

On Two Sanskrit Manuscripts of Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's Commentary on the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra**

Youngjin LEE

(HK Research Professor, Geumgang Center for Buddhist Studies)

국문요약

이 논문은 『현관장엄론』에 대한 아리야 비목띠세나의 주석서에 나타난 두 가지 문제를 다루고 있다. 두 문제 중 하나는 전와(轉訛)된 뿌라끄리뜨 문장이고 다른 하나는 아리야 비목띠세나의 주석서 제명의 혼란이다. 필자는 이 문제를 다루기 위해서 ‘사본 A’와 ‘사본 B’로 부른 네팔과 티벳에 보존되어있는 사본들과 ‘사본 C’라고 부른 네팔-독일 사본보존프로젝트(NGMPP)에서 두 군데로 흩어져 있던 새로 확인된 『현관장엄론』 사본을 참조하였다.

* This work was supported by the Korea Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (KRF-2007-361-AM0046).

불교학리뷰 (Critical Review for Buddhist Studies)

18권 (2015. 12) 15p~48p

www.kci.go.kr

두 번째 장에서는 아리야 비묵띠세나가 뿌라끄리뜨를 사용하는 다른 학파로부터 인용하였지만, 필사자들이 이 언어에 대해 익숙하지 않아 초래된 전와 된 문장을 “*tathāgato tti vattavvo no tu vattavvo sammāsambuddhaḥ*”(그를 단지 여래라고 불러야지 정등각자로 부르지 말아라)로 개선하였다. 그리고 특히 이 인용이 아리야 비묵띠세나가 주석하고 있는 『이만오천송반야』와 일치하지 않음에도 그가 이 문장을 인용한 의도에 관해 다루었다.

제 3장에서는 주로 아리야 비묵띠세나 주석서의 제명에 대한 혼동을 다루었다. 실례로 사본 A의 콜로폰에는 이 주석서의 제명이 “*Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāryaprajñāpāramitopadeśaṃ Abhisamayālaṃkāraśāstraṃ*”(이만 오천송 반야에 대한 가르침인 현관장엄론)으로 기술되어 있으며 이는 주석 대상인 『현관장엄론』 계송의 제명과 일치한다. 더욱이 새로 확인된 계송 사본의 첫 번째 앞면에는 “*Śrīpañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāyāḥ Prajñāpāramitāyāḥ · ĀryaVimuktisenakṛteyaṃ tīkā sunirmalā*”(이 [문헌]은 성스러운 이만 오천송 반야에 대한 오점이 없는 주석서로서 아리야 비묵띠세나가 지었다.)라는 기술이 있다. 이 두 자료는 “아리야 비묵띠세나가 『현관장엄론』 주석서뿐만이 아니라, 성 마이트레야 나타나 지었다고 전해지는 『현관장엄론』 그 자체 즉 계송도 지었다”는 것을 암시한다. 이 장의 결론에서는 무엇 때문에 주석서 제명의 혼란이 일어났는지에 대한 의견을 피력하였고 주석서의 제명을 다시 고려해야 한다고 주장하였다.

주제어: 현관장엄론, 아리야 비묵띠세나, 뿌라끄리뜨, 여래, 불지(佛地), 제명의 혼란

I. Introduction

Until very recently, it was believed that a single palm-leaf manuscript of Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's¹⁾ commentary, commonly called *Abhisamayālaṅkāravṛtti*,²⁾ survives. Giuseppe Tucci photographed this manuscript kept by Rājaguru, in Nepal, during his expedition in 1954. The photos with their modern apograph are now preserved in the Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente in Rome.³⁾ This palm-leaf manuscript was also microfilmed by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (NGMPP A 37/9) and is now preserved in the National Archives of Kathmandu (NAK 5-55) (hereafter, ms A).

In 2013, another manuscript of Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary, now

* I should make it clear that the third chapter of this paper is the revision of LEE 2015. However, I added some materials that I hadn't yet found at that time to support my assertion and changed my conclusion.

* I would like to express my gratitude to Ms. Wendy Morison who proofread this manuscript carefully and reviewers who gave valuable suggestions to me. Courtesy of them, I could revise and improve this paper.

1) I adopt "Vimuktiṣeṇa" instead of the proper Sanskrit form, Vimuktisena, based on readings of relatively old manuscripts (12th~13th?) that I consulted. cf. *Abhisamayālaṅkāralokā* NGMPP A 37/7(= NAK 3/738) 17r5, etc. Wohihara, one of editors of *Ālokā*, always adopted the reading, Vimuktiṣeṇa; *Abhisamayālaṅkāravivṛti* NGMPP A 35/12 (=NAK 5/236) 1v2 and 29r2; *Abhisamayālaṅkāravivṛti* NGMPP A 35/10 (=NAK 3/738) 35v6.

2) This text is not only the oldest available commentary on *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* but also possibly the first commentary. See Makransky 1997. 187; regarding the traditional view, which ascribes AA to Maitreyaṇātha and makes mention of Asaṅga and Vasubandhu as Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's predecessors, consult Apple 2008, 26-28; with respect to the unreliability of the traditional view, which was inherited by Tibetan tradition, see Nakamura 2011.

3) Sferra 2008. 28, 52; Regarding the modern apograph of the manuscript, see Sferra 2008, 63.

preserved in Tibet, was identified by Guan Di, a Ph.D. candidate at Peking University (hereafter, ms B). This manuscript, placed fourteenth on Wang Sen's list,⁴⁾ seems to have been microfilmed by the Institute of South Asia and Southeast Asia Studies of Peking University in 1988.⁵⁾ The manuscript on palm leaves consists of 107 folios and is written in the script named "the Proto-Bengali-cum-Proto-Maithili type" by Gustav Roth.⁶⁾ It probably dates back to the early twelfth century, which is about the same time period as ms A.⁷⁾ In 2014, the digital images from the microfilm were shared, courtesy of Prof. Duan Qing at Peking University, with scholars who are *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* specialists, including myself.

In a previous paper, I reported that eight folios that are scattered into two sets—three folios of ms A (numbered 97, 99, and 100) and five folios of NGMPP A 35/12 (the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 6th, and 8th folios), which are limited to parts that are only written in the Nepalese script with the hooked top on the palm leaves—constitute one and the same manuscript of AA (hereafter, ms C).⁸⁾ Recently, at the Geumgang-Taisho joint seminar, I also asserted

4) Hu-von Hinüber 2006, 300; another text, titled *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitābhisamayālaṅkāravṛtti*, comprised of 252 folios, is listed eighth on Wang sen's list. I also found a manuscript titled *Abhisamayālaṅkāravṛtti* consisting of 84 folios on the list of Sanskrit manuscripts preserved in CTRC. But these manuscripts are not accessible to almost all scholars until now.

5) Saerji 2014, 294; However, according to Prof. Dr. Karashima Seishima, this manuscript together with others, which had been preserved in the Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities (民族文化宮圖書館), Beijing, were microfilmed much earlier, probably in 1960s.

6) Roth 1970. XX I - XX V ; The *akṣara* list made by Kouda Ryōshū is very useful for learning this script: Kouda 2004, 93-112.

7) Consult the third chapter of this paper, "Colophon of ms B and the title of Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary"

that ms C was written by the first scribe of ms A.

In this paper, I would like to discuss two matters relating to the manuscripts of Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary, namely, ms A and ms B, together with the newly identified *kārikā* manuscript, ms C:

1. a quotation of one short sentence in Prakrit from another school, which is corrupt in both of the manuscripts, ms A and ms B, and unusually differentiates *tathāgata* from *samyaksambuddha*, and
2. the final colophon of ms B and the title of Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary, with reference to ms C.

II. Corrupt sentence in Prakrit

In the first chapter of his commentary, Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa quotes one short Prakrit sentence from another school (*nikāyāntara*), which is yet to be identified. In both manuscripts, ms A and ms B, this sentence seems to be corrupt, mainly because the scribes did not have sufficient knowledge of Prakrit. The corrupt sentence is preceded by the following passage:

[In the Perfection of Wisdom in 25,000 lines, the Blessed one says]
 “Furthermore, Subhūti, a bodhisattva should be called none other than *tathāgata* after⁹⁾ the tenth stage” with the implied sense of fulfilment of all qualities of

8) Lee 2015, 221-225.

