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The text of the Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra, edited by S. Lévi has played an important role not only in the study of the early Yogācāra philosophy, but also in that of Mahayanic philosophy in general. Above all, the chapter XI, “Dharma-paryesaṭṭhadikāra” is widely noted as the most important chapter for the reason why it intensively expresses the heart of the Yogācāra philosophy of Maitreyanātha himself. As is well known, its position is also regarded as the comparable to that of the Lakṣaṇapariccheda of the Madhyantavibhāga. Undoubtedly, the verse of XI. 35, with the preceding verse, that is entitled “Vijñāptimātrapareṣṭi” or the investigation of the concept “vijñāptimātra” is one of the most prominent verses in this chapter because of its reference to the heart of the philosophy. Examining the verse of Lévi’s edition, however, we find a number of strong grounds for doubting the authenticity of the edition. Therefore the purpose of this paper is to compare the text of the edition with the following new manuscripts and to correct the verse.1)

Materials and Abbreviations
Mss: Sanskrit manuscripts2)

1) Corrections of the text were already indicated by S. Lévi in his French translation of the text. Prof. Nagao has succeeded to Lévi’s business, and elaborated upon his corrections, making out Corrigenda of the Text. The main sources of his corrigenda, however, depend on the Tibetan and Chinese versions and the newly discovered manuscripts of ours are rarely consulted in his works. This paper attempts to achieve more authoritative results, more or less different from the above by means of consulting chiefly the new Sanskrit manuscripts.

2) Mss. A and B were studied by Prof. S. Takeuchi in the Ryukoku Daigaku Ronshu No. 352. His study led up to this one. Moreover, we owe it to the kindness of Mr. G. Tsutsumi, the vice-chief of the Library that we could get these copies.

---

Corrections of the Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra XI. 35 (T. Umino) (21)

A : The manuscript preserved in the Ryukoku University Library, Kyoto.
171 leaves, 17 lines 31.2×9.7cm

B : The manuscript preserved in the Ryukoku University Library, Kyoto.
186 leaves, 91 lines 26.2×12.2cm

When the verses (XI. 34, 35.) of Lévi’s edition are compared with the verses of Mss. A and B, they are as follows.3)

(Lévi’s edition)
cittaṁ dvayaaprabhāsaṁ rāgādyābhāsāmyaye tadvāt/
śraddhāyābhāsaṁ na tadanyo dharmāḥ kliṣṭakusālo ’sti// 34

cittamātram eva dvayaapratibhāsāmyaye grāhyapratibhāsāṁ grāhakapratibhāsāṁ ca/
tathā rāgādiklesābhāsaṁ tadevaye/ śraddhādikusaladharmaṁbhaśaṁ va/ na tu
tadābhāsādanyāḥ kliṣṭo dharme ’sti rāgādilakṣaṇaṁ kuśalo vā śraddhādilakṣaṇaṁ/
yathā dvayaapratibhāsādanyo na dvayalakṣaṇaṁ/
iti cittaṁ citrābhāsaṁ citrākāraṁ pravartate// 35

tathābhāso bhāvābhāvo na tu dharmāgaṁ mataḥ tatra
cittam eva vastu tacitra-

(Mss. A 66b 1~66b 7)
cittaṁ dvayaaprabhāsaṁ ca rāgādyābhāsāmyaye tadvāt/
śraddhāyābhāsaṁ vā na tu dharmāḥ kliṣṭakusālo ’sti// 34

cittamātram eva dvayaapratibhāsāmyaye grāhyapratibhāsāṁ grāhakapratibhāsāṁ ca
tathā rāgādiklesābhāsaṁ tadevaye
tadhādikusaladharmābhāsaṁ vā na

3) Oblique lines used for punctuating in Mss. A and B are put on the very place where their editors put punctuation marks. Verses of them are extracted from sentences that are not characterized as the verse, though punctuated, and arranged as stated above. There are no punctuation marks between the former half-verses of XI. 35 and the latter half-verses in Mss. A and B, so we punctuate between them according to the verse cited in Vasubandhu’s commentary and Sthiramati’s of the Tibetan version and the versification of the Anuṣṭubh. The dotted line and the straight line are used for showing the correlation of the passages of Mss. A and B with the passages of Lévi’s edition in their content.
tu tadabhāsādanyāḥ klīṣo dharmo ‘sti rāgadilakṣaṇaḥ kuśala vṛ ṣraddhādilakṣaṇaḥ yathā dvayapratibhāsādanyo na dvayalakṣaṇa iti/
cittaṁ citrābhāsaṁ citrākāram pravartate tacca ( / )
bhāso bhāvabhāvo na tu dharmāṇāṁ atas ta (tra)// 35
citamaves(?)ca taccitrābhāsaṁ pravartate/ paryāyena rāgabhāsaṁ vṛ dvēṣābhāsaṁ vṛ tadanyadharmābhāsaṁ vṛ citrākāraṁ(?) ca yugapat śraddhā(?)yākāraṁ bhāso bhāvabhāvāḥ klīṣaṅkulaṅkavasthe cetasi na tu dharmāṇāṁ kuśalanāṁ tatrābhāsāvatirekena tallakṣaṅkābhāvat/ (Mss. B 62a 2~62b 2)
cittaṁ dvayaprabhāsāṁ rāgadyābhāsamisīyaḥ tadvat/
śraddhādībhāsaṁ na tatra dharmāḥ klīṣaṅkulaṅko ṣti// 34
citamātrameva dvayapratibhāsāsamisīya mudrābhāsāsamisīya grāhakapratibhāśānca tathā rāgadiklesābhāsaṁ tadantevyate/ śraddhādikulakulaṅkavyeṣeṣtaḥ vṛ na tu tadabhāsādanyāḥ klīṣo dharmo ‘sti rāgadilakṣaṇaḥ kuśalo vṛ śraddhādilakṣaṇaḥ vṛ yathā dvayapratibhāsādanyo na dvayalakṣaṇa iti/
cittaṁ citrābhāsaṁ citrākāraṁ pravartate tacca ( / )
bhāso bhāvabhāvo na tu dharmāṇāṁ atas ta// 35
citamavesa taccitrābhāsam pravartate/ paryāyena rāgabhāsaṁ vṛ dvēṣābhāsaṁ vṛ tadanyadharmābhāsaṁ vṛ citrākāraṁca yugapat śraddhāyākāraṁ bhāso bhāvabhāvāḥ klīṣaṅkulaṅkavasthe cetasi na tu dharmāṇāṁ kuśalanāṁ tatrābhāsāvatirekena tallakṣaṅkābhāvat/

