥ*. As Lambert SCHMITHAUSEN pointed out (letter, 24 August, 2000), this results from a misreading of the *ā* vowel sign in *nā* which, combined with the *e*-sign, yields *-no*, not *-nyo* (if *-y-* were present, one would have to read *-nye!*).<sup>34</sup>

The “Index” and “Dictionary” would also not have helped me avoid an oversight in my recent study of the term *yogācāra*.<sup>35</sup> I missed giving any reference to a passage in the *Śrāvakabhūmi* in which it has been suggested that Xuanzang’s 瑜伽師 renders Sanskrit *yogajña*, rather than the usual *yogācāra*.<sup>36</sup> The passage reads in Chinese:<sup>37</sup> 云何初修業者、始修業時、於修作意、如應安立。隨所安立、正修行時、最初觸證、於斷慧樂心一境性。謂、善通達修瑜伽師、最初於彼依瑜伽行、初修業者、如是教誨。善來、賢首、汝等。 . . . This corresponds to the following Sanskrit text:<sup>38</sup> *tatra katham ādikarmikaḥ tatprathamakarmiko manaskārabhāvanāyām viniyujyate | yathāyam viniyujyamānaḥ pratipadyamānaś ca sprśati | tatprathamataḥ prahānābhīratim cittasyaikāgratām | iha yogajño yogaprayuktam ādikarmikam | tatprathamata evam avavadate | ehi tvam bhadramukha . . .* The Tibetan translation has this as:<sup>39</sup> *de la ji ltar na las dang po pa las thog ma pa de yid la byed pa bsgom pa la nges par sbyor bar byed ce na | de de ltar nges par sbyor byed cing sgrub par byed pa 'i tshes | dang por spong ba la mngon par dga' ba dang | sems rtse gcig pa nyid la reg par byed pa na | rnal 'byor pa rnal 'byor shes pa des | las dang po pa rnal 'byor la brtson pa de la dang por 'di skad gdams par bya ste | bzhin bzangs [read: bzang] tshur shog |* Here Chinese 善通達修瑜伽師 corresponds to the printed Sanskrit text’s *yogajña*.<sup>40</sup> In fact, it seems likely that the Sanskrit manuscript (if transcribed properly) has dropped a

<sup>34</sup> In the initial Taishō University edition 1981: 34 (195), the manuscript is read correctly.

<sup>35</sup> “The *Yogācāra Bhikṣu*.” In Jonathan A. SILK, ed., *Wisdom, Compassion, and the Search for Understanding: The Buddhist Studies Legacy of Gadjin M. Nagao* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2000): 265–314.

<sup>36</sup> The passage was pointed out and the equivalence suggested by Jikidō TAKASAKI 高崎直道, “Yugagyōha no Keisei” 瑜伽行派の形成 [The formation of the Yogācāra school]. In Akira HIRAKAWA 平川彰, Yūichi KAJIYAMA 梶山雄一 and Jikidō TAKASAKI, eds., *Kōza Daijō Bukkyō 8: Yuishiki Shisō* 講座大乘仏教 8: 唯識思想 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社, 1982): 1–42; p. 36, n. 18.

<sup>37</sup> T. 1579 (XXX) 459b25–29.

<sup>38</sup> Editions of I.13 by WAYMAN p. 122; SHUKLA p. 411.5–10.

<sup>39</sup> Derge Tanjur 4036, *sems tsam*, *dzi* 151a6–7.

<sup>40</sup> Although no reference is provided, as always in this dictionary, in Akira HIRAKAWA’s *Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary / Bukkyō Kanbon Daijiten* 佛教漢梵大辭典 (Tokyo: The Reiyukai, 1997): 264a the whole compound 善通達修瑜伽師 is given as equivalent to *yogajña*.

*yogī* (or less likely *yogācāra*), so that the Chinese really represents \**yogajñō yogī* (or: *yogācāra*), but the “Index” and “Dictionary” do not deal with the passage well. The word *yogajñā* is cited as equivalent only to *rnal 'byor shes pa* and 善達瑜伽, the references for which do not lead to this passage. There is no entry at all for *yogaprayukta*, none for 依瑜伽行 or even for 瑜伽行 (!—but 修瑜伽行 is given the equivalent *yogam karoti*), no references under 普通達 refer to the present passage, nor do any under 修瑜伽師. I would like to suggest that it is most likely that 普通達修 here in fact translates *yogajñā* alone, corresponding to *rnal 'byor shes pa*, and a *yogī* (as suggested by *rnal 'byor pa*, or less likely a *yogācāra*) has dropped out of the Sanskrit text (or edition).<sup>41</sup> But the “Index” and “Dictionary” do not help to elucidate the issue.