9) Excluding the recast version of PvsP and Xuanzang's translation, 若菩薩摩訶薩住第十地已。與諸如來應言無別: 《大般若波羅蜜多經》 83c23-24, other sources do not support “*daśamyā*

the Buddha such as the ten powers, which is the realization of the Perfectly enlightened one.¹⁰⁾

A 36v4-5, B 34v1: *daśamyāḥ punaḥ subhūte bhūmeḥ param bodhisatvas*¹¹⁾
tathāgata evēti vaktavya iti | samyaksambuddhādhigamadaśabalādisarvabu-
*ddhadharmmaparipūryabhisandhinā*¹²⁾

Being preceded by the above passage, Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa quotes one sentence from the unidentified text of the unspecified school:

bhūmeḥ param”, but instead give support to “is staying at the tenth stage (*daśamyām bhūmau sthitaḥ* or *vartamānaḥ*)” as in LPG 97r14, 97r15, and 93v15-94r1. Surprisingly, in PvsP[K] 102.23~29, the Buddha’s reply to the question from Subhūti, “*katham bodhisattvo mahāsattvo daśamyām bhūmau sthitaḥ saṃs tathāgata eveti vaktavyaḥ*”, is as follows: *evam hi subhūte bodhisattvo mahāsattvo daśamyāḥ punar bodhisattvabhūmeḥ param tathāgata eveti vaktavyaḥ*. This would implies that “*daśamyāḥ bodhisattvabhūmeḥ param*” is actually of the same meaning of “*daśamyām bhūmau sthitaḥ*”, which could be translated into “sometimes after [a bodhisattva has entered] the tenth bodhisattva-stage.”

10) The Tibetan translation is portrayed differently. D [No. 3787] *shes phyin, ka* 78b5; Q [No. 5185] *sher phyin ka* 90b5-6: *rab 'byor byang chub sems dpa' chen po sa bcu pa la gnas pa ni de bzhin gshegs pa nyid du brjod do zhes bya ba ni yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas kyi brnyes pa'i stobs la sogs pa sangs rgyas kyi chos thams cad yongs su ma rdzogs pa la dgongs pa yin no* || “... a bodhisattva who is abiding at the tenth stage should be called none other than *tathāgata*” ...[he] has not fulfilled all qualities of the Buddha, such as the ten powers that the Perfectly enlightened one had attained.

11) *bodhisatvas* A, *bodhisattvas* B; At the first *abhisamaya* of ms B, the unexpected reading, *śattva*, appears more than ninety times, while it appears only fourteen times in ms A. On the Hybrid Sanskrit form of *bodhisatva*, see Bhattacharya 2010.

12) 'paripūryabhisandhinā' applied sandhi, 'paripūriabhisandhinā AB

A 36v4-5, B 34v1-2: *nikāyāntare* [']*py uktam* |

A	तथागतोतिवन्तवो नो तु रथतार्थो सम्मसांभुद्धा इति
transcription	<i>tathāgato tti vantavo no tu rthattartha sammāsambuddha iti</i>
B	तथागतोतिवन्तवो नो तु रथतार्थो सम्मसांभुद्धा इति
transcription	<i>tathāgato tti caturtho no tu vvattartha sammāsambuddha iti</i>

Tib[D] 78b6; Tib[Q] 90b6-7: *sde pa gzhan dag las kyang de bzhin gshegs pa zhes brjod par bya'i* | *yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas zhes ni brjod par mi bya'o zhes bshad do* ||

Based on the Tibetan translation, we can assume that the Sanskritized form of the quotation is “*tathāgata iti vaktavyaḥ | no tu vaktavyaḥ samyaksambuddhaḥ*”. If we accept this reconstruction, then we could correct the Prakrit sentence to “*tathāgato tti vattavvo no tu vattavvo sammāsambuddhaḥ*.”¹³⁾ The translation would be as follows:

13) I am deeply indebted to Prof. Dr. Karashima Seishi for this correction. He willingly accepted my request to read this sentence, together with the colophon of ms B, at the *Brāhmī* club. Prof. Karashima suggested this revision, hereby sharing his excellent knowledge of Prakrit with myself and others. The main reason for corruption of this sentence is because the scribes did not accept the gemination of *vv*. For them, only gemination after *r*—for example, *rvv* and *rmm* and so on—is allowed. They, therefore, read *rvv* as *rth*, which is very similar to the shape of the former. With regard to Pkt. *vattavva* < Skt. *vaktavya*, see Pischel, 1965, 392. (§ 570); In Pkt. the dental *n* is changed into the cerebral *ṇ*. Pischel 1965, 165, 224; Woolner 1917, 11 (§ 7). I did not find any rule stating that the initial gemination of *vv* is allowed in Pkt.

In another school, there is also a saying that you should call him *tathāgata*, but not *samyaksambuddha* (perfectly enlightened one).

As mentioned before, the text, along with the school,¹⁴⁾ has not been identified. Although I searched both Sanskrit e-texts and Chinese texts available to me, I could find neither the same sentence nor the concept that differentiates *tathāgata* from *samyaksambuddha*. I did, however, find a passage in the section of the *Daśabhūmikasūtra*, describing the tenth bodhisattva-stage (*Dharmameghā bhūmi*), which is quite similar to the quotation and the explanation offered by Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa.

[When] rays of light have been poured on the head of the bodhisattva simultaneously, he is called “one who has been initiated” into the sphere of the Perfectly enlightened one. However, he is called “a perfectly enlightened one” after fulfilling the ten powers [of the Buddha] ... You, Conqueror’s child! In this way, the bodhisattva, as soon as he has been initiated by Buddhas, Blessed ones, is called “one who has been conferred the initiation of the great wisdom”, namely, initiation into the perfectly enlightened one.¹⁵⁾ However, he will be called “a perfectly enlightened one” by fulfillment of the ten powers [of the Buddha] ...

14) We can exclude the *Sammatīya* school (正量部), since colophons of ms A and ms B reveal that Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa as a Mahāyānist belonged to the *Kaurukulla[ka]* branch of the noble *Sammatīya* school. See n. 52.

15) This compound, *samyaksambuddhābhīṣeṇa*, does not occur in sources other than the Sanskrit texts.

*tās ca raśmaya[s] tulyakālaṃ tasya bodhisatvasyottamāṅge nipatitā*¹⁶⁾
*bhavaṃti | sa ca bodhisatvo 'bhiṣikta*¹⁷⁾ *ity ucyate | samyaksambuddhaviśaye*
daśabalaparipūryā tu samyaksambuddha iti saṃkhyāṃ pratilabhate | ... evam
*eva bhavaṃto jinaputrā[h] samanaṃtarābhiṣikto*¹⁸⁾ *bodhisattvas tai[r] buddhair*
bhagavadbhir mahājñānābhiṣekābhiṣikta ity ucyate samyaksambuddhābhiṣekeṇa
*daśabalaparipūryā tu samyaksambuddha iti [saṃkhyāṃ gacchati] | ...*¹⁹⁾

'od gzer de dag kyang dus gcig tu byang chub sems dpa' de'i yan lag gi dam pa
 la 'bab par 'gyur te | byang chub sems dpa' de yang yang dag par rdzogs pa'i
 sang rgyas kyi yul la mngon par dbang bskur ba zhes bya'o || stobs bcu yong su
 rdzogs nas ni | yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sang rgyas su bgrang ba yang thob
 par 'gyur ro || ... kye rgyal ba'i sras de bzhin du byang chub sems dpa' yang
 sang rgyas bcom ldan 'das de dag gis dbang bskur ma thag tu ye shes kyi
 dbang bskur bas dbang bskur ba zhes bya ste | stobs bcu yong su rdzogs nas ni
 yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sang rgyas kyi grangs su 'gro 'o || ...

