

Some Remarks on the Textual History of the *Śrāvakabhūmi**

Florin Deleanu

The *Śrāvakabhūmi* (=ŚrBh) (Tibetan, *Nyan thos kyi sa*; Chinese, 聲聞地) or *The Disciples' Level* constitutes Book XIII of the vast encyclopaedic compilation *Yogācārabhūmi* (=YoBh) (*Rnyal 'byor spyod pa'i sa*; 瑜伽師地論), the *Summa Ascetica* of the Yogācāra school, attributed to Asaṅga by the Tibetan tradition and to Maitreya according to Chinese sources. The work is dedicated to the exposition of the spiritual cultivation practised by a *śrāvaka* or disciple following the conservative (non-Mahāyāna) path. The nature of its discourse is multiple. All of the following terms reflect one or another of its multiple facets: exposition of the contemplative path, philosophical treatise on related topics, meditation manual, and Abhidharmic taxonomy of doctrines and human types relevant to spiritual practice. In spite of its incorpo-

* I am most grateful to Professor Lambert Schmithausen for his kind and extremely helpful suggestions and critical remarks made on the preliminary drafts of this paper. I should also like to offer my warmest thanks for the precious observations and assistance given by Dr Michael Zimmermann, Dr Mudagamuwe Maithrimurthi, Mr Martin Delhey, and all the other members of Professor Schmithausen's colloquium of PhD candidates at Hamburg University, Asia-Africa Institute, Department of Indian and Tibetan Culture and History, where a first version of the article was read. I also wish to express my sincerest gratitude for the comments made by my colleagues at the International College of Advanced Buddhist Studies where a second draft of the paper was presented. Last but not least, I am very grateful for the kind advice and help offered by Dr Lore Sander, Dr Harunaga Isaacson, and Mr Yasuhiro Sueki.

ration in a classic of the Yogācāra school, the ŚrBh is written from or, at least, reflects a Śrāvakayānika doctrinal standpoint.

In what follows I intend to advance a few hypothetical remarks (apparently the *svabhāva* of the Buddhist historico-philological studies) on the textual formation of the ŚrBh. In order to do that, we must first take a look at the content of this work, and the synoptic presentation below has been drafted mainly to serve this purpose¹. This bird's-eye is

¹ Different ways of summarising the content of the text having been attempted so far. The most comprehensive and reliable synopsis of the whole text remains the one found in the KIK, basically the outcome of Katō Seishin's laudable efforts, who also draws upon the Sino-Japanese commentarial tradition, especially Ji's 基 *Yuqieshi di lun lüe zuan* 瑜伽師地論略纂 and Daolun's 道倫 *Yuqie lun ji* 瑜伽論記. (The author of the latter work is usually known as Dunlun 遁倫, but according to Yūki 1985, 264-267, Daolun is the correct name.) Wayman (1956, 318-324) includes a brief presentation of the ŚrBh, but it unfortunately insists too much on some sections and omits altogether some important parts of the text. His later and more detailed work (W 58-134) contains a so-called 'analysis' of the ŚrBh, which is actually a selection of important passages in Sanskrit text and English translation. Despite its imperfections, Wayman's undertaking should be acknowledged as the first major effort to present, partially edit and translate the ŚrBh in a Western language. His 'analysis' is useful, though it fails to insist on some important parts and is rather too long for a brief survey of the text. The latter deficiency is remedied in Potter ed. 1999 (407-414), which basically relies upon W, but the summary here often omits important parts and departs from the terminology peculiar to the ŚrBh. In the presentation of the *Caturthaṃ yogasthānam* (pp. 413-414), for example, no mention is made of the seven contemplations and their function on the soteriological path. Shukla ed. 1991 contains 'A Short Survey of the Contents' (CL VIII – CL IX) (indeed, a very short one!) and 'An Analytic Summary of the SBH [=ŚrBh]' (CL X – CC XI). Though useful, the latter does not always offer a satisfactory division and presentation of the text. For instance, the Section on the Supramundane Path (3.29. below) is not structured according to the seven contemplations and contains a rather chaotic list of the topics discussed, which makes it fairly difficult for the

admittedly not free from, so to speak, 'unwholesome factors' (*aku-śaladharmā!*). First, it indulges in simplification, which means that I have deliberately omitted some minor parts altogether. For our present purpose, a detailed presentation would, however, have become too long and tiresome (unduly increasing the reader's *styānamiddha*). Second, some sections have been briefly summarised; others have received more attention. The synopsis of Chapter IV in particular is more detailed since it constitutes the object of my ongoing project of editing and translating this part of the ŚrBh. Other passages, though short or relatively minor (like, for instance, Section 2.4.), have been discussed more amply because they seem to point at relevant aspects in the redactional 'geology' of the text. With these caveats in mind, let us now embark on a brief presentation of the text.

reader to follow how the yogi advances along this path. Besides, Shukla's presentation is largely rendered in a Buddhist Hybrid English style abundantly using Sanskrit terms left untranslated. The best synopsis so far, fulfilling rigorous philological and comparative standards, has been achieved by the Śrāvakahūmi Study Group (ŚrBh Group XXI – XXXV; ŚrBh Group (13) 77-79; ŚrBh Group (14) 24-26; ŚrBh Group (15) 5-6). It is obviously restricted, however, only to the parts published so far by the Group. Two very useful collation tables of the MS, Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana's negatives, Shukla's edition, Peking edition of the Tibetan translation, and Taishō edition of the Chinese translation are found in the introduction to the *Facsimile Edition of the "Śrāvakahūmi" Sanskrit Palm-leaf Manuscript*. A brief collation table and presentation of the MS is also found in Matsunami 1992.

Synoptic presentation of the ŚrBh

The ŚrBh is divided into three parts (*bhūmi*)² and four chapters (*yogasthāna*). The first two parts, which are relatively short, are included in the Chapter I. Part Three begins with the second half of

² The word *bhūmi* in the YoBh is used both with the meaning of 'level' and editorial unit corresponding to 'book' or 'part'. 'Level' here does not mean a stage in an uninterrupted spiritual progression. The fact that the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* follows the *Śrāvakabhūmi* and *Pratyekabuddhabhūmi* does in no way entail the presupposition that the yogi must first reach these two stages and then proceed with a bodhisattva career. *Bhūmi* rather refers to different levels of spiritual orientation and development, and it is within these levels that the progression takes place. The second nuance is, however, also present, and it is not impossible to construe the titles of the seventeen *bhūmis* of the YoBh as 'books' (in this sense, resembling the different 'books' in the *Bible*). A rendering doing justice to both senses would probably be the 'book/part on the level of...'

Actually, the same usage of *bhūmi* is seen in the ŚrBh itself, which is structured into three *bhūmis*, i.e., *Gotrabhūmi*, *Avatārabhūmi* and *Naiṣkramyabhūmi*. Though *bhūmi* is here best understood as primarily denoting a textual unit, the nuance of 'level' is not utterly absent. The *Gotrabhūmi* deals with the basic classification of persons who embark upon the spiritual path, therefore starting at the zero-level or propaedeutic stage when each practitioner has to know where he or she stands. Quite obviously, the *Avatārabhūmi* represents the entry upon the path, and the *Naiṣkramyabhūmi* details the actual progression. When I refer to the word as a textual unit, I prefer to render *bhūmis* in the title of the seventeen portions of the *Maulī Bhūmi* as 'books' and within the ŚrBh itself, i.e., the three *bhūmis* above, as 'parts'.

It must also be said that the *bhūmis* seem play the role of the main structuring units in the ŚrBh. The parallel units called *yogasthānas*, on the other hand, seem secondary and their thematic unity is not always apparent.

Chapter I and covers the rest of the book³.

CHAPTER I (*prathamam yogāsthānam*)

[Treating preliminary stages and requisites of the path]⁴

PART [ONE] ON LINEAGE

(*Gotrabhūmi; Rigs kyi sa; 種姓地*)

1.1. Definition of the lineage (*gotra; rigs; 種姓*) (ŚrBh Group 2,17)

‘What is a lineage? Answer: it is the factor which represents the seed of a person stationed in a lineage.’ (*de la rigs gang zhe na | smras pa | rigs la gnas pa'i gang zag gi sa bon gyi chos gang yin pa ste | ŚrBh Group 2,17-18*).

1.2. Establishment of the lineage (*gotravyavasthāna; rigs kyi rnam*)

³ As far as this synopsis is concerned, though I also use the MS and other partially edited fragments of the Sanskrit text as well as the Tibetan and Chinese translations, I give only the page and line numbers of the Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group’s edition in progress and Shukla’s complete edition. These show the place where the respective textual unit begins. The Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group edition also contains the Tibetan text of the initial missing portion and subsequent lacunae in the MS and Shukla’s edition (which closely follows the MS only). Shukla’s edition actually contains a further omission amounting to about one folio. This lacuna originally occurs in the MS, but a scribe (or ‘proofreader’?) appears to have noted the omission and the passage was written at two other places in the MS. The missing passage was identified and edited by Kimura (1992) (cf. also Matsunami 1992, 32). Part II of Shukla’s edition (1993, 2-10) contains Sanskrit reconstructions from the Tibetan translation of two missing passages. As such attempts, even when resulting in pieces of high class Sanskrit style, remain hypothetical, I give only the page and line numbers of the Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group’s edition of the Tibetan version. The Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group’s edition has so far covered the text up to the first part of the mindfulness of breathing (*ānāpānasmṛti*), i.e., section 3.7.2. below (see ŚrBh Group (15)).

⁴ Obviously, the square brackets represent my own additions or clarifications.

- par gzhag pa*; 種姓安立)⁵ (ŚrBh Group 4,4) The main topics include:
- 1.2.1. the dichotomy between the subtle (**sūkṣma*; *phra ba*; 細), i.e., not manifested lineage/seed, and the coarse (**audārika*; *rags pa*; 麤), i.e., manifested lineage/seed (ŚrBh Group 4,4)
 - 1.2.2. the single or multiple nature of the continua (*rgyud gcig gam rgyud du ma* 一多相續) of the lineage (ŚrBh Group 4,11)
 - 1.2.3. the four causes for not attaining [i.e., obstructing the attainment of] *parinirvāṇa* (*rgyu bzhi yongs su mya ngan las ma 'das pa* 四因緣故不般涅槃) (ŚrBh Group 4,22)
 - 1.2.4. the conditions [necessary for the attainment] of *parinirvāṇa* (*yongs su mya ngan las 'da' ba'i rkyen rnam* 涅槃法緣) (ŚrBh Group 8,13)
 - 1.2.4.1. main conditions (**pradhānapratyaya*; *rkyen gtso bo*; 勝緣), which include the preaching of the true teaching and one's own correct reflection based upon this (ŚrBh Group 8,17).
 - 1.2.4.2. minor conditions (**nihīnapratyaya*; *rkyen dman pa*; 劣緣), including twelve conditions, eight of which have their equivalent in the list of thirteen requisites detailed in section 3.4. (ŚrBh Group 8,20).
- 1.3. Characteristics (*liṅga*; *rtags*; 相) of the persons lacking the quality necessary for the attainment of *parinirvāṇa* (*aparinirvāṇadharmaka*; *yongs su mya ngan las 'da' ba'i chos can ma yin pa*; 不般涅槃法者) and those stationed in the lineage (*gotrasthāḥ pudgalāḥ*;

⁵ *Vyavasthāna* also conveys the meaning of 'differentiation' or 'distinction' (*vi-* clearly adds this nuance). The Tibetan *rnam par gzhag pa*, also used as a rendering for *vyavasthāna* in, for instance, the *Kaśyapaparivarta* (Chandra 1971, s.v.), stresses the sense of 'to establish' (though, *rnam par* obviously stands for *vi-*). *Gzhag pa* is the future form of 'jog pa, which is glossed by Zhang Yisu 1993 as 'to put in a place or lay in order' (*gnas su 'jog pa'm sgrig pa'i don du go ba'i 'jog pa'i ma'ongs pa*; s.v.). The Chinese 安立 and (later in 3.6.) 建立 mean 'to establish'.

rigs la gnas pa'i gang zag; 住種姓補特伽羅), i.e., persons having the quality necessary for the attainment of *parinirvāṇa* (**parinirvāṇadharmaka*; *yongs su mya ngan las 'da' ba'i chos can*; 般涅槃法者) (ŚrBh Group 24,2; Sh 16,7)

- 1.4. Classification of persons stationed in the lineage (*gotrasthāḥ pudgalāḥ*; *rigs la gnas pa'i gang zag*; 住種姓補特伽羅) (ŚrBh Group 28,19; Sh 19,7): twenty-three types of persons.

