

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS



"The Hand Treatise," a Work of Aryadeva

Author(s): F. W. Thomas and H. Ui

Source: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, (Apr., 1918), pp. 267-310

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25209382>

Accessed: 25/06/2014 04:55

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

VIII

“THE HAND TREATISE,” A WORK OF ARYADEVA

BY F. W. THOMAS AND H. UI

THE little work here presented in text and translation attracted my notice many years ago in connexion with a certain literary question. It occurs as Nos. 1255-6 in Bunyiu Nanjio's *Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist Tripiṭaka*, where its title is given as *Muṣṭī-prakarana (?)-śāstra (Tālāntaraka-śāstra)*, translated (p. 374, among the works of Gīna, i.e. Dignāga) as “Śāstra on the explanation of the fist”. I was not in a position to consider its relation to a Tibetan work with which I was familiar, ascribed to Āryadeva and bearing the name *Hastabāla (sic)* or *Hastābhava-prakarana* with commentary.

It was accordingly with great satisfaction that I found an opportunity of consulting a Japanese Buddhist scholar interested in Sanskrit philosophy, in the person of Professor H. Ui, whom the War had brought to England. Together with the Vaiśeṣika text *Daśapadārthī* (Nanjio, No. 1295), which he has now published in the Oriental Translation Series of the Royal Asiatic Society, we discussed also this little work; and in good time Professor Ui furnished me with a text in two versions, adding word-for-word and free translations and explanatory notes. The first comparison of these was sufficient to show that the Chinese version of the work ascribed to Dignāga and the Tibetan version of the work ascribed to Āryadeva were indeed from the same original.

In the meanwhile I had become aware¹ that among the Tibetan MSS. brought by Sir M. A. Stein from Tun-huang and now in the India Office Library there were three

¹ From Professor de la Vallée Poussin's Catalogue (in MS.).

copies of the same work, two being imperfect. They likewise ascribe the Sanskrit original to Āryadeva.

Ultimately Professor Ui agreed to join me in publishing the two versions together. Accordingly I here present his copy of the two Chinese translations with a selection from his notes (he having now left for Japan), preceded by (1) an English translation from the Tibetan, (2) a conjectural reconstitution of the original Sanskrit, (3) the Tibetan version with collation of the MS. and xylograph copies. It has not seemed worth while to print a translation from the Chinese, since, as compared with one based upon the Tibetan (in this case, as always, reliable and exact), it would necessarily be, especially as regards syntactical and sentence connexions, largely conjectural.

The last-mentioned circumstance does not at all deprive the Chinese versions of utility. They are considerably older than the Tibetan ones, that of Paramārtha being placed in 557–569 A.D. and that of I-ting in 703 A.D. When read in the light of the Tibetan, they reveal themselves as in general surprisingly close to the original, the correspondence of the phrases being in expression and order very satisfactory, and the indications as regards both technical terms and grammatical constructions being most useful in the reconstitution of the Sanskrit. Here Professor Ui's word-for-word interpretation has been exceedingly helpful. On the other hand, the demarcation of the *kārikās* and of the clauses in the Chinese gains greatly in certainty from comparison with the Tibetan.¹

The Sanskrit text will not be regarded as an over-venturesome attempt to rewrite a *chef d'œuvre* of a famous Buddhist philosopher. Its object is simply to bring home to the reader (and students of Indian

¹ The corresponding paragraphs bear the same numbers in all the versions *infra*.

philosophy think best in Sanskrit) the real force and form of the original. On the other hand, we need not fear to have departed too hopelessly from what the author wrote. The Tibetan is good authority for phraseology, word-order, and construction; the technical terms are familiar both from the Buddhist Sanskrit literature and from the criticisms of opponents, e.g. Śaṅkara's commentary on the *Brahma-sūtras*, ii, 2. 18-32, and the Buddhist chapter in the *Sarvadarsānusaṅgraha*. And the Chinese comes in, as already stated, with its confirmations. The style is the straightforward one of rough *kārikā* verses (here the reconstitution is least certain) and commentary.

A few points of textual criticism are elicited by comparison of the several versions. One of the Tanjur copies supplies at the end an extra *kārikā* with commentary appropriating the text to Yoga practices. Although it is by no means impossible that this addition also had a Sanskrit original, it is so clearly a late and incongruous accretion that it did not deserve to be reproduced in that language.

The particulars of the different MSS. and other copies are as follows :—

- a. MS. (Ch. 9, I, 17 = 623) from Tun-huang. Foll. 4, viz. Nos. 61-4 of volume 7; size $44\frac{1}{2} \times 8$ cm.; ll. 5 per page (writing ends on l. 2 of fol. 64a). Fol. 61a text; foll. 61b-64a text (in red ink) with commentary. Complete.

Title of text : *Rab . tu . byed . pa . lag . tshad . kyi . tshig . lehur . byas . pa* (= *Prakarāṇa-Hastamātra-kārikā*).

Title of commentary : *Rab . tu . byed . pa . lag . tshad . kyi . hgral . pa* (= *Prakarāṇa-Hastamātra-vṛtti*).

Author of text : Āryadeva.

- β. MS. (Ch. 51, I, 29 (42) = 624) from Tun-huang. Fol. 1 not numbered; size $49\frac{1}{2} \times 9$ cm.; ll. 5 and 6 per page. *a*, text; *b*, text (in red ink) with commentary as far as verse 1b.

Title of text and commentary as in *a*.

Author of text: Āryadeva.

- γ. MS. (625) from Tun-huang. Foll. 2, viz. ω and ρ; size 45×9 cm.; ll. 6 per page. Text (in red ink) and commentary from verse II (part) to end, nearly joining at beginning the end of β. There are a few glosses in small cursive writing.

Title of commentary as in *a* and β.

Author of commentary: Āryadeva.

- A. Xylograph, *Tanjur*, Mdo, vol. ५. Foll. 312b–315a of India Office copy. Text (312b) and text with commentary.

Title of text: *Cha . śas . kyi . yan . lag . ces . bya . baḥi . rab . tu . byed . pa* (Sanskrit given as *Hastabala-nāma-prakarāṇa*).

Title of commentary: *°byed . paḥi . hḡrel . pa* (*°prakarāṇa-vṛtti*).

Author of text and commentary: Āryadeva.

Translators of both: the Indian Pandit Śraddhākara-varman and the Tibetan *lotsābu Rin . cen . bzan . po*.

- B. Xylograph, *Tanjur*, Mdo, vol. ६. Foll. 21b–23a of India Office copy. Text (21b) and text with commentary (21b–23a).

Title of text: *Rab . tu . byed . pa . lag . paḥi . tshad . kyi . tshig . lehur . byas . pa* (Sanskrit given as *Hastābhava-prakarāṇa-kārikā*).

Title of commentary: *Lag . paḥi . tshad . kyi . hḡrel . pa* (*Hastābhava-vṛtti*).

Author of text and commentary: Āryadeva.

Translators of both : the Indian Pandit Dānaśīla and the *lotsāba* the *bhikṣu* Dpal . ḥbyor . sñiñ . po. Revising *lotsāba* the *bhikṣu* Dpal . brtsegs . rakṣita.

B is a revised text which has plainly been compared with Chinese versions. *A* shows, as confronted with the MSS., a few variations in detail, due to corruption. It should be observed that all the Tibetan copies, MS. and xylograph, contain the same version : there is no question of independent translations. Accordingly the MS. copies from Tun-huang, which do not name the translator, must also exhibit the work of Śraddhākara-varman and Rin . cen . bzañ . po, the latter a famous scholar whose date is about 950–1050 A.D. (see *Pag . sam . jon . zang*, ed. Sarat Chandra Das, Calcutta, 1908, part ii, pp. xv–xvii).

In order of date the authorities for our text are therefore as follows:—

- (1) Paramārtha, A.D. 557–569 (*circa* one hundred years later than Dignāga);
- (2) I-tsing, A.D. 703;
- (3) Śraddhākara-varman and Rin . cen . bzañ . po, *circa* A.D. 1000 :
 - (a) MSS. from Tun-huang;
 - (b) Xylographs *A* and *B* (revised) in the *Tanjur*.