²⁰⁾

16) nipatitā] em., nipatitāni ms

17) bodhisatvo 'bhiṣikta] em., bodhisatvābhiṣikta ms

18) samanaṃtarā] em., syamanaṃtarā' ms

19) Quotation from a manuscript of the *Daśabhūmikasūtra* referred to as ms B by Matsuda (1996) contained in NGMPP A38/7 56v1-6: This passage from the oldest Nepalese manuscript, named ms A by Matsuda, is unfortunately missing. Other Sanskrit sources include (1) DBh[R] 85.23-86.09 (2) DBh[K] 183.11-184.08; Chinese translation : (3) 《漸備一切智德經》 (T.285, Dharmarakṣa 297 CE) 490c18-491a13 (4) 《十住經》 (T.286, Kumārajīva 402-412 CE) 529a19-b06 (5) 《大方廣佛華嚴經》 (T.278, Buddhahadra 418-412 CE) 572b02-25 (6) 《大方廣佛華嚴經》 (T.279, Śikṣānanda 695-699 CE) 206a16-b01 (7) 《佛說十地經》 (T.287, Śīladharma 753-790 CE) 568b11-c09; This passage is also quoted in the Chinese translation of Vasubandhu's commentary on the *Daśabhūmikasūtra* 《十地經論》 (T.1522) 195b24-c10.

20) Tibetan translation in the *mdo sde* section: Stog Kanjur [TBRC version], *mdo sde*, ga

This quotation makes no mention of a bodhisattva who abides at the tenth bodhisattva-stage and has been initiated by Buddhas as *tathāgata*. However, a clear distinction is made between the bodhisattva who has been conferred the initiation of the great wisdom, and the perfectly enlightened one who has completed the ten powers. Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's explanation that all qualities of the Buddha are represented by the ten powers would seem to have something to do with the *Daśabhūmikasūtra*. This is due to the fact that PvsP, on which Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa commented, lists additional items to the ten powers, which begin with ten perfections and end in the abandonment of all defilements and cessation of continuation of the latent tendencies.²¹⁾ Given that the *Daśabhūmikasūtra* and the *Mahāsāṃghikas* had a close relationship,²²⁾ the aforementioned, unidentified school might be the *Mahāsāṃghikas*.²³⁾

Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa quotes the same sentence from the PvsP twice more. The following quotes support Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's distinction between *tathāgata* and *saṃyaksambuddha* as in the Prakrit sentence and reveal why a bodhisattva after the tenth stage is called *tathāgata*.

136a6-131a1 (vol. 54), Shey Kanjur[TBRC version] *mdo sde, ga* 136a7-137a1 (vol.50).

21) PvsP[D] 225.08-12; PvsP[K] I-2, 102.23-29; LPG 97r13-15; 《光讚經》(T.222, Dharmarakṣa 286 CE) 197a23-26; 《放光經》(T.221, Wu Chaluo (無叉羅) 291 CE) 29b19-22. Up to the *sarvākārājñatā* (薩云若慧); 《摩訶般若波羅蜜經》(T.223, Kumārajīva 404 CE) 259c07-10; 《大般若波羅蜜多經》(T.220, Xuanzang 660-663 CE) 88c11-17. All Chinese translations start with the six perfections, instead of the ten perfections; Tib[Kanjur] D No.0009, *shes phyin, ka* 260a5-260b1; Tib[Tanjur] D No. 3790, *sher phyin, ga* 248b7-249a3.

22) Karashima 2014, p.139, n.82; Skilling 2013, 202.

23) It was reported that the language of the *Mahāsāṃghikas* was Prakrit. Bareau 1955, p.56, n.4; Baruah 2000, 48.

- (1) Then, in this context which bodhisattva is referred to? [A bodhisattva] who has a wisdom of such qualities that has been cultivated for a single day [is referred to.]

Is he one for the first time to resolve [to become the Buddha], who has entered into the activities, who is irreversible, or who is obstructed by one rebirth?

First, he is not the fourth since it will be said, “a bodhisattva should be called none other than *tathāgata* after the tenth stage.”

What does it mean? The [bodhisattva] should be called *tathāgata* because of his engaging in the services of *tathāgata*, not because of his realization of *tathāgata*.

- (2) If the aforementioned Non-returner has abandoned the eighth class of defilements relating to the Summit of Existence, then this [bodhisattva] is taught to be one progressing towards the fruit of Arhatship. [The Blessed one] says: “Śāriputra! There are bodhisattvas who, having stood in the six perfections, make the qualities of the Buddha appear and they themselves are not separated from the qualities of the Buddha until they realize the unexcelled complete enlightenment.” Regarding this [bodhisattva progressing towards the fruit of Arhatship, the Blessed one] will say, “A bodhisattva should be called none other than *tathāgata* after the tenth stage.”

For what reason? Because it is accepted that he is waiting on living beings with the duties of *tathāgata*.

The *Arhat*, however, is none other than the Perfectly enlightened one. This [Arhat identified as the Perfectly enlightened one] is not mentioned here

because it has already been explained in the instruction on the Buddha-jewel.²⁴⁾

- (1) *katamaḥ punar atra bodhisatvo [']dhikriyate | yasyēyam evaṃguṇā ekadivasaparibhāvitā prajñā | kiṃ prathamacittotpādikaḥ | caryāpratipanno [']vaivarttikaḥ | ekajātipratibaddho vā na tāvac caturtho daśamyā bhūmeḥ paran tathāgata eva vaktavya ity abhidhānāt | ko [']rthas tathāgatakr̥tyena pratyupasthānāt tathāgato [']sau vaktavyo na tu tathāgatādhigamena | A 9v4-6, B 9r2-3.*

- (2) *ya eṣo 'nāgāmīty uktas tasya yadi bhāvāgrikāṇāṃ kleśānāṃ aṣṭamaḥ prakāraḥ prahīṇo bhavati | tato [']sāv arhatvaphalapratipannaka ity ucyate | yad āha santi śāriputra²⁵⁾ bodhisatvā ye ṣaṭsu pāramitāsu sthitvā satvānāṃ buddhadharmmābhāsam kurvanti²⁶⁾ ātmanā ca buddhadharmmābhāse-nāvirahitā bhavanti²⁷⁾ yāvad anuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhim abhisambuddhā iti | tam evādhikṛtya vakṣyati | daśamyā bhūmeḥ param bodhisatvas tathāgata eva vaktavya iti | kiṃ kāraṇaṃ sa hi tathāgatakr̥tyena satvānāṃ pratyupasthita iti kṛtvā | arhaṃs tu samyaksaṃbuddha eva sa²⁸⁾ ca buddharatnānavāde nirdiṣṭatvān²⁹⁾ na punar ihocyate | A 14r1-3, B 13r2-3.*

24) With regard to another English translation, consult Sparham 2006, 30 and 43.

25) śāriputra] B, *śāripu* A

26) kurvanti] A, *kurvvanti* B

27) bhavanti] B, *bhavanti* A

28) sa] B, *om.* A

29) nirdiṣṭatvān] B, *tinirdiṣṭatvān* A^{pc}... *diṣṭatvān* A^{ac}

In these quotations, the bodhisattva whom should be called *tathāgata* is considered to have two possible identities. Either he is one who is obstructed by a single rebirth (*ekajātīpratibaddha*)³⁰⁾ or one progressing towards the fruit of arhatship (*arhattvaphalapratipannaka*). Both of whom, however, belong to the assembly of irreversible bodhisattvas.³¹⁾ This bodhisattva is referred to as *tathāgata* because he, who has not yet attained the final realization (*tathāgatādhigama*=*bodhi*), is performing services for other beings. The last two sentences of the second quotation clearly show that *tathāgata* identified as *arhattvaphalapratipannaka* is differentiated from *arhat*, which is a synonym for the perfectly enlightened one. What Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa means here is that after the tenth stage, a bodhisattva can be called *tathāgata* who is still waiting on living beings with the duties of *tathāgata*, but cannot be called *Arhat · Samyaksambuddha* who has fulfilled the qualities of the Buddha.

Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa, after having quoted the sentence in Prakrit, mentions another system of the ten levels that are common to all three vehicles, introduced in PsvP:

The tenth stage, however, [is taught, as such, in the *kārikā* of the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*] :

30) Tsong kha pa also placed the *ekajātīpratibaddha* at the tenth stage. See Apple 2008, 159.

31) Although the *ekajātīpratibaddha* is understood to be the “Once-returner” (Apple 2008, 159), Rngog blo ldan shes rab, the first commentator of the AA and the Tibetan translator of the Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa’s commentary as well, asserted that the *arhattvaphalapratipannaka* is to be obstructed by one rebirth. For details on the irreversible bodhisattvas, consult Apple 2008, 149-180.

The stage of the Buddha [in which a bodhisattva]³²⁾ dwells by [certain kinds of] knowledge,³³⁾ after having gone beyond the nine levels,³⁴⁾ is to be known as the tenth bodhisattva-stage.

