

## **Critical Textual Evaluation of Two Paragraphs of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*, Chapter 2 (Nanjo 55.2-58.2): Focusing on the Relationship of Manuscripts**

Toshio Horiuchi

### **0. Introduction**

It is almost unnecessary to reiterate the common sense of this field with regard to *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* (LAS). Specifically, there are very few<sup>1</sup> textual studies based on Sanskrit manuscripts after the memorial work of Nanjo 1921 (Nj), and this text needs to be re-edited. In this paper, I provide a tentative critique of two paragraphs in Chapter 2 of LAS. I further investigate some of the peculiar characteristics of the manuscript. With respect to the division of paragraphs in LAS, as I have stated in my previous article, “LAS is divided into ten chapters in Sanskrit. However, Kokan Shiren (虎関師錬, 1278-1346), a Japanese monk scholar of the Kamakura period divided the text of Sung (=Song) translation into 86 paragraphs in his Shinron (〔仏語〕心論). Although some of the divisions of paragraphs should be re-considered<sup>2</sup>,” I will be adopting Shiren’s system of dividing paragraphs in this article too. In accordance with his division, it is the 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> paragraphs that are considered in this study, corresponding to Nj 55.2-58.2. According to Shinron, the 10<sup>th</sup> paragraph is named 淨流漸頓分, which means something like “the chapter on [whether] purification of the stream (personal continuity) is gradual or sudden.” The 11<sup>th</sup> paragraph, on the other hand, is named 三身簡説分, which must mean “the chapter on the concise teaching of the [Buddha’s] three bodies.” Takasaki further gives the subtitle of “the purification of the continuance of what is seen by one’s own mind (*svacittadrśyadhārā*) and the teachings of the Buddhas (1) and (2).”<sup>3</sup> Actually, these two paragraphs can be regarded as a set. I will demonstrate the edition of the manuscripts first and then investigate some of the interesting points of the manuscripts<sup>4</sup>.

### **1. Material**

The manuscripts I use in this article are<sup>5</sup> C8, C9, N11, N12, N13, N14, N16, R10, Ry, T1,

---

<sup>1</sup> See Deleanu 2018 for detail.

<sup>2</sup> Horiuchi 2017: n. 10.

<sup>3</sup> T&H 2015: 118-120.

<sup>4</sup> I had almost finished writing this article when Prof. Lambert Schmithausen published his three volumes study that included a critical edition of Sanskrit text of Chapter 8 of LAS (Schmithausen 2020). I thank him for gifting me this book while I am in Hamburg. However, it is a pity that I could not make full use of this study while writing this article. I thank Prof. Harunaga Isaacson for reading together the draft edition of this study and for his valuable suggestions during the two sessions that were held in January and February in Hamburg, Germany and Japan. I also thank late Professor Seishi Karashima and colleagues at the Brahmi club (manuscript reading club) for reading the T1 manuscript with me and giving suggestions. The readings that I adopted, together with all the problems that remain in this study are my own.

<sup>5</sup> I have followed Takasaki 2014 (1981) for the abbreviation used in the manuscripts. However, \* is placed on those manuscripts, which Prof. Schmithausen kindly shared with me several years prior. I have utilized five manuscripts from the ones that were shared. He helped me pay attention to Ry. As some of the sigla that he uses overlap with those of Takasaki’s *ibid.*, which I primarily use, I have

T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, \*N4, \*N5, \*N8, \*N14, and \*N17<sup>6</sup>. Manuscript T2 does not contain the part that is relevant for this article. I did not utilize N15 and N17<sup>7</sup>.

The editions and translations<sup>8</sup> used in this study are:

- Sanskrit: Nj 55.2-58.2; Vaidya 1963: 24.27-25.29.
- Tibetan: D 76a7ff., P 83a7ff., S1 107a4ff., S2 183b6ff.
- Chinese: Song, 485c26-486b5<sup>9</sup>; T&H 2015: 118-122<sup>10</sup>.

The commentary used in this study is Jś, D 86b5ff. (Hadano et al 1993: 173ff.).

The various symbols and sigla used in this study are as follows:

\* *virāma*

- indicates that part of a word, before or after the part given, has been omitted.

○ separates the entries commented on in the same footnote.

/ or

, caesura by the editor (author of this article)

++ an unreadable *akṣara* (++ per *akṣara*; + part of an *akṣara*)

| *daṇḍa*

] separates the accepted reading; emendations or conjectures from other readings

[] encloses the number added by the editor

{ { } } encloses the cancellation made by the scribe(s), *ante correctionem*

<< >> encloses the insertion made by the scribe(s), [usually] at the margin, *post correctionem*

◇ encloses the insertion made by the editor

() after Σ encloses the actual readings in the particular manuscripts, although it finally (*post correctionem*) accords with the readings in other manuscripts. For example, mahāmate] Σ (<<mahā>>mate N11)

() includes my comments on the reading of the manuscript.

---

added \* to these manuscripts (namely, \*N6=N12, \*N7=N16, \*N9=N13, \*N10=N14, \*N12=N17) in order to distinguish them from Prof. Takasaki's sigla. For the details of manuscripts in general, see Takasaki 2014: 15-17, and for the details of manuscripts with \* mark, see Schmithausen 2020 (Teil 3): 43-44.

A part of Paragraph 10 (up to the first half of [10]-[6]) is cited in *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* (CMP) (information from Prof. Isaacson). The page numbers for the manuscripts presented in Wedemeyer 2007 are a) Skt: 342-343 and 347-348, b) Tibetan translation: 505-506 and 510, and c) English translation: 143-144 and 148. I will only mention the substantial variant in CMP.

<sup>6</sup> I adopt this order when referring to manuscripts in fn.

<sup>7</sup> See section 3.3.3.

<sup>8</sup> Since my primary focus in this article are Skt manuscripts of LAS, I will not refer to studies that are not based on the manuscripts. However, I will refer to Tokiwa 2018 (2003), which has one proper textual comment (The other comments are not acceptable. I doubt the validity of his basic methodology in "restoring" Skt LAS from Song, a Chinese translation of LAS, even if Song is the oldest witness of LAS. This is because, first, the Chinese do not correspond with Skt word by word, and secondly, Tokiwa's restoration is mainly a modification to Nj, which is not a firm ground.). Vaidya's edition is said to be "merely a reissue of the Nanjio Edition with a few corrections" (Takasaki 2014: 10). However, since it has brought out one philological insight, I have picked it up in fn.

<sup>9</sup> I only cite the Song translation by Guṇabhadra in this article, the oldest Chinese translation (443CE) of LAS, and also the oldest witness of the sutra in comparison to Skt and Tibetan texts.

<sup>10</sup> This is a kundoku 訓読 style in a Japanese annotated translation of Song, which sometimes includes suggestions of emendations to Nj. I will refer to this as Takasaki, for the corresponding part I pick in this article is basically the same as his annotated translation of Song, which was published in 1980.

em. emendation made by the editor

...] Σ all other manuscripts available read “...”<sup>11</sup>

φ non-existent

sic. or ! is used for extremely odd readings. However, this does not mean that I always use it in such cases.

In this study, I do not note variant readings such as *varṭtate/vartate* (gemination), *saṃbu/sambu*, *nti/ṃti*, *l/r*; and *s/ś*. I also do not mention the variants of *daṇḍa*. To avoid overburdening the critical apparatus, the variant readings of the ending of the word (-a/-aḥ/-o) are not noted.

For the abbreviations for Sanskrit manuscripts, see Takasaki 2014 (1981). Among the 17 manuscripts he used, C8 is C, R10 is A, T2 is K, and T1 is T in the abbreviation in Nj.

All the abbreviations have been recorded in an alphabetical order, except for the abbreviation Nj, which has been placed at the end.

## 2. Text

LAS Paragraphs [10]-[11], Nj 55.2-58.2.

[10]

[0] atha khalu mahāmatir bodhisattvo mahāsattvaḥ<sup>12</sup> punar api svacittadṛśyadhārāviśuddhyartham<sup>13</sup> bhagavantam adhyeṣate<sup>14</sup> sma | katham bhagavan<sup>15</sup> svacittadṛśyadhārā viśudhyati,<sup>16</sup> yugapat<sup>17</sup> kramavṛtṭyā<sup>18</sup> 19 vā |

bhagavān āha | kramavṛtṭyā mahāmate svacittadṛśyadhārā viśudhyati na yugapat\* |

[0] de nas bcom ldan 'das la byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po blo gros chen pos rang gi sems snang ba'i rgyud (rgyud] DPS2; rgyun S1) rnam par dag par bya ba'i phyir yang gsol ba btab pa/ bcom ldan 'das rang gi sems snang ba'i rgyud cig car ram rim gyis (rim gyis] DP; rims kyis S1S2) 'jug pas sam ji ltar rnam par dag par 'gyur/

bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa/ blo gros chen po/ rang gi sems snang ba'i rgyud ni rim gyis (rim gyis] DP; rims kyis S1S2) 'jug pas rnam par 'dag ste/ cig car (cig car] DS1S2; gcig char P) ni ma yin no//

[0] 爾時大慧菩薩。爲淨自心現流故，復請如來白佛言。世尊。云何淨除一切衆生自心現流。爲頓爲漸耶。

<sup>11</sup> I used positive apparatus. Thus, this Σ is an exception that I used, as I expect the other reading to be a minor one. However, I have to confess that my expectations were not correct at times. For example, some manuscripts have *dharmato buddha*, where *dharmatābuddha* is expected ([10]-[8]). I thought of this variant as minor and thus, wrote “dharmatā-] Σ;”. What many of the other manuscripts actually had, however, was *dharmato*.

<sup>12</sup> bodhisattvo mahāsattvaḥ] Σ; bodhisattvaḥ <<mahāsattva>> N11, bodhisattvo mahāsattveḥ (sic.) \*N14

<sup>13</sup> svacitta-] Σ; svayaṃ svacitta- C8, N12, N16, Ry, T4, T7, \*N5, \*N8, \*N14, svayasvacitta- C9, \*N17, svayaṃ citta- N13, N14, T3, T5, svaya- N15, R10 ○ -dṛśya-] Σ; -dṛṣṭa- N15, N16, N17, \*N5, \*N17 ○ -artham] Σ; -artha- N11, \*N8

<sup>14</sup> -te] Σ; -nte N11

<sup>15</sup> -am/n\*] Σ; -a- N15, \*N17

<sup>16</sup> -ti] Σ; -te [T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14]

<sup>17</sup> yugapat] Σ; yu{{evam eva mahā}} gapa T5 (influenced by one sentence below), yugapaṃ \*N17

<sup>18</sup> yugapat kramavṛtṭyā] Σ; yugaṣa kamavṛtṭyā N15

<sup>19</sup> As Nj fn. says, “-vṛtṭyā here and hereafter in all MSS.”