The problem of reliability mentioned above extends even to BHATTACHARYA's edition of the first five bhūmis of the *Maulī Bhūmi*, although this edition is surely much superior in quality to SHUKLA's *Śrāvakabhūmi*. I will quote only one example from this text. In the section on cosmology translated by Yūichi KAJIYAMA (BHATTACHARYA 30.21–44.14),<sup>42</sup> the following expression occurs in the edition (44.10–11): *tadyathā varṣādhāre deve varṣati*. The Tibetan translation (Derge ed. 22a22) has *char pa gshol mda' tsam 'bab pa na*, and Chinese 288a21 天雨注如車軸. The “Dictionary” lists *varṣa* only as equivalent to *dbyar* 夏, which leads to a reference only in the *Śrāvakabhūmi*. Tibetan *char pa* is given as equivalent to *vr̥ṣṭi* 雨 or 天雨, which lead only to passages a few pages in advance of the one quoted above. Tibetan *gshol mda'* is quoted for 車軸, the entry for which indeed seems to refer to this passage, but no Sanskrit equivalent at all is quoted there (“Index” 400b). On the other hand, Tibetan *gshol mda' 'dzin* is quoted as equivalent to 持軸山, which the “Index” (387b) correctly points out renders *Īśādhara* a few pages back (38.9). However, the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (ed. BENDALL 247.7) has *īśādhāro devo varṣati*, which its Tibetan translation (Derge 136b1) renders *gshol mda' tsam gyi char gyi rgyun 'bab po*. Note also that in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (according to HIRAKAWA's index), Xuanzang renders the name *Īśādhāra* with 滴如車軸. I therefore suggested, and Prof. KAJIYAMA adopted, the emendation *Īśādhāra* for the reading *varṣādhāra*. As is plain from the above, the compilers of the “Index” and

<sup>41</sup> For a similar case, see my “The *Yogācāra Bhikṣu*,” p. 302, n. 133. For Xuanxang's rendering of *yogin* with 瑜伽師, see the same article's p. 272.

<sup>42</sup> “Buddhist Cosmology as Presented in the *Yogācārabhūmi*.” In Jonathan A. SILK, ed., *Wisdom, Compassion, and the Search for Understanding: The Buddhist Studies Legacy of Gadjin M. Nagao* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000): 183–199.

“Dictionary” had some trouble with the passage, which they dealt with by omitting altogether, and without any note, the words they evidently did not understand. In fact, even in the space of the small section translated by KAJIYAMA there are any number of cases of words in all three languages which simply fail to be listed at all in the “Index” or “Dictionary.” (I may now add that, when he read a draft of the present notes, Prof. SCHMITHAUSEN kindly informed me [letter, 24 August, 2000] as follows: “The reading *īṣā*<sup>o</sup> is absolutely clear in the *Yogācārabhūmi* manuscript. No *varṣā*<sup>o</sup>.” It is certainly gratifying to have one’s conjectural emendations actually confirmed!)

It is worth quoting directly from the “Acknowledgments” of the “Dictionary,” dated 1997:<sup>43</sup>

There has already been published an index to the *Yogācārabhūmi*, the Index to *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, compiled by late Dr. Hakuju UI; however, it is not a comprehensive, but partial index only to *Bodhisattvabhūmi* of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, with no Tibetan terms collated therein. As a result of the present publication of *the Dictionary*, therefore, it should be possible that the meanings of Sanskrit terms of the *Yogācārabhūmi* have been made accessible further accurately, in comparison with the respective Tibetan and Chinese equivalents, as far as the recensions of Sanskrit texts of the *Yogācārabhūmi* have been available so far.

This statement is quite accurate in part: UI’s Index<sup>44</sup> does cover only the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, and moreover is an index of WOGIHARA’s edition, some portions of which were later supplemented by DUTT. In addition, it is true that UI did not make use of the Tibetan translation. However, it is untrue that this has resulted in a work less reliable than the effort of YOKOYAMA and HIROSAWA. In fact, in at least some cases exactly the opposite is true.

The term 無退轉 is found in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*,<sup>45</sup> for which UI quite correctly gives one Sanskrit equivalent as *aparihīyamāna*.<sup>46</sup> Although the term 無退轉 is entered in the “Index” and given the equivalent (along with 2

<sup>43</sup> I quote the English as it stands, but the Japanese version says almost exactly the same thing.

<sup>44</sup> Hakuju UI 宇井伯壽, *Bonkan Taishō Bosatsuji Sakuin* 梵漢對照菩薩地索引 (Tokyo: Chibetto Daizōkyō Kenkyūkai 西藏大藏經研究會, 1961).