PART [TWO] ON ENTRY [INTO THE PATH]

(*Avatārabhūmi*; 'jug pa'i sa; 趣入地)

- 2.1. Essence of the entry [into the path] (*avatārasvabhāva*; 'jug pa rang bzhin; 趣入自性) (ŚrBh Group 40,6) *Avatāra* is defined as entry, proceeding, going into the path, course, and accomplishment (*lam gang yin pa dang lam srang gang yin pa dang sgrub pa gang yin pa der zhugs pa dang yang dag par zhugs pa dang rab tu zhugs pa yin pas na | de'i phyir zhugs pa zhes bya ste | ŚrBh Group 42,2-4*) leading to *parinirvāṇa*.
- 2.2. Establishment of the entry [into the path] (*avatāravavasthāna*; 'jug pa mam par gzhags pa; 趣入安立) (ŚrBh Group 42,6) Here *avatāra* is explained in more concrete terms as the preliminary stage of spiritual cultivation in which the practitioner 'for the first time acquires [faith], observes morality, grasps the teachings, develops generosity, and purifies [his] views' ([*dad pa*] dang por thob par gyur cing tshul khrims yang dag par len pa dang thos pa 'dzin pa dang gtong ba spel ba dang lta ba sbyong bar byed pa gang yin pa ste | de ni zhugs pa zhes bya'o | | (ŚrBh Group 42,18-20). Persons are classified according to how ripe (**paripāka*; *yongs su smin par byed pa*; 成熟) their practices are as well as on the basis of six general degrees of spiritual levels, from one having

potentiality (*bhavya*) to one who has attained the culmination [of the path] (*niṣṭhāgata*).

- 2.3. Characteristics of the person who has entered [the path] (*avatīrṇasya pudgalasya liṅgāni; zhugs pa'i gang zag gi rtags rnams; 已趣入者所有諸相*) (ŚrBh Group 52,14; Sh 28,14)
- 2.4. Persons having entered [the path] (*avatīrṇāḥ pudgalāḥ; zhugs pa'i gang zag; 已得趣入補特伽羅*) (ŚrBh Group 58,5; Sh 32,3) A brief passage listing four types of persons classified according to their degree of ripeness. The section concludes: 'And their division should be understood as above. The other persons with weak faculties, etc. have been explained in the Part on Lineage. Their division should be known here, too, in its due order.' (*eṣāṃ ca pūrvavad vibhāgo veditavyaḥ || tadanye mṛdvindriyādayaḥ pudgalāḥ gotrabhūmau nirdiṣṭāḥ | teṣāṃ ihāpi yathāyogaṃ vibhāgo veditavyaḥ ||*) (Sh 32,5-8, which I follow here; ŚrBh Group 58, 8-10).

PART [THREE] ON DELIVERANCE

(*Naiṣkramyabhūmi; Nges par 'byung ba'i sa; 出離地*)

- 3.1. Brief definition of the Part/level of Deliverance (ŚrBh Group 60,1; Sh 35,1). 'What is the level of deliverance? Answer: It is the way to detachment by the mundane path, the way to detachment by the supramundane path, and the requisites [necessary] for these two' (*niṣkramiyabhūmiḥ katamā | āha | yac ca laukikena mārgeṇa vairāgyagamanam, yac ca lokottareṇa mārgeṇa vairāgyagamanam, yaś ca tayoh sambhāraḥ* ŚrBh Group 60,2-4).
- 3.2. Brief definition of the mundane path (*laukiko margaḥ; 'jig rten pa'i lam; 世間道*) (ŚrBh Group 60,5; Sh 35,5), which consists in the practice of the eight attainments (*samāpatti*).
- 3.3. Brief definition the supramundane path (*lokottaro margaḥ; 'jig*

rten las 'das pa'i lam; 出世道) (ŚrBh Group 60,16; Sh 36,2), which means contemplating the four noble truths and knowing them as they are in reality (*yathābhūtaṃ prajānāti*).

3.4. Requisites (*sambhāra*; *tshogs*; 資糧) (ŚrBh Group 62,2; Sh 36,11)

A lengthy section which occupies about two thirds of chapter I. It deals with the thirteen requisites necessary for the two paths:

- 3.4.1. propitious conditions regarding oneself (*ātmasaṃpad*; *bdag gi 'byor ba*; 自圓滿) (ŚrBh Group 62,8; Sh 37,4)
- 3.4.2. propitious conditions regarding others (*parasamṃpad*; *gzhan gyi 'byor ba*; 他圓滿) (ŚrBh Group 62,8; Sh 37,4)
- 3.4.3. wholesome aspiration for the teaching (*kuśalo dharmacchandaḥ*; *dge ba'i chos la 'dun pa*; 善法欲) (ŚrBh Group 62,8; Sh 37,4)
- 3.4.4. restraint in morality (*śīlasaṃvara*; *tshul khrims kyi sdom pa*; 戒律儀) (ŚrBh Group 62, 11; Sh 37,7)
- 3.4.5. restraint of senses (*indriyasaṃvara*; *dbang po sdom pa*; 根律儀) (ŚrBh Group 100,2; Sh 63,14)
- 3.4.6. moderation in food (*bhojane mātrajñatā*; *zas kyi tshod rig pa nyid*; 於食知量) (ŚrBh Group 116,2; Sh 73,19)
- 3.4.7. staying awake and meditating in the first and last watches of the night (*pūrvārātrāpararātraṃ jāgarikāyogasyānuyuktatā*; *nam gyi cha stod dang nam gyi cha smad la mi nyal bar sbyor ba'i rjes su brtson pa nyid*; 初夜後夜常勤修習覺寤瑜伽) (ŚrBh Group 150,2; Sh 97,16)
- 3.4.8. mindful conduct (*saṃprajānadvihāritā*; *shes bzhin du spyod pa nyid*; 正知而住) (ŚrBh Group 172,2; Sh 111,11)
- 3.4.9. qualities of the spiritual friend (*kalyāṇamītratā*; *dge ba'i bshes gnyen*; 善友性) (ŚrBh Group 212,2)
- 3.4.10. listening to and reflecting upon the true teaching (*saddharmaśravaṇacintanā*; *dam pa'i chos nyan pa dang sems pa*; 聞思正法) (ŚrBh Group 226,4; Sh 134,6)

- 3.4.11. lack of obstructions (*anantāraya; bar chad med pa; 無障*)
(ŚrBh Group 244,2; Sh 144,1)
- 3.4.12. generosity (*tyāga; gtang ba; 捨*) (ŚrBh Group 256,4; Sh 149, 8)
- 3.4.13. [spiritual] adornments of the ascetic (*śramaṇālaṃkāra; dge sbyong gi rgyan; 沙門莊嚴*) (ŚrBh Group 268,2; Sh 155,1)

CHAPTER II (*dvityaṃ yogāsthānam*)

[Discussing relevant technical terms]

- 3.5. Classification of persons (*pudgala; gang zag; 補特伽羅*) (ŚrBh Group (13) 82,3; Sh 169,14): twenty-eight types of persons
- 3.6. Establishment of [different types] of persons (*pudgalavyavasthāna; gang zag rnam gyi rnam par gzhas pa; 補特伽羅建立*)⁶ (ŚrBh Group (13) 104,10; Sh 184,1): eleven criteria for classifying persons
- 3.7. Meditative objects (*ālambana; dmigs pa; 所緣*) (ŚrBh Group (14) 28,3; Sh 192,21) Four basic categories:
- 3.7.1. universal meditative objects (*vyāpy ālambanam; khyob pa'i dmigs pa; 遍滿所緣*) (ŚrBh Group (14) 28,8; Sh 193,4)
- 3.7.2. meditative objects for the purification of conduct (*caritaviśodhanam ālambanam; spyad pa rnam par sbyong ba'i dmigs pa; 淨行所緣*) (ŚrBh Group (14) 52,3; Sh 202,3) This subsection describes the pan-Budhist meditative techniques on impurity (*aśubhatā*), friendliness (*maitrī*), dependent origination (*idaṃ-pratyayatāpratityasamutpāda*), analysis of the elements (*dhātuprabheda*), and mindfulness of breathing (*ānāpānasmṛti*).
- 3.7.3. meditative objects for proficiency (*kauśalyālambanam; mkhas pa'i dmigs pa; 善巧所緣*) (Sh 237,6)

⁶ Here *vyavasthāna* is clearly construed as the basis upon which the differentiation (*prabheda*) between various types of persons is made.

3.7.4. meditative objects for the purification of defilements (*kleśaviśodhanam ālambanam; nyon mongs pa rnam par sbyong ba'i dmigs pa; 淨惑所緣*) (Sh 249,12)

Each of these categories is further classified into subcategories.

3.8. Instruction (*avavāda; gdams ngag; 教授*) (Sh 258,14): four types

3.9. The threefold training, i.e., training in morality (*adhiśīlam śikṣā; lhags pa'i tshul khrims kyi bslab pa; 增上戒學*), training in mind [cultivation] (*adhicittam śikṣā; lhag pa'i sems kyi bslab pa; 增上心學*) (i.e., meditation), and training in wisdom (*adhiprajñam śikṣā; lhag pa'i shes rab kyi bslab pa; 增上慧學*) (Sh 261,8)

3.10. Factors consistent with the training (*śikṣānulomikā dharmāḥ; bslab pa dang rjes su mthun pa'i chos; 隨順學法*) (Sh 270,11): ten factors

3.11. Impediments of the spiritual practice (*yogabhraṃśa; rnal 'byor nyams pa; 瑜伽壞*) (Sh 273,1): four types

3.12. Spiritual practice (*yoga; rnal 'byor; 瑜伽*) (Sh 275,23) Four categories:

3.12.1. faith (*śraddhā; dad pa; 信*) (Sh 276,2)

3.12.2. aspiration [for liberation] (*chanda; 'dun pa; 欲*) (Sh 276,5)

3.12.3. vigour (*vīrya; brtson 'grus; 精進*) (Sh 276,20)

3.12.4. method [of practising mindfulness and meditation] (*upāya; thabs; 方便*) (Sh 277,11)

3.13. Contemplation (*manaskāra; yid la byed pa; 作意*) (Sh 278,1): two taxonomic sets, each containing four types. Also discussed are four types of signs (*nimitta*) and nine classes of conviction (*adhi-mokṣa*).