And the nine levels [in the *kārikā*] are (1) the lineage-level, characterized by lineages of disciples and so on, (2) the eighth level of one progressing towards the first fruit, (3) the level of seeing of stream-enterers, (4) the level of diminishment of once-returners, (5) the level of being free from desire of none-returners, (6) the level of those one who have done [the work to be done] of *Arhats*, (7) the level of disciples of which intention is to clearly distinguish the three vehicles, as it is said, “the designation of the ‘vehicle of disciples and *pratyekabuddhas*’ is for distinguishing [the three] Vehicles,”³⁵⁾ (8) the

32) This translation is supported by Haribhadra’s comment on the same *kārikā*, which I will quote in footnote 47. The *kārikā* itself could be translated into “The knowledge—with which a bodhisattva abides at the stage of the Buddha, after having gone beyond the nine stages—is to be known as the tenth bodhisattva-stage”, the meaning of which the composer of AA would intend.

33) Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa seems to interpret the knowledge (*jñāna*) as skill in means (*upāyakauśala*) in his commentary. According to Haribhadra’s commentaries on AA, certain kinds of wisdom are ascribed to those that start with the wisdom based on the sovereign mastery of karmic actions (*karmavaśitāśrayatva* : AAA[W] 104, 10) or that begin with the wisdom of aspirational prayer (*pranidhāna* : AAV[A] 34.21.)

34) I will refer to “*bhūmi*” as “level”, instead of “stage”, which I have used so far. This is in order to distinguish the stages common to the three Vehicles from those of bodhisattvas only.

35) The recast version of the Sanskrit text, namely PsvP[D] and PsvP[K], along with two Tibetan translations, Tib[Kanjur] and Tib[Tanjur], enumerate 9 stages, from (1) to (9). This is the same as the quotation mentioned. However, other sources omit the seventh level, and prior to the lineage level (*gotrabhūmi*) add another stage: *śuklavipaśyanābhūmi* (level of bright insight, LPG 97v1); 見現 (insight), 《光讚經》 199a1; 滅淨 (destruction of virtues[?], 《放光經》 29b25; 乾慧地 (level of dry wisdom) 《摩訶般若波羅蜜經》 259c12; 淨觀地 (level of

pratyekabuddha-level of *pratyekabuddhas*, both living like rhinoceros and living with crowds, and (9) the bodhisattva-stage with the previously mentioned nine kinds. Therefore, [the Blessed one] says [in the 25,000 lines,] “When a bodhisattva who is practicing in the six perfections up to the Buddha’s qualities not shared with others with skill in means, having gone beyond the lineage-level to the bodhisattva-stage, dwells in the Buddha-stage. This is the tenth bodhisattva-stage.”³⁶⁾

*daśamī punar*³⁷⁾ *bhūmir*

nava bhūmīr atikramya buddhabhūmau pratiṣṭhate |
*yena jñānena sā jñeyā daśamī bodhisattvabhūh*³⁸⁾ ||

tās cēmā nava bhūmayo yad idaṃ gotrabhūmīḥ śrāvakādigotrakakṣaṇā |
*aṣṭamakabhūmīḥ prathamaphalapratipannakasya*³⁹⁾ *·darśanabhūmīḥ śrota-*
pannasya | tanubhūmīḥ sakṛdāgāmināḥ | vītarāgabhūmīr anāgāmināḥ |
kṛtāvibhūmīr arahataḥ | śrāvakabhūmīr yānatrayav[y]aktavyavasthānābhisandhinā |
yathoktaṃ śrāvakaḥ pratyekabuddhayanam iti bhūmivyavasthānasyāitad adhivacanam

bright insight), 《大般若波羅蜜多經》88c18. I do not know how to interpret “若有所處” in 《光讚經》199a1, which should be related to (3) and (4). There are other passages in the recast version of PvsP and Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa’s commentary, in which the ten levels start with the level of bright insight (*śuklavipaśyanābhūmī*). cf. PvsP[K] 1-2, 113 and A 38r5 and B 36r1 of Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa’s commentary.

36) With regard to another English translation, see Sparham 2005, 123.

37) punar] A, *puna* B

38) bodhisattvabhūh] B, *bodhisattvabhūmīḥ* A (hypermetric)

39) *pratipannakasya*] A, *pratipannasya* B

*iti | pratyekabuddhabhūmiḥ khaḍgaviṣṇānakalpānām varggacārīṇām ca
pratyekabuddhānām | bodhisatvabhūmiś⁴⁰⁾ ca yathoktāiva navavidhā | tenāha
yadā Subhūte bodhisattva upāyakaśālena pāramitāsu yāvad āveṇikeṣu
buddhadharmmeṣu caran* gotrabhūmiṃ yāvad bodhisatvabhūmim atikramya
buddhabhūmau pratiṣṭhate | iyaṃ bodhisatvasya⁴¹⁾ daśamī bhūmir iti || 16 || A
36v5-37r1 ; B 34v2-4*

If we depend entirely on Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's explanations, then the intention of the composer(s) of PvsP in introducing this heterogeneous system, is accounted for as follows: a bodhisattva, who stays after the tenth bodhisattva-stage and is engaging in the services of *tathāgata*, is not qualified to attain the ultimate stage, until he perfects all the qualities of the Buddha and comprehends the levels of disciples and *pratyekabuddhas*. The real tenth bodhisattva-stage can only be reached after he has fulfilled all qualities of the Buddha and passed through the levels common to all three vehicles. In doing so, he will attain the final realization and the title of the *Arhat · Samyaksambuddha*.

According to this understanding, the Buddha-stage is the stage of Cloud of Dharma even though the former is a higher stage than the latter. This is because Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa excludes the stage of Cloud of Dharma from the ninth of the ten levels common to all three vehicles. In this respect, he appears to divide the Cloud of Dharma into two stages, namely, the lower pseudo-stage and the ultimate true stage. The former is the stage in which a

40) bodhisatva] A, bodhisattva] B

41) bodhisatva] B, bodhisattva] A

bodhisattva who has yet to embrace the vehicle of disciples and *pratyekabuddhas* remains, while the latter is the level of the Buddha where only one who has embraced the vehicle can reach.

However, we are not sure that the explanation of Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa conforms to that of the Perfection of Wisdom in 25,000 lines itself. This is because many of the versions of the Perfection of Wisdom in 25,000 lines describe a bodhisattva who has already attained the qualities of the Buddha as *tathāgata*.⁴²⁾

In the latest Chinese translation by Xuanzang (660~663 CE), the last stage of the ten levels common to all three vehicles appears to be interpreted as being distinct from the stage of Cloud of Dharma, which differs from Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's explanation. According to his translation, the last stage is not defined as the tenth bodhisattva-stage, but as the level of *Tathāgata* (如來地). When a bodhisattva at the tenth stage has completed the qualities of the Buddha, passed through the nine stages from the level of bright insight (淨觀地) up to the bodhisattva-stages, and perpetually abandoned all

42) When a bodhisattva has attained the qualities of the Buddha, he becomes *tathāgata*. LPG 97r13-15, Tib[Kanjur]: Delge[0009] *shes phyin, ka* 260a5-260b1, Tib[Tanjur]: Delge [2790] *shes phyin, kha* 248b7~249a3, 《放光經》T 221. 29b19-22, PvsP [D] 225.08-11, PvsP[K] I -2 102.24~102.29. The Chinese translation by Kumārajīva, “須菩提。十地菩薩當知如佛 (Subhūti! You should know that a bodhisattva of the tenth stage is the same as the Buddha.)《摩訶般若波羅蜜經》T.223, 257c06-07) and Xuanzang's interpretation, “若菩薩摩訶薩住第十地已。與諸如來應言無別 (A bodhisattva, a great being, who has stayed at the tenth stage, should be told to be no different from *tathāgatas*: 《大般若波羅蜜多經》T.220, 83c23-24) remind me of “*tathāgata iva*” instead of “*tathāgata eva*”. The reason why a bodhisattva is almost identical to *tathāgatas* or buddhas seems to rest on his ability to (or the possibility of) becoming *tathāgata* through fulfilling all qualities of the Buddha. That is to say that he will have completed the qualities of the Buddha someday.