We may now remark upon the authorship, the object, and the title of the treatise.

There cannot be many Buddhist works which are illuminated by such a galaxy of Buddhist authorities as Āryadeva, Dignāga, Paramārtha, and I-tsing, all too well known to need any further statement of their position and work. The Tibetan translator Rin . cen . bzañ . po was likewise, as already stated, an eminent scholar. But who is the real author, Āryadeva or Dignāga? From Professor Ui I understand that the Chinese tradition is not really unanimous in naming Dignāga. Both authorities

have their supporters. As Dignāga often appears as a commentator upon the works of Nāgārjuna and others, it may be suggested that, while the *kārikās* may be the work of Āryadeva, the commentary may be due to Dignāga. For a real decision of the question we have no material.

In any case the little treatise belongs to the Mādhyamika school. This is clear from *kārikā* iv, where not only external objects, but also the mental activities (*viññāna*) are shown to be illusory. On the other hand, the term *śūnya*, "void," does not occur, and the argument lacks the sophistical turn common in the Nihilist school. The distinction between conventional and ultimate truth (*saṃvṛti* (or *vyavahāra*)-*satya* and *paramārtha-satya*) is not distinctive of a particular sect.

The title presents some difficulty. The Chinese has, according to Nanjio, "Explanation-fist-śāstra" (Paramārtha) and "Palm-within-śāstra", which are rendered *Muṣṭi-prakarāṇa-śāstra* and *Tālāntaraka-śāstra*. But, as Professor Ui points out in his note, the former should probably be "Explanation-roll-up(twist)-śāstra", and the latter "Fist-within-śāstra".¹ M. Cordier, in his catalogue of the Tanjur (*Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, iii, p. 297) interprets *Haslavāla* as a synonym for *karavāla*, "a scimitar," an explanation which does not account for the Tibetan rendering *lag . tshad*, "hand-measure." I would suggest that Paramārtha's rendering supplies the best hint. If we might suppose that his "roll-up", "twist", represented a Sanskrit

¹ Mr. L. C. Hopkins, who with great kindness has read the proof of the Chinese texts, remarks that the first of the three characters in Paramārtha's title, though often meaning "explain", has primarily the physical sense of "undo", "untie", "dissect"; while the second, according to Kang-hsi's Dictionary, is interchanged with 拳 "a fist". He therefore considers that the sense is "undo the fist", and is parallel to the common expression in the spoken language 解手, "undo the hand," which might correspond to I-tsing's phrase.

form *vāla*, from the root *val*, to “roll” or “twist”, and that his “Explanation” either conceals the word “hand” or represents “commentary”, we should be able to point to the Sanskrit phrase *valita-hasta* in the sense of “clenched hand”, the “fist” of I-tsing. The work would then be entitled “Hand-clenching”. Why “hand” and “clenching”? “Hand” is an idea which occurs in other titles, either virtually, as in *Kusumāñjali*, or explicitly, as in *Hastāmalaka*, meaning “myrobalan fruit in the hand”. It is well applied to a summary exposition, the *kara-budara* or “berry in the hand” of the *Vāsavadattā*, verse 1. The “clenching” would well represent the closing of the grasp of the matter. Accordingly, I understand the title *Hasta-vāla* in this sense, and regard it as a significant fact that the *kārikās* are six in number, of which the sixth draws the practical conclusion: it is the five fingers and the closing upon them.

The Tibetan form of the title, *lag . tshad, lag . paḥi . tshad*, and *cha . śas . kyī . yan . lag* (= *aṃśāvayava!*), must be regarded as free renderings, unless we may suppose an early copyist's error, in which case we might think of the verb *geud*, “twist” (cf. the phrase *lag . pa . geus*, quoted by Jüschke from the *Zamatog*), or of the noun *glad*, “top,” as the original reading in place of *tshad*.

THE CLOSED HAND

In the language of India: *Hastavāla-nāma-prakarāṇa-vṛtti*.

In the language of Tibet: *Rab . tu . byed . pa . lug . tshad . kyī . hgral . pa* (Commentary upon the treatise "Hand-Measure").

Homage to the exalted Mañjuśrī, whose essence is knowledge!

Since in regard to the Triple Universe, owing to imagination of reality in what is merely conventional, living creatures do not penetrate to the truth (1-2), this treatise is undertaken (5) in order that, by way of distinguishing the proper nature of things (3), they may attain an infallible knowledge (4).

हस्तवालप्रकरणवृत्तिः ।

मञ्जुश्रिये ज्ञानसत्वाय नमः ।

त्रैलोक्ये¹ व्यवहारमात्रे² सति¹(1) परमार्थाभिमानात् तत्त्वार्थानवगाहिभिः सत्त्वे²(2) र्वस्तुस्वभावविवेकद्वारेणा³(3) विपर्ययज्ञान³-संप्राप्तये⁴ (4) [शास्त्र]रचनेयम् (5) ।

¹ Locative also in Chinese.

² The Tibetan seems to use *tha'sñad* for *vyavahāra* and *kun'rdzob* for *sanvrti*.

³ The *sems (citta)* of *B* is a correction, not supported by the Chinese.

Ia. *Conception of snake in regard to rope,
When the rope is seen, is without reality (6).*

Here in some place not too distant, but merely appearing in a moderate light (7), on seeing something having a feature in common with the form of a rope¹(8), there arises through error a cognition in the form of certitude, "This is a snake" (9): because we do not penetrate to the specific form (10). When the specific form is ascertained (11), that cognition, since it is merely an emanation of fancy, not corresponding with fact (12), is illusory cognition, without reality (13).

Ib. *When we see its parts, in regard to it also
The cognition is illusory, like the snake (14).*

When we consider the rope also as divided into parts (15), the proper form of the rope is not perceived (16). Since it is not perceived (17), the perception of rope also is, like the thought of snake (18), merely illusion and disappears (19).

Again, just as the cognition of the rope is illusory (20), so the parts also; when we look at their parts, half, fraction, and so on (21), their own proper form is not apprehended (22): as that is not apprehended, the thought which has the form of perceiving them, like the thought of the rope, is merely illusion (23).

¹ Paramārtha everywhere gives "wisteria", "creeper" (which is also a meaning of the Tibetan *thay . pa*) in place of "rope".

I (a)

रज्जौ सर्पमनस्कारो रज्जुं दृष्ट्वा निरर्थकः। (6)

अत्रानतिदूरे¹ ऽप्यालोकमात्रया भासमाने देशे (7) रज्जुस्वरूपसाधारणधर्मोपलब्धितो (8) भ्रान्त्या सर्प एवायमिति निश्चयरूपं ज्ञानं आयते (9) । विशेषस्वरूपानवगाहनात्² (10) । तद्विशेषं गृहीत्वा (11) । अथयार्थतो³ ऽभिमानपरिस्फुरणत्वात् (12) तज्ज्ञानं भ्रान्तज्ञानं निरर्थकमेव भवति (13) ।

I (b)

तदंशान् वीक्ष्य तत्रापि भ्रान्ता बुद्धिरहाविव⁴ (14) ॥

रज्जावपि⁵ तस्यामंशविभागेन परीक्ष्य (15) रज्जुस्वरूपं नोपलभ्यते (16) । तदनुपलब्धौ⁶ (17) रज्जुपलब्धिरपि सर्पइतिबुद्धिवद् (18) भ्रममात्रा⁷ कुत्रापि लीयते⁷ (19) । अथ यथा रज्जुज्ञानं भ्रान्तं (20) तथा⁸ ते ऽप्यवयवाः । तत्खण्डच्छेदादिषु दृश्यमानेषु (21) तेषां स्वरूपं न निर्धारयति (22) । तदनिर्धारणात्⁹ तदुपलब्ध्याकारबुद्धिरपि रज्जुबुद्धिवद्¹⁰ भ्रममात्रैव (23) ।

¹ The Tibetan *skal* or *bskal* is of uncertain meaning: the Chinese has "far".