佛告大慧。漸淨非頓。

[1] tad yathā mahāmate āmrāphalāni kramaśaḥ<sup>20</sup> pacyante na<sup>21</sup> yugapat\* | evam eva mahāmate svacittadṛśyadhārā sattvānām kramaśo viśudhyati na<sup>22</sup> yugapat\* |

[1] 'di lta ste/ blo gros chen po/ shing a mra'i (a mra'i] DPS2, a ma 'bra'i S1) 'bras bu ni rim gyis (rim gyis] DPS2; rims kyis S1) smin par 'gyur gyi/ cig car (cig car] DS1S2; gcig char P) ma yin no// blo gros chen po/ de bzhin du sems can rnam kyī rang gi sems snang ba'i rgyud kyang rim gyis rnam par 'dag ('dag] DS1; dag PS2) ste/ cig car (cig car] DS1S2; gcig char P) ma yin no//

[1] 如菴羅果，漸熟非頓。如來淨除一切衆生自心現流，亦復如是。漸淨非頓。

[2] tad yathā mahāmate<sup>23</sup> kumbhakāraḥ kramaśo bhāṇḍāni<sup>24</sup> kurute na yugapat\* | evam eva mahāmate tathāgataḥ sattvānām svacittadṛśyadhārām<sup>25</sup> kramaśo<sup>26</sup> viśodhayati na yugapat\* |

[2] blo gros chen po/ 'di lta ste/ rdza (rdza] DS1S2; rdza ma P) mkhan ni snod rnam rim (rim] D; rims PS1S2) gyis (gyis] DP; kyis S1S2) byed de/ cig car (cig car] DS1S2; gcig char P) ma yin no// blo gros chen po/ de bzhin du/ de bzhin gshegs pa yang (pa yang] PS1S2; pa'ang D) sems can rnam kyī rang gi sems snang ba'i rgyud rim gyis (rim gyis] DP; rims kyis S1S2) rnam par sbyong ste/ cig car (cig car] DS1S2; gcig char P) ma yin no//

[2] 譬如陶家造作諸器，漸成非頓。如來淨除一切衆生自心現流，亦復如是。漸淨非頓。

[3]<sup>27</sup> tad yathā mahāmate prthivyām tṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspatayaḥ<sup>28</sup> kramavṛtyā<sup>29</sup> virohanti na yugapat\* | evam eva mahāmate sattvānām tathāgataḥ kramaśaḥ svacittadṛśyadhārām<sup>30</sup> viśodhayati<sup>31</sup> na yugapat\* |

[3] blo gros chen po/ 'di lta ste/ sa chen po las rtsva dang/ shing gel ba dang/ sman dang/ nags tshal rnam rim gyis (rim gyis] DPS1; rims kyis S2) 'jug pas skye'i/ cig car (cig car] DS1S2; cig char P) ma yin no// de bzhin du/ blo gros chen po/ de bzhin gshegs

<sup>20</sup> āmrāphalāni kramaśaḥ] Σ (-phalānikra- Ry); -phalā vikra- C8, R10, T4, \*N5, \*N17, -phalam vikramaś/saḥ C9, N11, N14, T3, -phalāni saḥ (!) T5 (shows corruption of T5)

<sup>21</sup> pacyante na] Σ; pacyate T6, pacyate na \*N4, \*N8, \*N14

<sup>22</sup> svacittadṛśyadhārā satvānām kramaśo viśudhyati na] Σ; satvānām kramaśaḥ svacittadṛśyadhārā viśudhyate [T6, satvānām kramaśaḥ svacittadṛśyadhārā viśudhyate na [\*N4, \*N8, \*N14], tathāgataḥ sarvasattvānām kramaśaḥ svacittadṛśyadhārām viśodhayati na CMP

<sup>23</sup> mahāmate] Σ (<<mahā>>mate N11), mahāmateḥ T1

<sup>24</sup> bhāṇḍāni] Σ; ṇḍāni (sic.) \*N17

<sup>25</sup> svacittadṛśyadhārām] Σ; -dhār/lā N11, \*N4, \*N8, \*N17, dṛśyadhārām N16, svacittadṛśyarā (sic.) T6

<sup>26</sup> kramaśo] Σ; φ \*N14

<sup>27</sup> In \*N14, [3] and [4] are inserted in the margin of the folio because of the eye skip caused by the frequent occurrence of *tad yathā*.

<sup>28</sup> tṛṇa-] Σ; sarve tṛṇa- N11, sarvatṛṇa- CMP ○ -tayaḥ-] Σ; -teyaḥ R10, \*N17

<sup>29</sup> kramavṛt<t>yā] Σ; kramatyā (sic.) N13, kramaś/so vṛtyā [T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14]

<sup>30</sup> svacittadṛśyadhārām] Σ; svacittam dhārām C8, N14, R10, Ry, T3, T4, T5, \*N5, \*N17, svacittam dhārā (sic.) C9, svacittadṛśyadhārā N11, svacittadhārām N12, N13, N16, T7

<sup>31</sup> vi-] Σ; vī- N11

pa yang (pa yang] PS1S2; pa'ang D) sems can rnam kyī rang gi sems snang ba'i rgyud rim gyis sbyong ste/ cig car (cig car] DS1S2; kcig char (sic.) P) ma yin no//

[3] 譬如大地，漸生萬物非頓生也。如來淨除一切衆生自心現流，亦復如是。漸淨非頓。

[4] tad yathā mahāmate<sup>32</sup> hāsyālāsyagītavāditravīṇālekhyayogyāḥ<sup>33</sup> kramaśaḥ pravartante<sup>34</sup> na<sup>35</sup> yugapat\* | evam eva mahāmate tathāgataḥ sarvasattvānām<sup>36</sup> kramaśaḥ svacittadṛśyadhārām<sup>37</sup> viśodhayati na yugapat\* |

[4] blo gros chen po/ 'di lta ste/ bzhad gad dang/ rol mo dang/ glu dang/ pi wang (pi wang] D; bi bang P, bi lwang S1S2) dang/ sil snyan dang/ ri (ri] DP; rol S1S2) mo dag la mkhas pa ni rim gyis 'byung gi/ cig car (cig car] DS1S2; gcig char P) ma yin no// de bzhin du/ blo gros chen po/ de bzhin gshegs pa yang (pa yang] PS1S2; pa'ang D) sems can thams cad kyī rang gi sems (sems] DPS2; sems sems S1) snang ba'i rgyud rim (rim] DPS2; rims S1) gyis rnam par sbyong ste/ cig car (cig car] DS1S2; gcig char P) ma yin no//

[4] 譬如人學音樂書畫種種技術，漸成非頓。如來淨除一切衆生自心現流，亦復如是。漸淨非頓。

[5] tad yathā<sup>38</sup> mahāmate<sup>39</sup> darpaṇāntargatāḥ sarvarūpāvabhāsāḥ saṃdṛśyante<sup>[Nj 56]</sup> nirvikalpā yugapat\*<sup>40</sup> | evam eva mahāmate svacittadṛśyadhārām<sup>41</sup> yugapat\*<sup>42</sup> tathāgataḥ sarvasattvānām viśodhayati nirvikalpām<sup>43</sup> nirābhāsagocarām<sup>44</sup> |

[5] blo gros chen po/ 'di lta ste/ me long gi nang du gzugs kyī gzugs su (gzugs kyī gzugs su] S1S2, CMP; gzugs kyī gzugs brnyan DP) snang ba thams cad rnam par rtog pa med par cig car (cig car] DS1S2; gcig char P) snang ngo// de bzhin du/ blo gros chen po/ de bzhin gshegs pa yang (pa yang] PS1S2; pa'ang D) sems can thams cad kyī rang gi sems snang ba'i rgyud rnam par mi rtog cing snang ba med pa'i spyod yul rnam cig car (cig car] DS1S2; gcig char P) rnam par sbyong ngo (snyong ngo] DS1S2; sbyod do (sic.) P)//

<sup>32</sup> mahāmate] Σ; mate N13

<sup>33</sup> -vāditra-] Σ (-{citra}) <<vāditra>>- Ry); -vādita- N11, T1, -citta- [T6, \*N4, \*N8], -citra- CMP Cf. Tib. bzhad gad dang/ rol mo dang/ glu dang/ pi bang dang/ sil snyan dang/ ri mo dag. For -gītavāditra-, \*N14 has tasisya (?)

<sup>34</sup> pravartante] Σ; pravartate T1, T3, T6, \*N4, \*N8

<sup>35</sup> na] Σ; φ T6

<sup>36</sup> sarvasattvānām] Σ; satvānām [T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14]

<sup>37</sup> svacittadṛśyadhārām] Σ; -dhārā N11, svacittadhārām N12, T1, T7

<sup>38</sup> tad yathā] Σ; yathā R10

<sup>39</sup> mahāmate] Σ; māmāte N11

<sup>40</sup> yugapat\*] Σ; na yugapat\* [N12, T7]

<sup>41</sup> -dhārām] C9, T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14, Nj; -dhārā C8, N11, N12, N13, N14, N16, R10, Ry, T1, T3, T4, T7, \*N5, \*N17, -dhāro T5

<sup>42</sup> yugapat\*] Σ; yugapat\* tad yathā \*N17

<sup>43</sup> -ām] T1, Nj; -ā C8, C9, N11, N12, N13, N14, N16, R10, Ry, T3, T4, T5, T7, \*N17, -ān T6, \*N4(-ām/n?), \*N8, \*N14, -o \*N5

<sup>44</sup> nirābhāsagocarām/m] Σ; -gocarā N11, -gocarāḥ [N12], N16, [T7], nirā<<bhāsagocarā>>n Ry, nirābhāsagocarān T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14

[5] 譬如明鏡，頓現一切無相色像。如來淨除一切衆生自心現流，亦復如是。頓現無相無有所有清淨境界。

[6] tad yathā mahāmate somādityamaṇḍalam yugapat\* sarvarūpāvabhāsān<sup>45</sup> kiraṇaiḥ prakāśayati<sup>46</sup> | evam eva mahāmate tathāgataḥ svacittadrśyadauṣṭhulyavāsanāvigatānām<sup>47</sup> sattvānām yugapad<sup>48</sup> acintyajñānaginagocaraviśayaṃ<sup>49</sup> saṃdarśayati |