<sup>45</sup> 565c8-9.

<sup>46</sup> WOGIHARA 369.22-23 = DUTT 255.3.

others) *na parihīyate*, there is no reference anywhere to the passage cited by UI, or the form *aparihīyamāna*. UI's index likewise lists the forms *naṭa* and *nartaka*, in fact from a reconstruction of the text by WOGIHARA (p. 5, n. 7), but the same actual reading is found in DUTT's edition (3.21), which the "Index" is apparently indexing.<sup>47</sup> These references do not occur in the "Index" or "Dictionary." I found these instances literally within a few moments of beginning to search, just by opening UI's index entirely at random and trying to locate the quoted equivalents in the "Index" or "Dictionary." It would be a waste of time and energy to continue to pile up examples. It may therefore be taken as an established fact that the claim of the compilers to have improved on the accuracy and comprehensiveness of UI's index cannot be accepted. Although UI's index is surely far from perfect, the work of YOKOYAMA and HIROSAWA cannot be judged an improvement.

The expression of the compilers in the passage quoted above "as far as the recensions of Sanskrit texts of the *Yogācārabhūmi* have been available so far" stands in Japanese as 現在までサンスクリットテキストが校訂出版された部分についてだけ, that is more literally "only with regard to the portions of the Sanskrit text heretofore published critically." Let us recall that this is stated by the compilers in their "Acknowledgments" dated 1997—and return to the list of Sanskrit materials given above, in which the dates of publication are underlined. With the exception of YONEZAWA's 1998 edition of the *Pratyekabuddhabhūmi*—the third edition of this particular text to be published—, the very latest reedition of the *Śrāvakabhūmi* (also 1998), and SCHMITHAUSEN's edition of part of the *Śrutamayī bhūmi* (2000), all of the Sanskrit materials listed above should in fact have been available to the compilers (some published long before the project even began), in what passes these days for critical editions; at least they are as critically edited as the editions actually used by the compilers, and usually more so. All of these works have been absolutely ignored by the compilers of the "Index" and "Dictionary." It is difficult to understand how this could have come to be. I myself am no specialist in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, and heretofore have had little occasion to consult the text more than casually. Yet in the space of a few days, working sporadically and without much effort, I was able to collect much more material than the compilers of these publications seem to have

<sup>47</sup> The Chinese passage is 479b1.

had at their disposal during a twenty year long research project in which a number of collaborators took part. It is likewise hard to understand the complete lack of reference to the continuing work on the text of the *Yogācārabhūmi* being carried out at Taishō University.<sup>48</sup>

It might have been some compensation for their shortcomings if these books were at least easy to use. But alas! The “Index” will be rather difficult to consult for those without a good knowledge of Japanese Buddhist reading pronunciations of Chinese. Although it is arranged in Japanese alphabetical order, there is no indication of the reading of characters given anywhere. The only guide to the head characters under which entries are to be found is a Pinyin index at the end of the volume. This too is not free from errors. For example, the character 藏 (Jpn. *zō*) is read in Pinyin *cang* as a verb, but *zang* as a noun, as the quickest glance at any dictionary such as the *Shinjigen* 新字源 will show. The Pinyin index lists the character only under *cang*, although needless to say the entries show it to be a noun. An index by stroke count and radical, such as that found in the Chinese volume of HIRAKAWA’s *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* index mentioned above, or a list of the characters with their readings, such as is found alongside a stroke count index in NAGAO’s splendid *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra* index,<sup>49</sup> would have eased the way for those not at home in Japanese Buddhist readings of Chinese characters. Some familiarity with modern Japanese may not make things much easier. For example, in the case of the term *go-’śvarathaka* quoted in note 52, below, the Chinese headword 牛 is placed in the order of its Japanese Buddhist reading *go* (unrelated to Sanskrit *go*!), not the much more common modern *gyū*, although it is true that there are entries within the “Index” to redirect the reader to the proper reading (but no page number is given, just a note of the way the character is being read). I would think that for non-Japanese at any rate, the system employed in most Chinese dictionaries, like the *Shinjigen*, and for instance in HIRAKAWA’s *Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit*

<sup>48</sup> According to the Preface of the 1998 edition of the *Śrāvakabhūmi* by the Taishō University team, in 1981 they received a photocopy of the manuscript sent by Prof. SCHMITHAUSEN through Takayuki HIROSAWA, the co-compiler of the “Index” and “Dictionary,” who had been studying in Hamburg under SCHMITHAUSEN. In a number of the publications of the team in the *Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* through 1991, HIROSAWA is listed as a member of the group.