² This clause comes earlier in the Chinese.

³ This word is omitted by I-tsing.

⁴ In I-tsing's version this half-verse joins on to the previous half

⁵ Locative in Chinese and Tibetan.

⁶ Apparently I-tsing read in error *tatupalabdhanu*.

⁷ These words do not appear in the Chinese.

⁸ Clause omitted by Paramārtha.

⁹ Omitted in Chinese, which inserts "rope" and "parts".

¹⁰ Omitted in Chinese, which inserts "all".

II. *All dependent*¹ *things,*
If we examine their proper form,
Throughout the range of conventional cognition
Are dependent upon something other (24).

As, when we examine ropes and so forth, making divisions of parts, etc. (25), the proper form is not perceived, and so the thought also of rope and so forth is, like the thought of snake, illusory (26), so, when we regard the sides and so forth, pot, cloth, etc., throughout the range of conventional cognition, are of the essence of thought (*or* dependent) (27). When we divide them to the end, every one, pot and so forth, is merely dependent upon convention (28): "upon something other": [other than] ultimate reality (29).

¹ Or "relative". "Dependent" in Chinese: no doubt *btags* represents *āśrita*, which is a technical term in the Vaiśeṣika philosophy for all non-atomic *dravyas*: see *Praśastapāda-bhāṣya*, pp. 16 and 18, *Bhāṣāpariccheda*, v. 23, and compare Burnouf, *Buddhisme*, p. 449.

It is tempting to read in the Sanskrit *sarvālambana*^o ("all objects of thought") in place of *sarvānyāśrita*^o. But both the Tibetan (*B*) and the Chinese of Paramārtha seem to have the same word here as in the following line.

II

सर्वाण्याश्रितवस्तूनि स्वरूपे सुविचारिते ।
आश्रितान्यन्यतो यावत् संवृत्तिज्ञानगोचरः (24) ॥

यथावयवादिविभागेन पृथग्रज्जादिषु विचार्यमाणेषु स्वरू- (25)
पानुपलब्धितो रज्जादिवुद्धिरपि सर्परतिबुद्धिवद्¹ भ्रान्ता (26)
तथा दिग्भागादीर्नपेक्ष्य घटपटादयो व्यवहारज्ञानगोचरो यावत्
सर्वे चिदात्मका एव (आश्रिता एव) (27) । तेष्वन्ततो विभज्यमानेषु
प्रत्येकघटादयो व्यवहाराश्रिता भवन्ति (28) । अन्यत² इति पर-
मार्थतः (29) ।

¹ Omitted in I-tsing.

² Paramārtha has apparently *kapālādīn* and I-tsing *tantrādīn* in place of *śiṅghāgādīn*.

³ I-tsing places *anyatah*, apparently, before *vyavahāra*.

IIIa. *Since things without parts cannot be conceived,
The last (part) is equivalent to non-existent (30).*

As for the last end of all dependent things, the substance of the atom, the only one without parts (31), that also, since it cannot be seen, having an unthinkable form¹ (32), is proved to be equally with a garland of sky-flowers, a hare's horn and so on, without reality (33-4).

But, if you ask how, for this very reason of its having an unthinkable mark¹ (35), you can know that (37) the substance of the atom, if it exists, is not an unity (36), this is because, if it exists, it has different sides (38); for example, the substances of pot, cloth, cart, etc., which exist, are seen, because they have different sides, east, west, and so on, to have different parts (39); if the substance of the atom also exists (40), undoubtedly, since it has different sides, it must be admitted to have different parts, east, west, etc. (41). Having different parts, the substance of the atom cannot be proved one (42). Since various differences of substance are seen, the unity does not exist (43). Inasmuch as the atom is not visible, give up this speaking of atomic substance (44).

IIIb. *Therefore a wise man should not regard
What is mere illusion as reality (45).*

Why? Because the Triple Universe is thus merely illusion, therefore, "a wise man," one who desires to attain to felicity, must not in regard to it entertain the conception of ultimate reality (46).

If you say that upon this view it is true that external things, pot, etc., since they have an unthinkable form, are imagined out of nothing (47), yet the illusory cognitions which have the form of perceiving them exist (48); for example, just as, while illusions, mirage, etc., do not exist, the cognitions which have the form of perceiving them are—if you so approve, [then] (49)—

¹ "Being invisible" might give better sense, if the Tibetan word (*rtogs*) admitted this meaning.

III (a)

निरंशानामचिन्त्यत्वादन्यो ऽप्यवस्तुना समः(30) ।

यत्त्वाश्रितवस्तूनां सर्वेषामन्त्यं परमाणुद्रव्यं निरवयवमेकं (31) तस्याप्यचिन्त्यस्वरूपत्वेनानुपलभ्यत्वात् (32) तदपि स्रपुष्पमालाशशृङ्गादिभिः सम (33) मवस्तुकमेव सिध्यते (34) । किंच कथमचिन्त्यलक्षणत्वहेतुना (35)¹ परमाणुद्रव्यं सदप्येकं नास्ती (36) ति ज्ञातुं शक्यते (37) । यतः सत्त्वे दिग्भागनानात्वात् (38) । तथा हि यथा सतां घटपटशकटादीनां द्रव्याणि प्राक्प्रत्यगादिनानादिग्भागवत्त्वान् नानावयवीनि विद्यन्ते (39) यदि परमाणुद्रव्यमप्यस्ति (40) तदावश्यं² दिग्भागनानात्वात् प्राक्प्रत्यगादिनानावयवाः स्वीकर्तव्याः (41) । सत्सु तु नानावयवेषु परमाणुद्रव्यमेकं न सिध्यते (42) । विद्यमानेषु ब्रह्मेषु द्रव्यविभागेष्वेकत्वं नास्ति (43) । परमाण्वनुपलब्धेः³ परमाणुद्रव्यत्वकथनमिदं त्यक्तव्यम् (44) ।

III (b)

भ्रान्तमात्रमतः प्राज्ञैर्न चिन्त्यं परमार्थतः (45) ॥

कस्मात् । एवं त्रैलोक्ये भ्रान्तमात्रमस्ति तस्मात् । प्राज्ञैः श्रेयस्कामिभिरत्र परमार्थचिन्ता न कर्तव्या (46) ।⁴ यद्येतन्नते तानि घटादिबाह्यवस्तून्यचिन्त्यरूपत्वादभावतः संकल्पितानीति सत्यम् (47) । तदुपलब्ध्याकारभ्रान्तज्ञानमिदमस्थेव (48) । यथासत्स्वपि माया⁵गन्धर्वनगरादिषु तदुपलब्ध्याकारज्ञानमिवेतीष्यते (49) ।

¹ §§ 34-5 omitted by Paramārtha, who also had a different text in § 32. The Sanskrit text here was perhaps expanded after his date by a gloss : cf. the English translation, which reads awkwardly.

² "Six" parts by Paramārtha.

³ Altered in Paramārtha's version.

⁴ "Those who desire most excellent teaching," I-tsing : °mokṣa, Paramārtha.

⁵ The Chinese here insert verse IV, but give its substance again apparently in § 50.

⁶ The Chinese here have *nirmīta-puruṣa* or *māyā-puruṣa*, in which respect they are followed by *B*. But *māyā* is supported by use (see Śaṅkara, *Brahma-sūtra*, ii, 2. 28), and below, § 57, it is given by the Chinese also.

IV. *If illusion, that also, since it is not true,
Is not such as it appears ;
Being appearance without reality,
It is of like character with those (50).*

As to this illusion, again, which thinks the form of substance, the substance is not of that same form (51). This has been explained above (52). Since, if its content does not exist, it cannot of itself be existent, it is not true (53). Not being true, it is likewise of illusory form (54). How is this known? (55). Thus: in the world also, if the seed does not generate, we do not see such a phenomenon as existence of the thence to be generated shoots, etc. (56). Hence we declare the example of the illusion to be without cogency (57).¹

¹ The argument here requires a little elucidation. We may compare Śāṅkara on *Brahma-sūtra*, ii, 2, 28, and *Sāṅkhya-pravacana-bhāṣya*, i, 43. The point is that apperception includes the consciousness of the thing as distinct from the perception of it. If the thing-content is false, the *vijñāna* itself is then also false, since it does not exist without a content.