3.14. Functions of the spiritual practice (*yogakaraṇīya; rnal 'byor du bya ba; 瑜伽所作*) (Sh 283,2): four aspects

3.15. Spiritual practitioners (*yogācāra; rnal 'byor spyod pa; 瑜伽師*) (Sh 284,4) Three classes:

- 3.15.1. beginners (*ādikarmika; las dang po pa; 初修業瑜伽師*) (Sh 284, 7), who are at the level of practising the first of the seven contemplations (see sections 3.28. and 3.29. below).
- 3.15.2. adepts (*kṛtaparicaya; yongs su spyod pa byos pa; 已習行瑜伽師*) (Sh 284,16), who practise the next five levels of contemplation.
- 3.15.3. practitioners having transcended the practice of contemplation (*atīkrāntamanaskāra; yid la byed pa las 'das pa; 已度作爲瑜伽師*) (Sh 284,19), who enjoy the seventh level of *manaskāra* called 'the fruit of the culmination of the practice' (*prayogaṇiṣṭhāphalo manaskāraḥ*).
- 3.16. Spiritual cultivation (*yogabhāvanā; rnal 'byor bsgom pa; 瑜伽修*) (Sh 285,11) Two types:
- 3.16.1. cultivation of ideation (*saṃjñābhāvanā; 'du shes sgom pa; 想修*) (Sh 285,13)
- 3.16.2. cultivation of the [thirty-seven] factors of awakening (*bodhipakṣyabhāvanā; byang chub kyi phyogs bsgom pa; 菩提分修*) (Sh 288,19), which are described in detail.
- 3.17. Fruits of [spiritual] cultivation (*bhāvanāphala; bsgoms pa'i 'bras bu; 修果*) (Sh 331,1): the four fruits of the ascetic life (*śrāmaṇyaphala*), discussed in relation with the defilements (*kleśa*) abandoned at each of these stages in the spiritual progress. We also find a discussion of the characteristics of the persons with a slight degree of impurity (*mandarajaskasya pudgalasya liṅgāni*).
- 3.18. Alternative terms [used] for [designating] 'person' (*pudgalaparyāya; gang zag gi rnam grangs; 補特伽羅異門*) (Sh 338,9): one taxonomic set of six types and another of eight types.
- 3.19. The acts of evil (*māraḥkarman; bdud kyi las; 魔事*) (Sh 343,10) Four classes of evil, i.e., the evil of aggregates (*skandhamāra*), the evil of defilements (*kleśamāra*), the evil of death (*maraṇamāra*),

and the Evil One, the god (*devaputramāra*), and their acts.

- 3.20. Reasons for failing in the undertaking of the right exertion (*samyakprayuktasyāpi ārambho viphalo bhavati; yang dag par rab tu brtson pa yang rtsom pa 'bras bu med par 'gyur; 正修行者精勤發空無有果*)⁷ (Sh 347, 9): three reasons

CHAPTER III (*tr̥tyaṃ yogāsthānam*)

[Dealing with the initial training of the beginner]

- 3.21. The beginner (*ādikarmika; las dang po pa; 初修業者*) begs to be instructed in spiritual cultivation (*yoga; rnal 'byor; 瑜伽*) (Sh 351, 1) After ascertaining his faith and background, the spiritual master (*yogin; rnal 'byor pa; 瑜伽師*)⁸ 'instructs [him] on five points' (*pañcasu sthāneṣu vinayate* Sh 358,2; *gnas lnga po 'di [...] nges par sbyar bar bya'o* D 130a5; 於五處如應安立 T 449c15-16)⁹, to wit:
- 3.22. Guarding and accumulating the requisites [necessary] for meditation (*samādhisaṃbhārarakṣopacaya; ting nge 'dzin gyi tshogs bsrung zhing bsags pa; 護養定資料糧*) (Sh 358,4) The requisites (*sambhāra; tshogs; 資糧*) have already been explained in section 3.4. above.

⁷ Like in this case, the actual wording of the text cannot be easily made to match word for word the titles of the sections, which I have tried to keep as succinct as possible.

⁸ We often find the word *yogajña; rnal 'byor shes pa; 善達瑜伽* used as a quasi-synonym or specification for the spiritual master (*yogin*) (e.g., Sh 411,8; W 122).

⁹ MS 96b4R, Sh, and W 106 read *vinayate*. The Tibetan *nges par sbyar bar bya'o* and the Chinese 如應安立, however, suggest something like *vinijoyayet, niyoyayet, saṃniyoyayet*, etc., in which case the sense would be 'to commit [the beginner] to the five points'. We find, for instance, *manaskārabhāvanāyāṃ viniyujyate* (Sh 411,5-6), translated into Tibetan as: *yid la byed pa bsgom pa la nges par sbyar bar byed* (D151a6), and into Chinese as: 於修作意如應安立 (T 456b25-26). Cf. also Sh 434,19: *vinijoyā*.

3.23. Solitude (*prāvivekyā; rab tu dben pa; 遠離*) (Sh 359,1) Three perfect conditions of dwelling in solitude:

3.23.1. the perfect conditions regarding places (*sthānasampad; gnas phun sum tshogs pa; 處所圓滿*) suitable for meditation (Sh 359, 2)

3.23.2. the perfect conditions regarding bodily movements (*iryāpathasampad; spyod lam phun sum tshogs pa; 威儀圓滿*) (Sh 360, 10)

3.23.3. the perfect conditions regarding isolation (**vyapakarṣasampad; dben pa phun sum tshogs pa; 遠離圓滿*)¹⁰ (Sh 362,1) implying physical seclusion (*kāyavyapakarṣa*), i.e., dwelling away from monks and laymen alike, and mental seclusion (*cittavyapakarṣa*), i.e., cultivating the wholesome contemplation 'after having removed the defiled and neutral contemplation' (*kliṣṭam avyākṛtaṃ ca manaskāraṃ ca varjayitvā* | Sh 362,4-5).

3.24. Focusing of mind (*cittaikāgratā; sems rtse gcig pa nyid; 心一境性*) (Sh 362,11): nine types of tranquillity (*śamatha*) and four types of insight (*vipaśyanā*). Also discussed in relation to the

¹⁰ MS 97a2L-M reads: *prāvivekyāṃ katamat | yā sthānasampad iryāpathasampad* | (cf. Sh359,1-2; W 107: *prāvivekyāṃ katamat / yā sthānasampad iryāpathasampad / prāvivekyasamapat ca*), thus mentioning only two of the perfect conditions. The Tibetan (D 130b3-4: *rab du dben par gnas pa gang zhe na | gnas phun sum tshogs pa dang | spyod lam phun sum tshogs pa dang | dben pa phun sum tshogs pa gang yin pa'o* ||) and the Ch. (T 450 a3: 云何遠離。謂處所圓滿。威儀圓滿。遠離圓滿。), on the other hand, list three perfect conditions. The Sanskrit text does, however, mention a third category called *vyapakarṣa* (starting at MS 97b4L). This is rendered into Tibetan (D 131b7) as *dben pa phun sum tshogs pa* and into Chinese (T 450 b19) as 遠離圓滿. We could assume that the Sanskrit sentence above originally contained *vyapakarṣa* (or **vyapakarṣasampad?*) and this was later lost in the process of scribal transmission.

For the meaning of *vyapakarṣa*, see Edgerton s.v. *vyapakarṣa*.

latter are the insight with three doors (*trimukhā vipaśyanā*) and the meditative object analysed under six aspects (*ṣaḍvastuprabhedā lambana*)¹¹.

3.25. Purification of the hindrances (*āvāraṇaviśuddhi; sgrib pa nam par sbyong ba; 淨障*) (Sh 397,11) Four hindrances, i.e., depression (*paritasaṇā*)¹², obstacles (*nivaraṇa*), discursive thoughts [directed at pleasures] (*vitarka*)¹³, complacency (*ātmasaṃpragraha*)

3.26. Cultivation of contemplation (*manaskārabhāvanā; yid la byed pa bsgom pa; 修作意*) (Sh 405,19)

3.26.1. Four types of contemplation and their application in general:

3.26.1.1. Definition of the four contemplations (Sh 406,7): the contemplation making the mind undergo austere training (*cittasaṃtāpano manaskāraḥ; sems kun tu gdung bar 'gyur ba'i yid la byed pa; 訓練心作意*), the contemplation fostering (literally, 'moistening') the mind (*cittābhiśyandano manaskāraḥ; sems mngon par brlan par 'gyur ba'i yid la byed pa 滋潤心作意*), the contemplation engendering ease (*praśrabdhi-janako manaskāraḥ; shin tu sbyang pa skyed pa'i yid la byed pa; 生輕安作意*), and the contemplation purifying the wisdom and view (*jñānadarśanaśodhana manaskāraḥ; yes shes dang*

¹¹ For the six aspects, see Subsection 3.28.2.1.1. on the Contemplation Perceiving Characteristics.

¹² Sh 398,16; 399,1; and 399,10 reads *paritamanā*, which is unattested (probably, misreading of *ma* for *sa*, which are practically similar letters in the script of our MS). The term is construed as actually referring to two mental states. Its explanation goes as follows: *tatra paritasaṇā yā naiṣkramyaprāvivēkyaprayuktasya kliṣṭā utkaṅṭhā aratiḥ* | (Sh 399,1-2) '*paritasaṇā* is the defiled longing [for worldly pleasures formerly experienced] [and] dissatisfaction [with the hardships and loneliness of the wilderness] [which arise] in relation with the [the practice of] detachment and solitude'.

¹³ Cf. *vitarkaḥ kāmavitarkādayaḥ kliṣṭā vitarkāḥ* | Sh 399,4-5.

mthong ba rnam par sbyong ba'i yid la byed pa; 淨智見作意).

3.26.1.2. Application of the four contemplations in general (Sh 407, 10). The passage discusses the factors conducive to loathing (or fright) (*saṃvejanīyā dharmāḥ*; *kun tu skyo bar 'gyur ba dang mthun pa'i chos*; 可厭法), the factors conducive to rejoicing (*abhipramodanīyā dharmāḥ*; *mngon par dga' bar 'gyur ba dang mthun pa'i chos*; 可欣尚處), and the application of the four contemplations.

3.26.2. Detailed description of the actual practice of contemplation (Sh 411,5) by grasping the five signs (*pañca nimittāni*; *mtshan ma lnga po dag*; 五種相) in correlation with the meditation on impurity (*aśubhatā*), friendliness (*maitrī*), dependent origination (*idaṃpratyayatāpratītyasamutpāda*), analysis of the elements (*dhātuprabhedā*), and mindfulness of breathing (*ānāpānasmṛti*).