<sup>49</sup> Gadjin M. NAGAO, *Index to the Mahāyāna-sūtrālamkāra* (Sylvain Lévi Edition). Part One: Sanskrit-Tibetan-Chinese; Part Two: Tibetan-Sanskrit & Chinese-Sanskrit (Tokyo: Nippon Gakujutsu Shinkōkai [Japan Society for the Promotion of Science], 1958, 1961).

*Dictionary*,<sup>50</sup> of organization of the characters under the 214 radicals (established by the *Kangxi zidian* 康熙字典 in 1716),<sup>51</sup> would be the easiest to use.

In addition, although references are given to page and line in Sanskrit, and to page and column (but not line—and there are 29 lines of about 16 characters each in a column of Taishō text) in Chinese, absolutely no references are provided for the citations of Tibetan equivalents. Therefore, given the fact that there is also no concordance of any kind, there is no way to locate any Tibetan term within the text. One must thus take it entirely on faith that the compilers have identified the proper Tibetan equivalent in every case. I think that the examples shown above must cast some doubt on the advisability of the latter course.<sup>52</sup>

And what of the “Dictionary”? Here once again our expectations are confounded. This work is called in Japanese a *jiten* 辞典. The *Kōjien* 広辞苑 defines the modern Japanese term *jiten* (which it equates with *jisho* 辞書) rather narrowly, limiting its use to a work which lists words in order, gives their pronunciation, meaning, etymology and use. The *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* is somewhat more flexible, and defines “dictionary” as follows:

1. A reference book containing an explanatory alphabetical list of words, as: a. A book listing a comprehensive or restricted selection of the words of a language, identifying usually the phonetic, grammatical, and semantic value of each word, often with etymology, citations, and usage guidance, and other information. b. Such a book listing the words of a particular category within a language.
2. A book listing the words of a language with translations into another language. . . . .

If we wish to follow very strictly the second definition, the “Dictionary”

<sup>50</sup> See n. 40, above. It should be noted that whatever its other shortcomings, the indices to this dictionary are excellent, even including a four-corner index, a very powerful tool indeed.

<sup>51</sup> Strictly speaking, although the system of 214 “radicals” became standard thanks to the *Kangxi zidian*, it was actually created by MEI Yingzuo 梅膺祚 in his *Zihui* 字彙 dictionary of 1615, according to William BOLTZ in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 120/3 (2000): 471.

<sup>52</sup> The compilers’ proofreading is also sometimes insufficient. The form *gv-aśva-rathaka* (“Index” 282a, “Dictionary” 109b) quoted for *Bodhisattvabhūmi* 191.4 (DUTT = WOGIHARA 281.13–14) is impossible. Both WOGIHARA and UI in his *Index* print *go-’śva-rathaka*, while DUTT prints an alternate form *go-aśvarathaka*. It must be the latter which is intended.

may indeed qualify; however it is in fact, as the Japanese “Foreword” by Yūshō MIYASAKA 宮坂宥勝 plainly states, a reverse<sup>53</sup> of the “Index.” Words are listed there in Sanskrit, with Tibetan and Chinese equivalents given, and words are listed in Tibetan, with Sanskrit (sometimes) and Chinese equivalents. That is all. There are no references, no definitions, no explanations. To find even the spot at which a particular term appears, one must look up the Chinese term in the “Index”—after determining, of course, how it is pronounced. So one cannot use the “Dictionary” without the “Index,” and it is also plain that this “Dictionary” is not at all a “Dictionary of Buddhist Terminology based on [the] *Yogācārabhūmi*,” as its title claims for it, and is of quite limited help in the task of reading and understanding the *Yogācārabhūmi* or related literature.

Still, after all, as a matter of principle some index is better than no index, and this is no doubt also true in the present case. Many if not most of the references are certainly correct (even if, for example, they do not list a Sanskrit equivalent although it would be possible to do so), and no doubt in this respect the “Index” is helpful, and should find a place among the holdings of good academic libraries. At the same time, it is not as if we are entirely without other guides to the vocabulary of the *Yogācārabhūmi* texts. In the first place, there is UI’s index to the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, discussed above. There is also an index of important words in the *Śrāvakabhūmi* added to volume 2 of SHUKLA’s work (again, although published in 1991 apparently unknown to the compilers). Moreover, in 1952 Shōju INABA 稲葉正就 published an index to the technical terms in multiple Chinese versions of the *Yogācārabhūmi* and the *Xianyang shengjiao-lun* 顯揚聖教論,<sup>54</sup> in which he included Sanskrit and Tibetan equivalents for the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (at that time, the only section available in Sanskrit).<sup>55</sup> Although this is no doubt a bibliographical rarity, copies are certainly available in Japan. And this is not even to mention the index to the Chinese text published in the series of indices to the Taishō canon,<sup>56</sup> or the fact that the entire Chinese text, at least, of the

<sup>53</sup> 逆引き.