IV

भ्रान्तं तदप्यसम्यक्त्वाद् यथा भानं तथास्ति न ।
अनर्थकं भासमानं तत्सदृशात्मकं भवेत् ¹ (50) ॥

भ्रान्त्यापि तथा यद् द्रव्यस्वरूपं ज्ञायते तथारूपं द्रव्यं तत्रा-
स्ति (51) । इदं प्रागुक्तम् ² (52) । असति तु तस्मिन्नर्थे सा स्वरूपेणाशक्त-
त्वात्सम्यग्भवति (53) । असम्यक्त्वाद् भ्रान्तरूपिव तदद् भवति ³ (54) ।
तत् कथं ज्ञायते ⁴ (55) । तथा हि लोके ऽपि बीजादिकमलाभावे
जन्याङ्कुरादयः सन्तीति धर्म ईदृक् न वृक्षते (56) । अत एव
मायासादृश्यमसिद्धमस्माभिर्निर्दिष्टम् (57) ।

¹ The Chinese gives "the percipient (*grāhaka*) also is unreal".

² Sentence omitted in the Chinese.

³ The Chinese seems here rather doubtful.

⁴ The Chinese has "how can that illusoriness be established?" (Paramārtha), and "how let that illusoriness exist?" (I-tsing).

V. *Whoso with subtle intelligence
 Conceives all things as merely dependent,
 That intelligent man easily abandons
 Attachment, etc., like the fear of the snake (58).*

In this Triple Universe, which, as explained above, is merely dependent, whoso clears away the thought of coarse things, pots and so on (59), and with fine intelligence apprehends certainly that things are without substance and merely conventional (60), just as a man, after reflection upon the particular fear arising from the cognition of rope as snake (61), upon ascertaining that it is a rope, is not frightened by that snake (62), so he, after examining the things which give rise to desire, etc. (63), "easily," "without difficulty," "soon," verily abandons the nets of infirmities, such as desire and so forth (64).

V

सर्वमेवाश्रितं येन विद्यते सूक्ष्मबुद्धिना ।

त्यजेत्स बुद्धिमान् सुष्ठु रागाद्यहिभयं यथा (58) ॥

यथोक्तप्रकारेणाश्रितमात्रे सति त्रैलाक्ये ऽस्मिन् यो घटादि-
स्थूलबुद्धिं विहाय (59) सूक्ष्मबुद्ध्या द्रव्यहीनं व्यवहारमात्रं निश्चि-
नोति (60) यथा रज्ज्वी सर्प इति ज्ञानादागतभयो (61) विशेषं
विचार्य रज्जुनिश्चये सर्पान्निर्भयो भवति (62) तथा रागादिजनक-
वस्तूनि परीक्ष्य (63) तेनापि रागादिक्लेशजालानि सुष्ठु अकृच्छ्रेण
अचिरेणैव त्यज्यन्ते¹ (64) ।

¹ The Chinese has for *tyajyante* the future passive of *ucchid*.

VI. *When considering worldly things,
One should conceive like the world ;
When desiring entirely to abandon infirmities,
One must seek according to ultimate reality (65).*

As worldly people, conceiving of things, pot, etc., under the aspect of existing, attach to them conventions such as "This is a pot", "This is a cloth", "This is a cart" (66), thus in accordance with previous acceptance one should employ conventions (67). Afterwards, wishing to abandon infirmities, such as desire, etc. (68), one must investigate things according to the above expounded definition of ultimate reality (69). If we so investigate things, the nets of infirmities, desire, and so forth, do not again arise (70).¹

[VII. *Thus, knowing thoroughly according to fact,
The Yogin, being rendered capable
By his conduct in relation to colour, etc.,
Quickly attains the fruit of his asceticism.*

Having the above explained knowledge, reflecting completely upon the proper nature of reality (*tattva*), the Yogin, acting according to the desired virtues, obtains by the Vajradhara asceticism a body withdrawn into the principal artery (*purītat*.)]

End of the commentary upon the treatise "Hand-Measure", composed by Āryadeva.

[A. Translated by the Indian Paṇḍit Śraddhākara-varman and the Tibetan *lotsāba* Rin . chen . bzan . po.

B. Translated by the Indian Paṇḍit Dānaśīla and the *lotsāba* Dpal . hbyor . sñin . po.]

¹ The attitude here adopted in regard to conventional life and philosophical truth is identical with that of Descartes in his *Meditations*.

VI

लौकिकार्थविचारेषु लोकसिद्धिमनुव्रजेत् ।
क्लेशान् सर्वान् त्यक्तुमना यतेत परमार्थतः (65) ॥

यथा लौकिका(क) घटाद्यर्थेषु सद्रूपेण धिक्त्वमानेषु अयं घटः पटः
शकटः इति व्यवहारानावभ्रन्ति (66) तथा पूर्वसिद्धतो व्यवहारः
कर्तव्यः (67) । ततः परं रागादिक्लेशांस् त्यक्तुक्त्वामेन (68) यथोक्तपरमा-
र्थलक्षणेन वस्तूनि परीक्षितव्यानि (69) । तथा परीक्ष्यमाणेषु वस्तुषु
कामादिक्लेशजालानि न पुनस्त्यजन्ते ¹ (70) ॥

¹ Paramārtha has “actually existent *kleśas* disappear and those not yet originated do not arise”. Had he before him *kleśajātam* “mass of *kleśas*”, which he then misinterpreted? I-tsing certainly read *jālāni* with the Tibetans.

॥ ཕྱ་གར་སྐད་ཅུ།

། ཏྟ་བ་ལ་རྒྱ་མ་ཐ་ཀ་ར་ཏ་ཐི་དྲི།

ཐོད་སྐད་ཅུ།

རབ་ཏུ་བྱེད་པ་ལག་ཚད་ཀྱི་འབྲེལ་པ།²

འབགས་པ་འཇམ་དཔལ་ཡེ་ཤེས་སེམས་དཔལ་ལ་ཕྱག་འཚལ་ལོ།

། །ཁམས་གསུམ་པ³་ཐ་སྐྱད་ཚམ་ལ་(1) །ཡན་དག་པའི་དོན་ཅུ་ཀྱན་ཏུ་
རྟོག⁴་པ་ཕྱིར་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་ཀྱི་དོན་ཁོང་ཅུ་མ་ཚུད་པའི་སེམས་ཅན་རྣམས་
ལ་(2) དོངས་པའི་རང་བཞིན་རབ་ཏུ་བྱེད་པའི⁵་སྐོ་ནས(3) ། ཕྱིན་ཅི་མ་ལོག་
པའི་ཤེས⁶་པ་ཡང་དག་པར་བསྐྱབ་པའི་ཕྱིར་(4) འདི་བཅུམས⁷་སོ(5) །།

I (a)

། ཐག་པ་ལ་ནི་སྐྱལ་སྐྱམ་འཇོན།

། ཐག་པ་མཐོང་ནས⁸་དོན་མེད་དོ(6)།

། འདི་ནི⁹་ལལ་དུ་ཅང་བསྐྱལ¹⁰་བ་མ་ཡིན་པའང་འོད¹¹་ཚམ་སྐྱང¹²་བ་
ཉིག་ན(7) ། ཐག་པའི་གཟུགས་སྐྱེའི་ཚོས་ཅན་དམིགས¹³་པ་ལས¹⁴་(8) འཁྲུལ་

¹ B ཏྟ་སྐྱེ་བྱ་བ་.

² B ལག་པའི་ཚད་ཀྱི་འབྲེལ་པ ། A ཚ་ཤས་ཀྱི་ཡན་ལག་ཅེས་ཕྱ་བའི་རབ་
ཏུ་བྱེད་པའི་འབྲེལ་པ །

³ A B པའི་.