CHAPTER IV (*caturthaṃ yogasthānam*)

[Describing the mundane and supramundane paths]

3.27. Choosing the path (Sh 437,1) After mastering the basics of contemplation (*manaskāra*) and obtaining a certain limited degree of joy resulting from abandonment (*parittaprahāṇarati*), the yogi proceeds by either the mundane or the supramundane path.

3.28. Mundane path (*laukikamārga*; *'jig rten pa'i lam*; 世間道) (Sh 437, 16)

3.28.1. Types of persons proceeding by this path: one taxonomic set of four categories and another of two classes of persons (Sh 437, 16)

3.28.2. Seven contemplations (*sapta manaskārāḥ*; *yid la byed pa rnam pa bdun*; 七作意) (Sh 437,3)

3.28.2.1. Description of the seven contemplation with reference to

attainment of the first trance (*dhyāna*) (Sh 439,3)

- 3.28.2.1.1. contemplation perceiving characteristics (Sh 439,9)
(lakṣaṇapratisaṃvedī manaskāraḥ; mtshan nyid so sor rig pa'i yid la byed pa; 了相作意), achieved by examining the six aspects of desires, i.e., meaning (*artha*), object (*vastu*), characteristic (*lakṣaṇa*), category (*pakṣa*), time (*kāla*), and reason (*yukti*).
- 3.28.2.1.2. contemplation leading to conviction (*ādhimokṣiko manaskāraḥ; mos pa las byung ba'i yid la byed pa; 勝解作意*) (Sh 443,12)
- 3.28.2.1.3. contemplation engendering separation (*prāvivekyo manaskāraḥ; rab tu dben pa'i yid la byed pa; 遠離作意*) (Sh 443,19)
- 3.28.2.1.4. contemplation comprising joy (*ratisaṃgrāhako manaskāraḥ; dga' ba sdud pa'i yid la byed pa; 攝樂作意*) (Sh 443,23)
- 3.28.2.1.5. investigating contemplation (*mimāṃsā manaskāraḥ; dpyod pa'i yid la byed pa; 觀察作意*) (Sh 444,8)
- 3.28.2.1.6. contemplation attaining the culmination of the practice (*prayogaṇiṣṭho manaskāraḥ; sbyor ba mthar thug pa'i yid la byed pa; 加行究竟作意*) (Sh 445,1)
- 3.28.2.1.7. contemplation representing the fruit of the culmination of the practice (*prayogaṇiṣṭhāphalo manaskāraḥ; sbyor ba mthar thug pa'i 'bras bu'i yid la byed pa; 加行究竟果作意*) (Sh 445,10)
- 3.28.2.2. Three additional remarks concerning the function and grouping of the seven contemplations (Sh 445,13)
- 3.28.2.3. Extension of the seven contemplations pattern to the other three trances (*dhyāna*) and four immaterial attainments (*ārūpyasamāpatti*) (Sh 447,1)

- 3.28.3. Commentary to the canonical formula of the eight meditative attainments (*samāpatti*; *snyoms par 'jug pa*; 定): detailed exposition of the four trances (*dhyāna*) and the four immaterial attainments (*ārūpyasamāpatti*) (Sh 449,14)
- 3.28.4. Two attainments without mental activity (*acittike samāpatti*; *sems med pa'i snyoms par 'jug pa*; 無心定) (Sh 458,19): attainment of non-ideation (*asaṃjñīsamāpatti*) and attainment of cessation (*nirodhasamāpatti*)
- 3.28.5. Five supernatural faculties (*abhijñā*; *mngon par shes pa*; 神通) (Sh 460,19), i.e., magical power (*ṛddhiviśaya*), recollection of previous lives (*pūrvanivāsānusmṛti*), divine ear (*divyaṃ śrotram*), knowledge of the death and birth [of all living beings] (*cyutyupapādajñāna*) (also known as the divine eye (*divyaṃ cakṣuḥ*)), and knowledge of the minds [of all other living beings] (*cetaḥparyāyajñāna*). The yogi attains these faculties on the basis of *dhyāna* and the practice of the twelve ideations (*dvādaśa saṃjñāḥ*; *'du shes rnam pa bcu gnyis*; 十二想).
- 3.28.6. Births in different heavens according to the meditation level attained (Sh 468,10)
- 3.28.7. Characteristics of a person who has achieved detachment from desire by the mundane path (*vitārāgasya liṅgāni*; *'dod chags dang bral ba'i rtags*; 離欲者相) (Sh 469,12)
- 3.29. Supramundane path (*lokottaramārga*; *'jig rten las 'das pa'i lam*; 出世道)¹⁴ (Sh 470,7)

¹⁴ The treatment of the seven contemplations in relation to the supramundane path is far from simple. It is not always easy to understand the exact matching between various contemplations (see especially subsections 3.29.3., 3.29.4., and 3.29.5) and the steps of the classical Abhidharmic path of spiritual praxis. Equally difficult to determine with precision is whether the seven contemplations represent here a straight progression or an intricate pattern allowing for different contemplations to operate simultane-

3.29.1. Contemplation perceiving characteristics (*lakṣaṇapratīsamvedī manaskāraḥ*; *mtshan nyid so sor rig pa'i yid la byed pa*; 了相作意) (Sh 470,10)

3.29.1.1. Description of the contemplation perceiving characteristics (Sh 470,10)

3.29.1.1.1. The ascetic 'perceives the characteristic of the truth of suffering under four aspects, to wit, the impermanence aspect, the suffering aspect, the emptiness aspect, and the non-self aspect'. (*caturbhir ākārair duḥkhasatyasya lakṣaṇam pratīsamvedayate | tadyathā 'nityākāreṇa duḥkhākāreṇa śūnyākāreṇa anātmākāreṇa ca* | Sh 470,13-15¹⁵; *rnam pa bzhi po 'di lta ste | mi rtag pa'i rnam pa dang | sdug bsngal ba'i rnam pa dang | stong pa'i rnam pa dang | bdag med pa'i rnam pas bden pa sdug bsngal gyi mtshan nyid so sor rig par byed do* || D177b6; 由四種行了苦諦相。謂無常行苦行空行無我行。T 470c18-19) (Main treatment: Sh 471,1-492, 16) These four aspects, with many other ramifications, receive the most detailed treatment in the Section on the Supramundane Path.

3.29.1.1.2. The ascetic '[perceives the characteristic of] the truth of origination under four aspects, to wit, cause, origination, production, and condition'. (*caturbhir ākārāiḥ samudayasatyasya tadyathā hetutaḥ samudayataḥ prabhavataḥ pratya-yataś ca* Sh 470,15-16; *rnam pa bzhi po 'di lta ste | rgyu'i rnam pa dang | kun 'byung ba'i rnam pa dang | rab tu skyes ba'i pa dang | rkyen gyi rnam pas bden pa 'byung ba'i mtshan*

ously at the same level.

¹⁵ Shukla omits *śūnyākāreṇa*. W 130 includes the word but spells it as *śūnyatākāreṇa*. MS 130a7L clearly reads *śūnyākāreṇa*.

nyid so sor rig par byed do || D 177b6-7; 由四種行了集諦相。謂因行集行起行緣行。T 470c19-20) (Main treatment: Sh 492, 17-494,7)

3.29.1.1.3. The ascetic ‘perceives the characteristic of the truth of cessation under four aspects, to wit, cessation, calm, excellence, and going forth [from suffering]’. (*caturbhir ākārair nirodhasatyasya lakṣaṇaṃ pratisaṃvedayate | tad-yathā nirodhataḥ śāntataḥ praṇītato niḥsaraṇataś ca* Sh 470,17-19; *rnam pa bzhi po 'di lta ste | 'gog pa'i rnam pa dang | zhi ba'i rnam pa dang | gya nom pa'i rnam pa dang | nges par 'byung ba'i rnam pas bden pa 'gog pa'i mtshan nyid so sor rig par byed do* || D177b7-178a1; 由四種行了滅諦相。謂滅行靜行妙行離行。T 470c20-21) (Main treatment: Sh 494,8-12)

3.29.1.1.4. The ascetic ‘perceives the characteristic of the truth of path under four aspects, to wit, path, method, practice, and leading forth [from suffering]’. (*caturbhir ākārair mārgasatyasya lakṣaṇaṃ pratisaṃvedayate | tadyathā mārgato nyāyataḥ pratipattito nairyāṇikataś ca* | Sh 470, 19-21; *rnam pa bzhi po 'di lta ste | lam gyi rnam pa dang | rigs pa'i rnam pa dang | sgrub pa'i rnam pa dang | nges par 'byin pa'i rnam pas bden pa lam gyi mtshan nyid so sor rig par byed pa ste* | D178a1-2; 由四種行了道諦相。謂道行如行行行出行。T 470c22-23) (Main treatment: Sh 494,13-19)

3.29.1.2. The texts adds that the preceding analysis refers to the aggregates belonging to oneself (*pratyātmakāḥ skandhāḥ*), i.e., to one’s own sphere, and it should be extended to the other spheres, too (Sh 494,20).

3.29.2. Contemplation leading to conviction (*ādhimokṣiko manaskāraḥ; mos pa las byung ba'i yid la byed pa*; 勝解作意) (Sh 495,15) By

observing these sixteen aspects in his mental continuum (*citta-santati*; *sems kyi rgyud*; 心相續), the yogi penetrates (*avatirṇo bhavati*; *zhugs pa*; 悟入) the four truths and finally attains the supreme worldly factors (*laukikakā agradharmāḥ*; 'jig rten pa'i chos kyi mchog rnams; 世第一法) (*tasya yāval laukikebhyo < > gradharmebhya ādhimokṣiko manaskāraḥ* Sh 502,12-13)

3.29.3. Contemplation engendering separation (*prāvivekyo manaskāraḥ*; *rab tu dben pa'i yid la byed pa*; 遠離作意) (Sh 500,11) The ascetic attains the supramundane direct insight into the four truths and eliminates the defilements to be abandoned by the path of vision (*darśanaprahātavyāḥ kleśāḥ*; *mthong bas spang bar bya ba'i nyon mongs pa*; 見道所斷一切煩惱)¹⁶.

