

ON STHIRAMATI'S PAÑCASKANDHAKAVIBHĀṢĀ: A PRELIMINARY SURVEY*

Jowita KRAMER

Among the copies of Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts kept in the China Tibetology Research Center (Beijing), one of the more important texts is Sthiramati's commentary on Vasubandhu's *Pañcaskandhaka* (*PSk*), the *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* (*PSkV*).¹ A Tibetan translation of the *PSkV* is preserved in the Tibetan bsTan 'gyur as no. 5567 of the Peking edition (P). A Chinese version of a *PSk* commentary ascribed to Sthiramati (6th c.), which bears the title *Da cheng guang wu yun lun* (大乘廣五蘊論), is available in Taishō 1613. This text does not seem to be a direct translation of the *PSkV*, as it is much shorter and its contents do not exactly correspond to the Sanskrit and the Tibetan versions of the *PSkV*. Apart from Sthiramati's commentary, two other commentaries on the *PSk* are available in Tibetan translation: the *Pañcaskandhavivarāṇa* by Guṇaprabha (P 5568) and the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya* by *Pṛthivībandhu² (P 5569). This paper aims at investigating some important passages of the *PSkV*. The first section presents a general overview of the contents of the text, the second section deals with the purpose of the teachings of the *PSkV*, and the third section examines the characterization of the *skandha* "matter" (*rūpa*).

The main concern of the *PSk* and the *PSkV* is the analysis of the five aggregates (*skandha*), twelve bases (*āyatana*), and eighteen elements (*dhātu*). As one of the central ideas of Buddhist philosophy,

* This article is a revised version of a lecture I gave at Otani University (Kyoto) on March 3, 2008. I am grateful to Profs. Kazunobu Matsuda, Lambert Schmithausen, and Peter Skilling as well as to my husband Ralf who read previous drafts of this paper and made a number of valuable suggestions. I would also like to acknowledge the support received from the German Research Foundation (DFG) since 2007, which enabled me to complete this article.

¹ For a detailed description of the manuscript and the difficulties of the title of the text, see the introduction to my forthcoming diplomatic and critical editions of the *PSkV*.

² On the name of the author of the *Pañcaskandhabhāṣya*, see Schmithausen [1987: 575f.].

the five *skandhas* (as well as the twelve *āyatanas* and the eighteen *dhātus*) appear to be a well studied concept. Nevertheless, a thorough investigation of the *PSk(V)* makes it evident that the concept of the five *skandhas* as it is known from early canonical sources changed when it was integrated into the Abhidharmic system of the Yogācāras.³ In the process of systematizing all factors of existence within the Abhidharmic literature, the early concept of five *skandhas* which aimed at describing merely the physical and mental parts of living beings might have appeared not adequate anymore. As it was impossible to abandon this traditional model, the meaning of some of the *skandhas* was extended to subsume the whole outside world.⁴ The archaic scheme had to be harmonized with new teachings for instance, in the context of Yogācāra tradition, with the “store mind” (*ālaya-vijñāna*) or the “notion of I” (*kliṣṭamānas*). In Vasubandhu’s *PSk* and Sthiramati’s *PSkV* this process of reshaping the *skandha* model becomes visible.

I. Subject Outline of the PSkV

The structure of the *PSkV* follows the arrangement of Vasubandhu’s root text and can be divided into seven main parts as depicted in the following outline:

1. Introductory remarks (1b1-3b2)
2. Explanation of the five *skandhas* (3b2-61a1)
3. Explanation of the twelve *āyatanas* (61a1-64a6)
4. Explanation of the eighteen *dhātus* (64a6-65b4)
5. Reasons for explaining the *skandhas*, *āyatanas* and *dhātus* (65b4-67a4)
6. *Mātrkā* of qualities (67a4-73b1)
7. Concluding matter (73b2-5)

³ A very detailed investigation of the five *skandha* model in the canonical period is offered by Tilmann Vetter [2000]. Vetter made accessible all passages of the Vinayapīṭaka and the main Nikāyas of the Suttapīṭaka (as they were known to him) mentioning the five *skandhas*. Through his minute approach Vetter succeeded in presenting a very precise characterization of the five *skandha* concept as found in the Pāli canon.

⁴ Some important observations regarding this development are found in the studies by Erich Frauwallner [1963] and [1994: 110ff.]. However, Frauwallner focuses in his investigation almost exclusively on the Abhidharmic tradition of early Buddhism.