[6] blo gros chen po/ 'di lta ste/ zla ba dang nyi ma'i dkyil 'khor ni 'od zer gyis (gyis] DS1S2; gyi P) gzugs su snang ba thams cad cig car (cig car] DS1S2; gcig char P) mngon par byed do// de bzhin du/ blo gros chen po/ de bzhin gshegs pa yang (pa yang] PS2; pa'ang D, pa'ang blo gros chen po S1) sems can rang gi sems snang ba'i gnas ngan len gyi bag chags dang bral ba rnams la/ rgyal ba ye shes bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i yul dang/ spyod yul cig car (cig car] DS1S2; gcig char P) yang dag par ston (ston] DPS2; bston S1) to// (to//] DS1S2; te/ P)

[6] 如日月輪，頓照顯示一切色像。如來爲離自心現習氣過患衆生，亦復如是。頓爲顯示不思議智最勝境界。

[7] tad yathā<sup>50</sup> mahāmate ālayavijñānaṃ<sup>51</sup> svacittadrśyadehapratīṣṭhābhogaviśayaṃ<sup>52</sup> yugapad vibhāvayati | evam eva mahāmate niṣyandabuddho<sup>53</sup> yugapat\* sattvagocaraṃ<sup>54</sup> paripācyākaniṣṭhabhavanavimānālaye yogayoginām<sup>55</sup> arpayati<sup>56</sup> |

[7] blo gros chen po/ 'di lta ste/ kun gzhi rnam par shes pa ni rang gi sems snang ba'i lus dang/ gnas dang/ longs spyod kyi yul cig car (cig car] DS1S2; gcig char P) rnam par ston no// de bzhin du/ blo gros chen po/ rgyu 'dra ba'i sangs rgyas kyang cig car (cig car] DS1S2; gcig char P) sems can gyi spyod yul yongs su smin par byas te/ 'og min gyi pho brang dang/ gzhal med khang gi gnas kyi rnal 'byor gyi rnal 'byor can du gzhang (gzhang] PS1S2; bzhag D) go//

[7] 譬如藏識，頓分別知自心現及身安立受用境界。彼諸依佛，亦復如是。依者胡本云 津賦謂化佛是真佛氣分也頓熟衆生所處境界。以修行者，安處於彼色究竟天。

<sup>45</sup> -sān] C9, N11, N14, T3, T4, Nj; -sāt C8, N12, N13, N16, R10, Ry, T5, T7, \*N5, \*N17, -sāt T1, -sām T6, -sam \*N4, \*N8, \*N14

<sup>46</sup> -ti] Σ; -nti N11

<sup>47</sup> -vāsanāvigatānām] Σ; -vāsanāvigatām N13, -vāsanām vīgatānām T1, -vāsanādhigatānām [T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14]

<sup>48</sup> yugapad] Σ; yugapat\*d (sic.) \*N17

<sup>49</sup> acintya-] Σ (aci{ {tta} } <<ntya>>- Ry); acitta- C8, \*N5

<sup>50</sup> tad yathā] Σ; tad yathā pi nāma [ \*N4, \*N8, \*N14]

<sup>51</sup> ālaya-] Σ; āla- N13, N14

<sup>52</sup> -citta-] Σ; -cittam N11 ○ -viśayaṃ] Σ; -viśaṃya N13, -viśaya N14, T1

<sup>53</sup> niṣyanda-] Σ (niṣp/ya{ {nna} } <<nda>> Ry) ○ -buddho] Σ; -buddhā \*N14

<sup>54</sup> sattvagocaraṃ] Σ (sa{ {drśya} } tvagocaram Ry); sagocara T1

<sup>55</sup> akaniṣṭha-] Σ; akaniṣṭham N11 ○ -ālaye yogayoginām] \*N8, \*N14; -ālayayogaṃ yoginām C8, C9, N12, N13, N14, N16, Ry, T3, T4, T7, \*N5, \*N17, Nj, -ālayayogayoginām T1, N11(-yoginām), \*N4, -ālaye yoginām T6; Cf. ... gzhal med khang gi gnas kyi rnal 'byor gyi rnal 'byor can du gzhang go// (\*-vimānālayayogayoginam arpayati(?)) Tib. Cf. yogayogin in LAS (III.28d and X.482d, Takasaki 1981: 18.6). Or, -ālayaṃ is also possible?

<sup>56</sup> arpayati] Σ; apayati N13

[8] tad yathā mahāmate<sup>57</sup> dharmatābuddho<sup>58</sup> yugapan<sup>59</sup> niṣyandanirmāṇakiraṇair<sup>60</sup> virājate | evam eva mahāmate pratyātmāryagatidharmalakṣaṇam<sup>61</sup> bhāvābhāvakudṛṣṭi-vinivartanatayā<sup>62</sup> yugapad<sup>63</sup> virājate |

[8] blo gros chen po/ 'di lta ste/ chos nyid kyi sangs rgyas ni cig car (cig car] DS1S2; gcig char P) rgyu 'dra ba dang/ sprul pa'i 'od zer gyis rnam par mdzes so// de bzhin du/ blo gros chen po/ 'phags pa so so rang gis (gis] DS1S2; ϕ P) rig pa'i chos kyi mtshan nyid kyang yod pa dang/ med pa'i lta ba ngan pa rnam par zlog (zlog] DS1; bzlog PS2) pas (pas] DPS1; pa/ S2) cig car (cig car] DS1S2; gcig char P) rnam par mdzes so//

[8] 譬如法佛所作依佛，光明照曜。自覺聖趣，亦復如是。彼於法相有性無性惡見妄想照令除滅。

[11]

[1] punar<sup>64</sup> aparaṁ mahāmate dharmatāniṣyandabuddhaḥ<sup>65</sup> svasāmānyalakṣaṇa-patitān<sup>66</sup> sarvadharmān<sup>67</sup> svacittadrśyavāsanāhetulakṣaṇopanibaddhān\*<sup>68</sup> parikalpita-svabhāvābhīniveśāhetukān\*<sup>69</sup> atadātmakavividhamāyāraṁgapuruṣavicitryābhīniveśā-nupalabdhitō<sup>70</sup> mahāmate<sup>71</sup> deśayati<sup>72</sup> ||

[1] gzhan yang blo gros chen po chos nyid dang 'dra bar byung (byung] S1; 'byung DPS2) ba'i sangs rgyas ni sgyu ma'i yan lag rnam pa mang po'i skyes bu de'i bdag nyid

<sup>57</sup> mahāmate] Σ; mahāmater T1

<sup>58</sup> dharmatā-] Σ; dharmato- C8, C9, N12, N13, N16, T4, T5, T6, T7, \*N5, \*N8, \*N14, \*N17 ○ -o/-ah] Σ; -a T1

<sup>59</sup> yugapan/t\*] Σ; yugapa T5

<sup>60</sup> -nirmāṇa-] Σ; -nirvāṇa- T1, -nirmāṇa- N16

<sup>61</sup> -lakṣaṇam] Σ; -lakṣaṇa- T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14

<sup>62</sup> bhāvābhāva-] Σ; bhāvābhāvaṁ N16

<sup>63</sup> -tayā yugapad] Σ (-tayā <<yugapat\*>> Ry); -taya T1

<sup>64</sup> punar] Σ; +++r T1

<sup>65</sup> dharmatā-] Σ; dharmato- C8, C9, N12, N16, T4, T6, \*N5, \*N8, \*N17; dharmā- N11, dharmate- T5, T7 ○ -niṣyandabuddhaḥ] Σ; -niṣyandabuddha T1, -niṣyandaḥ buddha- [T6], -niṣyandaḥ buddhaḥ \*N4, \*N8, \*N14

<sup>66</sup> -lakṣaṇa-] Σ; -lakṣaṇam C8, \*N5 ○ -ān] N11, T1, T6, \*N4, \*N8; -āt C8, C9, N12, N13, N14, N16, Ry, T3, T4, T5, T7, \*N5, \*N17, Nj

<sup>67</sup> -ān] N11 (-ān\* ||), T4, T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14, Takasaki; -āt C8, C9, N12, N13, N14, Ry, T3, T5, T7, \*N5, \*N17, Nj, -āṇā- T1, -āḥ N16

<sup>68</sup> -ṇopa-] Σ; -ṇapa- \*N4, \*N17 ○ -ān] T1, T5, T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14, Takasaki; -ā- C8, \*N5, -āna N11, -āt C9 (-lakṣaṇoparikalpitapanibaddhāt (there is an eye skip here because of *pa*. The scribe instructs the reading of *lakṣaṇoparibaddhāt parikalpita* by numbering 1 and 2 above the character *pa*), N12, N13, N14, N16, Ry, T3, T4, T7, Nj, -ām \*N14

<sup>69</sup> -svabhāvābhīniveśa-] Σ; -svabhāvāniveśa- T6

<sup>70</sup> -ān\* atad-] Ry (-ān\* { {ma} } <<a>>tad- (while Ry seems to be cancelling *ma*, however, the sign is unusual as a cancellation mark. One could also assume the possibility of Ry not cancelling *ma*, but modifying it into *a*)), \*N4 (-ān\* || atad-); -ān tad- N14, T3, T5, -ān | atad- T1, -ān | tad- (-ān\* tad-) C8, C9, N13, T4, T6, \*N5, \*N8, \*N14, \*N17, -āt tad- [N12], N16 (-āt\* || tad-), [T7] ○ -ātmaka-] Σ; -ātmakam T1, -ātmaka \*N8 ○ -māyāraṇ/mga-] Σ; -māyāṅga- T1, N11 (-(vividhar)mmāyāṅga- (sic.)), \*N4

<sup>71</sup> mahāmate] Σ; ϕ Nj

<sup>72</sup> deśayati] Σ; deśayayati T5

ma yin pa sna tshogs la mngon par zhen pa mi (mi] DPS1; ma S2) dmigs pa'i phyir rang dang spyi'i mtshan nyid du gtogs (gtogs] DPS2; rtogs S1) pa'i chos thams cad rang gi sems snang ba'i bag chags rgyu'i mtshan nyid dang 'brel ba yongs su brtags pa'i rang bzhin la mngon par zhen pa'i rgyu las byung bar ston to//