⁴ A B རྟོགས་.

⁵ B རབ་ཏུ་རྣམ་པར་བྱེད་པའི་.

⁶ B སེམས་.

⁷ B བཅུམ་སོ་.

⁸ A B ན་.

⁹ B ན་.

¹⁰ A སྐྱལ་.

¹¹ A ཡིན་པ་འོད་.

¹² B A ཚམ་ཉིག་སྐྱང་.

¹³ B A ཅན་ཉིག་དམིགས་; B ཚམ་ཉིག་.

¹⁴ A ལ་; B དམིགས་པས་.

པར་མ་ཟེན་པས་དེ་ལ་དམིགས་པའི་རྣམ་པ་ཅན་གྱི་སྐྱོ་ཡང་ཐག་པའི་སྐྱོ་བཞིན་
རྩ་འབྲུལ་བ་ཙམ¹ཁོ་ནའོ (23) |

II

| བཏགས²་པའི་དངོས་པོ་ཐམས་ཅད་ལ |

| རང་གི་ངོ་པོ་བཏགས³་པ་ན |

⁴ | གཞན་རྩ་ཀྱན་ཚྭ་བ་ཤེས་པའི |

| ལྷོད་ལུལ་ཇི་སྟེད་བཏགས⁵་པ་ཡིན (24) |

| ཇི་ལྟར་ཆ་ཤས་ལ་སོགས་པའི་དབྱེ་བས་ཐ་དད་པའི་ཐག་པ་ལ་སོགས་པ་
ལ་བཏགས་ལ⁶ (25) རང་གི་ངོ་པོ་མ་དམིགས་ཏེ⁷ | ཐག་པ་ལ་སོགས་པའི་སྐྱོ་
ཡང་སྐྱུལ་ལོ་སྐྱུམ་པའི་སྐྱོ་བཞིན་རྩ་འབྲུལ་བ་ཡིན་པ⁸ (26) དེ་བཞིན་རྩ |
⁹ ཇོས་ཆ་ལ་སོགས་པ་ལ་བཞྐས་ནས་ཡོད་པ་ཇ་མ་དང་པོར་བྱ་ལ་སོགས་པ¹⁰ .

¹ Here ends the text of β. ² A བཏགས.
³ Here begins the text of γ.
⁴ A ཀྱན་ཚྭ་བ་རྩ་བ་ཤེས་པ་ཡི || ལྷོད་ལུལ་ཇི་སྟེད་བཏགས་པ་ཡིན |
B ཀྱན་ཚྭ་བ་ཤེས་པའི་ལྷོད་ལུལ་ནི || ཇི་སྟེད་ཡོད་པ་གཞན་ལས་བཏགས |
⁵ A བཏགས. ⁶ γ ན ; A པ་ན.
⁷ B མི་དམིགས་པས. ⁸ B འབྲུལ་བ་ཙམ་རྩ་བཅད་པ.
⁹ B omits ཇོས . . . ཡོད་པ, having ཇ་མ་དང་བྱར་བྱ་ལ་སོགས་པ
immediately after དེ་བཞིན་རྩ and continuing བཏགས་པའི་ཡོད་པ་ཐམས་
ཅད་ཀྱང་ཇོས་ཆ . . . བཞྐས་པ་ཡིན་པས་ཐ་སྐྱུད་པའི་ཤེས་པའི་ལུལ་བུམ་པ་
ལ་སོགས་པ་དབ་རྩ་དབྱེ་བའི་མཐར་ཐུག་པ་དང་བཅས་པ་ཇི་སྟེད་པ་འདི་དག་
ནི་གཞན་ལས་ཐ་སྐྱུད་བཏགས་པ་ཁོ་ན་ཡིན་གྱི་དོན་དམ་པར་ནི་མ་ཡིན་ནོ.
¹⁰ A B omit པ.

བ་སྐྱད་པའི་ཤེས་པའི་སྤྱོད་ལུལ་ཇི་སྟེད་པ་བམས་ཅད¹་བརྟགས་པར་ཡོད་པ་
 ཡིན་ཏེ་(27) | དེ་དག་མཐར་པར་ཏུ་བྱེ་ན། རེ²་ཞིག་བུམ་པ་ལ་སོགས་པ་ནི་
 བ་སྐྱད་ཏུ་བརྟགས་པ³་⁴ཡིན་ནོ(28) | གཞན་ཏུ་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ནི། རོན་དམ་པའི་
 ཉིད་ལས་སོ (29) |

III (a)

| ཆ་མེད་བརྟགས་པར་བྱ་མེད⁵་ལྟེར།

| བ་མ་ཡང་ནི་མེད་པར་མཚུངས་(30) |

| གང་ཡང་བརྟགས⁶་པའི་དངོས་པོ་བམས་ཅད་ཀྱི་བ་མ་རྣམས་སྤྱ་རབ་ཀྱི་ཇུས་
 ཆ་མེད་པ་གཅིག་ལྟ་(31)དེ་ཡང་། བརྟགས་པར་བྱ་བ་མ་ཡིན་པའི་རང་གི་ངོ་
 བོས⁷་དམིགས་པར་མི་རྣམས⁸་པའི་ལྟེར་(32) | བམ་མཁའི་མེ་དྲོག་གི་སྡེང་བ་
 དང་། རེ་བོང་གི་རྩ་ལ་སོགས་པ་དང་མཚུངས་པས་(33) ; དེ་ཡང་དངོས་པོ་
 མེད་པ་ཉིད་ཏུ་འགྲུབ་པོ་(34) || ཇི⁹་སྟེ་ཡང་ཇི་ལྟར་ན་བརྟགས་པར་བྱ་བ་
 མ་ཡིན་པའི་མཚན་ཉིད་ཀྱི¹⁰་གཞན་ཚོགས་དེས་(35) | རྣམ་སྤྱ་རབ་ཀྱི་ཇུས་
 ཡོད་པ་དེ་ཉིད་གཅིག་ཏུ¹¹་མེད་དོ(36) | ཞེས་རྣམ་པར་ཤེས་ཞེ་ན¹²་(37) | གང་

¹ a γ insert ཀྱང and continue བརྟགས, with which the Chinese also agree and which is perhaps preferable.

² B omits རེ. ³ A བརྟགས་པ.

⁴ γ A insert ཁོ་ན. ⁵ B མེན.

⁶ A བརྟགས.

⁷ B (probably influenced by I-tsing) omits བརྟགས་ . . . བོས here, and inserts it, but reading . . . ངོ་བོ་དག, after རྩ་ལ་སོགས་པ just below.

⁸ A རྣམ. ⁹ A ཅེ.

¹⁰ A omits ཀྱི. ¹¹ A reads ཡོད་པ་ཉིད་གཅིག་པ་ཉིད་ཏུ.

¹² A B ཞེས་ཤེས་པར་རྣམ་ཞེ་ན ; a ལུབ for རྣམ. The Chinese has "reason what?", "that difference what?"