Sthiramati opens his commentary with a worshipful invocation and some introductory remarks. The latter include information on the author's motive for composing the text, the reasons for the number and the order of the five *skandhas*, and the etymology of the compounds *rūpaskandha*, *vedanāskandha*, and so on. The concluding matter consists of a final sentence mentioning the name of the author and the text as well as of a short colophon of three lines that has been added in a different script. The main and longest section of the *PSkV* is the second one, where the five *skandhas* are described and analysed in detail. An investigation of the first part of this section, which is the explanation of *rūpa*, is presented below (in section III).

The third section of the *PSkV* deals mainly with those two *āyatanas* that are not included in *rūpaskandha*. These are the mental faculty (*manas*) and its objects, the factors (*dharma*).⁵ The latter are said to comprise eight different entities: the three *skandhas* *vedanā*, *saṃjñā*, and *saṃskāra*, the "not making known" (*avijñāpti*), and the four unconditioned (*asaṃskṛta*) factors space (*ākāśa*), cessation not resulting from consideration (*apratisaṃkhyānirodha*), cessation resulting from consideration (*pratisaṃkhyānirodha*), and the true reality (*tathatā*).⁶ Remarkably, the lists of the unconditioned constituents of the *dharmāyatanal-dhātu* presented in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* vary from the four entities given in the *PSk*. In the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* three different kinds of true reality are mentioned: the *tathatā* of the wholesome factors (*kuśaladharmatathatā*), of the unwholesome factors (*akuśaladharmatathatā*), and of the neutral factors (*avyākṛtadharmatathatā*).⁷ These three entities are combined with *ākāśa*, *apratisaṃkhyānirodha*, *pratisaṃkhyānirodha*, the state of motionlessness (*āniñjya*) and the cessation of ideations and feelings (*saṃjñāvedayitanirodha*) to form a group of eight. In *AKBh* 3,16-19 *ākāśa*, *apratisaṃkhyānirodha*, and *pratisaṃkhyānirodha* are mentioned as three kinds of unconditioned factors. Vasubandhu apparently tried to find a compromise in the *PSk* between the eight entities as found in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and the three entities listed in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. He adopted the group of three and adjusted it

⁵ The five *āyatanas* covering the five sense faculties (*indriya*) and the five *āyatanas* comprising their objects (*viṣaya*) are identified as *rūpa* by Sthiramati. See *PSkV* 65a6: *tatra pañcendriyāṇi cakṣurādīni pañca viṣayā rūpādayaḥ*.

⁶ *PSkV* 61b4f.

⁷ *AS** 12,18f. (*AS*₇ 62a7).

to the Yogācāra context of the *PSk* by adding *tathatā* to it, a central philosophical concept of the Yogācāra tradition.

As twelve of the eighteen *dhātus* are identical to the twelve *āyatanas*, the fourth section of the *PSkV* covers only one folio of the text. The most significant information of this passage is that the *manaāyatana* and the six “elements of mind” (*cittadhātu*), i.e., the six *viññānadhātus*, are to be regarded as being identical to the *viññāna-skandha*.⁸ In the fifth section of the *PSkV* Sthiramati comments on Vasubandhu’s explanation that the three concepts of five *skandhas*, twelve *āyatanas*, and eighteen *dhātus* were taught in order to eliminate the three *ātmagrāhas*. This part of the *PSkV* is dealt with in more detail in section II, below.

Covering seven folios, the sixth section of the *PSkV* is the second longest. It includes a list of qualities (*mātrkā*) which are applied consecutively to the eighteen *dhātus*. The *mātrkā* treats the *dhātus* under the following eleven aspects:

- material (*rūpin*) — immaterial (*arūpin*)
- visible (*sanidarśana*) — invisible (*anidarśana*)
- penetrable (*sapratigha*) — impenetrable (*apratigha*)
- pure (*sāsrava*) — impure (*anāsrava*)
- belonging to [the sphere of] sensual pleasures/to the material [sphere]/to the immaterial [sphere] (*kāma-/rūpa-/ārūpyapratīśamyukta*) — not belonging to [any of the three spheres] (*apratīśamyukta*)⁹
- wholesome (*kuśala*) — unwholesome (*akuśala*) — neutral (*avyākṛta*)
- internal (*ādhyātmika*) — external (*bāhya*)
- having an object (*sālambana*) — having no object (*anālambana*)
- having a conception (*vikalpaka*)¹⁰ — having no conception (*avikalpaka*)
- appropriated (*upātta*) — not appropriated (*anupātta*)
- similar (*sabhāga*) — similar to itself (*tatsabhāga*)¹¹

