Preface

Sthiramati's *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya* (TrBh) is a traditional commentary on Vasubandhu's *Triṃśikākārikā* (Tr), the latter being an integral and highly influential presentation of the essential thought of Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda presented in 30 stanzas. As the only commentary on the *Triṃśikā* that has survived in original Sanskrit, the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya* is indispensable for an understanding of this work of the Kośakāra.[1]

Known to have functioned as the abbot of a Buddhist monastery at Valabhī (Western India), the years 510-570 CE have been determined as the approximate *floruit* of Sthiramati.[2] He was a prolific author and produced a

---

[1] By ascribing the *Triṃśikā* to the Kośakāra, reference is made to Vasubandhu as the author of the *Abhidharmakośa(bhāṣya)*, *Vyākhyāyukti*, *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa*, *Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa*, *Pratītyasamutpādavyākhyā*, *Viṃśatikā* and *Triṃśikā* (cf. *Ālayav.*: n. 101; SKILLING 2000: 299ff.) — however, in strict distinction from Vasubandhu the author of works such as the commentaries on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*, *Madhyāntavibhāga* and *Mahāyānasaṃgraha*. Most contemporary buddhologists seem to reject FRAUWALLNER's (1951) theory that distinguished between the Kośakāra and the author of MASBh, MAVBh and MSgrBh (for a bibliography, see SKILLING 2000: 298n. 2), while some scholars accept the existence of two Vasubandhus only in the sense that there must have existed an insignificant (and nowadays unidentifiable) earlier Vasubandhu apart from the great Abhidharma-cum-Yogācāra master (cf. MEJOR 1991: 42-49; SKILLING 2000: 311f.). In my view the case is not yet settled. Some of the materials, which I intend to reconsider, would rather support Frauwallner's distinguishment of the Kośakāra from Vasubandhu, the so-called brother of Asaṅga (cf. also FRAUWALLNER 1961: 129ff.).

On the other hand, Frauwallner's (1956: 76) assumption of c. 400-480 CE as the lifetime of the Kośakāra has certainly to be adjusted, since already Vasubandhu's disciples — among them Guṇabhadra (MEJOR 1991: 50; SKILLING 2000: 313), the translator of LAS into Chinese in 443 — have incorporated material from the *Triṃśikā*, probably Vasubandhu's last work, into the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*. SCHMITHAUSEN's "A Note on Vasubandhu and the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*" (1992) has taken up this issue, and I agree with his view (p. 397) in regarding the solution of the problem to require no more than dating the Kośakāra a few decades earlier than Frauwallner had done.

[2] The dates 510-570 for Sthiramati's lifetime have been established by FRAUWALLNER (1961: 136f.) on the basis of [1] epigraphical evidence documenting a royal grant to a monastery that had been erected for Sthiramati under the reign of Guhasena (cf. LÉVI 1986/1937: 231f.), and [2] Hsüan-tsang's testimony of having met two very old monks at Valabhī who had been personal students of Sthiramati. KAJIYAMA 1968/69 defended Frauwallner's dating against the dating 470-550 (suggested by H. UI) prevalent in Japan at the time when Kajiyama wrote his article. In order to account for his ascription of the authorship of the *Kāśyapaparivartaṭīkā* (KSṬ) to Sthiramati, CUONG TU NGUYEN (1990: 21ff.) has recently tried to revive Ui's date. Bodhiruci's Chinese translation of this *Kāśyapaparivartaṭīkā* was produced in 510, but without indicating any authorship (cf. KAJIYAMA, *op. cit.*: 197).

Although it is true that KSṬ contains Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda terminology (cf., e.g., KPṬ 126, where the notions of *kun tu brtags pa'i raṅ bźin* [*parikalpitasvabhāva*] and *yoṅs su grub pa'i raṅ bźin* [*pariniṣpannasvabhāva*] are employed), this does not sufficiently support Cuong tu Nguyen's assumption of regarding Sthiramati as its author.

MAVṬ 245-250 (= MAVṬ$_t$ [D 4032]: 311a-313b) quotes from, and interprets, KP §§

significant corpus of philosophical works, mostly, as far as can be judged from what has come down to us, in the form of commentaries on Abhidharma, Madhyamaka and Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda texts.[3] In view of the size of his *opus*, and of the fact that its study has not yet proceeded very far, it is still premature to characterize his authorship as a whole. Steps in that direction may take different shapes.

Consisting in the critical editions of the Sanskrit text of the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya* and its Tibetan translation, the present contribution constitutes a purely philological undertaking. As has been elaborated in detail below, in the introduction preceding my critical editions, this work attempts to fulfil the desideratum of providing a reliable philological basis of the only text completely available in original Sanskrit that supplies, though not in an encyclopedic manner, a systematic outline of Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda thought in its essential structure.

Serving practical purposes, a separate presentation of only the edited kārikās of the *Triṃśikā* as well as a Structural Analysis of TrBh, outlining the philosophical discourse of this text, are found in appendices. My translation of TrBh is scheduled for a subsequent publication.