[1] 大慧。法依佛說一切法入自相共相，自心現習氣因相續，妄想自性計著因，種種無實幻種種計著不可得。

[2.1] punar aparaṃ mahāmate parikalpitasvabhāvavṛttilakṣaṇaṃ<sup>73</sup> paratantrasvabhāvābhīniveśataḥ<sup>74</sup> pravartate |

tad yathā mahāmate<sup>75</sup> tṛṇa<sup>[Nj 57]</sup> kāṣṭhakāṭhalyāśrayān<sup>76</sup> <māyāvī><sup>77</sup> māyāvidyāpuruṣasamyogāt sarvasattvarūpāṅgasamuditāṃ vicitrarūpadhāriṇaṃ<sup>78</sup> māyāpuruṣavi-graḥaṃ abhiniṣpannaikarūpasattvaśarīraṃ<sup>79</sup> vividhavidhikalpavikalpitaṃ<sup>80</sup> khyāyate | tathā ca<sup>81</sup> khyāyann<sup>82</sup> api<sup>83</sup> mahāmate tadātmako<sup>84</sup> na bhavati |

[2.1] blo gros chen po gzhan yang yongs su brtags pa'i rang bzhin 'byung ba'i mtshan nyid ni/ gzhan gyi dbang gi rang bzhin la (la] DPS2; las S1) mngon par zhen pa las 'byung ('byung] DPS2; byung S1) ngo//

blo gros chen po 'di lta ste/ rtwa dang shing dang gyo mo la brten te sgyu ma'i sngags

<sup>73</sup> -bhāva-] Σ; -bhāvā- \*N4

<sup>74</sup> paratantra-] Σ; paratatra- N13 ○ -svabhāvā-] T1, T5, T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14, Nj; -svakāyā- C8, C9, N11, N12, N13, N14, N16, Ry (-sva { {bhāva} } <<kāya>>), T3, T4, T7, \*N17

<sup>75</sup> mahāmate] Σ; Nj fn. states that mahāmate is added in I and does not accept the reading. However, in truth, all manuscripts have it. This is also supported by the Tibetan translation.

<sup>76</sup> -kāṭhalyā-] N11, T1; -valyalatā- C8, C9, N13, N14, N16 (-valyala { {yā} } tā-), R10, Ry (- { {kāṭhalyā} } <<valyalatā>>-), T3, T4, \*N17, -vallatā- T6, \*N4, -vallyalatā- \*N8, -vallyatāra- \*N14 (methathesis of vallyaratā=vallyalatā?), -kalyalatā- T5, -valilatā- [N12, T7]; Cf. -gulmalatā- Nj; Nj fn. (-kāṣṭha)valyalatā A.C.I.K. kagu lmā T; Cf. Tib. rtwa dang shing dang gyo mo=tṛṇa-kāṣṭha-kāṭhalla/kāṭhalya

○ -ān/t] Σ; -ā \*N4

<sup>77</sup> <māyāvī>] em.(Isaacson). (or māyāvī vidyāpuruṣa-?) See the parallelism of magician and paratantrasvabhāva here. Magician (māyāvin) manifests himself in another form, although he does not possess that nature (atadātmaka). Although parikalpitasvabhāva appears in paratantrasvabhāva (paratantra- appears as parikalpita-), the latter does not possess the nature of the former. If so, khyāyate, which is an intransitive form in this LAS, should also be a transitive form having māyāpuruṣavīgraha (masculine) as its object. Cf. 工幻師 (magician) is used in Song.

<sup>78</sup> sarvasatva-] Σ; sarva- T6 ○ -rūpāṅgasamuditāṃ vicitrarūpadhāriṇaṃ/m] Σ (-rūpāṅgasamuditāṃ vicitrarūpa>>dhāriṇaṃ N11), -rūpadhāriṇaṃ Nj. Nj's fn. states that <only> I. reads rūpāṅgasamuditāṃ vicitrarūpadhāriṇaṃ. However, in truth, it is T1 (and other manuscripts) that read it as such (this may be a confusion of T(=T1) and I, while typesetting Nj's manuscript for printing). Moreover, this variant is also supported by Tibetan and other manuscripts.

<sup>79</sup> abhiniṣpanna-] Σ; abhinīṣpanna- N11 ○ -rūpasatva-] N11, [T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14], (Tib.); -rūpasarva- T1; -satva- C8, C9, N12, N13, N14, N16, R10, Ry (-satva { {rūpa} } -), T3, T4, T5, T7, \*N17, Nj; Tib: ma grub pa

<sup>80</sup> vividhavidhikalpa-] [\*N4, \*N8, \*N14]; rūpavidhidhikalpa- T5, vidhavidhikalpa- [T6] (haplography of one vi-), vividhavidhikalpa- Σ

<sup>81</sup> tathā ca] Σ; tathā N11, T1, Nj, tadā \*N4, tathā bha (!) N16

<sup>82</sup> khyāyann] Σ; khyānamam T6

<sup>83</sup> api] Σ; epi C9, N14, T4, T5, \*N17

<sup>84</sup> -ko] Σ; -ke N16, masculine agreeing with <māyāvī>?



dang/ mir ldan pa las sems can thams cad kyi gzugs kyi yan lag phun sum tshogs shing sna tshogs kyi (kyi] DPS2; kyis S1) gzugs 'chang ba'i sgyu ma'i skyes bu'i gzugs/ sems can gyi lus rang bzhin gcig tu ma grub pa/ rnam par rtog pa rnam pa sna tshogs kyis rnam par brtags pa snang ste/ blo gros chen po de ltar snang yang de'i bdag nyid ma yin no//

[2.1] 復次大慧。計著緣起自性，生妄想自性相。大慧。如工幻師依草木瓦石作種種幻，起一切衆生若干形色，起種種妄想。彼諸妄想亦無真實。

[2.2] evam eva mahāmate<sup>85</sup> paratantrasvabhāve<sup>86</sup> parikalpitasvabhāvo<sup>87</sup> vividhavidhāvikalpācittavicitralakṣaṇaḥ<sup>88</sup> khyāyate<sup>89</sup> | vastuparikalpalakṣaṇābhīniveśavāsanām<sup>90</sup> parikalpayan<sup>91</sup> mahāmate parikalpitasvabhāvalakṣaṇam bhavati |

eṣā<sup>92</sup> mahāmate<sup>93</sup> niṣyandabuddhadeśanā<sup>94</sup> |

[2.2] de bzhin du blo gros chen po gzhan gyi dbang gi rang bzhin la kun brtags (brtags] DPS2; btags S1) pa'i rang bzhin rnam par rtog (rtog] DPS2; brtags S1) pa'i sems sna tshogs rnam pa mang po'i mtshan nyid du snang ngo// blo gros chen po dngos po yongs su rtog (rtog] DPS2; rtogs S1) pa'i mtshan nyid du mngon par zhen pa'i bag chags la yongs su rtog pas kun brtags (brtags] DPS2; btags S1) pa'i rang bzhin gyi mtshan nyid du 'gyur te/

blo gros chen po 'di ni 'dra bar byung (byung] DPS1; 'byung S2) ba'i sangs rgyas kyi (kyi] DPS1; ϕ S2) bshad pa'o//

[2.2] 如是大慧。依緣起自性，起妄想自性種種妄想心種種想行。事妄想相計著習氣妄想。大慧。是爲妄想自性相生。

<sup>85</sup> mahāmate] Σ; mahāmate rūpaṃ (slipping in from one line before?) C8, N12, N16, Ry (mahāmate <<rūpaṃ>>), T4, T6, T7, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14, mahāmate rūpa T5

<sup>86</sup> paratantra-] R10, T6, \*N8, \*N14, Nj; paratantre C8, C9, N11, N12, N13, N14, N16, Ry, T1, T3, T4, T5, T7, \*N4, paṃparatantra- \*N17 (this strange *paṃ* must be a remnant of *rūpaṃ* in the exemplar of \*N17. See the previous fn.) ○ -bhāve] Σ; -bhāva \*N4, \*N8

<sup>87</sup> -bhāvo] N16, Ry, T1, T5, Tokiwa; -bhāve C8, C9, N12, N13, N14, R10, T3, T4, T6, T7, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14, \*N17, Nj; -bhāva- N11 (-bhā<<va>>-), Takasaki (Rather than Takasaki's emendation that assumes a compound construction, Tokiwa's emendation seems to be more appropriate here.)

<sup>88</sup> vividhavidhāvikalpa-] Σ; vivikalpa- N13, N14 ○ -citta-] Σ; -citra- C8 ○ -vicitra-] Σ ({[kalpaṇaḥ]} <<vicitra(lakṣaṇaṃ)>> Ry); -citra- T6, ϕ \*N4, \*N8, -citta- \*N14, -vicitra- \*N17 ○ -ṇaḥ] N11, T1, T5, \*N4; -ṇa- C9, N13, T3, -ṇam/m C8, N12, N14, N16, R10, Ry, T4, T6, T7, \*N8, \*N17, Nj

<sup>89</sup> khyāyate] Σ; ākhyāyate T6, \*N14

<sup>90</sup> -parikalpa-] Σ; -parikalpita- [T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14] ○ -vāsanām/m] T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14; vāsanāt Σ, -vāśasanāt R10. Alternatively, it is strange that impression (*vāsanā*) is an accusative form (*vāsanām*), and that it becomes the object of conceptualizing (*pari-klp*). Thus, another possibility is to eliminate *daṇḍa* (|) after *khyāyate* and include it in the previous sentence like *khyāyate vastuparikalpalakṣaṇābhīniveśavāsanāt* | (... appears from the impression of ...). However, this supposition is neither supported by the Tibetan nor the Chinese translations (incidentally, it is often the case that Song translates Sanskrit into Chinese by just following the word order of Sanskrit, not adjusting the word order to conform to the rules of Chinese grammar).

