

MAHĀYĀNASAMGRAHOPANIBANDHANA (I)

Its Tibetan and Chinese Texts

by

Noriaki Hakamaya

INTRODUCTION

The *Mahāyānasamgrahopanibandhana* is a commentary written by Asvabhāva on the *Mahāyānasamgraha* of Asaṅga. This commentary is of great use not only in comprehending the terse basic text, *Mahāyānasamgraha*, but also in making clear Asvabhāva's position in the historical development of the *Vijñaptivāda* school.

However, we must study it through its Tibetan and Chinese translations, since the Sanskrit original of the commentary is not extant.

The texts of these translations are as follows:

1) *Theg pa chen po bsdus paḥi bśad sbyar*

P. ed., No. 5552, Vol. Li, 232b - 356b

D. ed., No. 4051, Vol. Ri, 190b - 296a

N. ed., No. 3543, Vol. Li, 212b - 342a

2) 攝大乘論, by 玄奘 (Hsüan-tsang)

Taisho. ed., No. 1598, Vol. XXXI, 380 - 449

É. Lamotte has translated it partially basing on either of them in the foot notes of his French translation of the *Mahāyānasamgraha*¹⁾. Though his attempt fits in to understand the meaning of the passages in the *Mahāyānasamgraha*, it is not enough to examine the historical position of Asvabhāva himself.

If we compare the Chinese translation of the *Mahāyānasamgrahopanibandhana* by Hsüan-tsang with the Tibetan translation of it, we can recognize quite a few differences between them in their contents. As we have discussed elsewhere²⁾, the differences seem to have happened, because Hsüan-tsang has translated it putting his own idea into the original.

We are going to point out a few paragraphs as examples, comparing the Tibetan with the Chinese.

(1)

rgyud gañ la ħjug pa de lhan cig ħjug pañi
tshul gyis rnam par smin pañi rnam par śes
pa la ħjug ste//ħo ma dañ chu bñin no// śes
bya ba ni rnam par smin pañi rnam par śes
pa dañ lhan cig ħbyuñ bar ħdod kyi/ de sa bon
ñid du ni mi ħdod do// thos pañi bag chags kyi
sa bon de ni kun gñi rnam par śes pañi no bo
ñid ma yin te/ deñi gñen po sa bon ñid yin
pañi phyir ro// śes bya ba ni kun gñi rnam par
śes pañi gñen po rnam par mi rtog pañi ye śes
kyi rgyu yin no śes bya bañi tha tshig go//

(P. ed., 262a²⁻⁵, D. ed., 213b⁶—214a¹)

(2)

khams gsum pa ni khams gsum du snañ
bañi rnam par rig pa rnams so// khams gsum
pa smos pas ni ħdod pa la sogs pañi sred pa
dañ mtshuñs par ldan pa khams gsum par
gtogs pañi sems dañ sems las byuñ ba rnams
rnam par rig pa tsam ñid du dam bcañ ba
ste/ de bñin ñid la dmigs pa dañ/ gñan gyi
dbañ la dmigs pa lam gyi bden pas bsdus pa
rnams dañ rjes las thob pa rnams ni ma yin
te/ khams gsum na spyod pañi sred pa rnams
kyis bdag gir ma byas pa dañ/ gñen po yin pa
dañ/ ma ħkhrul bañi phyir ro//

(P. ed., 271a³⁻⁶, D. ed., 221a⁷—b²)

(3)

deñi phyir sna tshogs kyi rnam pa ñid la ħjug
ces bya ba smos te/ rnam par śes pa gcig ñid
gzuñ ba dañ ħdsin pañi dños por rnam pa tha
dad pas dus gcig tu rnam pa sna tshogs su snañ
no śes ħjug go// sna tshogs śes bya ba ni śes
pa gcig ñid rnam pa mañ por rañ gis rig go//

(P. ed., 298b⁷⁻⁸, D. ed., 245a⁵⁻⁶)

「與彼和合俱轉，猶如水乳」者，此聞熏習，雖非彼識，而寄識中俱轉，「然非阿賴耶識」者，謂，此聞熏習，是出世心種子，非阿賴耶識自性，亦非彼種子，但就俱轉不相離性，許是唯識。「是彼對治種子性故」者，是阿賴耶識對治，無分別因性故。