defilements and ended continuation of the latent tendencies with skilful means, he, as the *Arhat · Samyaksambuddha*, finally abides at this level.⁴³⁾ The stage of Cloud of Dharma is defined as the tenth stage where bodhisattvas must perfect twelve *dharma*s beginning with accepting earnest vows of (beings of) limitless places (攝受無邊處所大願).⁴⁴⁾ In other materials, except for the Chinese translation by Dharmarakṣa (286 CE), these twelve *dharma*s are mentioned as preparations that bodhisattvas at the ninth bodhisattva-stage need to complete. This tenth bodhisattva-stage is also considered the place where a bodhisattva, who in essence is no different from *tathāgata*, stays as he is capable of becoming *tathāgata*.⁴⁵⁾ Because the bodhisattva at the tenth bodhisattva-stage should go forward or reach (趣) the level of *Tathāgata*, this level becomes a distinctive and higher state than the tenth bodhisattva-stage.⁴⁶⁾

43) “善現。云何菩薩摩訶薩住第十地趣如來地。善現。是菩薩摩訶薩方便善巧。行六波羅蜜多四念住乃至十八佛不共法。超淨觀地種姓地第八地具見地薄地離欲地已辦地獨覺地及菩薩地。又能永斷一切煩惱習氣相續。便成如來應正等覺住如來地。善現。如是菩薩摩訶薩住第十地趣如來地。”《大般若波羅蜜多經》T.220, 88c17-24.

44) The meaning of this term differs in its Sanskrit equivalent, “*yad uta anantapraṇidhānapariagrahaḥ, sa yathā yathā praṇidadhāti tathā tathāsyā samṛdhyate* (Accepting infinite earnest vows means that the more he (=a bodhisattva at the ninth stage) takes the earnest vow, the more increased it becomes.)” PvsP[K] I-2 92.06-08.

45) “復次善現。諸菩薩摩訶薩住第十地時。應圓滿十二法。云何十二。一者應圓滿攝受無邊處所大願隨有所願 皆令證得 … 十二者應圓滿一切功德成辦具足。善現。諸菩薩摩訶薩住第十地時。應勤圓滿此十二法。善現 當知。若菩薩摩訶薩住第十地已。與諸如來應言無別。”《大般若波羅蜜多經》T.220, 83c13-24.

46) When it comes to the bodhisattva-stages that are peculiar to bodhisattvas, the level of *Tathāgata* (如來地) can be considered the eleventh bodhisattva-stage, even though it is still the tenth level common to the three vehicles. I am hesitant to apply this interpretation to other sources. It could be an unique or liberal interpretation by Xuanzang from the

Nevertheless, it is obvious that Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's quotation of the Prakrit sentence had played a crucial role in reinforcing his understanding of PvsP.⁴⁷⁾

III. Colophon of ms B and the title of Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary

Ms A and ms B end with a final colophon on folio 112 *recto* (112r2-6) and on folio 106 *verso* (106r4-106v2) respectively. While the colophon of

Yogācāra's standpoint. In the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* belonging to the *Yogācāra* tradition, the thirteenth *Tathāgatabhūmi* is clearly distinguished from the twelfth *niṣṭhāgamanabhūmi*, which is a synonym for the *Dharmameghabhūmi*. See Kim 2004, 89-91. Especially n. 29; Also see MSA[Levi] 160.21-28. Here, the stage of the Buddha (*Buddhabhūmi*) of which fruit is attainment of enlightenment (*bodheḥ prāptiḥ*) is separated from the tenth stage of which fruit is initiation [into the sphere of the Buddha] (*abhiṣeka*). Xuanzang's translations of the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* and the *Yogācārabhūmi*, both of which have exactly the same sentences, clarify that the Buddha-stage is the eleventh stage: “爾時觀自在菩薩白佛言。世尊。如佛所說菩薩十地。所謂極喜地·離垢地·發光地·焰慧地·極難勝地·現前地·遠行地·不動地·善慧地·法雲地。復說佛地爲第十一。”《解深密經》(T.676) 703b14~17, 《瑜伽師地論》(T.1579)729a19-23.

- 47) The tendency to divide the tenth bodhisattva-stage (Cloud of Dharma stage) into two, was continued by Haribhadra (active during the reign of King Dharmapāla in the late-eighth century, or at the beginning of the ninth century). Evidence of this can be seen in his commentary: *bodhisattva-bhūmiś ca yathoktā bodhisattvānām navavidhā. ity evaṃ nava-bhūmim atikramya daśamyām punar bhūmau bodhisattvo buddha eva vaktavyo, na tu samyaksambuddha iti pañcaviṃśatisahasrikāyā vacanāt. yatra buddha-bhūmau yena karma-vaśitāśrayatvādinā jñānenāvatiṣṭhate sā tena prāpyā daśamī dharmameghāmbu-pravarśaṇād dharmameghā bodhisattva-bhūmiḥ*. AAA[W] 104,03-11. Also see AAV[A] 34,16-23.

ms A is almost perfectly preserved,⁴⁸⁾ around half of the colophon of ms B is missing. Fortunately, we can reconstruct the missing part of ms B with assistance from ms A and the Tibetan translation.⁴⁹⁾ This, however, does exclude the portion peculiar to ms B that contains information regarding the identity of the donor of the manuscript as well as the date it was copied. Thanks to Nakamura's excellent edition as well as his English translation,⁵⁰⁾ we do not need to thoroughly deal with the colophon of ms A here. I will briefly mention three relevant points:

1. The colophon provides information confirming that the title of this text, commonly called *Abhisamayālaṃkāravṛtti*,⁵¹⁾ is “*Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-ryaprajñāpāramitopadeśaṃ Abhisamayālaṃkāśāstram*.”
2. Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa, a Mahāyānist, was also affiliated with the *Kaukulla*[ka] branch of the *Sammatīya* school (正量部).⁵²⁾
3. The colophon dates ms A — donated by Cintāmaṇisīrīmitra, also a Mahāyānist — to the thirty-second regnal year of a king named Rāmapāla (ca. 1077-1120) of the Pāla Empire.⁵³⁾

48) The last three *akṣaras* at the end of line 4, as well as the first three and a single *akṣara* in the middle of line 6, are damaged. We can, however, reconstruct them without too much difficulty. See Lee 2015, 229-230; Nakamura 2014, 712-713.

49) Nakamura 2014, 498.06-14., which ends with the first verse in the *Śārdūlavikrīḍita* meter of ms A.

50) Nakamura 2014, 328.09-329.12; 655.26-656.21.

51) Pensa 1967; Sparham 2005; Nakamura 2014.

52) Nakamura 2014, 328; *mahāyānasam(pr)asth(i)tasya śākyabhikṣor Āryavimuktiṣeṇasya kaurukullāryasammatāyasyā* A112r3; /// .. rukullārya .. + + B 106r5; Regarding the *Kaukullaka* branch of the *Sammatīya* school, see Bareau 1955, 25, 40, 126.

53) A 112r5-6: *deyadharmmo yaṃ pravaramahāyānāyāyinaḥ paṇḍitasthaviraśākyabhikṣoś*

Below is a transcription of the colophon of ms B, which was not included in ms A, followed by its translation based on my own reconstruction:⁵⁴⁾

106v1 /// ... (m).(h)ā(y)ānāyāyi(na)ḥ paṇḍitasthaviṛābha(yā) ... g(u)p.aśiṣya-
(sya) sthavira(Ś)ubhākaraguptasya ya .. tra punyaṃ tad bhavatv ācār(y)o .ā ..
... .. pitṛpūrvvaṅgamaṃ kṛtvā sakalasattvarā tta(r)ajñā lāvā .. ///
106v1v2 ///.. likhitam (i)daṃ pustaka(m)* || @ || .. bhaṃ bh. .. tu sa(r)vva-
ttvarāśe(r) nnara ... m iti || @ ||⁵⁵⁾

[This is a religious gift] of the elder Śubhākaragupta, practicing the excellent Great Vehicle and a pupil of the learned, the elder [Abhayākara]gup[t]a.⁵⁶⁾ May the merit of this lead [a heap of] all beings preceded by [teachers, preceptors, mother] and father [to obtain the fruit of] the highest knowledge! This manuscript has been written ... Let it be virtuous ...