<sup>91</sup> parikalpayan/t] Σ; payat (!) T5

<sup>92</sup> eṣā] C8, C9, N14, N16, Ry (eṣā{ {ñ ca} }), T3, T4, Nj; eṣā ca N13, T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14, eṣāñ ca N11, T5, evam eva T1, eṣām [N12], R10, [T7], \*N17

<sup>93</sup> mahāmate] Σ; mahāte N11, mate R10

<sup>94</sup> niṣyanda-] Σ; niṣyande \*N14

大慧。是名依佛說法。

[3] dharmatābuddhaḥ<sup>95</sup> punar mahāmate \*-cittasvabhāvalakṣaṇavisamyuktām<sup>96</sup> pratyātmāyagatigocaravyavasthām<sup>97</sup> karoti |

[3] blo gros chen po chos nyid kyi sangs rgyas ni sems kyi rang bzhin gyi (gyi] DPS2; ϕ S1) mtshan nyid dang bral ba/ 'phags pa so rang gis rig pa'i spyod yul rnam par gzhaḡ (gzhaḡ] S1; gzhaḡ DPS2) go//

[3] 大慧。法佛者。離心自性相自覺聖所緣境界建立施作。

[4] nirmitanirmāṇabuddhaḥ punar mahāmate<sup>98-99</sup> dānaśīladhyānasamādhicittaprajñā-jñānaskandhadhātuvāyatanavimokṣavijñānagatīlakṣaṇaprabhedapracāram<sup>100</sup> vyavasthāpayati, tīrthyadr̥ṣṭyā cānurūpyasamatikramaṇalakṣaṇam<sup>101</sup> deśayati<sup>102</sup> |

[4] blo gros chen po 'phrul pas (pas] DPS2; pa S1) sprul pa'i sangs rgyas (rgyas] S1S2; rgyas rnam DP) ni sbyin pa dang/ bsam gtan dang/ tshul khriṃs dang/ ting nge 'dzin dang/ sems dang/ shes rab dang/ ye shes dang/ phung po dang khamṣ dang skye mched dang rnam par thar pa dang/ rnam par shes pa 'jug pa'i mtshan nyid rab tu phye ba rgyu ba rnam par gzhaḡ go// mu stegs can gyi lta bas (bas] S1S2; ba bas DP) gzugs med pa'i ting nge 'dzin gyi rim pa'i mtshan nyid kyang ston to//

[4] 大慧。化佛者。說施戒忍精進禪定及心智慧離陰界入解脫識相分別觀察建立，超外道見無色見。

[5] dharmatābuddhaḥ<sup>103</sup> punar mahāmate<sup>104</sup> nirālambi lambavigatam<sup>105</sup> sarvakriye-

<sup>95</sup> dharmatābuddhaḥ] Σ; dharmatāḥ T5

<sup>96</sup> -visamyuktām/m] Σ; -viśamyuktā N11, -visamyukta- T1, T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14

<sup>97</sup> -ārya-] Σ; ϕ N11, [T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14] ○ -gati-] Σ; -gagati- R10 ○ -gocara-] Σ; gocale N11 ○ -vyavasthām] Σ; -vyavasthā C8, N11, T4

<sup>98</sup> mahāmate] Σ; mahāte N11

<sup>99</sup> \*~\* ϕ [N12, T7] (eye skip instigated by the word mahāmate)

<sup>100</sup> -citta-] Σ; -citra- Nj ○ -skandhadhātu-] Σ; -skadhātu- (sic.) T3 ○ -vimokṣa-] Σ; -vimokṣam N12, T7 ○ -vijñāna-] Σ (<<vi>>jñāna- Ry); -jñāna- T1 ○ -lakṣaṇa-] Σ; -lakṣaṇam N13, N14 ○ -prabheda-] Σ; -prabhena- N16, -prabhera- T5, -prabhe- T6 ○ -pracāram] Σ; -pracāra N11 (-pracāla), T1

<sup>101</sup> tīrthyadr̥ṣṭyā cānurūpyasamatikramaṇalakṣaṇam] em. Cf. Jś: mu stegs can gyi lta ba dang mthun pa las 'das pa'i mtshan nyid (\*tīrthyadr̥ṣṭyānurūpyasamatikramaṇalakṣaṇa or \*tīrthyadr̥ṣṭyā cānurūpyasamatikramaṇalakṣaṇa); tīrthya/ādr̥ṣṭyā ca rūpyasamatikramaṇalakṣaṇan C8, C9, N12, N13, N14, N16, R10, Ry (tī{rthya}) <<rthya>>dr̥{ṣṭā} <<ṣṭyā>> ca rūpyasamatikramaṇalakṣa<<ṇa>>n), T3, T4, T5, T7, \*N17, Nj, tīrthyādr̥ṣṭhvārūpyasamatikramaṇa<<lakṣaṇa>> N11, tīrthyadr̥ṣṭyarūpyasamatikramalakṣaṇam T1,

tīrthyadr̥ṣṭyarūpyasamatikramaṇalakṣaṇam T6, \*N8, \*N14, tīrthyādr̥ṣṭarūpasamatikramaṇalakṣaṇam \*N4, \*tīrthyadr̥ṣṭyās cārūpyasamāpattisamatikramaṇalakṣaṇam Nj fn.

<sup>102</sup> deśayati] Σ; deśayam/nti C8, N12, N13, N14, N16, Ry, T3, T4, T7, \*N17

<sup>103</sup> dharmatābuddhaḥ] Σ; dharmatāḥ C8, T1

<sup>104</sup> In C9, after this word, there is a dittography of the previous paragraph beginning from \*-cittasvabhāva-, to mahāmate\*.

<sup>105</sup> nirālambi lambavigatam] C8, N12, N16, R10, Ry, T5, T6, T7, \*N8, \*N17; nirālambāmbavigatam \*N4, \*N14, nirālambāmbavigata- (sic.) N11, nirālambavigatam C9, N13, N14, T1, T3, T4, nirālamba āmbavigatam Nj, nirālambah | ālam... Vaidya

ndriyapramāṇalakṣaṇavinivṛttam<sup>106</sup> aviṣayaṃ<sup>107</sup> bālaśrāvakaḥpratyekabuddhatīrthakar-  
ātmalakṣaṇābhiniṣeṣābhiniṣṭānām<sup>108</sup> |

[5] blo gros chen po chos nyid kyi sangs rgyas ni dmigs pa med cing dmigs pa dang  
bral ba/ bya ba dang/ dbang po dang/ tshad ma'i mtshan nyid thams cad las rnam par log  
(log] DPS1; ldog S2) pa/ byis pa dang/ nyan thos dang/ rang sangs rgyas dang/ mu stegs  
can bdag gi mtshan nyid la mngon par chags pas mngon par zhen pa (pa] DPS2; pa'i S1)  
rnams kyi yul ma yin par (par] DP; pa S1S2) ston to//

[5] 又法佛者。離攀緣所緣，離一切所作根量相滅，非諸凡夫聲聞緣覺外道計著  
我相所著境界，自覺聖究竟差別相建立。

[6] tasmāt tarhi<sup>109</sup> mahāmate<sup>110</sup> pratyātmāyagativīśeṣalakṣaṇe<sup>111</sup> yogaḥ karaṇīyaḥ<sup>112</sup>  
| svacittala<sup>[Nj 58]</sup> kṣaṇadṛśyavinivṛttidṛṣṭinā ca te bhavitavyam |

[6] blo gros chen po de bas na 'phags pa so so rang gi (gi] DP; gis S1S2) rig pa'i khyad  
par gyi mtshan nyid la brtson par bya'o// khyod kyis rang gi sems kyi mtshan nyid snang  
ba'ang ('ang] DPS2; yang S1) rnam par log par lta bar gyis shig/

[6] 是故大慧。自覺聖差別相當勤修學。自心現見應當除滅。

### 3. Remarks

In this section, I will investigate some of the characteristics of the manuscripts based on the previous section.

#### 3.1. Ry as an exemplar of C9, N13, N14, T3, T4, and T5

Example 1:

Ry is a unique and a valuable manuscript that sometimes contains cancellation and addition ({}{} and <> in accordance to my sigla), showing that this text consulted several manuscripts. There is an interesting reading of the place where *tasmāt tarhi* is expected in this Ry ([11]-[6]). I have to first note that this part is found in the first line of a folio (25b) in Ry. Therein, it has *tasmā{r}ttarhi*, in which the unnecessary *r* above *tta* is cancelled by a cancellation mark that looks like “” (see below). Ry is thus reporting the proper form *tasmāt tarhi*. However, precisely over the cancellation of *r*, there is a word *dvi*<sup>2</sup>, which means that a word *dvi* should be inserted in the second line (2), namely, the line below the line that is at issue. This second line, which belongs to the next

<sup>106</sup> -ndriya-] Σ; -ndriye C8, N11, N13, N14, R10, T4, \*N14, \*N17, -ndriyendriya- \*N4 ○ -lakṣaṇa-]  
Σ; -lakṣaṇaḥ T6 ○ -vinivṛttam] C8, N11, N12, N13, T7, \*N4, \*N14, Nj; -vinivṛttam C9, -vinivṛttim  
Ry, T1, T3, T4, T5, T6, \*N8, -vivivṛttim N14, R10 (vinivṛttam?), N16 (vinivṛttam)

<sup>107</sup> -yaṃ] Σ; -ya- R10, \*N17

<sup>108</sup> -tīrthakarā-] Σ; -tīrthyakarā- N12, T6, T7, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14, -tīrthakaraḥ N11 ○ -ātma-] N11, T1,  
T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14; -ātmaka- C8, C9, N12, N13, N14, N16, R10, Ry, T3, T4, T5, T7, \*N17, Nj ○ -  
viṣṭānām] Σ; -veśānām N13

<sup>109</sup> tasmāt tarhi] Σ (tasmā{r}ttarhi Ry); tasmādvirhi C9, N13, N14, T3, tasmārhi T4  
(tasmā{dvi}rhi), T5

<sup>110</sup> mahāmate] Σ; mate T1

<sup>111</sup> -ārya-] Σ; -āryajñāna- [T6, \*N4, \*N8, \*N14] ○ -viśeṣa-] Σ; -viśeṣaṃ N11 ○ -ṇe] Σ; -ṇa- N11, N13,  
T1

<sup>112</sup> -yaḥ] Σ; -kaḥ N14

paragraph (paragraph [12]), has  $\{\{vi\}\}vidham$ . Thus, Ry instructs the deletion of *vi* and the insertion of *dvi* in the second line, and then instructs the creation of the form *dvividham*, meaning “of two kinds.” Again, all this is concerned with the second line, not the first line of Ry.