In the above, we may find out that there are a number of differences between Lévi’s edition and Mss. A and B, while Mss. A is nearly equivalent to Mss. B in its content. Therefore the textual criticism between both of them should be required as follows.

4) This fragment is illegible also in these manuscripts. Prof. Nagao “vastu tac ci-” of Lévi’s edition as “vastutas ci-” in his Corrigenda. We, however, can find out no words equivalent to “vastu” in any texts. For instance, Tibetan translation of this fragment is as follows. sems bdi id rna ma’i ka’i khyi bchod chags su snan ba ‘bras/ she sde du snan ba ‘bras/ de las yul pa’i cho ba snan ba ama thog pa snan ba da/ cig char dad pa da’i brtson ‘gbras la sogs pa’i rnam pa te/...... We would rather change vastu tac ci- into ca tac ci-, because we may suppose that ca tac ci- corresponds to citrābhāsāṁ tacca of the verse of XI. 35.

—511—

1) The textual criticism based on the Sanskrit versification.

Undoubtedly, the meter of XI. 35 in Mss. A and B belongs to the Anuṣṭubh, judging from the number of syllables. The same is applicable also to the meter of the verse of Lévi’s edition, to say nothing of the ambiguity of its meaning. (Mss. A and B)

/---------/ ---------/ ---------/ ---------/ ---------/ 16 syllables
/---------/ ---------/ ---------/ ---------/ ---------/ 15 syllables

(Lévi’s edition)

/---------/ ---------/ ---------/ ---------/ ---------/ 16 syllables
/---------/ ---------/ ---------/ ---------/ ---------/ 16 syllables

Strictly speaking, the latter half-verses in Mss. A and B consists of fifteen syllables and the number of syllables in them lacks one syllable of sixteen syllables, while that of Lévi’s edition perfectly keeps to the rule of the Anuṣṭubh. On the point of view of the Sanskrit versification, we cannot but conclude that the verse of the edition is superior to that of Mss. A and B. However, that of the edition that is punctuated between “yathā dvayapratibhāsādanyo na dvayalakṣaṇaḥ” and “iti”

5) Examining the syllable or the mora of the verses of the chapter XI, we see the fact that there are a few verses that accurately keep to the rules of the Sanskrit versification. For instance, the verse of XI. 34 does not accurately keep to the rule of the Ārya, though Lévi assigns it to the Ārya. In the Ārya, the first and third quarters must each contain 12 morae or syllabic instants, and the second 18, and the fourth 15, so the former half-verses must contain 30 morae, and the latter half-verses 27, while the former half-verses of Lévi’s edition contains 29 morae, and the latter half-verses 28 morae. The verses of Mss. A and B, however, present a striking contrast to the above. It is indisputably evident that they keep to the rule of the Anuṣṭubh. They are as follows.

(Lévi’s edition)

/---------/ ---------/ 29 morae
/---------/ ---------/ 28 morae

(Mss. A)

/---------/ ---------/ 18 syllables
/---------/ ---------/ 16 syllables

(Mss. B)

/---------/ ---------/ 17 syllables
/---------/ ---------/ 16 syllables

—510—
sounds strange from the standpoint of the sentence structure and the meaning of the verse itself. The above two fragments are not punctuated between each of them in Mss. A and the same example is seen also in the Tibetan translation. We should, accordingly, know that the conformity to the rule does not necessarily shows the authenticity of the verse, as is often the case with the Buddhistic versification of those days.

2) The textual criticism on its meaning.

Undoubtedly, the word of “iti” forms a part of Vasubandhu’s commentary of XI. 34. Therefore the verse of XI. 35 must take on a new meaning different from that of the French translation. The new verse of XI. 35 translates as follows.

The consciousness appears, as though its appearance were something miscellaneous, and a miscellaneous form (ākāra). Their appearance on it exists and yet does not exist. Therefore there is nothing in the categories (dharma), however.

According to the commentaries, the meaning of the verse reads as follows.

The consciousness, appears, as though its appearance were the category of the viciousness (kliṣṭadharma) and that of the meritoriousness (kuśaladharma). Their appearance on the consciousness, however, does exist as a delusion, while it does not exist because it is only apparent and unsubstantial. Therefore there is no entity in the above categories, which may be regarded as a kind of the noumenon.

Thus examining, we may conclude that the verse of XI, 35 of the edition should be corrected as follows.

· · · · yathā dvayaspratibhāsādanyo na dvayalakṣaṇa iti/
  cittāṁ citrābhāsaṁ citrakāraṁ pravartate taccā/
 bhāso bhāvabhāvo na tu dharmān̄ta tu tattatā/ 35

(昭和48年度文部省科学研究費[総合研究A]による研究成果の一部)