གི་ཕྱིར་ཡོད་ན་¹་ཕྱོགས་ཆ་ཐ་དང་པའི་ཕྱིར་ (38) | དཔེར་ན་ཡོད་པ་ཐུམ་པ་
 དང་སྐྱམ་ཐུ་དང་ཤིང་རྟ་ལ་སོགས་པའི་ཇས་རྣམས་ནི | བར་དང་རུབ་ལ་²་
 སོགས་པའི་¹་ཕྱོགས་ཆ་ཐ་དང་པའི་ཕྱིར | ཆ་ཤས་ཐ་དང་པ་དག་སྐྱད་པ་
 ལྟར་ (39) གལ་ཏེ³་རྩལ་སྤ་རབ་ཀྱི་ཇས་ཀྱང་ཡོད་པ་བྱུར་ན་¹ (40) | གོད་ན་
 མི་བཟང་ཕྱོགས་ཆ་ཐ་དང་པའི་ཕྱིར་བར་དང་རུབ་ལ་⁴་སོགས་པའི་ཆ་ཤས་
 ཐ་དང་པར་⁵་ཁས་སྐྱད་བར་བུའོ (41) | ཆ་ཤས་ཐ་དང་པ་ཡིན་ན་ནི་རྩལ་སྤ་
 རབ་ཀྱི་ཇས་གཅིག་ཏུ་མི་འབྲུབ་པོ (42) | ཇས་ཀྱི་དབྱེ་བ་མང་པོ་སྐྱད་པའི་
 ཕྱིར་གཅིག་པ་ཉིད་ནི་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་ཏེ⁶ (43) | རྩལ་སྤ་རབ་མི་དམིགས་པས་
 རྩལ་སྤ་རབ་⁷་ཇས་སྐྱ་སྐྱ་བ་འདི་ཐོང་ཞིག⁸ (44) |

III (b)

| དེ་ཕྱིར་མཁས་པས་འབྲུལ་བ་ཙམ |

| ཡང་དག་དོན་རྩ་མེན་པར་བརྟག (45) |

| གང་གི་ཕྱིར་དེ་ལྟར་ཁམས་གསུམ་ལ་འབྲུལ་བ་ཙམ་ཡིན་པ་དེའི་ཕྱིར |
 མཁས་པ་ལེགས་པ་ཐོབ་པར་འདོད་པས་འདི་ལ་ཡང་དག་པའི་དོན་རྩ་བརྟག་
 པར་མི་བུའོ (46) | གལ་ཏེ་འདི་སྐྱམ་རུ་ཐུམ་པ་ལ་སོགས་པ་ཕྱི་རོལ་གྱི་

¹ B བ.

² A བར་དང་རུབ་དང་སྐྱད་དང་འོག་ལ; γ B བར་དང་རུབ་དང་བུང་དང་
 སྐྱད་ལ. I-tsing has "east, west, north, etc."

³ B omits གལ་ཏེ.

⁴ A བར་དང་རུབ་དང་བུང་དང་སྐྱད་ལ; γ the same, but omitting
 དང་བུང. I-tsing "east, west, north, etc."

⁵ A omits ཐ་དང་པར.

⁶ B གཅིག་ཉིད་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་ན་ནི.

⁷ A inserts ཀྱི.

⁸ a γ A ཤིག.

རྟེན་ན་ཡང་ས་མོན་ལ་སོགས་པ་བརྒྱུད་པར་བེད་པར་བེད་པ་མེད་ན། བརྒྱུད་
 པར་བུ་བའི་¹སྐྱ་བྱ་ལ་སོགས་པ་²ཡོད་དོ། ཞེས་བུ་བའི་ཚེས་དེ་ལྟ་བུ་ཡང་
 མ་མཐོང་དོ (56) །། དེ་ཉིད་ཀྱི་ཕྱིར་³སྐྱ་མའི་དཔེ་ཡང་མ་གྲུབ་པར་ངས་
 བཤད་དོ།⁴ (57) །

V

། གང་ཞིག་ཞིབ་མོའི་སློ་ཡིས་ནི།

། གམས་ཅན་བདག་ས་⁵པ་ཁོ་ནར་ཤེས།

། སློ་ལྟན་དེས་ནི་⁶ཆགས་⁷ལ་སོགས།

། བདེ་བར་སྐྱལ་བྱི་སྐྱག་བཞིན་སྤྱོད་ (58) །

། ཇི་སྐད་བཤད་པའི་རྣམ་པས་བདག་ས་⁵པ་ཚམ་དུ་ཡོད་པའི་ཁམས་གསུམ་
 པ་འདི་ལ་གང་ཞིག་སྐྱུ་ལ་ལ་སོགས་པ་རྣམས་པའི་སློ་བསྐྱལ་⁸ཏེ (59) ། ཞིབ་
 མོའི་སློས་ཇམ་⁹མེད་པ་མ་སྐྱད་ཚམ་ཡིན་པར་ངེས་པར་འཛིན་པ་ (60) དེ་
 ནི། ཇི་ལྟར་ཐག་པ་ལ་སྐྱལ་ལོ་སྐྱུ་ལ་པའི་ཤེས་པས་ཀྱན་ནས་བསྐྱང་¹⁰བའི་
 འཇིགས་པའི་¹¹(61) རྩད་པར་རྣམ་པར་དབྱུང་¹²ནས་ཐག་པར་ངེས་པ་
 ན། དེའི་¹³སྐྱལ་བྱིས་¹⁴སྐྱག་པ་མེད་པར་གྱུར་པ་(62) དེ་¹⁵བཞིན་དུ་¹⁶འདོད་

¹ A བ.
² A omits བ.
³ B inserts བདག་ནི.
⁴ A reads སྐྱ་མ་ལྟ་བུ་འདོད་པ་ཡང་མ་གྲུབ་པར་ངས་བཤད་པ་ཡིན་དོ།
 B སྐྱ་མའི་སྐྱེས་སུའི་(Chinese *nirmita-puruṣa*) དཔེ་ཡང་མ་གྲུབ་པར་འཆད་དོ.
⁵ A བདག་ས.
⁶ A དེ་ཡིས་; B དེ་ནི.
⁷ B ཆ.
⁸ A B བསལ་
⁹ B inserts ལྟ.
¹⁰ A སྐྱང.
¹¹ B པས་དེའི་; A པ་དེའི.
¹² A སྐྱད.
¹³ B omits དེའི.
¹⁴ A ལྱི.
¹⁵ A སྐྱག་པ་མེད་པ་དེ་; B omits དེ.
¹⁶ B inserts དེས་ཀྱང.

ལ¹་ཡོངས་སྤྱོད་ཚོལ་བ་ན² ། དེའི³་ལོད་ཆགས་ལ་སོགས་པ⁴་ཉོན་མོངས་པའི་
པ་བ⁵་ཕྱིས་མི་སྐྱེ་བར་འགྱུར་རོ (70) །

VII

⁶[། དེ་ལྟར་རང་བཞིན་ཡོངས་ཤེས་པའི །

། རྣལ་འབྱོར་པས་ནི་གསུགས་སོགས་ལ །

། ཉེ་བར་སྐྱུར་པས་སྐྱབ་པ་ཡིས །

། བརྒྱལ་ཞུགས་ཀྱི་འགྲུག་ལྟར་བྱ་བ་ལྟམ །

། ཇི་སྐད་བྱ་བའད་པའི་རིགས་པས ། དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་ཀྱི་རང་བཞིན་ཡོངས་
སྤྱོད་གས་པའི་རྣལ་འབྱོར་པ་འདོད་པའི་ཡོན་ཏན་རྣམས་ལ་མངོན་བྱ་སྐྱུར་པ་ནོ་
ཇི་འདྲིན་ཀྱི་རྒྱལ་ཞུགས་ཀྱིས་བྱང་བྱ་འཇུག་པའི་སྐྱེ་འགྱུར་པ་ཡིན་ནོ།]

རབ་བྱ་བྱེད་ལག་ཚར་གྱི་འགྲེལ་པ་ཇོགས་སྟོ། །⁷

¹ A omits ལ .

² འ ཇི .

³ B འདོདེ .

⁴ B པའི .

⁵ B འདྲི་མ ; not so I-tsing. Paramārtha had *jātam* for *jālāni* ?

⁶ a γ B and Chinese omit this verse and its commentary.