Interestingly, C9, N13, N14, T3 have *tasmādvirhi*, T4 has *tasmā $\{\{dvi\}\}rhi$* , and T5 has *tasmārhi*, cases where *tasmāt tarhi* is expected. Moreover, all of them are highly unnatural forms. It is true that many kinds of transcribing errors occur in manuscripts (for example, poor Mahāmāti, the interlocutor of this sutra, is sometimes spelled as *mate*, *mahāte*, or *mahāmāter* in various manuscripts, where *mahāmāte* is expected as its vocative case). However, these three forms do not make any sense and it is hard to explain how and why these forms were created. In this case, the most probable scenario for the creation of the three forms is the following: they consulted Ry as an exemplar, they misunderstood that Ry has a cancellation for the entire word *rtta* instead of just *r* above *tta*, and then they inserted *dvi* in the place where *rtta* was supposed to be inserted. As a result, the above forms were created. The following image illustrates the process:

margin	dvi2	
	𑖅	
line 1:	tasmāttarhi	> tasmādvirhi
line 2:	$\{\{vi\}\}vidham$	
	Ry	> C9, N13, N14, T3, T4, T5

Incidentally, T4 cancelled *dvi* probably because it noticed that it made a mistake after arriving at the second line (although, I have to report that other manuscripts such as C9 have the proper form, *dvividham* in the next line). As a result, it created a more unusual form, *tasmārhi*. One might also assume that T5 has another exact unique form, *tasmārhi*, because it copied T4 and followed its instruction of deleting *dvi* in *tasmādvirhi*.

#### Example 2:

There is another example in which Ry seems to serve as an exemplar for several manuscripts. At the place where *āmraphalāni kramaśaḥ* is expected ([10]-[1]), Ry has *ā* in *phalāni*, which is not written as a full stroke unlike other cases. Here, it has something like a reversed number 3 on top of the word *la*, as a sign for *ā*. This *ā* sign is similar to *anusvāra* (*m*).

Incidentally, C9, N11, N14, T3 have *-phalaṃ vikramaś/saḥ*, which is an inconceivable irregular form and can be explained as a confusion of *ā* with *m* (then, the modification of *ni* to *vi*, since *nikrama-* does not make sense), which is based on Ry’s irregular *ā* sign. However, *phalā vikra-* in C8, R10, and T4 could be explained by the confusion of *ni* and *vi*, not necessarily by the influence from Ry.

We can assume from Example 1 that C9, N13, N14, T3, T4, and T5 stem from Ry.

Based on Example 2, this point can be more firmly confirmed with C9, N14, and T3<sup>113</sup>. However, since Example 1 should be strong evidence, I would like to assume that C9, N13, N14, T3, T4, and T5 stem from Ry<sup>114</sup>. Of these, T5 is a highly corrupted manuscript, as can be seen from [10]-[0][1], [11]-[1][2.2], etc.

Incidentally, Takasaki 2014 (1981), who edited Chapter 6, divided the manuscripts he used (p. (2)) into four groups. Of these, T3, T5, C9, N14, N16, and N17 are included in the same group (group D). Although T4 and N13 are included in group C, I am pleased to see that he also included T3, T5, C9, and N14 in the same group<sup>115</sup>. Further, if my assumption is right, one need not consult them, but could instead consult Ry, which Takasaki was not able to consult at the time. With regard to N17, see section 3.3.

I have to add that the above supposition is not contradictory to the date of the manuscripts.

With regard to the dates of the manuscripts, Schmithausen 2020: 43-44 adopts those estimated by Shanshan Jia in her PhD dissertation. According to that source, Ry is dated A.D. 1646. Since C9 is dated A.D. 1781, this is surely younger than Ry. Although the other manuscripts have no date, Takasaki 2014 speculates that T5 is “modern.” Moreover, Takasaki speculates that, except for the three manuscripts (T2=A.D. 1737, C8=A.D. 1796, and C9=A.D. 1782<sup>116</sup>) that are clearly dated, “all the rest seem to belong mostly to the nineteenth century” (2014: 11)<sup>117</sup>. If this is the case, they are surely newer than Ry. Of course, one should be alert to the fact that the new manuscripts can be a copy of an old manuscript, as Takasaki estimated with regard to N16, stating it to be “modern” (probably a copy of an old manuscript). If they are direct or indirect copy of Ry, it follows that we practically have to only consult Ry instead of them<sup>118</sup>.

<sup>113</sup> We do not have to underestimate the skill of scribes. In order to defend my assumption, I assume that the scribes of N13, T4, and T5 had a good sense of recognizing the proper form.

<sup>114</sup> However, I must admit that *nirālambī lambavigatam*] C8, N12, N16, R10, Ry, T5, T6, T7, \*N8, \*N17; *nirālambāmbavigatam* \*N4, \*N14, *nirālambāmbavigata-* (sic.) N11, *nirālambavigatam* C9, N13, N14, T1, T3, T4 in [11]-[5] is strong counterevidence for my assumption. I argue that an eye skip of the *lambī* in *nirālambī lambavigatam* occurred at some stage and was shared by the later manuscripts.

<sup>115</sup> However, it is true that our groupings do not match perfectly. One thing to be noted is that, unfortunately, he did not demonstrate his ground for grouping. Another is that the evaluation can differ depending on the part one analyzes. In manuscripts, there is also the possibility that a manuscript is written by several scribes or a manuscript is dependent on different exemplars. What one is required to do is accumulate the examples step-by-step, based on the examination of the text.

<sup>116</sup> Jia’s estimation of the dates of the manuscripts differs by one year from that of Takasaki.

<sup>117</sup> However, according to Jia, some manuscripts (two of which Takasaki was not able to utilize) date before the nineteenth century (\*N4 and \*N14 date 1698, \*N12 (=N17) dates 1754), although this does not affect my argument here.

<sup>118</sup> The estimation of Ry by Schmithausen (2020) is as follows. I am happy to know that many of my independently-obtained beliefs converged with his. Here, I cite his evaluation with page number and my comments follow (note that his numbering of mss is different from that of Takasaki):

p. 123: Ganz deutlich greifbar ist eine (direkte oder zumindest indirekte) Abhängigkeit von Ry(pc) bei den Hss. T4, T5 und N7.

According to Schmithausen, T4, T5, and N16 (his N7) are [directly or at least indirectly] dependent

### 3.2. *Jś as the material for editing Sanskrit LAS*

There are two commentaries of LAS that are preserved in Tibetan translations, namely, Jñānaśrībhadrā (Jś) and Jñānavajra (Jv). Hadano 1975: 6 and Hadano 1993: II point to the possibility that Jś was written in Tibetan from the outset<sup>119</sup>. After consulting not just a few paragraphs, I also share the same impression that also applies to Jv<sup>120</sup>. However, in one specific case of the passage that I picked up in this article, the Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese manuscripts and translations seem to be corrupted. This Jś seems to be reporting the right reading and serves as a material for editing the Sanskrit text.

In [11]-[4] mentioned above, there are two sentences in accordance to Nj 57.10-13, which are as follows:

*nirmitānirmāṇabuddhaḥ punar mahāmate dānaśīladhyānasamādhicitra(sic.)-  
prajñājñānaskandhadhātuvāyanavimokṣavijñānagatilakṣaṇaprabhedapracāraṃ  
vyavasthāpayati/ tīrthyadrṣṭyā ca rūpyasamatikramanalakṣaṇam deśayati/*

Of these, the underlined part is problematic<sup>121</sup>. Thus, Nj has a footnote<sup>122</sup>: *-drṣṭyāś cārūpyasamāpatti-* Tib. Since the Tibetan translation has *mu stegs can gyi lta bas* (*bas*] S1S2; *ba bas* DP) *gzugs med pa'i ting nge 'dzin gyi rim pa'i mtshan nyid kyang*, the more literal, underlying Sanskrit seems to be *\*tīrthyadrṣṭyāś cārūpyasamādhikramalakṣaṇam*.

---

on the *post correctionem* (pc) of Ry. With regard to N16, since neither Ex. 1 nor 2 in section 3.1 is applied, I did not regard this as a copy from Ry. However, further investigation is needed.

p. 125: In der Gruppe {F} fasse ich die Hss. T3, N10, N13, N15 und Ca2 zusammen ... Einige der gemeinsamen Fehler signalisieren eine zumindest indirekte Abhängigkeit von der Hs. Ry (pc).

I was not able to consult his N13 and N15. However, his evaluation with regard to T3, N10 (=N14), and Ca2 (=C9) is the same as mine.

p. 128: Auch in den übrigen Hss. der Kat. III (T2 N12 N17 Lc N2 N9 N11) lassen sich, wenngleich weniger deutlich, Lesungen aufzeigen, die eine (allerdings noch genauerer Klärung bedürftige) Beziehung zu der Hs. Ry nahelegen.

He also points out the relationship of several manuscripts with Ry. I am pleased to know that at least his N9 (=N13) is included therein. On his N12=N17, see section 3.3.3. Other manuscripts either do not include the relevant part taken up in in this article (T2) or I was not able to consult them.

However, according to his understanding, these too show a relationship with Ry. Thus, Ry actually seems to be serving as a direct or indirect exemplar of many manuscripts of the LAS.

<sup>119</sup> Hadano 1975: 6: In the present commentary on the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* (Toh. 107), for some reason or other, there is no colophon, so consequently the details concerning the writing and translation of it are uncertain. One might hazard a guess that it was compiled from the lectures he gave on the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* in Tibetan. But in Jñānavajra's commentary on the Sūtra, the '*Tathāgatahrdaya-ālaṃkāra*' (*De-bshin-gshegs-pa'i snying-po'i rgyan*, Toh. 4019), Jñānaśrī's explanations are occasionally quoted. Consequently, the problem still remains to be investigated.

<sup>120</sup> The doubt raised by Hadano at the end of the above footnote can be solved by this assumption. My assumption was based on my own experience, independent of the remarks made by Hadano. There is no colophon in this Jñānavajra's commentary and the wording and other elements give an impression that this text also is not a translation of the Skt text.

<sup>121</sup> Vaidya has the same reading (Vaidya 1963: 25.25-26).

<sup>122</sup> Probably a suggestion made by Unrai Wogihara. See Horiuchi 2017: n. 2.

Rather than adhering to the suggestion in Nj's fn, Suzuki's translation seems to be rough and based on Nj. "The Buddha discloses against the philosophical views that which surpasses forms." (Suzuki 1932: 52).

Yasui emends *ca rūpyasamati-* to *cārūpyasamāpatti-* (Yasui 1976: 337) and translates the following text probably based on Tibetan: "また、外教の見解によって、無色定の次第の相を説示する。[And [he] teaches the characteristics of the order of attainment/meditation [in] formless [sphere] (*ārūpyasamāpatti*) by heretical view]" (ibid.: 52). Since some spheres of the meditative stage are associated with the teachers of Śākyamuni, before he attained awakening, it is possible to connect them with the heretical view. However, it is strange to witness that Buddha teaches something, which is based on a heretic viewpoint.