Unfortunately, the part containing the exact date when ms B was copied

*Cintāmaṇiśrīmitrasya ... paramaśvaraparamabhaṭṭāra .. paramasaugata mahārājādhirāja-
śrīmat Rāmapāladevapravarddhamānakalyāṇavijayarājye samvat* || 32 || aśvinadine || 5 ||*

54) Lee 2015, 230ff.

55) Lee 2015, 228; The conventions adopted by me here are as follows: three slashes “///” mean a leaf is broken off here; round brackets “()” indicate that a character or characters are damaged but can nonetheless be read or inferred with certainty; a single period “.” indicates that a part of *akṣara* is illegible, while two periods “..” mean that the whole *akṣara* is unreadable; square brackets “[]” indicate supplemented letter(s) or word(s) by the editor ; * indicates an *anusvāra*; “@” represents an ornament.

56) Abhayākara Gupta is believed to have flourished between the late-eleventh century and early-twelfth century, during the reign of the Rāmapāla, and passed away in 1125 CE.

is missing. We can, however, make a rough guess as to when the manuscript was finished. I suggest that the teacher of Śubhākaragupta, who donated this manuscript and who is also the author of the *Abhisamayamañjarī*,⁵⁷⁾ is Abhayākaragupta. The renowned scholar Abhayākaragupta finished writing the *Munimatālaṅkāra*, a commentary on AA, during the thirtieth regnal year of King Rāmapāla.⁵⁸⁾ If my reconstruction is accepted, then ms B would have been written just slightly after ms A.

Before moving on to another topic, I would like to point out that the date of the Tibetan translation of Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary slightly precedes ms A and ms B. Both of these belong to the early twelfth century. The colophon of the Tibetan translation says that [rNgog] Blo ldan shes rab (1059-1109 CE), in collaboration with Amaragomin (Go mi 'chi med), translated this text.⁵⁹⁾ According to the only known full-length biography of Blo ldan shes rab, he went to Magadha which was ruled by the King Rāmapāla at that time and studied the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* under the tutelage of Amaragomin.⁶⁰⁾ There, with Amaragomin, he must have

57) *Abhisamayamañjarī* 30 : *śrīvajrayogñīsādhanam Abhisamayamañjarīnāma mahācārya-Śubhākaraguptaracitaṃ samāptam* | Lee 2015, 234, n.29.

58) Li 2013, 1-3. *samāpto 'yaṃ munimatālaṅkāraḥ || || kṛti(r) mahāpaṇḍit.Ābhayākaraguptapādānām iti || || sūrir vvikramasīlasyābhayo marmmasprśaṃ girāṃ | rājye śrīRāmapālasya triṇśada-bde 'karod imām* ||; Lee 2015, 234, n.30.

59) Nakamura 2014, 499.01-02: *rgya gar gvi mkhan po shar phyogs kyi dge bsnyen chen po dpal go mi 'chi med dang | lo ts'a ba chen po sh'akya'i dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis bsgyur cing zhus te legs par gtan la phab pa'o || ||* ; Nakamura 2014, 657.04-07: “Go mi 'chi med—Indian wise, great religious friend (→ great layman) of the East—and [rNgog] Blo ldan shes rab—great translator, Buddhist monk—translated, discussed, and made decision”; Only in the *sNar thang* version, “*maṅgalāṃ bhavantu*” (“May all [beings] be blessed!”) is added.

translated AA as well as Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary. He also revised the old Tibetan translation of AAV, or the short commentary by Haribhadra.⁶¹⁾ Since he returned to Tibet at the end of the eleventh century, the translation of Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary must have been finished before the twelfth century.

Let us return to the first point, which is the title of the text we are dealing with. In the colophon of ms A, Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary is titled “*Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāryaprajñāpāramitopadeśaṃ Abhisamayālaṅkāraśāstram*”⁶²⁾ This title is reminiscent of the title of AA itself, *Abhisamayālaṅkāraṃ [nāma] Prajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstram*, which is believed to have been composed by the Noble Maitreyañātha.⁶³⁾ The section colophons of ms A and ms B clearly show that the commentary by

60) Apple 2009, 17-18; Kramer 2007, 38-41.

61) Kramer 2007, 58. He also revised the Ālokā by Haribhadra in collaboration with Dhīrapāla; Nakamura Hodo gave me information about his forthcoming paper, which also deals with Blo ldan shes rab's works, “The reception and Transmission of the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* in Tibet- The Interpretation of the Embodiment of Buddha in the Chapter 8” which was presented at the 3rd Conference of the International Seminar of Young Tibetologists in Japan.

62) Namely, the Treatise of *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* that is instruction on the noble Perfection of Wisdom in 25,000 lines; A 112r2-3: *pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāryaprajñāpāramitopadeśaṃ abhisamayālaṅkāraśāstram parisamāptam** || ❀ || *kṛ'(. . . .ṃ su)* «*tīḥ su*» *kṛtikarmmaṇo mahāyānasam(pr)asth(i)tasya śākyabhikṣor Āryavimuktiṣeṇasya*; B 106r4 : *pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāryaprajñāpāramitopadeśa . . . ///*

63) *abhisamayālaṅkāre prajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstre sarvākārajñatā'lhikāraḥ prathamah samāptah* || C 3r5. In Obermiller (1970, 40), the text is titled “*Abhisamayālaṅkāraṃ nāma prajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstram*”. Additionally, another title, “*abhisamayālaṅkāratnāmāprapāramitopadeśaśāstram*”, found on the colophon of the paper manuscript in the *Devanāgarī* script that is pasted onto ms C, should be corrected to “*abhisamayālaṅkāraṇa nāma prajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstram*.”

Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa has the same title as AA itself.⁶⁴⁾ This could possibly mean that Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa himself composed the *kārikās* i.e., the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*.

On the first folio *recto* of ms A, there is a title written in *Devānāgarī* by the same scribe who wrote the second title on the first folio *recto* of ms C, which was corrected by another hand:

C 1r1	transcription
(1) Late Nepalese	<i>Śrīpañcaviṃśtisāhasrikāyāḥ Prajñāpāramitāyāḥ · ĀryaVimuktisenakṛteyaṃ tīkā sunirmalā</i>
(2) Devānāgarī	<i>Abhisamayālaṅkāra-kārikā ĀryaMaitreya-nāthakṛtiḥ</i>

A 1r1	transcription
(3) Before correction written by the same hand (2)	<i>Āryapañcaviṃśtisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Abhisamayālaṅkāropadeśaśāstram śākyabhiḥṣor ĀcāryaVimuktisenasya kṛtiḥ</i>
(4) After correction	<i>Āryapañcaviṃśtisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Abhisamayālaṅkāropadeśaśāstranyākyā śākyabhiḥṣor ĀcāryaVimuktisenasya sunirmalā kṛtiḥ</i>

64) Lee 2015, p.236, n.34. A 44v3, B 42r2: *Abhisamayālaṅkāre Prajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstre sarvākārajñatādihikāraḥ || @ || subhūtiparivarttaḥ prathamah || @ ||* The topic of the knowledge in all aspects in *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*, the treatise of instruction on the Perfection[s] of Wisdom. The first section of Subhūti [in Perfection of Wisdom in 25,000 lines.] (sarvā] A, sarvā B); C 8v3 *Abhisamayālaṅkāre Prajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstre sarvākārajñatādihikāraḥ prathamah samāptaḥ || @ ||*; The difference between the two section colophons is that both ms A and ms B have the title of the first topic and the first section of the *Prajñāpāramitā*, while ms C does not. In the Tibetan translation of Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary, the "*abhisamayālaṅkāraśāstra*" refers to the *kārikās*. See n. 68.

The correction of ms A indicates that the corrector's choice of the title (3), which appears to have been copied from the final colophon, was not suitable for Ārya (or Ācārya) Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary, since he believed that Maitreyaṇātha had composed the *kārikās*. Therefore, he added *vyākhyā* to the *śāstra*⁶⁵ in order to distinguish between the commentary and the *kārikās*. If we follow these corrections, then we are forced to understand that (1) is the title of the commentary, even though it is written on the first folio of ms C, the content of which comprises the *kārikās* only.