⁸ *PSkV* 65b1: *yo viññānaskandhaḥ sa manaāyatanam cittadhātavaś ca sapta cakṣur-viññānadhātur yāvan manoviññānadhātur iti.*

⁹ After this category the root text of the *PSk* mentions the categories *skandhasaṃgrhīta* and *upādānaśaṃgrhīta* (See *PSk* 7a6).

¹⁰ In *PSk* 7b3 this category is listed under the term *savikalpa*.

¹¹ For further information on the meaning and translation of these two terms, see Kramer [2005: 128, n. 144].

The *mātrkā* found in the *PSk* is much shorter than *mātrkā*s included in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, or in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, in which the lists in some cases comprise more than twenty items.¹² Why Vasubandhu has chosen these particular qualities and excluded others is not certain. It seems that his list includes mainly qualities which — in both cases (i.e., *rūpin* and *arūpin*) — describe worldly phenomena in order to classify them in material or in mental entities, and not to differentiate them from phenomena of the absolute level, such as the *tathatā* or *nirvāṇa*. This might be one of the reasons why we find qualities like “material” or “immaterial”, “internal” or “not internal”, “having an object” or “not having an object” in the *mātrkā* and not qualities like “mundane” (*laukika*) or “supramundane” (*lokottara*), “conditioned” (*saṃskṛta*) or “unconditioned” (*asaṃskṛta*), “being the highest” (*anuttara*) or “not being the highest” (*sottara*). These latter qualities separate worldly, conditioned, and inferior entities like the *skandhas* from the unconditioned, supreme *tathatā* or *nirvāṇa*. As our text does not deal with these supreme entities in the first place but is intended to be an analysis of the conditioned parts of a person, Vasubandhu might have chosen only those qualities that are suitable for specifying these worldly factors.

II. The purpose of teaching the *skandhas*, *āyatanas*, and *dhātus*

According to Vasubandhu there is a reason to teach the three different models of *skandhas*, *āyatanas*, and *dhātus*: The understanding of each of the three concepts eliminates one of the three wrong views of the self (*ātmagrāha*).¹³ The *skandha* analysis is taught as an antidote to the apprehension of the self as a unity (*ekatvagrāha*). Sthiramati adds that people who claim the existence of a substantial self hold that there is a unitary self which sees, hears, smells, tastes and touches,

¹² See *AKBh* 19,1ff. and *AS* 17,8ff. In the *Yogācārabhūmi mātrkā*s are found at several locations, e.g., *Y_T* 'i 6a1ff. (see also Kramer [2005: 122ff.]), *zi* 78a3ff., and *zi* 212a5ff.

¹³ *PSkV* 65b6f.: *kimarthaṃ skandhādideśaneti prayojanaṃ vaktavyam ity ata āha trividhātmagrāhapratipakṣeṇeti*. The *Abhidharmasamuccaya* gives an explanation that appears to point in a similar direction but actually has a different background. There it is stated that there are five *skandhas* due to five kinds of entities [mistaken for] the self (*ātmavastu*) consisting of “the body with its possessions” (*saparigrahadēha*), “experiencing” (*upabhoga*), “designating” (**vyavahārabhīlāpana*), “producing right and wrong” (**dharmādharmābhisāṃskāra*), and “[mind as] the basis for [all] these” (*tadāśraya*) (see *AS** 1,14-2,1 [*AS_T* 51b3-5] and *ASBh* 1,14-2,4). On the three *ātmagrāhas* as the motivation for teaching the *skandhas*, *dhātus*, and *āyatanas*, see also Skilling [1980: 32-34].

thinks and perceives.¹⁴ But there is no unitary self besides the five *skandhas* within the personal existence (*ātmabhāva*)¹⁵ of the living being, as neither its own nature (*svarūpa*) nor its effects (*kārya*) can be grasped. There is no seer apart from the faculty of seeing (*cakṣuḥ*).¹⁶ In contrast, the understanding of the twelve *āyatanas* is taught in order to eliminate the apprehension of the self as the one that experiences (*bhoktrtvagrāha*) the object of the sense faculties and the results of good and bad karma. But there is no such self. Actually those *āyatanas* that are the six sense faculties have the six kinds of experiences (*upalabdhi*).¹⁷ Finally the classification of the eighteen *dhātus* is taught as an antidote to the apprehension of self as an independent agent (*kartrtvagrāha*). Sthiramati explains that there is no self that effects wholesome and unwholesome karma. There is no action besides the effect of causes and results, and without an action no agent is possible.¹⁸