The Chinese translation has 超外道見無色見, which suggests the following in Sanskrit: 超 *samatikramaṇa* 外道見 *tīrthyadrṣṭi* 無色 *ārūpya* 見 *drṣṭi*. Tokiwa emends the Sanskrit text based on this Chinese translations as follows: *tīrthyadrṣṭyārūpya-darśanasamatikramaṇalakṣaṇam* (Tokiwa 2003: 62). Although the Chinese translation has all these or similar elements, his emendation shows a deviation from the current Sanskrit translation. Takasaki says that the original Sanskrit text of Song can be assumed to be *tīrthyadrṣṭyārūpya[drṣṭi]samatikramaṇam [deśayati]*. However, he also notes that "view (*drṣṭi*)" in "*ārūpyadrṣṭi*" does not make sense (T&H 2015: 329-330).

In truth, there are more variants in the manuscripts than the variants that Nj has brought out in his work. The variants are as follows:

*tīrthyādrṣṭhvārūpyasamatikramaṇa*<<*lakṣaṇa*>> N11

*tīrthyadrṣṭyarūpyasamatikramalakṣaṇam* T1

*tīrthyadrṣṭyārūpyasamatikramaṇalakṣaṇam* T6, \*N8, and \*14

*tīrthyādrṣṭarūpasamatikramaṇalakṣaṇam* \*N4.

All of these variants are problematic. An important question that arises is—why do "heretic view (*tīrthyadrṣṭi*)" and "formless sphere (*ārūpya*)" appear here?<sup>123</sup> Moreover, based on the syntax, the subject who teaches (*deśayati*) this is still *nirmitānirmāṇabuddha* (the Buddha of magically formed magic-creation<sup>124</sup>). The question that naturally arises then is—what is the relationship of this sentence with the sentence before?

Thus, by drawing some help from the commentary, I found the following phrase in Jś: *mu stegs can gyi lta ba dang mthun pa las 'das pa 'i mtshan nyid* (Jś, D88b6)<sup>125</sup>. This may suggest (1) *\*tīrthyadrṣṭyānurūpyasamatikramaṇalakṣaṇam*, meaning, "the characteris-

<sup>123</sup> I am aware of the fact that in the other place of LAS, there is the use of the form, *dhyānāpramāṇārūpyadhātusamatikramāya* (in order to go beyond the [four] *dhyāna*, [four] immeasurable, and formless sphere, Nj 121.8). However, this makes sense.

<sup>124</sup> See BHSD.

<sup>125</sup> Takasaki already focused on Jś and made the following statement "in the commentary by Jñānaśrībhaddra, there is a word, 'the characteristics that are beyond the equality with heretic view 外道の見と等しきを超えたる相', which seems to support *atikramaṇa*" (T&H 2015: 330). My assumption, however, is slightly different from his.

tics that go beyond (*samatikramaṇa*) the conformity (*ānurūpya*) with heretic view (*tīrthyadrṣṭi*).” Thus, this can be a paraphrase of the previous sentence, arguing that giving (*dāna*) and so on, which *nirmitanirmāṇabuddha* establishes are uncommon with the heretic view. Or, if one makes use of *kyang*, \**ca* (and) in the Tibetan translation of LAS too, we can add *ca* and assume the following form: (2) \**tīrthyadrṣṭyā cānurūpyasamatikramaṇalakṣaṇam*. In truth, Jś in detail has *mu stegs can gyi lta ba dang mthun pa las 'das pa'i mtshan nyid ni rtag pa dang/ bdag dang/ phyi'i don las 'das pa ste/ chos dang gang zag la bdag med par ston to*/<sup>126</sup>. Namely, it explains the content of these “characteristics” as “beyond permanence, self (*ātman*), and outside object, namely, he (Buddha) teaches the selflessness of elements and the self.” If this is so, it has added new information to the previous sentence. Thus, we can translate the two sentences in two ways.

Oh Mahāmati, furthermore, the Buddha of magically-formed magic creation establishes the appearance of difference of characteristics of the state (\**gatilakṣaṇa*<sup>127</sup>) of giving, good conduct, meditation, concentration, mind, wisdom, gnosis, aggregates, elements, gates, liberation, and consciousness. [(1) Namely he/ (2) And he] teaches the characteristics that go beyond the conformity with the heretic view.

If this is so, the confusion in manuscripts can be explained in the following way: at an earlier stage, even before the Song translation (443CE), *nu* in *-ānurūpya-* was dropped and thus, the original meaning was lost. If this assumption is right, the example also shows that Jś serves the purpose of editing the Sanskrit of LAS.

### 3.3. Other characteristics of manuscripts

#### 3.3.1. T6, \*N4, \*N8, and \*N14

As I have marked with the use of square, T6, \*N4, \*N8, and \*N14 show substantial<sup>128</sup> similarity, which is uncommon to other manuscripts. However, T6 seems to be a more corrupted manuscript. T6 is a “wise” manuscript that has its own viewpoint and seems to be changing its exemplar based on its own understanding or misunderstanding of LAS.

<sup>126</sup> Jś is almost a word-by-word translation of LAS. When he cites LAS, Hadano et al 1993 kindly distinguishes LAS from the text of Jś through underlines. In this case, they only underline *mu stegs can gyi lta ba* (\**tīrthyadrṣṭi*), which is a natural assessment based on the current text of LAS, Nj. However, I assume that *mu stegs can gyi lta ba dang mthun pa las 'das pa'i mtshan nyid* is a citation from LAS.

<sup>127</sup> This word is hard to translate.

<sup>128</sup> What I refer here as substantial is for the example difference of word order or word itself. This does not include the sameness of *sandhi* and existence or non-existence of *anusvāra* that do not necessarily show the identity of the group (an adept scribe can make such minor change against the exemplar).



For example, with regard to the purification of “continuance of what is seen by one’s own mind (*svacittadṛśyadhārā*)”<sup>129</sup>, while [10] [1]-[4] state that it occurs gradually (*kramaśaḥ*), however, [5]-[8] state that it occurs suddenly (*yugapat*). The final position of LAS seems to be the latter. Interestingly, in three places among the eight cases where negation to sudden (*yugapat*) was required (thus, *na yugapat*), T6 was lacking the negation *na* (in [1] (two times) and [4]). While it is true that the five rest cases have negations, it is only T6 that lacks three negations. One possibility is that T6 is a wise manuscript and emends text based on its own understanding of LAS<sup>130</sup>. After all, the scribe is not a copy machine, but a human being<sup>131</sup>.

### 3.3.2. N12 and T7

These share substantially different readings in comparison to the other manuscripts and seem to belong to the same group (see [10]-[4], [10]-[5], [11]-[1], [11]-[2.1]). There is also a shared lacuna of one and a half sentence because of an eye skip instigated by the existence of the word *mahāmati* (see [11]-[3]). These two manuscripts must be the later ones, for the missing part exists in other manuscripts. Namely, they cannot be the exemplars of other manuscripts. This may not undermine the value of these manuscripts, for it does not exclude the possibility that their exemplars are old manuscripts<sup>132</sup>.

### 3.3.3. N15 and N17

These are highly corrupted manuscripts. Since these manuscripts report the same reading and share common unusual errors, these must have stemmed from the same exemplars. For example:

[10]-[0] *yugaśakamavṛtyā* for *yugapat kramavṛtyā*

[11]-[1] *-panibaddhārikaplita-* for *-panibaddhān\* parikalpita-*

[11]-[2.2] *evaṃm eva mahāmate paṃparatattasvabhāve* in N15 and *evaṃ eva mahāmate paṃparatartusvabhāve* in N17 for *evaṃ eva mahāmate paratantrasvabhāve*.

These suggest strong relationship between the two manuscripts. In such cases, one of the possibilities is that one of them copied the other. Incidentally, N15 has a big lacuna. While N17, on the one hand, has *paṃparatartuasvabhāve parikalpitasvabhāve vividhavikalpacittavicitralakṣaṇam khyāyate* ... (I will skip about two lines in the manuscript) ... *-samatikramaṇalākṣaṇan deśayati* ([11]-[2.2]), N15, on the other hand, only has *paṃparatattasvabhāve vividhavikalpacitralakṣaṇalaśan deśayaṃti*.

<sup>129</sup> A kind of a synonym of *saṃtāna* (personal continuity), which is special to this LAS.

<sup>130</sup> This is just one example. However, I felt something similar when I dealt with this manuscript with regard to the other parts of LAS too. For example, see Horiuchi 2017: 69-70.

<sup>131</sup> Schmithausen (2020) includes these four manuscripts in one group.

p. 107: In der Gruppe {B} fasse ich die Hss. N4, N8, N14 und T6 zusammen ...

<sup>132</sup> Schmithausen 2020: 113: Die Gruppe {C} besteht nur aus den Hss. N1 und N6.

With regard to N12 (=N6), Schmithausen includes this in one group along with N1, which I was not able to consult at this time. T7, on the other hand, is missing from his Chapter 8. We can thus include \*N1, \*N6 (=N12), and T7 in one group.

In this case, since it is N15 that has a big lacuna, it is appropriate to assume N15 to have copied N17 and skipped several sentences. However, the lacunae in N15 do not seem to be caused from the miscopy of N17. The lacunae in N15 are apparently an eye skip that is instigated by the word *lakṣaṇa*, which I underlined. It is common that this kind of eye skip happens when the same words are located immediately in one or the several lines below. However, these two words are not located the same way in N17. Thus, I argue that N15 and N17 stem from the same exemplar and do not have direct relationship. In any case, as these manuscripts are highly corrupted and less valuable, I did not utilize them in the edition used in this article<sup>133</sup>.

### 3.4. Evaluation of manuscripts

Having made the above evaluations of the manuscripts, I read my previous article<sup>134</sup> again, which I consciously refrained from consulting while carrying out this research, in order to not be influenced by my previous judgements. Therein, I picked up paragraph [2] of LAS (Nj 39.9-40.10) and pointed out “interesting relationship between T5 and Ry” (section 2.1), “reliability of Ry, T1, and T6” (section 1.1.1), “The readings of C9, N14, T3 and N13 which are recorded after the first ● in note 13 show that for the scribes of these manuscripts, one *akṣara* (*ṣṭya* or *ṣṭyā*) was unreadable, and then omitted” (section 3.1), and “The reading of N12 and T7 in note 5 shows that it is an addition based on the association from *tathāgatānām*, etc.” (section 3.1). If I add one comment to the last case in order to make my point clearer, I contend that N12 and T7 are the new ones therein. I am happy to know that the same conclusions and further insights were substantially obtained based on the examination of different parts of LAS in this article. With regard to T6, however, I may have been a bit fascinated by its wisdom. As far as the part that I dealt with is concerned, this manuscript had many corruptions.