Confusion of the title of AA with that of its commentary may imply that there was a tendency to affiliate the *kārikās* with Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa at a certain point in time.⁶⁶ Presumably after Haribha (or perhaps his predecessors) had ascribed the *kārikās* to Maitreyaṇātha for the first time,⁶⁷ this

65) The possibility exists that the first verse in *Śārdūlavikrīḍita* meter influenced this correction: A 112r4 “... *tenāryeṇa cirād ayaṃ paṭudhiyā (pr)ṣṭvēva sāksāj jinaṃ sam[kh]yāc ca kramaṇāmabhedaphalato vyākhyāta ity adbhuṭam ||*” (“Therefore, it is marvelous that ... the noble [Vimuktiṣeṇa], after having directly asked the Victor (=Maitreyaṇātha who composed AA(?)) with the clear intelligence, he has at last explained (*vyākhyāta*) this [system or doctrine of Perfection of Wisdom] by means of number, sequence, name, divisions and results.” Nakamura 2014, 655.

66) Considering that the titles of (1) and (3) were added after the scribe had finished writing almost half of ms A and ms C in the early-twelfth century, this tendency may have at least continued throughout the twelfth century.

67) Two Haribhadra's commentaries, AAA and AAV, are the earliest accounts to attribute the authorship of AA to Maitreyaṇātha. See AAA[W] 01.13-14, AAV[A] 03.10-11; In the c and d *pādas* of the first verse of the colophon of ms A, which I have quoted in n. 65, Maitreyaṇātha seems to be regarded as the author of AA or, at least, one who inspired Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa to compose his own commentary; Regarding the question of Ārya Maitreyaṇātha's authorship and the existence of the commentaries by Vasubandhu and Asaṅga first mentioned by Haribhadra, consult Makransky 1997, 111 and Nakamura 2011.

mythological, though popular belief gained prevalence over the authorship of Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa, as in (2). As a result of this trend, the title of the commentary would have been changed to either the *Abhisamayālaṅkāraśāstravyākhyā*, as in (4), or the *Abhisamayālaṅkāraśāśāstravṛtti*, as the Tibetan translation of the commentary reveals.⁶⁸⁾ I believe that we do not have decisive enough evidence to ascribe authorship of the *kārikās* to Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa, although some of the aforementioned titles would support this claim.⁶⁹⁾

If we turn our eyes to the Tibetan translation of AA by Blo Idan shes rab

68) Nakamura 2014 ; D [No. 3787] *shes phyin, ka* 14b1-2 ; Q [No. 5185] *sher phyin ka* 15b4-5 : 'phags pa shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stong phrag nyi shu lnga pa'i tshul gyi mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyan gyi man ngag gi bstan bcos kyi 'grel pa = Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-ryaprajñāpāramitopadeśasya *Abhisamayālaṅkāraśāstrasya vṛtti*; This name might have been derived from or influenced by the one of the opening verses by Haribhadra (AAA[W] 01.19-20) “yogābhyāsapadārthatattvamathanāl lokottarajñāninaḥ jātas tv ĀryaVimukti-ṣeṇasudhiyo yatno mahān vṛttitaḥ | ” (The very intelligent Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa, who had supramundane knowledge coming from churning out the truth of the subjects [of AA] through repeated yoga practice, has made a great effort in [composing] the *Vṛtti*.)

69) For example, the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* consists of the *kārikās* that were also traditionally ascribed to Maitreya-nātha, along with their commentary (*bhāṣya*) by Vasubandhu. In the colophon of the Levi's edition, which ascribes the authorship of *kārikās* to the Great Bodhisattva Vyavasthāsamaya, the work is titled not “*Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkārabhāṣya*” but “*Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*” (*samāptaś ca Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra iti* || MSA[Levi] 189.07.) A recent English translation adds “*vyākhyā*” after “*Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*” based on the Tibetan translation. Jampal, L, R. Clark, J. Wilson, L. Zwillling, M. Sweet, and R. Turman 2004, 344; However, we cannot exclude the possibility that Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa himself actually composed the *kārikās*, as is asserted by modern scholarship: “It is possible Ārya Vimuktisena's commentary is not only the oldest available commentary on the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* but also the first. As we have said, it is also quite possible that Ārya Vimuktisena himself was the author of AA.” Makransky 1997, 187.

with the assistance of Amaragomin, who also translated Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary, there is no mention of its authorship in the colophon.⁷⁰⁾ I am uncertain of the reason why Blo ldan shes rab did not refer to its authorship. Especially since in his commentary on the *Ratnagotravibhāga*, named the *Theg chen rgyud bla'i don bsdus pa*, he classified AA as a provisional (*neyārtha*) text among the five teachings of Maitreya.⁷¹⁾ The most acceptable explanation for this is that the Sanskrit manuscript(s) that Blo ldan shes rab consulted did not contain any information regarding its authorship.

Based on the previously mentioned sources, I suggest that regardless of its authorship, AA was not originally separated from Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary. This is the most probable reason for why the two texts have the same title. Regardless of whether my suggestion is acceptable or not, we might at least reconsider the title of Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary, commonly called *Abhisamayālaṅkāravṛtti* by many contemporary scholars.

70) Obermiller 1929, 72.14-16 : “*shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i man ngag gi bstan bcos mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyan ces bya ba | rje btsun byams pa mgon po'i mdzad ba rdzogs so ||*” (= *Abhisamayālaṅkāraṃ nāma Prajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstram | bhāṭṭarakaMaitreyaṇāthasya kṛtiḥ samāptā ||* “The work of the most venerable Maitreyaṇātha has been completed.”; Although Obermiller edited a colophon that attributes authorship to Maitreyaṇātha, I could not find this sentence in any of the versions of the Tibetan translation of AA that are accessible to me; Tib[C] 13b4-6, Tib[D] 13a6-7, Tib[K] 15b2-3, Tib[N] 14a7, Tib[Q] 15b2-3 : “*phags pa shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i man ngag gi bstan bcos mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyan zhes bya ba'i tshig le'ur byas pa rdzogs so || || paṇḍita go mi 'chi med dang | lo ts'a ba blo ldan shes rab kyi 'gyur ||*”; However, on folio 1 recto of the Narthang and the Golden Tanjur, I found a title “*shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i man ngag gi bstan bcos mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyan zhes bya ba rje btsun byams pa mgon pos mdzad pa bzhugs so ||*”, from which Obermiller's insertion most probably came.

71) Cha 2013, p.243, n.7.

약호 및 참고문헌

- AA = *Abhisamayālaṅkāra(kārikā)*
- AAA[W] = *Abhisamayālaṅkāralokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā The work of Haribhdara*, ed. by Unrai Wogihara. Tokyo 1932-1935: The Toyo Bunko.
- AAV[A] = *Abhisamayālaṅkārakārikāśāstravivṛti Haribhadra's commentary on the Abhisamayālaṅkāra-kārikā-śāstra edited for the first time from a Sanskrit manuscript*, ed. by Amano, Kōei H. Kyoto 2000: Heirakuji-Shoten.
- DBh[R] = *Daśabhūmikasūtra et Bodhisattvabhūmi- Chapitres Vihāra et Bhūmi*, ed. by Rahder, J. Paris 1926: Paul Geuthner.
- DBh[K] = *Daśabhūmīśvaro nāma Mahāyānasūtram*, ed. by Kondō, Ryūkō, 3rd ed., Kyoto 1983: Rinsen Book Co.
- LPG = The Gilgit manuscript of the Larger *Prajñāpāramitā*. in *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Śaṭapiṭaka vol. 10(3-5) ed. by Vira, Raghu and Chandra Lokesh
- MSA[Levi] = *Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṅkāra Exposé de la Doctrine du Grand Véhicule*, ed. by Lévi, Sylvain, reprint. Kyoto 1983: Rinsen Book Co.
- PvsP[D] = *The Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā-edited with critical notes and introduction*, ed. by Dutt, Nalinaksha, London 1934: Luzac & Co.
- PvsP[K] I -2 = *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā I-2*, ed. by Kimura, Takayasu, Tokyo 2009 : Sabkibo Busshorin Publishing.

Abhisamayamañjarī Subhākaragupta viracita, Mñon-par rtogs pa'i sne ma.
ed. by Samdhong Rinpoche and Vrajavallabha Dvivedī, Sāranātha, Vā
rāṇasī : Durlabha Bauddha Grantha Sodha Yojanā.

Apple, James.

2009 “Contributions to the development and classification of the
Abhisamayālaṅkāra literature in Tibet from the ninth to fourteenth
centuries.” *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies*
5(2009): 1-57.