This traditional interpretation of the three models offered by Vasubandhu and Sthiramati is just one of several possibilities to explain why it appeared necessary to add the models of the twelve *āyatanas* and the eighteen *dhātus* to the concept of the five *skandhas*. Another reason for the extension of the five *skandha* model is certainly the fact that it was impossible to include unconditioned entities, like *nirvāṇa*, in it, as all the *skandhas* are conditioned.¹⁹ Within the concept of the *āyatanas* and *dhātus* unconditioned entities could be incorporated into the category of the *dharmas*, the object of the mental faculty (*manas*). Another reason for the extension of the five *skandha* model becomes visible when we look at the traditional

14 PSkV 66a3f.: *sarve hy ātmavādināḥ evaṃ pratipannāḥ/ ya eva paśyati sa eva śṛṇoti jighraty āsvādayati sprśati cetil tatra ya eva vedayate sa eva cetayate sañjānīte vijānānti.*

15 On the meaning of the concept of *ātmabhāva*, see Schmithausen [1987: 552ff., n. 1477].

16 PSkV 66a4f.: *na hi sattvātmabhāva evaṃ skandhavyatirikto 'nyaḥ kaścid ekavyavasthito rūpo vidyatel tatsvarūpakāryānupalabdheḥ/ na cakṣurvyatirekeṇānyo draṣṭā vidyate.*

17 PSkV 66b3-6: *bhoktrgrāhaḥ punaḥ sarvavādināṃ yaḥ śubhāśubhasya karmaṇa iṣṭāniṣṭaṃ sukhaduḥkhavedanāprabhāvitaṃ phalam upabhuṅkte rūpaśabdādīṃś ca viṣayān sa ātmetil asyā tmagrāhasya pratipakṣeṇāyatanāṃ deśanā/ śubhāśubhakarmaphalasya rūpādīnāṃ ca viṣayānāṃ upabhuktir upalabdhiḥ/ tāṃ yaḥ karoti sa karmaphalasya rūpādīnāṃ copabhoktā/ tāṃ śatprākārāṃ upalabdhim āyatanāny eva kurvanti.*

18 PSkV 67a1-4: *kartrtvagrāhaḥ punar yaḥ śubhāśubhānāṃ karmaṇāṃ kartā valgaṇāspḥoṭa-nādināṃ ca sa ātmā/ asyātmagrāhasya pratipakṣeṇa dhātudeśanā/ ... na ca kāryakāraṇa-svarūpavyatirekeṇānyā kriyāsti ... kriyāṃ antareṇa ca kutaḥ kartā.*

19 The explanation that unconditioned *dharmas* cannot be included in any of the five *skandhas* is found for example in AKBh 14,22-15,6. See also Kritzer [2005: 18]. In AKBh 14,10-13, Vasubandhu states that the three teachings of the *skandhas*, *dhātus* and *āyatanas* are aimed at people with different levels of ignorance, of faculties, and of faith. See also Kritzer [2005: 16].

division of the eighteen *dhātus*. As mentioned above, the *PSk* explains that ten of the *dhātus* are to be regarded as matter and seven as mind (*citta* or *viññāna*).²⁰ Obviously the contrast between matter and mind could be expressed more clearly within the model of the eighteen elements.