## 4. Concluding remarks

In this essay, I provided a critique of two paragraphs of the LAS. I utilized 20 manuscripts, including Tibetan and Chinese translations. Although the study remains a tentative attempt, I believe that this article was able to bring out some characteristics and groupings of the manuscripts, which could be assumed from the two paragraphs. The article provides impetus for future studies in this direction.

### Appendix: Corrigenda to Nj.

1. It is only when the adopted reading is not based on a manuscript, but based on my emendation, that I used the word “(em.).”

<sup>133</sup> Schmithausen (2020) includes T2, \*N12 (=N17), \*N17, Lc, \*N2, \*N9, and \*N11 in one group (ibid., 128). In Chapter 8, too, N17 (\*N12) is reported to have a big lacuna (ibid., 130)

<sup>134</sup> Horiuchi 2017. Schmithausen (2020) includes T2, \*N12 (=N17), \*N17, Lc, \*N2, \*N9, and \*N11 in one group (ibid., 128). In Chapter 8, too, N17 (\*N12) is reported to have a big lacuna (ibid., 130).

2. When a corrigendum in the article is already suggested by a previous study, I mentioned it in ().

p. 56:

9-10: -ālayayogaṃ yoginām>-ālaye/-aṃ yogayoginām (em.)

15-16: -patitāt sarvadharmāt ... panibaddhāt>-patitān sarvadharmān ... panibaddhān (Takasaki)

p. 57:

1: -gulmalatā->-kaṭhalyā-

1: māyāvidyā->māyāvī māyāvidyā- (Isaacson)/māyāvī vidyā-

1-2: sarvasattvarūpādhāraṇam>sarvasattvarūpāṅgasamuditaṃ vicitrarūpadhāraṇam

2: abhiniṣpannaikasattva->abhiniṣpannaikarūpasattva-

2-3: vividhakalpa->vividhavikalpa-

3: tathā>tathā ca

4-5: parikalpitasvabhāve>parikalpitasvabhāvo (Tokiwa)

5: -lakṣaṇam>-lakṣaṇaḥ

6: -vāsanāt>-vāsanām/(khyāyate) ...-vāsanāt/

11: -citra->-citta- (Tokiwa)

12-13: tīrthyadṛṣṭyā ca rūpyasamatikramaṇalakṣaṇam > tīrthyadṛṣṭyānurūpyasamatikramaṇalakṣaṇam/tīrthyadṛṣṭyā cānurūpyasamatikramaṇalakṣaṇam

14: nirālamba ālambavigatam>nirālambi lambavigatam

20: -ātmaka->-ātma-

### Abbreviations

Bendall Catalogue: Bendall, Cecil. *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge: With Introductory Notices and Illustrations of the Palaeography and Chronology of Nepal and Bengal*. Cambridge: University Press, 1883. Reprint (Publications of the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project 2; Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband 33), Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1992.

BHSD: Edgerton, F. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. New Haven: 1953; repr. Delhi: 1970.

C: Sanskrit Manuscripts kept in the University Library, Cambridge.

C8: Bendall Catalogue, Add. No. 915. “C” in Nj.

C9: ibid. Add. No. 1607.

CMP: *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa*. See Wedemeyer 2007.

D: Derge edition of Tibetan tripitaka.

Hodgson Catalogue: Cowell, E. B. and J. Eggeling. “Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Possession of the Royal Asiatic Society (Hodgson Collection).” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, New Series, 8.1 (1876): 1-52.

- Jś: Jñānaśrībhadrā. \**Ārya-Laṅkāvatāravṛtti*. D No. 4018, P No. 5519. See Hadano et al. 1993.
- Jv: Jñānavajra. \**Āryalaṅkāvatāra-nāma-mahāyānasūtravṛtti tathāgatahṛdayālaṅkāra-nāma*. D No. 4019, P No. 5520.
- LAS: *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*.
- Matsunami Catalogue: Seiren Matsunami. *A Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tokyo University Library*. Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation, 1965.
- N: Sanskrit Manuscripts photographed under the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, Kathmandu.
- N11: Reel No. E 406/2.
- N12: Reel No. E 3/3 (8E1) E 4/1 (8E 2).
- N13: Reel No. D 73/8.
- N14: Reel No. D 52/5.
- N16: Reel No. D 58/4.
- \*N4: Reel No. A 1(0)12/10.
- \*N5: Reel No. A 1(0)12/9.
- \*N8: Reel No. D 58/6.
- \*N14: Reel No. E 1200/8.
- \*N17: Reel No. A 917/6.
- Nj: Nanjio, Bunyiu 南条文雄 ed., 1923. *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*. Bibliotheca Otaniensis 1. Kyoto.
- P: Peking edition of Tibetan tripiṭaka.
- R10: Sanskrit Manuscript in possession of the Royal Asiatic Society, London, Hodgson Catalogue No. 5. "A" in Nj.
- Ry: Inokuchi, Taijun 井ノ口泰淳 ed. 1990. *Bonbun Butten Shahon Jyuei* 梵文佛典写本聚英 [*Sanskrit Manuscripts of the Buddhist Sutras from Nepal*]. Ryūkokudaigaku Bukkyōbunka Kenkyūjo 龍谷大学仏教文化研究所 [Research Institute for Buddhist Culture, Ryukoku University]. Kyoto: Hozokan 法蔵館; Cf. Wakahara 2003: 36 (No. 611).
- Shinron: Kokan Shiren 虎関師錬. *Butsugoshinron* 仏語心論. 1914-1920. Nihon Daizōkyō 日本大蔵経. Hōdōbu Shōso 3 方等部章疏三. Tokyo: Nihon daizōkyō-hensankai 日本大蔵経編纂会.
- S: sTog palace edition of Tibetan tripiṭaka. See Skorupski 1985.
- Song: *Ryōga Abatsutara Hōkyō* 楞伽阿跋多羅宝経. Taisho No. 670 (Vol. 16.480a-514b): Song (宋) translation by Guṇabhadra in 443, in 4 fasciculi.
- T: Sanskrit Mss. kept in the University of Tokyo General Library.
- T1: Matsunami Catalogue: 120, No. 333. "T" in Nj.
- T3: *ibid.*, 118, No. 328.
- T4: *ibid.*, 118-119, No. 329.
- T5: *ibid.*, 119, No. 330.
- T6: *ibid.*, 119, No. 332.

T7: *ibid.*, 118, No. 327.

Taisho: Taisho tripiṭaka.

T&H 2015: Takasaki Jikido 高崎直道 and Horiuchi Toshio 堀内俊郎 tr. *Ryōgakyō* (*Ryōga Abatsutara Hōkyō*) 楞伽經 楞伽阿跋多羅寶經. Tokyo: Daizo Shuppan 大蔵出版.

Tib: *'Phags pa Lang kar gshegs pa chen po'i mdo*. D No. 107, P No. 775, S1 No. 96, S2 No. 245.

Wakahara, Yusho. 2003. “Remarks on Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Otani Collection —Preliminaries to New Descriptive Catalogue—.” 龍谷大学佛教文化研究所紀要 *Bulletin of Institute of Buddhist Cultural Studies, Ryukoku University* 42: 29-37.

### Bibliography

Deleanu, Florin. 2018. “The *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*: A Bibliographical Survey”. *Bulletin of the International Institute for Buddhist Studies*. Volume 1, 15-43.

Hadano et al. 1993. *Jñānaśrībhadrā Arya-laṅkāvatāravṛtti Tohoku University Catalogue No. 4018 by Hakuyu Hadano, Professor Emeritus of Tohoku University with Hirofumi Isoda, Keinosuke Mitsuhara, Koichi Furusaka*, The Institute of Tibetan Buddhist Textual Studies. Kyoto: Hozokan.

Horiuchi, Toshio 堀内俊郎. 2017. “The Seven *Bhāvasvabhāvas* and Seven *Paramārthas* in the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*: Methodological Remarks on the New Edition of Chapter II of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*”. *Journal of International Philosophy*, 6, 65-84.

Schmithausen, Lambert. 2020. *Fleischverzehr und Vegetarismus im indischen Buddhismus: bis ca. zur Mitte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr.* Teil 3 Editionen. Bochum/Freiburg: Numata Center for Buddhist Studies.

Skorupski, Tadeusz. 1985. *A Catalogue of the sTog Palace Kanjur*, Bibliographia Philologica. Buddhica. Series Maior IV. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

Suzuki, Daisetsu. 1932. *The Laṅkāvatārasūtra: A Mahāyāna Text*. Delhi, rep. in 1999.

Takasaki, Jikido 高崎直道. 1981. *A Revised Edition of the Laṅkāvatārasūtra Kṣanika-Parivarta*. Tokyo. (rerecorded in English in Takasaki 2014: 9-98).

\_\_\_\_\_. 2014. *Collected Papers on the Tathāgatagarbha Doctrine*. Delhi: Motilal Banarasiidass.

Tokiwa Gishin. 常盤義伸. 2003. *Laṅkāvatāra-Ratna-Sūtram: Sarva-Buddha-Pravacana-Hṛdayam -A Sanskrit Restoration-*. Osaka (private issue).

\_\_\_\_\_. 2018. *Daijōbukkkyōkyōten ryōgakyō shikanbon rankaa ni hairu - Subete no budda no osie no kakushin - Fukugenbonbungenten nihongoyaku to kenkyū* 大乘仏教経典『楞伽經』四巻本 ランカーに入る-すべてのブッダの教えの核心-復元梵文原典 日本語訳と研究. Kyoto: Zenbunkakenkyūjo 禅文化研究所.

Vaidya, P.L. ed. 1963. *Saddharmalaṅkāvatārasūtram*. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, no. 3. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute.

Wedemeyer, Cristian K. 2007. *Āryadeva's Lamp that Integrates the Practice*:

Toshio Horiuchi

*Caryāmelāpakapradīpa; The Gradual Path of Vajrayāna Buddhism According to the Esoteric Community Noble Tradition.* New York.

Yasui, Kōsai 安井広済. 1976. *Bonbun Wayaku: Nyūryōgakyō* 梵文和訳 入楞伽經 [*A Japanese Translation of the Sanskrit Laṅkāvatārasūtra*], Kyoto: Hozokan 法蔵館.

This study is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers 16K16697 and 17KK0031.