(Taisho., XXXI, 394c)

「如是三界皆唯有心」，此言顯示三界唯識。言「三界」者，謂，與欲等愛結相應，墮在三界。此唯識言，成立唯有心心法，無有三界橫計所緣。此言不遣，眞如所緣，依他所緣謂道諦攝，根本後得二種所緣，由彼不爲愛所執故，非所治故，非迷亂故，非三界攝。亦不離識故，不待說。

(Taisho., *ibid.*, 400b)

爲答此問故，說悟入及種種性，謂，唯一識所取能取性差別故，於一時間，分爲二種。又，於一識似三相現，所取能取及自證分名爲三相，如是三相一識義分非一非異，如餘處辨。於一識上有多相現故，名「種種」。

(Taisho., *ibid.*, 415b—c)

Each underline in the Chinese part indicates the passages which are not found in the Tibetan at all. Any of these passages agrees with the orthodox theory asserted in the *Ch'êng-wei-shih-lun* (成唯識論) or the tradition of the *Fa-hsiang* school (法相宗).

According to the *Ch'êng-wei-shih-lun*, the theory of the *vijñaptimātratā* displays that every thing does not exist apart from the *vijñāna* (不離識)³⁾. The passages in examples (1) and (2), namely '但就俱轉, 不相離性, 許是唯識' and '亦不離識故, 不待說' express the *vijñaptimatratā* from the standpoint agreed with the *Ch'êng-wei-shih-lun*. Though these passages may be indispensable to Hsüan-tsang who compiled the commentaries on the *Trimśikāvijñaptimātratā* from Dharmapāla's point of view and translated them under the title, *Ch'êng-wei-shih-lun*, they seem not be essential to the original form. Therefore, we judge that these passages were inserted by Hsüan-tsang and the Tibetan is more faithful to the original.

It is natural that H. Ui, who had studied the *Mahāyānasamgrahopanibandhana* only through Hsüan-tsang's translation of it, regarded Asvabhāva as a forerunner of Dharmapāla⁴⁾. He also traced the passage underlined in the Chinese part of example (3) to Dignāga's *Pramānasamuccaya* (集量論)⁵⁾. But, if so, since the meaning of this passage which is found in the Chinese only should have much weight with the *Fa-hsiang* school which admits the theory of the three *bhāgas* (三分) as well as the four *bhāgas* (四分)⁶⁾, we might be able to guess the same circumstance as seen in examples (1) and (2) behind this Chinese passage.

However, we cannot attribute all of the differences between the Tibetan and Chinese to Hsüan-tsang's addition to the original. There are other differences between the two than the character of examples (1), (2) and (3).

We are going to show below two examples from among these differences.

(4)

*rnam par rtog pas brtags paḥi don/
/kun tu brtags paḥi no bo ṅid/
/rnam par rtog pa gṣan gyi dban/
/de yi ston ṅid yons su grub//*

又, 遍計所執相即是遍計所執自性。依他起相即是依他起自性, 亦名分別自性。圓成實相即是圓成實自性, 亦名法性自性。如是三種, 即是宣說應知應斷應證三法。如大般若波羅蜜多經中亦說。佛告慈氏, ……廣說如經⁷⁾。

三六六

(5)

*rnam par śes paḥi phuñ po gyur pas ni me
loñ lta bu dan/ mñam pa ñid dan/ so sor rlog
pa dan/ bya ba sgrub paḥi ye śes la dbaṅ ḥb-
yor pa thob ste/*

*de la me loñ lta buḥi. ye śes ni dmigs pa mñ-
on du ma gyur kyañ bsñel ba mi mñah baḥo//*

*mñam pa ñid kyi ye śes ni sems can thams
cad la mñam par gzigs pa gañ las byuñ baḥo//*

*so sor rtog paḥi ye śes ni gañ gis tiñ ne
ḥdsin dan/ gzuñs kyi sgo rnamś dan/ śes bya
gšan dag kyañ ji ltar bṣed pa bṣin du thogs
pa med par mkhyen paḥo//*