It is notable that the other three *skandhas*, i.e., feeling (*vedanā*), ideation (*saṃjñā*), and impulses (*saṃskāra*), lost their relevance in the context of the *āyatana*s and *dhātus*, where they were included in the *dharma* category.²¹ As constituents of the latter they do not have the same value and position as *rūpa* and *viññāna*, but are merely objects of thinking. In contrast, the position of *rūpa* and even more so that of *viññāna* strengthened. These two are the categories that underwent the most important modifications during the evolution of the five *skandha* model. In particular the function of *viññānaskandha* — the original role of which was actual perception — was widened through the inclusion of subliminal forms of mind, like the “store mind” (*ālaya-viññāna*) and the “notion of I” (*kliṣṭamāna*s). The strong emphasis placed by Sthiramati on *viññāna* is evident, for instance, when he states that ordinary people — those who have not perceived reality — regard the *viññāna* as the self (*ātman*), whereas they view the other four *skandhas* as “mine” (*ātmīya*).²² Interestingly Sthiramati also mentions alternative concepts of the self, for example that of the Sāṃkhya tradition. According to his understanding, the Sāṃkhyas only regard *rūpaskandha* as *ātmīya*, and all the other four *skandhas* as *ātman*. He thus claims that for the Sāṃkhyas the self is not only identical to *viññāna* but also consists of the factors accompanying the mind (*caitasika*).²³

20 On this division, see also AS* 12,13-17 (AS, 62a2-6) and AKBh 11,16-18.

21 PSkV 65b2: *trayo vedanāsaṃjñāsaṃskārākhyāḥ skandhā ... dharmāyatanaṃ dharmadhātus ca.*

22 PSkV 2a4f.: *prāyeṇa hi bālānaṃ viññāna evātmagrāhaḥ/ śeṣeṣu rūpādiṣv ātmīyagrāhaḥ.* The same idea is found in ASBh 1,19.

23 PSkV 32a1: *sāṃkhyāś caitanyasvarūpaṃ ātmānaṃ manyantel te ca cittacaitasika-prabhede 'vidvāṃsaḥ sakalaṃ cittacaitasikakalāpam eva caitanyam ity āhuḥ/ atas te caturāḥ skandhān ātmeti pratipannāḥ/ rūpaskandham ātmīyatvena.*

III. Definition of *rūpa*

The sections on *rūpa*- and on *viññānaskandha* are of almost the same length and each cover more or less eleven folios in the *PSkV*.²⁴ In the following I present an outline of the section on *rūpa* and investigate its contents in detail. In this context I also try to explain some of the difficulties which the distinguishing of *rūpa* and *viññāna* posed to authors of Abhidharmic treatises. A more comprehensive study of the *viññāna* section is beyond the scope of the present paper. The following outline gives a preliminary overview of the contents of the *rūpa* section:

1. Is the question "What is matter?" not incoherent (*asambaddha*)? (3b2-4)
2. Matter of the four basic elements (*mahābhūta*) and matter dependent (*upādāya*) on them (3b4-14a5)
 - 2.1 Four basic elements (3b4-4b1)
 - 2.2 Matter dependent on the four basic elements (4b1-6)
 - 2.3 Definitions of the four basic elements, their effects (*karma*) and their own nature (*svabhāva*) (4b6-6a2)
 - 2.4 Definition of matter dependent on the basic elements (6a2-14a5)
 - 2.4.1 Sense faculties (6a3-7a2)
 - 2.4.1.1 Sense of sight (6a3-5)
 - 2.4.1.2 Pellucid matter (*rūpaprāsāda*) (6a5-7a2)
 - 2.4.2 Objects of the sense faculties (7a2-11b6)
 - 2.4.2.1 General remarks (7a2-4)
 - 2.4.2.2 Visible matter (*rūpa*): colour, shape, "making known" (*viññapti*) (7a4-9b1)
 - 2.4.2.3 Sound (9b1-6)
 - 2.4.2.4 Odour (9b6-10a2)
 - 2.4.2.5 Taste (10a2-3)
 - 2.4.2.6 Tangible (10a3-11b6)
 - 2.4.3 "Not making known" (*aviññapti*) (11b6-14a5)
 - 2.4.3.1 Definition (11b6-12a1)
 - 2.4.3.2 Different kinds of *viññapti* and *aviññapti* (12a1-12b2)
 - 2.4.3.2.1 The *aviññapti* of the sphere of sensual pleasures (*kāma-dhātu*) (12a2-6)

²⁴ The section on *rūpa* is located on fols. 3b2-14b2, that on *viññāna* on fols. 48b2-60a3.