<sup>54</sup> The title of this text and its relation to the *Yogācārabhūmi* are discussed by SCHMITHAUSEN, *Ālayavijñāna* p. 261, n. 99.

<sup>55</sup> *Yuishiki Gakujutsugo Sakuin* 唯識學術語索引 (Kyoto: Ōtani Daigaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyūshitsu 大谷大學佛教學研究室). Mimeograph. See TSUKAMOTO, MATSUNAGA and ISODA (n. 30, above): 328, n. 56 (where, however, the title is wrongly quoted). My deep thanks to Prof. Yōichi KAJI 加治洋一 for taking the trouble to send me a photocopy of this publication.

<sup>56</sup> Volume 17 of the *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō Sakuin* 大正新脩大藏經索引 (Tokyo: Taishō

*Yogācārabhūmi* is now available on line for searching.<sup>57</sup> Finally in this regard we may mention the 1995 publication of a Sanskrit-Chinese-Tibetan index to the *Hetuvidyā*, based on the edition of YAITA mentioned above.<sup>58</sup> Aside from the fact that this indeed appeared before the “Index,” we should notice once again that although it was published by the very same publisher, Sankibō, there is no note of it anywhere in the work of YOKOYAMA and HIROSAWA.<sup>59</sup>

That the creation of indices is largely a thankless task is quite true. Most text scholars constantly use—and often rely upon—such works, and only rarely acknowledge their use. And no doubt many of us are guilty of noticing an index least when it is most reliable and easiest to use. Those of us educated as philologists and historians have worked to actively develop our sense of doubt and suspicion; we are trained to look for trouble, for problems

---

Shinshū Daizōkyō Kankōkai 大正新脩大藏經刊行会, 1970). A quick random search here too found any number of Chinese terms listed in this index yet absent in the work of YOKOYAMA and HIROSAWA. I will not bother to document this here; I think the point has already been made sufficiently.

<sup>57</sup> The URL for a version in Chinese coding: <http://www.human.toyogakuen-u.ac.jp/~acmuller/yogacara/texts.htm>; in Japanese coding: <http://www.edu.nagasaki-u.ac.jp/private/yugagyō/main.html#down>. At this point, as far as I know only an incomplete version of parts of the Tibetan translation of the text is available from the Asian Classics Input Project: <http://www.asianclassics.org/download/TengSkt.html>.

<sup>58</sup> Hideomi YAITA and Masahiro TAKANO, “Index to the *Hetuvidyā* text in the *Yogācārabhūmi*.” *Shōmonji Kenkyūkai and Mikkyō Seiten Kenkyūkai 声聞地研究会・密教聖典研究会*, eds., *Bongo Bukkyō Bunken no Kenkyū 梵語仏教文献の研究* (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 1995): 217–284.

<sup>59</sup> I think it is important to offer some note about the price of the volumes I have discussed here. Although it is a handsome volume the *Abhisamayālamkāraloka* index costs ¥20,000. The “Index” and “Dictionary,” also very handsomely printed and bound, on excellent paper with individual boxes, and with all Tibetan words printed in a very nice type face of which the compilers are justifiably proud, cost, respectively, ¥20,000 and ¥18,000, in other words—since the second cannot be used without the first—¥38,000 (plus tax!), or something under \$400 at the present rate of exchange. Even the 1998 *Śrāvakahūmi* edition, 340 pages printed from computer-generated camera-ready copy and bound in paper (no box this time!), sells for ¥8500, or more than \$80 (again from Sankibō—but many other Japanese publishers are equally guilty). Surely very few individual scholars, even in Japan, can afford to acquire such Japanese publications at these prices. I must note here in the interests of full disclosure: I received complementary copies of the *Abhisamayālamkāraloka* index and *Śrāvakahūmi* editions from their editors, and this journal purchased the *Yogācārabhūmi* indices for review at a substantial discount.

in a text, for arguments that are not coherent or are unsupported by evidence. This is a good thing, but at the same time it tends to prejudice us in favor of noticing failure more than success. It also ill-prepares us simply to appreciate the massive amount of work that goes, for example, into the compilation of even a poor index. On the other hand, given the obvious amount of work involved, we must still regret those cases in which the application of just a bit more time and some greater attention to detail might have turned a work of questionable utility into a true monument to scholarship. Both of us have work to do: no doubt the critic must learn to dull his critical blade a bit, as the indexer must strive to sharpen his.