*bya ba sgrub paḥi ye śes ni gañ gis dgah
ldan la sogs pa na gnas pa nas gzuñ ste/ mya
ñan las ḥdas paḥi bar du de dag kun tu ston
pas sañs rgyas kyi mdsad pa bsgrub paḥo//*

(P. ed., 336b¹⁻⁴, D. ed., 278⁴⁻⁶)

由轉阿賴耶識等八事識蘊，得大圓鏡智等四種妙智。如數次第，或隨所應當知。

此中，轉阿賴耶識故，得大圓鏡智。雖所識境不現在前，而能不忘不限時處，於一切境常不愚迷，無分別行能起，愛用佛智影像。

轉染污未那故，得平等性智。初現觀時先已證得，於修道位轉復清淨。由此安住無住涅槃，大慈大悲恒與相應，能隨所樂現佛影像。

轉意識故，得妙觀察智。具足一切陀羅尼門三摩地門，猶如寶藏，於大會中能現一切自在作用，能斷諸疑，能雨法雨。

轉五識故，得成所作智。普於十方一切世界能現變化，從觀史多天宮而沒及至涅槃，能現住持一切有情利樂作事故。

(Taisho., *ibid.*, 438a)

As each passage underlined in the Chinese is not found in the Tibetan at all, it might be able to be regarded as an addition by Hsüan-tsang like the examples mentioned above. But there is no evidence to prove it, because each passage does not always express the theory peculiar to the tradition of the *Fa-hsiang* school.

The passage shown in the Chinese only of example (4) interprets three kinds of nature (*tri-svabhāva*) as *parijñeya* (應知), *prahātavya* (應斷) and *sāksātkartavya* (應證) respectively. We can recognize such an interpretation in the oldest literature of the *vijñaptimātra* system. For example, the following verse is shown in the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga* of Maitreya.

*kiñcit parijñāya yataḥ praheyam sākṣāc ca kiñcit karaniyam anyat/
atas tayor lakṣaṇatas vibhāgām cikirṣatā śāstram idam praṇitam⁸⁾//*

Since such an interpretation is common to the *vijñaptimātra* system, it is possible to suppose that Asvabhāva comments on the text as exposed

in the Chinese translation. However, it will be difficult to determine whether the difference between the two in example (4) is that of translation or that of the original⁹⁾.

Such also might be the case of example (5). Though each passage shown in the Chinese only looks like it fits into the tradition of the *Fa-hsiang* school, such a passage can be found in the *Sūtrālamkāravṛttibhāṣya* of Sthiramati who was not regarded as an authority on this school¹⁰⁾. Therefore, we cannot help hesitating to attribute the difference in example (5) to Hsüan-tsang's addition.

In conclusion, we will have to be aware of the necessity to study this commentary comparing the Tibetan with the Chinese. It is unfair to translate it at will basing on either of them as É. Lamotte had tried or to study it only through the Chinese as H. Ui had done, especially in order to examine the historical position of Asvabhāva himself. It is essential that critical research be done on both translations.

Therefore, in order to facilitate the comparison of the two translations, we shall edit the Tibetan and Chinese of this commentary, putting the Tibetan on the left side of the page and the Chinese on the right side of the page. After these texts have been completed, we will try to publish our English translation of this commentary basing it on both of them, with our research notes.

The Chinese commentary text is one where all passages of the basic text, *Mahāyānasamgraha* are interspersed, while the Tibetan text does not have it. Since the parts interspersed from the basic text seem to be arranged according to the way adopted by the translators in China, they are deleted from our present Chinese commentary text.

The present Tibetan text is collated by the Peking, Derge and Narthang editions.

In both the present texts, the underlines in the Tibetan and the brackets in the Chinese indicate the passage quoted from the basic text.

The underlines in the Chinese text indicate the passage which is not found in the Chinese.