- 2.4.3.2.2 The *avijñapti* of the material sphere (*rūpa[dhātu]*) and the pure (*anāsrava*) *avijñapti* (12a6-12b2)
- 2.4.3.3 *Avijñapti* being invisible (*anidarśana*) and penetrable (*apratigha*) (12b2-4)
- 2.4.3.4 Additional remarks on the *avijñapti* belonging to *kāma-dhātu*, the *avijñapti* belonging to *rūpadhātu* and the pure *avijñapti* (12b4-14a5)
- 3. Reasons for the term *rūpa* (14a5)

Sthiramati opens his commentary on the *rūpaskandha* section with the statement that it is impossible to determine the own nature (*svabhāva*) of the *skandhas* due to their lack of *svabhāva*. But it is possible to expose the basis [of their designation] (*upādāna*), which in the case of *rūpaskandha* is *rūpa*.²⁵ Therefore, in the next passage of the text a detailed definition of the constituents of *rūpa* is given. The *PSk* describes *rūpa* as the four basic elements (*mahābhūta*) and the matter that is dependent (*upādāya*) on them.²⁶ Sthiramati adds in his commentary that space (*ākāśa*) is not to be regarded as an additional basic element, as it is nothing other than the mere non-existence of impenetrable (*sapratigha*) *rūpa*.²⁷

In connection with the explanation of matter dependent on the *mahābhūtas*, Sthiramati mentions five kinds of how matter derived from the elements (*bhautika*) is dependent on them: generating (*janana*), basis [of change] (*niśraya*), continuity (*pratiṣṭha*), support (*upastambha*), and nourishing (*brmhaṇa*).²⁸ The first of these five indicates that derived matter could not arise without the existence of the *mahābhūtas*.²⁹ The fact that the *mahābhūtas* are the basis of *upādāyarūpa* means, according to Sthiramati, that dependent matter changes in the same moment as the elements change.³⁰ As long as

25 *PSkV* 3b3f.: *skandhānāṃ niḥsvabhāvatvāt tatsvabhāvavyapadeśena nirdhāraṇam aśakyam/ kiṃ tarhi tadupādānanīrdhāraṇenai vetil ato rūpaṃ katamad iti praśnaḥ/ na rūpaskandha iti.*

26 The same definition of *rūpa* is found in *AS** 3,12f. (*AS** 53a2) and *ASBh* 3,3f. In contrast, the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* describes *rūpa* as the five sense faculties (*indriya*), their five objects (*artha*) and the *avijñapti* (*AKBh* 5,22). The four *mahābhūtas* are dealt with in a passage that follows the *rūpaskandha* section, in *AKBh* 8,12.

27 *PSkV* 4a4f.: *prthivyādivad ākāśasyāpi mahābhūtatvaprasaṅgaḥ/ naitad evaṃ/ kiṃ kāraṇam/ na hy ākāśam nāma kiñcid astil anyatra sapratigharūpābhāvamātrāt.* See also *AS** 13,6 (*AS** 62b5) and *ASBh* 14,17.

28 *PSkV* 4b2f. The same list appears in *ASBh* 3,4.

29 *PSkV* 4b4: *tatra jananahetutvaṃ tair vinā tadanutpatteḥ.* See also *ASBh* 3,5f.

30 *PSkV* 4b4: *niśrayaheututvaṃ bhūtavikāre tatpratiṣṭhitopādāyarūpavikṛtyanuvidhānāt.* See

the elements are produced in a certain continuum, the series of derived matter will not be interrupted — this is the meaning of the third kind of dependence, “continuity”.³¹ The dependence consisting in “support” indicates that the continuum of *upādāyarūpa* can only exist where the *mahābhūtas* exist.³² “Nourishing” points to the fact that dependent matter can only increase if the *mahābhūtas* it depends on grow.³³

The definitions of the four *mahābhūtas* given by Sthiramati (in accordance with Vasubandhu) in the following section of the *PSkV* closely resemble the explanations of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. Solidity (*khakkhaṭatva*) is said to be the nature of earth, humidity (*sneha*) the nature of water, heat (*ūṣmā*) the nature of fire, and lightness and motion (*laghusamudīraṇatva*) the nature of wind.³⁴ The respective activities of the four *mahābhūtas* are support (*dhṛti*), cohesion (*saṃgraha*), ripening (*pakti*), and shifting (*vyūhana*).³⁵

In the section on matter dependent on the basic elements, Sthiramati explains the meaning of pellucid matter (*rūpaprasāda*), which is the nature of the five material sense faculties.³⁶ He gives the example of images being reflected in a clear mirror or in a water vessel. In the same way the pellucid matter of the five sense faculties reflects their

also *ASBh* 3,7f.