¹⁶ This and the following subsections are particularly hard to define and delimitate accurately. Especially difficult is to decide the boundary between sentences and subsections at Sh 502,14-503,3. Grammatically, it appears that the best way to punctuate and construe the text is: < | > *sa-tyāny abhisamitavataḥ darśanaprahātavyeṣu kleśeṣu prahīṇeṣu pravivekyo manaskāraḥ prahāṇāya ca ata ūrdhvaṃ yathā pratilabdham mārgaṃ bhāvayato ['] bhyasyataḥ*. The MS 127a1R-2L and Sh 502,14-503,2 punctuate, however, differently: they have no *daṇḍa* after *ādhimokṣiko manaskāraḥ* (which immediately precedes the sentence above), place a *daṇḍa* after *prahāṇāya ca* and continue the sentence after ['] *bhyasyataḥ (kāmāvaca-rāṇām adhimātramadhyānaṃ kleśānāṃ prahānāt sakṛdāgāmi bhavati |* Sh 503,2-3). Shukla also applies comma after *pravivekyo manaskāraḥ*. My rendering of the definition above is: 'one who has comprehended the truths by having abandoned the defilements to be abandoned by the path of vision and one who cultivates and repeats thereafter the path as he has attained it in order to eliminate [further defilements] has contemplation engendering separation'. Xuanzang translates *ata ūrdhvaṃ* 'thereafter' as 復從此後爲欲進斷修所斷惑 (T 476b3) 'hereafter in order to eliminate the defilements to be eliminated by the path of cultivation'. (Is it due to a different MS variant? Or is it an instance of Xuanzang's (or his team's) explanatory translation? — hard to decide!). Actually, both Tibetan and Chinese take *prahāṇāya ca* with the next sentence, but punctuate only after

3.29.4. Investigating contemplation (*mimāṃsā manaskāraḥ; dpyod pa'i yid la byed pa; 觀察作意*) (Sh 503,2) The subsection also contains an excursus on eleven types of cultivation (*bhāvanā; bsgom pa; 修*). At this stage the adept apparently begins his effort to eliminate the defilements to be abandoned by the path of cultivation (*bhāvanāprahātavyāḥ kleśāḥ; bsgom pas spang bar bya ba'i nyon mongs pa; 修道所斷一切煩惱*)¹⁷. Persevering in cultivation, he repeatedly investigates both the defilements which

bhavati. I am not sure whether we should supply <kleśa>prahāṇāya as in Tibetan (*nyon mongs pa*) or <bhāvanāprahātavyakleśa>prahāṇāya as in Chinese (修所斷惑), but the main problem with the interpretation above is that it conflicts with the explanation given at Sh 503,9-11 (see note 17 below). Let us also note that the Chinese 復從此後爲欲進斷修所斷惑 cited above is considered by the Sino-Japanese commentarial tradition reflected by KIK 267 as referring to the investigating contemplation.

¹⁷ Subsection 3.29.4. has no clear definition of the investigating contemplation, but its function appears to be explained at Sh 503,9-11: < | > *tatra sarvo bhāvanāmārgaḥ pratyavekṣya pratyavekṣya mimāṃsāmanas-kāreṇa prahiṇāprahiṇatām yathāpratilabdhamārgābhyāsaprabhāvitaḥ* (Sh reads °*maprabhāvitaḥ*) 'the whole path of cultivation is established as the result of the repeated practice in accordance with the path attained, after contemplating again and again the [defilements] abandoned and not [yet] abandoned by means of the investigating contemplation.' This is actually summarised at Sh 506,6-7. The Sanskrit sentence continues, separated by no *daṇḍa* or half-*daṇḍa*, with the passage cited in the following subsection on the contemplation comprising joy (Sh 506,8-10). Though difficult to delimitate and subdivide, the subsection on the investigating contemplation appears to consist in four portions: (1) remarks on the elimination of different defilements on the path of cultivation and the respective spiritual level attained thereby (*sakṛdāgāmin*, etc.) (Sh 502,15/503,2-503,9); (2) the sentence quoted above connecting the investigating contemplation with the path of cultivation (Does this represent an addition by a later redactor?)(Sh 503,9-11);excursus on different types of cultivation (Sh 503,12-506,5); and a final summary (Sh 506,6-7).

have been abandoned and those which have not yet been abandoned (*tasyaivam bhāvanāprayuktasya kālena ca kālaṃ kleśānāṃ prahīṇāprahīṇatāṃ mimāṃsataḥ* Sh 506 6-7).

3.29.5. Contemplation comprising joy (*ratisaṃgrāhako manaskāraḥ; dga' ba sdud pa'i yid la byed pa; 攝樂作意*) (Sh 506,8) The yogi repeatedly makes his mind loathe (or become frightened) on the basis of the factors conducive to loathing (or fright) and makes it rejoice on the basis of the factors conducive to rejoicing. Thus the contemplation comprising joy will occur (*kālena kālaṃ saṃvejaniyeṣu dharmeṣu cittaṃ samvejayataḥ, kālena kālaṃ abhipramodaniyeṣu abhipramodayataḥ, so 'sya bhavati <rati>¹⁸ saṃgrāhako manaskāraḥ |* Sh 506,8-10)¹⁹.

3.29.6. Contemplation attaining the culmination of the practice (*prayogaṇiṣṭho manaskāraḥ; sbyor ba mthar thug pa'i yid la byed pa; 加行究竟作意*) (Sh 506,10) This is equated with the diamond-like meditation (*vajropamasamādhi; rdo rje lta bu'i ting nge 'dzin; 金剛喻三摩地*). Relentlessly cultivating the contemplation comprising joy, the ascetic generates the diamond-like meditation by which all defilements to be abandoned by the path of cultivation are eliminated (*sarvupaścimaḥ śaikṣo vajropamaḥ samadhir utpadyate. tasyotpādāt sarvve bhāvanāprahātavyāḥ kleśāḥ prahīyante*. Schmithausen 460, which I follow

¹⁸ Shukla (p. 506, n. 2) says that *rati* is added by a separate hand. The MS is too blurred here, but I can hardly see anything looking like an addition by a separate hand. Both the Tibetan and Chinese translations contain, however, the equivalent of *rati*.

¹⁹ Again, it must be stressed that the text is not clear about the exact definition and role played by the investigating contemplation and the contemplation comprising joy, but if this is the order in which they were conceived in the context of the supramundane path, then this is the reverse of the sequence found in the Section on the Mundane Path (3.28. above).

here; Sh 506,13-15).

- 3.29.7. Contemplation representing the fruit of the culmination of the practice (*prayoganiṣṭhāphalo manaskāraḥ; sbyor ba mthar thug pa'i 'bras bu'i yid la byed pa; 加行究竟果作意*) (Sh 507,7) The result of the diamond-like meditation is the *summum bonum* of the path, the complete transcendence of suffering, the attainment of *arhatship* (*tatra yo vajropamaḥ samādhir <, > ayam prayoganiṣṭho manaskāraḥ. yaḥ punar agraphalārhattvasaṃgr-hito manaskāro <, ' >yam prayoganiṣṭhāphalo manaskāraḥ.* Schmithausen 472, which I follow here; Sh 510,10-12).

Historical Background

Any discussion of the ŚrBh inevitably requires a few words about the historical background of the YoBh. At the risk of never gaining rebirth in Tuṣita Heaven (as well as losing the chance to set foot in some universities during the present life), I dare to believe that the YoBh is not the work of Maitreya and/or Asaṅga. Following in the footsteps of Professor Schmithausen (not because of his *kalyāṇamitrata* but rather because of the soundness of his arguments), I take the view that this text has behind it a complex formation process possibly stretching over generations of authors, compilers, and redactors (Schmithausen 1969; Schmithausen 1987, especially 13-14; 183-185; Schmithausen 2000; see also Frauwallner 1969, 265). In this sense, I would consider it plausible, though not absolutely necessary, that Asaṅga became associated with this editorial process or may even have authored some parts. A detailed analysis concerning the formation of the YoBh is, however, too vast and intricate to be attempted here.

The ŚrBh appears to be one of the oldest textual layers of the YoBh (Schmithausen 1987, 14). Obviously, dating it with precision is

almost hopeless. Much of the material contained is very old and quite a few of the doctrines and spiritual practices go back to the earliest strata of Buddhist history. This, however, does not answer how old the ŚrBh as a work is. It is clear that the ŚrBh relies upon and contains many parallels to the canonical texts, but this should hardly come as a surprise. The canon has always represented a sacred intertextuality whose commentary and clarification is the very *raison d'être* of the *śāstra* literature.

The ŚrBh belongs to the fairly substantial corpus of spiritual cultivation literature. As far as I know, there is no traditional Indian Buddhist category denoting this genre, but the Chinese Buddhists, faced with an impressive number of such translations (also including apocrypha), coined terms like *chan jing* 禪經 'meditation scriptures', *chan dian* 禪典 'meditation sacred texts', and *chan yao* 禪要 'meditation summaries' (cf. Deleanu 1992, 43). This, again, is in no way surprising for a religion in which meditation was a paramount spiritual concern (at least theoretically speaking—reality is, as we all know, much more complex and often disappointing). Texts dedicated solely to meditation are not a rarity in the Canon. Abhidharmic literature has also dedicated much of its commentarial skills and *ars combinatoria* genius as well as a huge number of pages (or rather oral expositions, palm leaves and birch bark scrolls) to the discussion of spiritual cultivation. Furthermore, between roughly the 1st and the 6th century CE, we witness the production of an impressive output of meditation treatises and manuals of various school affiliations and discourse orientation. At least two of these texts, the *Xiu xing dao di jing* 修行道地經 (T No. 606) and the *Damoduoluo chan jing* 達磨多羅禪經 (T No. 618), surviving only in Chinese translations, appear to have originally been entitled **Yogācārabhūmi*²⁰. Apart

²⁰ The title of No. 606 appears both in Chinese phonetic transcription and translation in the Taishō Canon (T15.181c). The Chinese phonetic trans-

from a few idiosyncrasies, they both basically belong to the Śrāvakayāna (probably Sarvāstivāda) tradition. This background may have played a certain role, direct or indirect, in the birth and gradual growth of the YoBh, but this alone was not sufficient. Mahāyāna influence, of various strains and manifesting itself in various degrees throughout the YoBh, was an ingredient as important as the Nikāya background and the scholastic heritage.

The whole process is intrinsically linked to the birth of the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda school. This, again, is a hugely complex subject, and here I should only like to make a methodological remark. No matter what view is taken, one should strive to avoid the fallacy of linearity, unless, of course, corroborated by textual and/or epigraphic evidence. By 'fallacy of linearity' I mean the tendency to see historical development more or less as an uninterrupted genealogy of masters and disciples stretching back to the Buddha himself. To be sure, there is a long tradition of fondness of lineages, starting with Indian Buddhist sacred historiography and continuing in all local traditions. The Chan/Zen fascination with orthodox transmission of the Dharma is only one reflection, though, admittedly a very pronounced and highly institutionalised one, of this obsessive hunt for holy pedigrees. Modern historical research has done much to eliminate this fallacy of linearity, but we are still not completely free from it, especially in those cultural milieux where Buddhist faith and tradition form an integral part of the historian's background. I do not deny the importance of transmission from master to disciple,

cription of the title of No. 618 is known from Huiyuan's 慧遠 Preface to the scripture (T15.301b22). There is also a partial translation of No. 606 made by An Shigao 安世高 in the second half of the 2nd century. The translation entitled *Dao di jing* 道地經 (T No. 602), in one scroll, represents an extract of seven chapters, which is a selection probably made by An Shigao himself (Deleanu 1997, 38-39).

but this is not a simple, unequivocal flow of Dharma from ancient times to modern days. There is much more to this. Both masters and disciples are complex human beings, living, it is true, within the paradigms of a tradition, but, fortunately, not under a draconian Inquisition or totalitarian brain-washing regime. Being part of a *saṅgha* obviously meant sharing a Vinaya lineage and a sacred canonical intertextuality as well as an interpretative perspective (for the latter, the role of the *ācārya* was admittedly very important). But many other influences must have been at work. Genuine inquisitiveness, the wish to push further the explanatory coherence of the system, personal background, spiritual experiences, historical situations needing an answer not readily found in the tradition, encounter with other scholar-monks and ascetics, discussions with fellow monks, lay followers, or even heretics, browsing the temple manuscript collection on a dull afternoon and finding an unexpectedly stimulating piece of Dharma writing. All these have made many or most genealogies anything but straight lines of development. And this, coupled with other internal and external historical factors, can account for the transformation of the early Buddhism (itself perhaps not a monolithic teaching) into the later 'Buddhisms'.