Acknowledgements

Although writing acknowledgements is largely a matter of formal propriety, the very process of reviewing the extended procedure of producing a publication even of this kind may be filled with, also emotionally complex, memories and sentiments, many of which must remain private. To those scholars, colleagues and friends mentioned in the following by name, as well as to those who have remained unnamed, I offer my sincere thanks for their respective contributions.

The personal continuum in its basic function of constituting lifeworlds being unavoidably, in a modern setting, experienced as points of interference of

---

66-71. Against Sthiramati's fondness of (at least partially) reusing phrases, once formulated on certain topics, when arriving at the corresponding contexts in different commentaries, those sections of MAVṬ do not at all resemble KPṬ (pp. 148ff.) on KP §§ 66ff. Though this negative evidence is no ultimate criterium by itself, it concurs with the lack of ascribing KPṬ to Sthiramati in Bodhiruci's time.

To refer to a contrastive case, BRAARVIG (1993, II: cxxviii) has likewise recognized this habit of Sthiramati just mentioned. On the basis of Braarvig's documentation of the occurrence of this feature in the *Akṣayamatinirdeśaṭīkā* (cf. especially II: cxxiii), I would find it indeed justified to ascribe this *ṭīkā* to Sthiramati.

While Frauwallner's dates for Sthiramati's lifetime were naturally not meant to be historically exact dates, but merely to serve the purpose of a general orientation, the important point for Frauwallner was that Sthiramati, as an elder contemporary of Dharmapāla, outlived the latter and "must have been still active about 560 A.D." (FRAUWALLNER 1961: 137). Given that, around 640, Hsüan-tsang still met some of Sthiramati's former pupils, it is difficult not to agree with Frauwallner.

[3] Cf. NAKAMURA 1980: 280; POWERS 1991: 51ff.; M. MEJOR 1991: 90ff.; CUONG TU NGUYEN 1990: 13-83.

multiple historical factors of influence, the Tibetan diaspora had its share in manifesting as such a one, in my case after I had left Berlin for Copenhagen. Having originally been invited to Denmark by HRH Prince Peter of Greece and Denmark (likewise an anthropologist,[4] who spoke fluently Tibetan and contributed significantly to building up Tibetan collections in Copenhagen), Lha rams pa'i bge bśes bKra śis rab brtan, more generally known as Tarab Tulku, worked as a curator at DET KONGELIGE BIBLIOTEK when I first met him for discussions, then as a student of philosophy, and still, years later, as a colleague both at this Royal Library and at the University of Copenhagen. While Tarab Tulku has to be credited with successfully drawing my attention to the psychologically and philosophically elaborate system of Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda thought, it was Prof. Lambert Schmithausen in particular, who decisively sustained it subsequently, initially through his intellectually always challenging publications, later also personally and with respect to the present undertaking, not least with advices and discussions, arranging a Triṃśikā-semester in Hamburg as well as helping me to obtain photographs of manuscript-fragments from Göttingen — his characteristic kindness always permeating the whole atmosphere of communicating with him. To the generosity of Prof. Akira Yuyama I owe, among else, my own copy of *Three Works of Vasubandhu in Sanskrit Manuscript*, the crucial basis for the project leading to the present publication. Dr. Lore Sander kindly made her palaeographical expertise available to me and directed me into the right direction. Dr. Anne MacDonald, then still in Hamburg, helped me checking the sources of the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (NGMPP) for pertinent material. Thanks to the curator of the Tibetan Collection at the British Library, Mr. Burkhard Quessel, who most conveniently provided me with digitized versions, I was able to include Dunhuang manuscript material when preparing $TrBh_t$. In November 2003, at the occasion of publicly defending my Ph.D.-thesis, interesting comments were offered by Prof. Claus Oetke, Prof. Tom Tillemans and Prof. Eli Franco. Although my edition had been prepared earlier, I still learned from Dr. Kazuo Kano's edition of a fragment of $TrBh_s$ and responded to various phases of his editorial process, while comparing our views on the interpretation of several passages. Formal and informal discussions with Dr. Kenneth Zysk, Dr. Christian Wedemeyer and Dr. Ulrich Kragh at the former Institute of Oriental Studies, University of Copenhagen, contributed much to the stimulating ingredients of a critical research milieu, as did the continuous contact with other colleagues, friends and students. Drawing on his long standing interest in the TrBh, Prof. Shoryu Katsura very kindly provided a list of comments on $TrBh_s$. Finally it has to be emphasized that I am much indebted to Prof. Ernst Steinkellner's engagement and practical advices, all of which effected crucial benefit for the publication of this work.

---

[4] Cf. my preface to volume one of H. BUESCHER/T. TULKU, *Catalogue of Tibetan Manuscripts and Xylographs*, Copenhagen 2000 (= Catalogue of Oriental Manuscripts, Xylographs, etc. in Danish Collections, vol. 6, 1-2): XIII.