31 *PSkV* 4b4f.: *sthānahetutvaṃ bhūtānāṃ sadṛśasantānotpattau bhautikasyāpi sadṛśasantānānucchedahetutvāt*. See also *ASBh* 3,8f.

32 *PSkV* 4b5: *upastambahetutvaṃ tadvaśenānucchedāt*. See also *ASBh* 3,6.

33 *PSkV* 4b5f.: *br̥mhaṇahetutvaṃ bhūtavṛddhau tadāśritopādāyarūpavṛddhiḥ*. See also *ASBh* 3,9f.

34 *PSkV* 5a3-5. Though the terminology found in the Tibetan translation of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* is identical to the Tibetan rendering of the *PSkV* (see *AS_T* 53a3f., *PSk_T* 13a1f., and *PSkV_T* 5a6-8: *sra ba nyid*, *gsher ba nyid*, *tsha [ba nyid]*, *yang zhing g.yo ba nyid*), the terms given by Pradhan in his reconstruction of the Sanskrit text differ from those in the *PSkV*: *kaṭhinatā*, *niṣyandatā*, *uṣṇatā*, *kampanatā* (see *AS** 3,14-16). Pradhan’s retranslation is probably to be rejected here. The respective terms found in *AKBh* 8,20 are *khara*, *sneha*, *uṣṇatā*, *traṇā*.

35 *PSkV* 5b1-2.

36 According to the *PSk upādāyarūpa* consists of the five sense faculties, their five objects, and the *avijñapti*. The explanation of *AS** 3,16-18 (*AS_T* 53a4f.) is very similar, though the last category, the *avijñapti*, is extended to “matter included in the *dharmāyatana*” (*dharmāyatanasamgr̥hīta*). The answer to the question, what the five *indriyas* are, given in the *PSk* is: “subtle matter having colour as its object”, “... having sound as its object”, etc. (see *PSkV* 7a2f.: *cakṣurindriyaṃ katamatī varṇaviśayo rūpaprasādaḥ śrotrendriyaṃ katamac chabdaviśayo rūpaprasāda*). The definition found in *AS** 3,18f. (*AS_T* 53a5f.) differs somewhat. There it is said that the faculty of seeing is pellucid matter dependent on the four *mahābhūtas* and the basis for visual perception (*cakṣurviñāna*). See also *AKBh* 5,27ff., where a very similar explanation is found.

objects.³⁷ Sthiramati mentions in this context that *manas* and faith (*śraddha*) are also considered as *prasāda*, but they are to be distinguished from the *indriyas* as they do not have matter (*rūpa*) for their nature.³⁸

It is worth to investigate the subsequent passage of the *PSkV* which defines the objects of each sense faculty in detail, insofar as it reveals interesting dissimilarities between the *PSkV*, the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, and the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*. First of all, the object of the faculty of seeing is discussed. The *PSk* assigns three different categories to the visible (*rūpa*): colour (*varṇa*), shape (*saṃsthāna*), and “making known” (*viññapti*). All three categories are mentioned in the equivalent description of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, whereas the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* only points out *varṇa* and *saṃsthāna* as parts of the visible and obviously places *kāyaviññapti* under *saṃsthāna*.³⁹ When going into details the *PSkV*, the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* agree on four kinds of colour and eight kinds of shape.⁴⁰ But they disagree on the question whether entities like a cloud, smoke, or the sunlight are to be classified as separate categories, or whether they are already included in the categories of colour and of shape. In this context *AKBh* 6,13 mentions eight additional entities: cloud (*abhra*), smoke (*dhūma*), dust (*rajas*), mist (*mahikā*), shade (*chāyā*), sunlight (*ātapa*), (other) light (*āloka*), and darkness (*andhakāra*). In the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* space (*abhy-avakāśa*), *viññapti*, and the colour of the sky (*nabha*) as well as two further shapes, namely fine (*rdul phra mo*) and rough (*rags pa*) shape, are added to the eight entities found in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.⁴¹

37 *PSkV* 6a5f.: *tadyathā prasanna ādarśa udakapātre vā bimbaṃ pratītya tatpratibhāsaṃ pratibimbam utpadyate/ tadvat pañcasu rūpaprasādātmakeṣu cakṣurādīṣu rūpagandhādīṃ pratītya tatpratibhāsā viññaptaya utpadyante.*