- 1) É. Lamotte, *La somme du grand véhicule d'Asaṅga*, Tome II, (Louvain, 1938).
- 2) See my articles : “Hsüan-tsang's translation of the *Mahāyānasamgrahopani-bandhana*” (in Japanese), *JIBS*, XVIII-1, (1969), pp. 140-141 ; “Some features of Asvabhāva's *Mahāyanasamgrahopani-bandhana*, according to its Tibetan translation” (in Japanese), *JIBS*, XIX-1, (1970), pp. 439-444.
- 3) The following passages in the *Ch'èng-wei-shih-lun* express such a theory. “一切有爲無爲若實若假皆不離識。唯言爲遮離識實物,非不離識心所法等。” *Taisho.*, XXXI p. 38c : *Shindo.* ed., Vol. 7, 21b : Louis de la Vallée Poussin, *Vijñaptimātratā-siddhi La Siddhi de Hiuan-Tsang*, (Paris, 1928), p. 418 ; “識言總顯, 一切有情, 各有八識, 六位心所, 所變相見, 分位差別, 及彼空理所顯真如。識自相故, 識相應故, 二所變故, 三分位故, 四實性故。故是諸法, 皆不離識, 總立識名。唯言但遮愚夫所執定離諸識實有色等。” *Taisho.*, XXXI, p. 39c : *Shindo.* ed., Vol. 7, 26a-b : Poussin, *ibid.*, p. 431.
- 4) Hakuju Ui, *Shōdaijōron kenkyū* (A Study on the *Mahāyānasamgraha*, in Japanese), (Tokyo, 1935), p. 333 or 396.
- 5) H. Ui, *ibid.*, p. 527 ; *Indo Tetsugaku kenkyū*, Vol. 5 (A Study on the Indian Philosophy, in Japanese), pp. 142-147.
- 6) See *Ch'èng-wei-shih-lun*, *Taisho.*, XXXI, p. 10a : *Shindo.* ed., Vol. 2, 29b-30a : Poussin, *op. cit.*, p. 131.
- 7) The passage quoted from the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsūtra* (大般若波羅蜜多經) is as follows : “若於彼彼行相事中, 遍計爲色爲受爲想爲行爲識乃至爲一切佛法, 依止名想施設言說遍計以爲諸色自性乃至一切佛法自性, 是名遍計所執色乃至遍計所執一切佛法。若復於彼行相事中, 唯有分別法性安立, 分別爲緣起諸戲論假立名想施設言說, 謂之爲色乃至謂爲一切佛法, 是名分別色乃至分別一切佛法。若諸如來出現於世若不出世, 法性安立法界安立, 由彼遍計所執色故, 此分別色, 於常常時, 於恒恒時, 是真如性, 無自性性, 法無我性, 實際之性, 是名法性色。乃至, 由彼遍計所執一切佛法故, 此分別一切佛法, 於常常時, 於恒恒時, 乃至是名法性一切佛法”。 Its French translation is given by É. Lamotte in the introduction of his *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra L'explication des mystères*, (Louvain and Paris, 1935), p. 15.
- 8) The Sanskrit original of this verse is preserved in the photographic manuscript brought by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana. See “Search for Sanskrit MSS. in Tibet”, *JBORS*, XXIV-4, (1938), p. 163. This verse was identified by Prof. V. V. Gokhale with that of the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*. He mentioned it in his lecture at Tokyo University (Nov. 1971-Jan. 1972).
- 9) We have tried to compare and study the paragraph in both of the translations which contains the passage shown in example (4). See my article “Some features of Asvabhāva's.....” *op. cit.* pp. 442-443.
- 10) “*rnam par śes pa brgyad las kun gṣi dag na me loṅ lta buḥi ye śes su ḥgyur*

ro// n̄on moṅs paḥi yid dag na m̄nam pa n̄id kyi ye śes su ḥgyur ro// yid kyi rnam par śes pa dag na so sor kun tu rtog paḥi ye śes su ḥgyur ro// mig nas lus kyi bar du rnam par śes pa l̄na dag na bya ba sgrub paḥi ye śes su ḥgyur te/” (P. ed., No. 5531, Vol. Mi, 128a). Cf. *ibid.*, 152a. I had ever attributed the difference between the two in example (5) to Hsüan-tsang’s addition (in my article : “Hsüan-tsang’s translation……”, *op. cit.* p. 140). But my decision in this case will be deferred until my critical research will be done. [Suggestion is due to Dr. J. Takasaki in his private letter on my article].