2008 *Stairway to Nirvāṇa: A Study of the Twenty Saṃghas Based on the
Works of Tsong Kha Pa.* New York: State University of New York
Press.

Bureau, André. 1955. *Les sectes bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule* (Vol. 38).
École française d'Extrême-Orient.

Baruah, Bibhuti. 2000. *Buddhist sects and sectarianism.* Delhi: Sarup &
Sons, 2000.

Cha, Sangyeob. 2013. *An Edition and Annotated Translation of Chapter
One of rNgog Blo ldan shes rab's Theg chen rgyud bla ma'i don bsdus
pa.* Seoul: CIR. = 차상엽. 2013. 옥 로덴쎄랍의 보성론요의 여래장품, 서
울: 씨아이알.

Bhattacharya, Gouriswar 2010. “How to Justify the Spelling of the Buddhist
Hybrid Sanskrit Term Bodhisatva?” in *From Turfan to Ajanta:
Festschrift for Dieter Schlingloff on the Occasion of his Eightieth
Birthday*, ed. by Eli Franco and Monika Zin, 35~49: Lumbini: Lumbini
International Research Institute, vol. I.

Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan. 2006. “Some Remarks on the Sanskrit Manuscript

- of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Prātimokṣasūtra* found in Tibet,” in *Jaina-Itihāsa-Ratna: Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90. Geburtstag*, ed. by Ute Hüsken, Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Anne Peters, 295-335. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Jamspal, L, R. Clark, J. Wilson, L. Zwillling, M. Sweet, and R. Turman. 2004. *The Universal Vehicle Discourse Literature (Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra): by Maitreya-nātha/Āryāsaṅga, together with its Commentary (Bhāṣya) by Vasubandhu*. New York: American Institute of Buddhist Studies.
- Karashima, Seishi. 2014. “Who Composed the Mahāyāna Scriptures? — The Mahāsāṃghikas and Vaitulya Scriptures.” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology* 18(2014): 113-162.
- Kim, Seongcheol. 2004. “On the Precursors of *Nirvikalpa-jñāna* in the *Yogacārabhūmi*.” 九山論集 9(2004): 73-93. = 김성철. 2004. “《유가사론》에서 궁극적 실재를 보는자,” 구산논집 9(2004): 73-93.
- Kouda, Ryōshū (古宇田 亮修). 2004. “The Script of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* and the *Jñānālokālaṃkāra* Palm-leaf Manuscripts,” in *Introduction to VIMALAKĪRTINIRDEŚA and JÑĀNĀLOKĀLAṂKĀRA*, ed. by Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, 91-112. Tokyo: Taisho University Press.
- Kramer, Ralf. 2007. *The Great Tibetan Translator: Life and Works of rNgog Blo Ldan Shes Rab (1059-1109)*. Collectanea Himalayica: Studies on the History and Culture of the Himalayas and Tibet 1. München: Indus Verlag.
- Lee, Youngjin. 2015. “On the colophon of two Sanskrit manuscripts of

- Ārya-Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary with a newly identified manuscript of the *Abhisamayālaṅkārikā*." *Journal of Buddhist Studies* 43(2015): 217-243. =이영진. 2015. "새로 확인된 《현관장엄론》 계송사본과 아리야 비목띠세나의 《현관장엄론》 주석서콜로폰." *불교학연구* 43: 217-243.
- Li, Xuezh. 2013. "Diplomatic Transcription of the Sanskrit Manuscript of the *Munimatālaṅkāra*-Chapter 1: Fols. 1v1-3v5." *China Tibetology* 1(2013): 1-11.
- Makransky, John J. 1997. *Buddhahood Embodied*. Delhi, Sri Satguru Publications.
- Matsuda, K. (Ed.). 1996. *Two Sanskrit Manuscripts of the Daśabhūmikasūtra Preserved at the National Archives, Kathmandu (Vol. 10)*. Tokyo: Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for Unesco.
- Nakamura, Hodo.
- 2014 "Ārya-Vimuktisena's *Abhisamayālaṅkāravṛtti* the Earliest Commentary on the *Abhisamayā-laṅkāra*." PhD diss., Universität Hamburg.
- 2011 "Traditions of the Commentaries Ascribed to Asaṅga and Vasubandhu on the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*: Relationship with the Commentaries ascribed to Daṃṣṭrasena on the *Prajñāpāramitā*-literature." *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* Vol 59, No.3: 188-192.
- Obermiller, E. 1929. *Abhisamayālaṅkāra-Prajñāpāramitā-Upadeśa-Śāstra: The Work of Bodhisattva Maitreya*. Leningrad.
- Pensa, Corrado. 1967. *L'Abhisamayālaṅkāravṛtti di Ārya-Vimuktisena Primo Abhisamaya*. Roma: L'Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Pischel, R. 1965. *Comparative grammar of the Prākṛit languages*. Translated by Subhadra Jhā. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

- Roth, Gustav. 1970. *Bhikṣuṇī-vinaya: including Bhikṣuṇī-Prakīrṇaka and a summary of the Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*. KP Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Saerji. 2014. "Indic Buddhist Manuscripts in the People's Republic of China the Peking University Project" in *From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research*, ed. by Paul Harrison, Paul, and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, 291-300. Wien: ÖAW.
- Sferra, Francesco. 2008. "Sanskrit Manuscripts and Photographs of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Giuseppe Tucci's Collection," in *Manuscripta Buddhica 1: Sanskrit Texts from Giuseppe Tucci's Collection Part 1*, ed. by Francesco Sferra, 15-78. Roma: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente.
- Skilling, Peter 2013 "Vaidalya, Mahāyāna, and Bodhisattva in India: An Essay towards Historical Understanding," in *The Bodhisattva Ideal: Essays on the Emergence of the Mahayana*, ed. by Bhikkhu Nyanatusita himi, 69-162. Kandy: the Buddhist Publication Society.
- Sparham, Gareth. 2006. *Abhisamayālaṃkāra with Vṛtti and Ālokā First Abhisamaya*, California: Jain publishing company.
- Woolner, A. C. 1917. *Introduction to Prakrit*. Calcutta: University of the Panjab Lahore.

Abstract

On Two Sanskrit Manuscripts of Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's Commentary on the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*

Youngjin LEE

HK Research Professor, Geumgang Center for Buddhist Studies

This paper deals with two issues in Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary on the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*[*kārikā*], one being a corrupt sentence in Prakrit and the other relating to the title of the commentary by Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa. In this research, I have consulted two Sanskrit manuscripts preserved in Nepal and Tibet, which are referred to as ms A and ms B by me as well as a newly identified manuscript, which is scattered into two sets in NGMPP.

In the second chapter, I revised a corrupt Prakrit sentence into “*tathāgato tti vattavvo ño tu vattavvo sammāsambuddhaḥ*” (He should be called *tathāgata*, but not *saṃyaksambuddha*, a perfectly enlightened one.) in both the manuscripts. This mistranslation was due to the scribes's limited knowledge of Prakrit. I also tried to figure out why Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa

quotes this Prakrit sentence, in which *tathāgata* is unusually differentiated from *saṃyaksambuddha*, especially when we consider that the quotation, presumably from the *Mahāsāṃghikas*, does not match the description of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, on which Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa is commenting.

The third section mainly deals with confusion relating to the title of Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary. In the colophons of ms A, the text, commonly called *Abhisamayālaṃkāravṛtti*, is titled, "*Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāryaprajñāpāramitopadeśam Abhisamayālaṃkāraśāstram*. This is the same title that the manuscript(s) of *kārikās* has. Moreover, there is a description, "*Śrīpañcaviṃśtisāhasrikāyāḥ Prajñāpāyāmitāyāḥ ·ĀryaVimuktisenakṛteyaṃ īkā sunirmalā*" on the first recto of the newly identified manuscript of the *kārikās*. Both of these examples tell us that the *kārikās* and the commentary were composed by the same person, Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa. In conclusion of this chapter, I put forward reasons for the confusion and suggest that the title of Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa's commentary is to be reconsidered.

Key words : *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*, Ārya Vimuktiṣeṇa, Prakrit, *tathāgata*, *Buddhabhūmi*, confusion relating to the title

2015년 10월 14일 투고
2015년 11월 24일 심사완료
2015년 11월 30일 게재확정