The only consolation for those keen on precise historical dates is that we have a better picture for the *terminus ante quem* of the compilation process of the ŚrBh. We find a series of cross-references to our text in the earliest Chinese translation of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (= BoBh) done by the Indian monk Dharmakṣema 曇無讖 (var. 曇摩讖) in 418 under the title *Pusa di chi jing* 菩薩地持經 (**Bodhisattvabhūmyā-dhāra*)²¹. For instance, Dharmakṣema's translation lists the five factors

²¹ Both the date and the title are not beyond doubt. Year 7 of the Xuanshi 玄始 Era (418 CE) is given by Sengyou 僧祐 (445-518), the compiler of the *Chu san zang ji ji* 出三藏集記, the oldest extant Chinese scriptural catalogue, which though not infallible is generally considered a reliable

五事 (or 'aspects' (*ākāra*), according to the extant Sanskrit text) of the bodhisattva who is a spiritual friend (*kalyāṇamitrabhūto bodhisattvaḥ*), and then adds that these factors should be understood according to the ŚrBh (菩薩有五事。真善知識。調伏衆生爲善知識事。一者語言。二者與念。三者教授。四者教誡。五者說法。以是五事廣化衆生如聲聞地。教授教誡廣說如力性品。 T30.927a2-5; the corresponding passage in the Sanskrit text reads: *tatra pañcabhir ākārair ayaṃ kalyāṇa-mitrabhūto bodhisattvaḥ pareṣāṃ vineyānāṃ kalyāṇa-mitra-kāryaṃ karoti. codako bhavati. smārako bhavati. avavādako bhavati. anusāsako bhavati. dharma-deśako bhavati. eṣāṃ padānāṃ vistaravibhāgo veditavyaḥ tad-yathā śrāvaka-bhūmāv. avavādānūsānaṃ ca bhūyas tata uttari veditavyaṃ tad-yathā bala-gotra-ṣaṭale. BoBh 239,13-19; cf. Xuanzang's 玄奘 translation at T30.535a29-b3). There is actually a passage in 3.4.9. (Subsection on the Qualities of the Spiritual Friend) of the ŚrBh (ŚrBh Group 218-225) which gives indeed a detailed description of these five aspects. In another context Dharmakṣema's translation says that 'the adornments of morality' should be known as in the *Śrāvaka-bhūmi* (當知戒莊嚴。謂聲聞地。 T30.917c12-13; Sanskrit text: *śilālaṃkāro veditavyaḥ. tad-yathā Śrāvaka-bhūmau. BoBh 185,10-11; cf. Xuanzang's translation, T30.552b3-4). There is no substantial treatment of 'the adornments of morality' in the extant ŚrBh text and its**

historical source. The problem is that this date appears only in the Zifu, Puning and Jingshan Canons (the so-called 'Three Editions' of the Sung, Yuan, and Ming Dynasties abbreviated as 三 in the Taishō Canon) (see T 55.11b19 and note 14). As for the title, the *Chu san zang ji ji* also gives the variants 菩薩戒經 and 菩薩地經. Sengyou has also left a note (T55. 62c-63a) on the relation between this text and Guṇavarman's 求那跋摩 closely related translation the *Pusa shan jie jing* 菩薩善戒經. On the relation between these two renderings, see also Tokiwa 1973, 948-951, and Demiéville 1973, 301. There is, however, no doubt that both these two translations were done at the beginning of the 5th century.

translations, but we find, nonetheless, a short passage explaining the meaning of the word *śilālaṃkāra* as used by the Exalted One (ŚrBh Group, pp. 84 and 86). In another passage of the BoBh, we are told that the factors of awakening should be understood differently in accordance to the principles or method (*naya*) of Śrāvakayāna, on the one hand, and to that of Mahāyāna, on the other. The former, it adds, must be known as expounded in the *Śrāvakabhūmi* (Dharmakṣema's translation: 聲聞乘方便如實知。如聲聞地所說。T30.929c23-24; Sanskrit text: *tatra śrāvakayānanayena yathā-bhūtaṃ prajānāti tad-yathā śrāvakabhūmau sarvaṃ yathā nirdiṣṭaṃ veditavyaṃ*. BoBh 259,13-15; cf. Xuanzang's translation, T30.536c5-6). The ŚrBh contains a detailed description of the thirty-seven factors of awakening (subsection 3.16.2. above), and it is probably to this that the BoBh alludes. We find another cross-reference to the ŚrBh in the *Pratiṣṭhāpaṭala*, which mentions that the persons dominated by sensual passion (*rāgacarita*) should practise the contemplation of the impure (*aśubhā*) as explained in detail in the *Śrāvakabhūmi* (Dharmakṣema's translation: 貪欲觀不淨。廣說如聲聞地。T30.956c20-21; Sanskrit text: *rāgacaritānam aśubhā vistarena tad-yathā śrāvakabhūmau* BoBh 389,2-3; cf. Xuanzang's translation, T30.570a6-7). This probably refers to the presentation of this contemplative technique in the Subsection on the Meditative Objects for the Purification of Conduct (see 3.7.2. above). Finally, in a passage speaking of the Buddha's ability to preach to various beings according to their faculties and understanding, the BoBh refers to the teachings of the Tathāgatas to the followers of the Disciples' Vehicle, which have been explained in the *Śrāvakabhūmi* (Dharmakṣema's translation: 如來爲諸衆生種種度門種種教授。如聲聞地次第開發顯示教授宣說。T30.957 b19-20; Sanskrit text: *tatra yathā tathāgatāḥ śrāvakāṇaṃ teṣu-teṣu avatāramukheṣu avavādam anuprayacchaṃti. tathā śrāvakabhūmau sarveṇa sarvaṃ niraṃtaram ākhyātam uttānaṃ vivṛtaṃ prajñaptaṃ*

prakāśitaṃ. BoBh 394,20-23; cf. Xuanzang's translation, T30.571b25-27). The BoBh most likely refers here to the Part on Entry (*Avatārabhūmi*) (part two above) and the Section on Instruction (*avavāda*) (3.8. above)²².

We must not, however, forget that without an equally early Sanskrit original and/or translations of the ŚrBh, a definitive conclusion is not possible. In view of the above cross-references, it is almost certain that a text called the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, probably already constituting an editorial pair to the BoBh, existed at that time, i.e., beginning of the 5th century, and, roughly speaking, its content seems to have been fairly similar to our extant text. Yet, we do not know how similar in terms of general structure, doctrinal nuances, and wording. We have already discussed above that the cross-reference to the *śilālaṃkāra* in the BoBh appears to match a minor passage in the extant ŚrBh. Of course, it is not excluded that the compiler(s) of the BoBh had this particular fragment in mind and simply wanted to refer to it. It is, nevertheless, also possible to see this as a proof of the fact that the ŚrBh of that age was different from our text. Maybe a larger fragment was dedicated to the 'adornments of morality', and this was later renamed²³. Or maybe the whole subsection on *śilasamvara* (3.4.4.above) was re-arranged.

Does this *terminus ante quem* provide the ground for any assumptions concerning when the actual compilation of the ŚrBh started? Unfortunately, not a very solid ground. It is, therefore, a matter of speculation to assign it more or less precise historical dates. Probably,

²² We also find a reference to the ŚrBh in the *Pusa shan jie jing Youboli wen pusa shou jie fa* 菩薩善戒經優波離問菩薩受戒法 translated by Guṇavarman (T30.1018a14-15). On the relations of this text with the *Pusa shan jie jing* 菩薩善戒經 in nine scrolls, see Tokiwa 1973, 950-951.

²³ A possible candidate would be the ten benefits of morality (*śilānuśaṃsa*) (ŚrBh Group 92-99), but this remains a mere conjecture.

the only thing we can surmise, and even this is not unproblematic, is that the ŚrBh referred to in Dharmakṣema's translation of the BoBh seems to be an already developed text and for its creation we should perhaps allow enough time.

Textual 'Geology'

Is the ŚrBh the product of a single author or group of authors who wrote a text more or less identical with the extant Sanskrit manuscript and its Tibetan and Chinese translations? Or do we also witness here a textual history of different layers? My conjecture is admittedly based on the tricky quicksand of circumstantial evidence, but I venture to advocate the latter view. Here are some of my arguments.

What do we learn from the synopsis above? The first impression is, I believe, that of an elaborate textual architecture and an undeniable attempt to confer it a systematic character. Yet no reader will fail to notice that the text also contains numerous repetitions and not all its taxonomic lists form an ideally balanced whole. Indeed, a historico-philologically-minded (-biased?) student cannot help feeling that certain passages appear to be later accretions in a process of expanding a certain textual core (or cores). Deciding whether the ŚrBh is a model of textual coherence is definitely not an easy task. Such a judgement depends on the historical age and personal standards of the reader²⁴. The specter

²⁴ There are scholars, traditional and modern, Eastern and Western, who definitely admire the structure of our text. Speaking of the YoBh in general, Saeki Jōin in KDK (p. 18) describes the work as 'coherent and neatly organised' 首尾一貫、組織井然. Similarly, commenting upon the YoBh, Wayman (1956, 317-318) says that 'Asaṅga's work demonstrates a remarkable degree of organization of material'. Concerning the ŚrBh, the American scholar praises Asaṅga's 'genius in organization of thought', which he considers 'certainly superior to [...] Buddhaghosa's *Visuddhi-*

of an age-biased and person-based evaluation may indeed loom ominously over such judgements. Nonetheless, I think that we can avoid it to a certain extent by placing our comparisons in the context of traditional Buddhist literature. To my mind, a comparison of the ŚrBh with, for instance, Vausbandhu's *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* or Buddhaghosa's *Visuddhimagga* seem to show that better achievements in matters of systematic textual structure can and do exist. Though not in a definitive manner, this may hint at the possibility that we have here a text containing different formative layers which the final editing effort could not arrange in a perfectly systematic whole.

Some of the repetitions may be more than lack of compositional talent. There are two sections (3.4. and 3.22.) discussing the requisites (*sambhāra*). And as if these were not enough, subsection 1.2.4.2. deals with eight of the requisites treated in 3.4. The interest in *puḍgala* typology, admittedly important for determining who and how one is fit for various practices, pops up at virtually every 'corner' of the text, leaving one strongly suspect that many of these sections, subsections, and smaller units may be later accretions rather than part of a unitary compositional plan. Conspicuous is section 2.4. which looks just like an addendum to the preceding classification of persons. The editors make no secret of this and actually refer the reader to the latter (see citation in 2.4. above). In spite of the fact that the whole chapter IV is dedicated to the mundane and supramundane paths (sections 3.28. and 3.29. respectively), we also find a discussion of these two paths in relation to the meditative objects for the purification of defilements

magga' (1956, 324). I do not completely deny the editorial virtues of the compilers of the YoBh in general and ŚrBh in particular, but I am not so ecstatic about the final outcome of their efforts. I do admit, however, that such evaluations concerning the coherence and organisation of a text contain an important dose of impressionistic and subjective judgement.