⁷ γ has འགྲེལ་པ་སྟོབ་དཔོན་འཇགས་པའི་ལྟས་མངོན་པ་ཇོགས་སོ། །

A has ཚ་ཤས་ . . . འགྲེལ་པ་སྟོབ་དཔོན་ . . . ཇོགས་སོ། ། ལྷ་གར་གྱི་
མཁན་པོ་བྱ་བུ་ཀ་ར་ལྷར་མ་དང་། བོད་ཀྱི་ལོ་རྒྱུ་བ་རིན་ཆེན་བཟང་པོས་
བརྒྱུར་བའོ། །

B has རབ་ . . . འགྲེལ་པ་སྟོབ་དཔོན་ . . . ཇོགས་སོ། ། ལྷ་གར་གྱི་མཁན་
པོ་རྒྱན་གྱི་ལ་དང་། ལོ་རྒྱུ་བ་དགོ་སྟོང་དཔལ་འབྱོར་སྐྱིད་པོས་བརྒྱུར་
འིང་། ལྷ་ཚེན་གྱི་ལོ་རྒྱུ་བ་དགོ་སྟོང་དཔལ་བཞེགས་ར་གི་དྲིས་ལྷས་ནས་གཏར་
ལ་མབ་པའོ། །

F. W. T.

PARAMĀRTHA

如此智人先隨此事 (67)

後若求解脫 (68)

應修真理、簡擇世法自性、若如

理簡擇 (69)

現起惑滅、未起不生 (70)

是立論用

十四

I-TSING

智者亦爾、當順世間而興言說
知¹非實有 (67)

若樂觀察煩惱過失、求解脫者 (68)

宜於如是真實勝義中、週遍探訪、

如理作意 (69)

於諸境處及能緣妄識、

煩惱繫縛不復生長 (70)

¹ Here 知 seems to mean "make to know".

PARAMĀRTHA

速易能滅欲等諸惑亦復如是 (64)

VI

智人不違世

隨說世間法

若欲滅惑障

依真應觀察 (65)

如世間瓶衣等物信有不違或說

亦他 (66)

I-TSING

易速滅除煩惱羅網

及諸業果自當斷滅 (64)

VI

有別頌曰²智人觀俗事

當隨俗所行

欲等煩惱斷

要明真勝義 (65)

猶如世人於諸俗事瓶衣等處

以為實有名瓶衣等³ (66)

¹ This phrase = *karmaphalāni*. The whole clause is an insertion by I-tsing.

² = "another verse", i.e. perhaps "the last verse".

³ [Omitted by P.]

PARAMĀRTHA

十二

但見唯有亂識無有外塵 (60b)

此亂識因不成就故似無物故体

則不成就內外已無所有 (53-4 bis?)

得會法空一切分別所作 (60b bis)

欲等諸惑智人易除 (64 bis?)

譬如於藤妄起蛇想而生怖畏 (61)

若見差別定知是藤能除蛇怖 (62)

由思量能起欲等諸塵自性 (63)

I-TSING

善觀察者能了知己 (60b)

即於繩處蛇怖除遣 (61)

復審思惟了彼差別於繩等處

妄執亦無 (62)

如是觀時一切能生離染之法 (63)

¹ *Var. lect.* 雜.

PARAMĀRTHA

V

一切假名類

若細心思量

智人欲等惑

能除如蛇怖 (58)

猶如是說已、識三界但假名、除瓶

等麤識 (59)

習微細心、 (60a)

如世間所立瓶衣等物、由假名有、 (66)

約世俗心不違此事、 (67) 後為遣此

俗 (68) 方起簡擇心、 (69)

I-TSING

頌曰

V

斯皆是假設

善覺者能知

智人斷煩惱

易若除蛇怖 (58)

論曰、如說三界但有假名、瓶等

麤覺已除遣已、 (59)

知從名言而有其事、 (60a)

十一

¹ These two signs usually = *Buddha*.

² 假 clearly corresponds to 名言 and 言名 and translates the same word, *nāma*, *nāmadheya*, etc.

³ [Here begins a long insertion by P., apparently made up of repetitions, with variations, from other parts of the text.]

PARAMĀRTHA

十

是義不然以不成就故云何不成就
 如所見不如見有故¹ (50a bis)
 此亂識似無物由物無体云何識
 得有如所緣塵自性能緣自性亦
 如是 (51)
 所緣塵已無 (52)
 此亂識不能自起 (53)
 由他功力他已不成³起義何在³ (54)
 以是義故亂識有義云何得立 (55)
 於世間無如此法種子等生因若無
 所生芽等果是有則無是處 (56)
 是故說幻化等譬亦不可立 (57)

I-TSING

設有此識亦非實有故與所見
 事不相應故¹ (50a bis)
 此惑亂識於所緣境作有性解
 彼事自性已明非有 (51)
 境已是無 (52)
 能緣妄識亦非實有 (53)
 云何令彼妄識有耶 (55)
 然於世間不曾見有無能生種
 子有所生芽等 (56)
 由斯汝說幻城等喻道理不成 (57)

¹ [Here we seem to have the equivalent of verse iv in its proper place, the verse having been already inserted by I-tsing above.]

² 所緣 is usually = *ālambana*.

³ [Insertion by P.]

⁴ 城 = *nagara* [insertion by I-tsing].

問²曰有亂識²

答若汝言我信瓶等外物自性
不可得故⁽⁴⁷⁾

但有分別亂識緣無境⁽⁴⁸⁾

何以故幻化人乾闥婆³城等實

非有亂識似幻等起⁴而非無⁽⁴⁹⁾

九

頌曰

能緣亦非有 ¹ (50)	由境相虛妄 ¹	與所見不同 ¹	妄有非實故 ¹
----------------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

論曰若言我亦於彼瓶衣等事
許彼自性是不可得皆是妄謬
之所分別⁽⁴⁷⁾

然而緣彼相狀亂識是其實有⁽⁴⁸⁾
觀健達婆城及幻人等其識是有⁽⁴⁹⁾

¹ These two lines mean "the objects being illusory, the recognizer is also unreal". ² [Insertion by P.]

³ We have here two transliterations of *Gandharva*.

⁴ 似 . . . 起 is a technical term of the *Vijñānavāda*, denoting the projection-perception of objects, as an activity of thought. 幻 = *māyā*.

PARAMĀRTHA

則是有分、不成一物 (42)

若不成一物、則為多物所成 (43)

與²瓶不異、亦無實體²

八

III
(b)

智人於俗境

勿起真實意 (45)

由此三界唯有散亂、若智人欲

求解脫、不應起真實計 (46)

I-TSING

支分別、故此實極微理不成就 (42)

亦非一體、多分成故、見事別故 (43)

一實極微定不可得、如是應捨

極微之論 (44)

是故智者了知三界咸是妄情³

欲求妙理、不應執實 (46)

¹ 實 apparently = *dravya*.

² [Insertion by P.]

³ We have here in P. *bhrānta* without *citta*. In I-tsing's version 情 apparently means mind and its activity; it has a bad sense in both Buddhist and Classical Chinese; its modern sense is "feeling".

其²異如何² (37)
 隣虛者不可立爲一物、若有物
 必有方異 (38)
 猶如瓶等、瓶等諸物是世間有、
 有方異是故有分不成一物 (39)
 若隣虛是有 (40)
 者應有六分 (41)

七

I-TSING

所執極微、定非實有 (34)¹
 所以須說不可見因 (35)
 由彼不能安立極微成實有故 (36)¹
 所以者何 (37)
 由有方分、事差別故 (38)
 猶現見有瓶衣等物東西比等、方
 分別故、斯皆現有、支分可得 (39)
 若言極微是現有者 (40)
 必有方分、別異性³故、是則應許
 東西比等 (41)

¹ [The omission by P. of clauses 34-6 is perhaps due to homœoteleuton *sidhyate—sakyate*. They are, however, perhaps reflected by the first nine characters in clause 38. See also p. 281, n. 1.]

² This is the equivalent of *kasya hetoh*.

³ 別異 = *viśeṣa*; 性 = *-tva*; 故, as before, = ablative.

PARAMĀRTHA

一切假名類最後分無分析 (31)

唯一隣虛若離一大餘大及一
大並不可顯現無有体故 (32)

如兔角等 (33)

III
(a)

難顯離皆無 (30)	最後無分析
------------	-------

六

I-TSING
頌曰 III

此即猶如空華及兔角等 (33)	若無方分是實有者 (31)	論曰若復執曰 ²	智者不應執 (45)	但由惑亂心 ¹	至極同非有 (30)	無分非見故
-----------------	---------------	---------------------	------------	--------------------	------------	-------

諸有假事至極微位不可分析

不可見故無力能生緣彼識故 (32)

¹ This character must be inserted.

² [Insertion by I-ting.]

³ 位 = "stage", "place".

⁴ Literally "next to vacuum", i.e. the limit of smallness (*antya*), a characteristic of Paramārtha's translation.

⁵ 大 usually = *bhūta*, *mahābhūta*, and not used in the sense of *paramāṇu*, "atom."

⁶ = *na śakyate* + infinitive.

PARAMĀRTHA

依分分析觀察藤時 (25)
 不見自体故如蛇知此藤
 等知¹但是亂知 (26)
 實無有境²一切假名有法⁴
 瓶衣人等若觀⁶瓦等諸分⁵
 乃至俗智境在 (27)
 及最後分此中瓶等假名
 從他而起 (28)

I-TSING

論曰如於繩等支分之處別別
 分析審觀察時 (25)
 知無有實體唯是妄心 (26)
 如是知已³一切諸法但是假名
 如瓶衣等物藉泥縷等成乃至
 言說識所行境 (27)
 未至破壞名為瓶等言從他者
 謂從世俗言說而有 (28)
 非於勝義 (29)

¹ [Omitted by I-tsing.]

² [Insertion by Paramārtha.]

³ [Insertion by I-tsing.]

⁴ 法 usually = *dharma*, but here = *vastu*, 物 (Paramārtha).

⁵ *Var. lect.* 瓶.

⁶ Another reading for 瓦 (*kapāla*) is 瓶 (*ghaṭa*).

⁷ *Var. lect.* 染.

⁸ 境 = *viśaya*; 所行 = *gocara*.

⁹ *Var. lect.* 知.

¹⁰ [Omission by Paramārtha.]

PARAMĀRTHA

乃 至 ⁶ 俗 ⁹ 境 ⁴ (24)	假 名 ⁶ 從 他 ⁷ 起 ⁷	簡 擇 自 性 ⁶ 時	一 切 假 名 ⁶ 類	II 亂 智 ⁴ (23)	此 知 緣 塵 及 塵 分 悉 皆	体 相 不 可 得 故 ⁴ (22)	量 分 析 ⁴ (21)	於 塵 諸 分 中 ² 亦 如 是 思
---	--	------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---	---	----------------------------------	--

四

I-TSING

乃 至 ⁶ 世 俗 ⁹ 境 ⁴ (24)	從 他 ⁷ 皆 假 名	詳 觀 自 性 ⁶ 時	頌 曰 II 諸 有 假 設 ⁶ 事	狀 ⁵ 但 唯 妄 識 ⁴ (23)	是 故 繩 及 分 等 心 所 有 相	無 實 可 得 ⁴ (22)	假 藉 ³ (21)	亦 於 彼 分 毫 釐 等 處 ³ 知 ³ 相	如 ¹ 於 繩 處 ¹ 有 惑 亂 識 ¹ (20)
--	------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---	---	--	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------	--	---

¹ [Omitted by P.]

² 於 . . . 中 = locative case.

³ [知 . . . insertion in I-tsing.] 假藉 is "provisional", "without foundation", "without corresponding real objects".

⁴ *Var. lect.* 知.

⁵ 心所有相狀 means "all the functions of *citta*" or "*citta* and all its functions".

⁶ 假名 and 假設 seem to have the same meaning. The latter is sometimes equivalent to *prajñapti*.

⁷ 從他起 and 從他 are translations of *paratantra* or *pāratantrya*. [But see p. 278, n. 1.]

⁸ 乃至 sometimes = *yāvat*.

⁹ The two signs in both translations = *saṃvṛti*.

PARAMĀRTHA

但 是 亂 知 (19)	此 藤 知 如 蚺 知 (18)	若 無 體 (17)	此 藤 境 藤 體 不 可 得 (16)	若 分 分 思 量 析 (15)	藤 知 如 蚺 知 (14)	I(b) ³ 若 見 藤 分 已	昔 解 但 是 亂 知 則 無 境 (13)	不 如 分 別 故 ¹ 虛 妄 相 故 (12)	若 見 藤 異 相 (11)
--------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------	--	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--	---	--	-------------------------------

三

I-TSING

唯 有 妄 識 ⁷ (19)	所 有 繩 解 猶 如 蛇 覺 (18)	如 是 知 已 ⁶ (17)	繩 之 自 體 亦 不 可 得 ⁵ (16)	復 於 繩 處 ⁴ 支 分 差 別 善 觀 察 時 (15)	但 是 錯 解 無 有 實 事 (13)	知 由 妄 執 誑 亂 生 故 (12)	後 時 了 彼 差 別 法 已 (11)
---------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	---	---	--	--	--

¹ 不 . . . 故 omitted by I-tsing.

² 妄 . . . "to be deluded by imagination".

³ [This second half of the verse is reproduced here at the same point as in the Tibetan.]

⁴ 於 . . . 處 = locative case.

⁵ 不 . . . 得 = *na upalabhyate*.

⁶ [I-tsing has apparently read *tad-upalabdhanu*, omitting the negative.]

⁷ = *bhrānta(mithyā)-jñāna*.

PARAMĀRTHA

二

爲生不顛倒智故¹(4)立此論(5)

I (a)

於藤起蛇知

見藤則無境(6)

昏昧時中在非遠處(7)

於藤色形見似蛇相(8)

爲境所誑(9a)

未見差別(10)

謂彼是蛇生決定解⁵(9b)

I-TSING

令無倒解故²(4)造斯論(5)

I

頌曰於繩作蛇解

見繩知境無(6)

若了彼分時

知如蛇解謬(14)

論曰如於非遠不分明處(7)

唯(見)³繩蛇相似之事(8)

未了彼差別自性(10)

被惑亂故定執爲蛇(9)

¹ 爲 . . . 故 = dative case.

² 欲 . . . 令 故 = "desiring make understand correctly".

³ 如 correlates with 如是 below.

⁴ 見 "see" is required by the sense "merely seeing the similarity of the rope to a snake".

⁵ Literally "produce a decided (*niscita*) understanding".

No. 1255 (PARAMĀRTHA)

諸 法 自 性 (3)	由 簡 擇 門 ⁸	故 不 得 真 ⁵ (2)	非 實 有 法 ⁴	由 強 分 別 ³	體 (1)	解 捲 論 ¹ 以 言 名 爲	三 界 者 唯
-------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------	--	------------------

No. 1256 (I-TSING)

自 性 之 門 (3)	決 擇 諸 法	未 證 真 者 ⁷ (2)	今 欲 爲 彼	由 妄 執 ⁶ 故 ⁶	實 無 外 境 ⁴	假 名 ² (1)	掌 中 論 ¹ 三 界 但 有	論 曰 謂 於
-------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	--	-------------------------------	----------------------------	--	------------------

¹ Paramārtha: Nanjio's Catalogue gives 拳 "fist" instead of 捲, which is literally "rolling up", "wrapping", and is not used in the sense of the former. 解 is preferable to 角 捲, because the latter seems not to be an usual phrase, and I-tsing uses 掌. 解 means "disclose", "explain", "understand". [See, however, Mr. Hopkins' note on p. 272.]

I-tsing: 掌 中 usually means "within a fist", "in a fist", rather than "in the palm of the hand", although 掌 itself does not mean "fist"; 中 in such a phrase presupposes a clenched hand. Accordingly 掌 is here similar to 拳.

² 言 名 and 假 名 seem to be different translations of one word.

³ Since 強 has a rather bad sense, 強 分 別 seems to be the same as 妄 執 故.

⁴ 實 有 法 and 外 境 are alternative translations, both still in use.

⁵ 真 does not necessarily of itself mean *paramārtha*; but not seldom it has that meaning. The usual rendering of *paramārtha* (or *paramārtha-satya*) is 真 諦 or 勝 義 諦 (諦 is *satya*).

⁶ 由 . . . 故 = instrumental or ablative case.

⁷ 彼 . . . 者 = "one who".

⁸ 門 = "a gate".

H. U.