(subsection 3.7.4.).

Speaking of larger textual units, my feeling is that there is a difference between the first two chapters, on the one hand, and the last two chapters, on the other. Though related to the spiritual path, the first two *yogasthānas* represent a lengthy propaedeutic exposition which reflects rather theoretical interests than the actual yogic praxis and progression. After this largely Abhidharmic prologue, chapter III starts on a different note. It is a lively description of the beginner visiting the master, paying respect to him, and begging for instruction. The rest of the text appears to be a blend of the direct teachings of the *kalyāṇamitra* and elaborations upon relevant doctrines and practices. Taxonomic and theoretical discussions are not absent, but they are less conspicuous and more directly connected to the meditation practice itself. Surprisingly, a large part of the first half of chapter III is actually another introduction to the fundamentals of the path (as if the previous two chapters were not enough!). This leads me to surmise that chapter III and chapter IV were the initial core of the ŚrBh and the need for further doctrinal clarifications and taxonomic arrangements subsequently gave birth to chapters I and II. This could explain the somehow anomalous repetition of the discussion on requisites in sections 3.4. and 3.22. The proto-ŚrBh text probably had a small section on the requisites necessary for meditation, but this must have been felt as fundamental knowledge for those embarking upon the spiritual path and gradually developed. As this became too large and other accretions were being incorporated into the text, the amplified discourse on requisites was made into an independent section and moved to its present position in chapter I. The former section (present 3.22.) could not be removed and was kept as such in the text. The spiritual master actually tells the disciple that he will instruct him 'on five points' (*pañcasu sthāneṣu*) (section 3.21.), thus making the presence of all these five

items absolutely necessary. Whether section 3.22. represents the original wording of the proto-ŚrBh is hard to know. Even if this is the case, some later editorial 'make-up' was perhaps needed in order to accommodate it into the final version of our text.

The compilation process did not stop here and must have continued with further accretions creeping into both the core text (chapters III and IV) and the newly developing introductory parts (chapters I and II). This can be surmised, for example, from section 2.4 which, as pointed out above, appears to be an addendum to section 2.3. This addition probably took place after the main parts of what now constitutes the *Avatārabhūmi* had already been compiled and incorporated into the ŚrBh. An equally very late accretion could be subsection 1.2.4.2. The need to explain from the very beginning the factors necessary for the attainment of *parinirvāṇa* probably led to the development of this subsection, even at the risk of repeating eight of the requisites in 3.4. The latter, too, suffered some modifications. The first three requisites are only briefly mentioned, and then the text says that they should be understood as above (ŚrBh Group 62,8-9) (referring to section 1.2.4.2.). The rest of the requisites are amply treated, though some of them are also described, admittedly not in detail, in 1.2.4.2. The editorial process must have been complex and not always very systematic.

The formation process may have been even more complex. The proto-ŚrBh text must not necessarily be regarded as identical with the present chapters III and IV. The original text may have been simpler and organised in a different way. It is also possible that there existed several proto-ŚrBh texts which were later combined together giving birth to an intermediate stage (an early version of Chapters III and IV or parts of it) subject to further accretions and elaborations.

Another indirect glimpse into the early 'geology' of the text might also be gained from the irregular position of the summary verses

(*uddāna*) in some parts of the *ŚrBh*. They usually appear at the end of each *yogasthāna* and *bhūmi*, obviously summarising the preceding textual unit. The pattern is not, however, always regular. Chapter III departs from the basic stylistic convention in a peculiar way. At the end of section 3.25. (MS 106a7R-106b1L; Sh 405,10-18; D 148b7-149a2; T 458b13-22) we find so-called 'intermediate summary verses' (*antaroddāna*²⁵; *bar gyi sdom*; 中唄柁南), which sum up the five preceding sections, i.e., from 3.21. to 3.25. The *yogasthāna* continues with a large section on the cultivation of contemplation (*manaskārabhāvanā*). Then at the end of chapter III (MS 113a6M-7L; Sh 434,17-20; D 163b7-164a2; T 448b26-29²⁶), we also find 'general summary verses' (*piṇḍoddāna*; *bsdus pa'i sdom*; 總唄柁南) listing up the main topics of the *yogasthāna*, including the *manaskārabhāvanā*. We may be seeing here a trace of an editorial restructuring of the text. The Section on the Cultivation of Contemplation (3.26.) may have originally belonged to chapter IV or may be a later accretion. (The four contemplations listed here are actually a different taxonomic set from the seven contemplations in chapter IV which play the central role in the spiritual progress of the yogi.) Its incorporation into chapter III was accompanied, at the same time or at a later date, by some extra 'surgical' modifications: the original *uddāna* was renamed *antaroddāna* and a *piṇḍoddāna* was inserted at the end of the newly reshaped chapter III. This *piṇḍoddāna* summed up all topics exposed in the newly edited *yogasthāna*, including the cultivation of contemplation, and thus gave the impression of a

²⁵ Sh reads *anantaro*^o.

²⁶ The position of the summary verses in Xuanzang's translation is different from the Sanskrit and Tibetan because of the Chinese convention of placing *uddānas* at the beginning of the chapters or sections which they summarise. This rule is not, however, applied to *antaroddānas*, which, as their name suggests, occur in the middle of textual units.

unitary chapter. This must have happened, however, at a fairly early date in the textual history of the ŚrBh as both the Chinese (mid-7th century) and Tibetan (early 9th century) translations as well as the extant Sanskrit Manuscript (probably dating from the 11th or 12th century) display the same *antaroddāna* and *piṇḍoddāna* arrangement²⁷.

Things are, however, not so simple, and other possibilities must be given equal attention. What I have termed ‘irregularities’ may actually represent a stylistic idiosyncrasy of our work. We also find summary verses in the middle of chapter I (after subsection 3.4.4.), though here they are not called *antaroddāna* (ŚrBh Group 98; cf. also p. 62, notes 9 and 10). The set of four *uddānas* at the end of chapter I also faces us with a rather complicated situation (ŚrBh Group 296; cf. also ŚrBh Group (13) 80-81). The Manuscript (MS 66a2L) and Shukla (Sh 169,1-2), following it, actually place the fourth *uddāna* at the beginning of chapter II, but this must be a scribal error rather than reflect a different rendition. The Tibetan translation, which follows the Indian stylistic convention of having the *uddāna* at the end of the textual unit in question, adds a further problem. It calls the first stanza *bar gyi sdom* (*antaroddāna*) (D 67a1), the next two stanzas *sdom* (*uddāna*) (D 67a2), and the fourth stanza *bsdud pa'i sdom* (*piṇḍoddāna*) (D 67 a3). As if it were not enough, still another complication arises. The order of the stanzas in the Sanskrit Manuscript is different from that

²⁷ The Indian tradition is not unaware of the possibility of later editorial operations on classical texts. We find, for instance, the following verses in the *Carakasamhitā*: *vistārayati leśoktaṃ saṃkṣipaty ativistaram | saṃskartā kurute tantraṃ purāṇaṃ ca punar navam* | (Chapter XII, stanzas 36-37, vol. 1, p. 681) ‘Detailing what is brief, abridging what is excessively detailed/ The redactor makes the old treatise new again’.

in the Tibetan translation²⁸. This, however, has probably nothing to do with the early history of the text and can be explained as an anomaly in the later scribal tradition.

Another important aspect, which we, unfortunately, cannot ascertain accurately is the role of the oral transmission in the formation and preservation of such texts. There is no doubt that in the first centuries of Buddhist history oral transmission was the only way of passing down the holy teaching from one generation to another. With the advent of the manuscript transmission in the 1st century BCE²⁹ and its later spread, we can surmise that the role of oral tradition suffered some changes, but it has, nevertheless, continued to play an important (often central) role in the passing down of the sacred corpus even in our cybernetic age. The details concerning how oral and written traditions interacted in the formation of different texts, especially of the

²⁸ In the MS (65bM-66a1R) the first two stanzas list the thirteen requisites, the next one enumerates the seventeen adornments of the ascetic (*śramaṇālaṃkāra*), detailing thus the last of the adornments, and the fourth stanza (placed at the beginning of Chapter II, MS 66a2L) sums up the three main themes of the *Naiṣkramyabhūmi*. The same order is followed by Shukla (p. 166 and p. 169). The Tibetan translation, however, gives first the third stanza, which enumerates the seventeen adornments of the ascetic, and calls it *bar gyi sdom* (*antaroddāna*) (D 67a). It then has the first two stanzas, which list the thirteen requisites, and calls them *sdom* (*uddāna*) (D 67a2). Finally, it gives the fourth stanza, which sums up the three main themes of the *Naiṣkramyabhūmi*, and, quite appropriately, calls it *bsdud pa'i sdom* (*piṇḍoddāna*) (D 67a3). This order is adopted by the Śrāvaka-bhūmi Study Group's edition (p. 296).

²⁹ The crucial decision of the Singhalese Therāvadin monks to commit the Buddhist sacred corpus to writing in the 1st century BCE is recorded in both the *Dipavaṃsa* (XX, 20-21) and the *Mahāvāṃsa* (XXXIII, 100-101). For details, see Lamotte 1958, 403-405.

sāstra literature, remain largely unknown³⁰. I imagine, however, that oral transmission could have played a certain part at least in the early formation of the ŚrBh, which may have started as a text (or texts?) recited by the master for the benefit of one or a relatively small number of disciples. The ŚrBh itself hints at the role of the personal guidance of the master and the oral transmission of the yogic tradition (see

³⁰ The role of the oral tradition has been discussed in many modern studies (see, for example, Cousins 1983; Collins 1992; Allon 1997, the latter also containing an ample bibliography on this subject). Cousins (1983, 5) argues that even after the introduction of writing, there followed 'a considerable transitional period with both oral and literary approaches remaining concurrent'. Collins (1992) convincingly proves that the Buddhist tradition remained largely an oral/aural one in spite of the parallel usage of writing (cf. also Allon, 1-8).

Some interesting information about the parallel existence of the oral and written traditions is provided by the Chinese accounts concerning the translation of Buddhist texts. We find instances of both recitation from memory and reading out of the manuscript, often with one and the same person. I shall give only two examples from one of the earliest documents of such kind, the *Biographies of Eminent Monks* 高僧傳 by Huijiao 慧皎, compiled in 519. The famous translator Dharmarakṣa 竺法護 (239-316) is described as 'everyday reciting scriptures tens of thousands of words' 誦經日萬言 (T50.326c4). In spite of his prodigious memory, however, Dharmarakṣa also valued the manuscript tradition. After a journey to the Western Regions, he 'brought a great number of scriptures in Indian languages and returned to China' 遂大齋梵經。還歸中夏。(T50.326c11-12). Saṅghabhadra, who came from Kashmir to China in 381, was famed for his knowledge by heart of the *Abhidharmavibhāṣā*, a text which he recited 口誦經本 (T50.328b7) for a translation team to render it into Chinese. The same Saṅghabhadra, however, also brought Vasumitra's Indian original 婆須蜜梵本 (T50.328b11) (referring to the *Āryavasumitrasaṅgītiśāstra* 尊婆須蜜菩薩所集論, T No. 1549), which later on he and two other translators took in hand 執梵本 (T50.328b13) and, with the help of a team, rendered into Chinese. Oral recitation and reliance upon manuscript transmission are seen thus side by side.

section 3.21. as well as other passages, especially in chapter III). Of course, it is not excluded that the ŚrBh was a written text from the beginning, but the religious environment of the age makes it more likely that oral transmission played a part, alone or in parallel with the manuscript tradition. If this is true, then the presence of many *uddānas*, some of them not in a very regular order, can be explained as a reflection of the reciters' need to make sure, by means of these summary verses, that they do not forget topics. Then the irregular patterns or, at least, some of them could be the result of the oral transmission process. Though impossible to corroborate with direct evidence and adding much more complexity to our hypotheses on textual formation, the oral transmission remains a strong possibility which cannot be ignored.

Now, all the above conjectural remarks are based on a simple presupposition, which, actually, is quite often seen in historico-philological studies. It basically represents a belief that an author must always or usually be coherent and systematic. Though this is one fundamental desideratum, which presumably authors of all ages and lands aspire to, the actual results of this widely espoused ideal may often be disappointing. Texts, even when authored by one single person, may be appalling examples of incoherence and chaos in spite of the creator's best intentions. Repetitions, ambiguities, inconsistencies, etc. do not necessarily mean different layers going back to different ages. Though I still believe that in the case of texts like the ŚrBh, the probability of historical strata remains high, I, nevertheless, do not wish to rule out completely another logical possibility: our text may be the product of a single author or group of authors and redactors either not very concerned with the perfectly systematic character of their discourse or, simply, whose noble intentions were not matched by equal talent. It is thus possible that the ŚrBh was authored or compiled as a whole on the basis of previous treatises and bits of tradition. Ignoring some

minor editorial operations and additions, inevitable in the process of sacred transmission, this ŚrBh was more or less similar to our present text. This possibility can equally account for repetitions. Some of the *antaroddānas*, for instance, may have belonged to the source materials incorporated into the ŚrBh and were preserved as such in the new work. Without compelling evidence, the historian should, I believe, remain content to list all major possibilities of the process which he or she tries to reconstruct, even when these possibilities may be contradictory.

My discussion concerning the formation of the ŚrBh is far from being complete or definitive. Other important aspects, like the school affiliation of our text and its doctrinal background, are certainly relevant topics and deserve equal attention. I hope that, with the kind *kṣānti* of my learned readers, I shall be able to deal with them in the future.

References

Primary sources, with abbreviations

The number following the abbreviated title indicates the page and the next number, separated by comma, stands for the line. When I cite from the Sanskrit manuscript, abbreviated as MS, I first write the folio number, then recto (=a)/verso (=b), the line number, and the segment of each line: left (=L), middle (=M), and right (=R). For the Tibetan translation of the ŚrBh, I have used in this article only the *sDe dge* edition, *Dsi* (see below), abbreviated as D. References give the folio number, recto (=a)/verso (=b), and the line number. References to the Taishō edition follow the usual conventions, but in the case of the Chinese translation of the ŚrBh (found in volume 30), I omit the volume number. I thus write T and then the page, segment (a/b/c), and line number.

Citations from the primary sources, ŚrBh included, follow the original punctuation and spelling as close as possible. (It goes without saying that this convention will not be followed in my critical edition.) The only modification I have made here was to use < > (employed, for instance, by Schmithausen, too) for additions made to the original texts. For unity's sake, I have thus replaced the square brackets used by Shukla with < >.

BoBh: *Bodhisattvabhūmi*

Wogihara Unrai, ed. [1936] 1971. *Bodhisattvabhūmi*. Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store

Carakasamḥita: Agniveśa's Treatise refined and annotated by Caraka and redacted by Dṛḍhabala. Sharma, Priyavrat ed. and transl. 2 vols. 1981-1983. Varanasi and Delhi: Chaukhambha Orientalia.

D: *sDe dge Tibetan Tripiṭaka bsTan ḥgyur—preserved at the Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo—Sems tsam 6, Dsi*. 1980. Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai.

KDK: *Kokuyaku daizōkyō* 國譯大藏經. Here the reference is to the Preface to the Japanese *kundoku* 訓讀 translation of the YoBh written by Saeki Jōin 佐伯定胤, also the translator of the work, found in the *Ronbu* 論部, vol. 6. First ed. of the series 1930-1936. Reprint 1986. Tokyo: Dai'ichi Shobō.

KIK: *Kokuyaku issaikyō* 國譯一切經. Here references are to the Japanese *kundoku* 訓讀 translation of the ŚrBh found in the *Yugaron* 瑜伽論, vol. 2, Katō Seishin 加藤精神 trans., Katsumata Shunkyō 勝又俊教 and Mukai Ryūken 向井隆健 revised. First ed. 1931. Second revised ed. 1993. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha.

MS: Joint Publication of Taishō University (Tokyo) and China Library of Nationalities (Beijing). 1994. *Facsimile Edition of the "Śrāvakabhūmi" Sanskrit Palm-leaf Manuscript* 瑜伽師地論聲聞地梵文原

文影印本. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Schmithausen: Schmithausen, Lambert. 1982. 'Die letzten Seiten der *Śrāvakabhūmi*'. In L.A. Hercus et al., eds. *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*. Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies.

Sh: Shukla, Karunesha, ed. 1973. *Śrāvakabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga*. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

Shukla, Karunesha, ed. 1991. *Śrāvakabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga*. Part II. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

ŚrBh: *Śrāvakabhūmi*

ŚrBh Group: Shōmonji Kenkyūkai 声聞地研究会 (*Śrāvakabhūmi* Study Group) ed. and transl. 1998. *Yugaron Shōmonji Dai'ichi yugasho: Sansukurittogo texitoto wayaku* 瑜伽論 声聞地第一瑜伽処 : サンスクリット語テキストと和訳 (*Śrāvakabhūmi: Revised Sanskrit Text and Japanese Translation, The First Chapter*). Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.

ŚrBh Group (13): Shōmonji Kenkyūkai 声聞地研究会 ed. and transl. 1994. 'Bonbun Shōmonji (13) — Daini yugasho (1), wayaku, kamon —' 梵文声聞地 (十三) — 第二瑜伽処 (1), 和訳・科文. *Taishō daigaku sōgō bukkyō kenkyūjo nenpō*. 16: 73-129.

ŚrBh Group (14): Shōmonji Kenkyūkai 声聞地研究会 ed. and transl. 1995. 'Bonbun Shōmonji (14) — Daini yugasho (2), wayaku, kamon —' 梵文声聞地 (十四) — 第二瑜伽処 (2), 和訳・科文. *Taishō daigaku sōgō bukkyō kenkyūjo nenpō*. 17: 19-71.

ŚrBh Group (15): Shōmonji Kenkyūkai 声聞地研究会 ed. and transl. 1996. 'Bonbun Shōmonji (15) — Daini yugasho (3), wayaku, kamon —' 梵文声聞地 (十五) — 第二瑜伽処 (3), 和訳・科文. *Taishō daigaku sōgō bukkyō kenkyūjo nenpō*. 18: 1-35.

T: Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaikyō 渡邊海旭, chief eds., *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經. 1922-1933. Popular

edition 1991. Tokyo: Taishō Shinshu Daizōkyō Kankōkai.

YoBh: *Yogācārabhūmi*

W: Wayman, Alex. 1961. *Analysis of the Śrāvakabhūmi Manuscript*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Secondary Sources

Allon, Mark. 1997. *Style and Function: A Study of the Dominant Stylistic Features of the Prose Portions of Pāli Canonical Sutta Texts and Their Mnemonic Function*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

Chandra, Lokesh. [1959] 1971. *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary*. Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co.

Collins, S. 1992. 'Notes on Some Oral Aspects of Pali Literature'. *Indo-Iranian Journal*. 35 (2-3): 121-135.

Cousins, L. S. 1983. 'Pali Oral Literature'. In Philip Denwood and Alexander Piatigorski, eds. *Buddhist Studies: Ancient and Modern*. London: Curzon Press.

Deleanu, Florin. 1992. 'Mindfulness of Breathing in the *Dhyāna Sūtras*'. *Transactions of the International Conference of Orientalists in Japan*. 37: 42-57.

Deleanu, Florin. 1997. 'A Preliminary Study of An Shigao's 安世高 Translation of the *Yogācārabhūmi* 道地經'. *The Journal of the Department of Liberal Arts of Kansai Medical University*. 17: 33-52.

Demiéville, Paul. [1957] 1973. 'Le chapitre de la *Bodhisattvabhūmi* sur la Perfection du Dhyāna'. In Demiéville, Paul. 1973. *Choix d'Études Bouddhiques (1929-1970)*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Edgerton: Edgerton, Franklin [1953] 1985. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. Volume I : Grammar. Volume II : Dictionary. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas Publishers. (The reference here

is made to the Dictionary volume.)

- Frauwallner, Erich. 1969. *Die Philosophie des Buddhismus*. 3rd revised ed. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Kimura Takayasu 木村高尉. 1992. 'Shōmonji bonbun no ketsuraku to sono hoten' 聲聞地梵文の欠落とその補填. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū*. 40(2): 165-168.
- Lamotte, Étienne. 1958. *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien, des origines à l'ère Śaka*. Louvain: Bibliothèque du Muséon.
- Matsunami Yasuo. 1992. 'On the Sanskrit Manuscript of the "Śrāvakabhūmi"'. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū*. 40 (2): 29-34.
- Potter, Karl H. ed. 1999. *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*. Volume VIII. *Buddhist Philosophy from 100 to 350 A.D.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Schmithausen, Lambert. 1969. 'Zur Literaturgeschichte der älteren Yogācāra-Schule'. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*. Supplementa I. 3: 811-823.
- Schmithausen, Lambert. 1987. *Ālayavijñāna: On the Origin and the Early Development of a Central Concept of Yogācāra Philosophy*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Schmithausen, Lambert. 2000. 'On Three *Yogācārabhūmi* Passages Mentioning the Three *Svabhāvas* or *Lakṣaṇas*'. In Jonathan A. Silk, ed. *Wisdom, Compassion, and the Search for Understanding: The Buddhist Studies Legacy of Gadjin M. Nagao*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Wayman, Alex. 1956. 'A Report on the Śrāvaka-bhūmi and Its Author (Asanga) [sic]'. *The Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 42 (3-4): 316-329.
- Tokiwa Daijō 常盤大定. [1938] 1973. *Gokan yori Sō-Sei ni itaru yakukyō sōroku* 後漢より宋齊に至る訳経総録. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai.
- Yūki Reimon 結城令聞. 1985. *Yuishikigaku tensekishi* 唯識學典籍志. 2nd

ed. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan Kabushikigaisha.

Zhang Yisu 張怡蘇, ed. in chief. 1993. *Zang-han da cidian* 藏漢大辭典. 2 vols. Beijing: Renmin Chubanshe.

Reader,
International College
for Advanced Buddhist Studies