38 *PSkV* 6a6-5: *atra cakṣurādīnāṃ parasparato viṣayarūpātmakāt prasādān manastāḥ śraddhātāś ca vyavacchedaḥ kāryaḥ/ ... rūpaprasādātmakatvena manasto vyavacchinattil tad dhi saty api varṇaviṣayatve na rūpaprasādātmakam/ rūpagrahaṇaṃ śraddhātmakatvāt* (read: *ātmakāt*) *prasādād vyavacchedakam/ ... ato rūpagrahaṇaṃ kriyata itil śraddhāyā arūpātmakatvāt.*

39 *AS** 3,23-26 (*AS_T* 53a8-53b3) and *AKBh* 6,8f. and 6,19. The *Abhidharmasamuccaya* does not mention the expressions “colour” and “shape” explicitly in this context but gives a list of different colours and shapes.

40 The four colours are *nīla*, *pīta*, *lohita*, *avadāta* and the eight shapes include *dīrgha*, *hrasva*, *vṛtta*, *parimaṇḍala*, *unnata*, *avanata*, *sāta*, *visāta*. See *PSkV* 7b1-2 and 5, *AS** 3,24f. (*AS_T* 53b1f.), and *AKBh* 6,12f.

41 See *AS** 3,25f. (*AS_T* 53b2f.) and also *ASBh* 13,14f. The *Abhidharmasamuccaya* states that all the different categories of visible matter can be of three kinds: beautiful (*kha dog bzang po*), not beautiful (*kha dog ngan pa*), or neither of these two (see *AS_T* 53b3).

Sthiramati lists the entities from *abhra* to *nabha* (omitting *vijñapti*, which he mentions in a separate section), but he rejects them as separate constituents different from colour and shape. He argues that clouds, smoke etc. are either included in the category *saṁsthāna*, in case they are limited, or in the category *varṇa*, in case they are not limited.⁴²

While the *PSk* analyses *vijñapti* as a third kind of visible *rūpa* beside colour and shape, in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* the definition of *vijñapti* is included in another context, namely in chapter 4, in which karma is characterized. The *Abhidharmasamuccaya* mentions *vijñaptirūpa* as one of the 25 separate categories forming the visible, but it neither explains what the matter of *vijñapti* includes nor mentions it in its chapter on karma. The examination of *vijñapti* presented in the *PSkV* and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* shows that there was a dispute over the characterization of the bodily *vijñapti* (*kāyavijñapti*) within the different traditions. This discussion was related to the general question of whether shape (*saṁsthāna*) was to be regarded as a real entity (*dravya*), in the same manner as *varṇa*, or as a designation for an accumulation of colour atoms arranged in a certain way.⁴³ The first view (i.e., *saṁsthāna* being *dravyasat*) was held by the Sarvāstivādins, who regarded *kāyavijñapti* as a kind of shape and therefore as a real entity.⁴⁴ They classified *kāyavijñapti* as shape without there being colour.⁴⁵ The opposite view was taken by the Sautrāntikas, who maintained that *saṁsthāna* was a mere designation and that *kāyavijñapti* was shape that does not exist as a real entity.⁴⁶ A very similar position is held by Sthiramati in the *PSkV*. He also explains that shape does not exist as an entity and argues that this is evident for example from the fact that there are no differently shaped atoms in the same way as there are atoms of various colours. Therefore there are for instance no long-shaped atoms

⁴² *PSkV* 7b2f.: *abhrādayo hi paricchinnaśa aparicchinnaśaś ca| tatra ye paricchinnaśaś te saṁsthāna evāntarbhūtā| ye 'paricchinnaśaś te varṇaviśeṣa eveti| na varṇa-saṁsthānābhyām prthag vyavasthāpayitum śakyanta ittha prthag noktāh.*

⁴³ See, e.g., *AKBh* 195,7ff.

⁴⁴ *AKBh* 192,20f. and 196,1f. For a more detailed description of the discussion of *saṁsthāna* existing either as a real entity or as a mere designation (*prajñaptisat*), see Karunadasa [1989: 50ff.].

⁴⁵ *AKBh* 6,18f. Another example for *rūpa* consisting of mere shape without colour exists, according to the Sarvāstivādins, in objects seen at a distance (see *AKBh* 195,12f.).

⁴⁶ *AKBh* 195,16f.

in an accumulation of atoms having a long shape.⁴⁷ According to Sthiramati shape and *viññapti* exist as mere designations and are hence not objects of the faculty of seeing, which can only have a real entity as its object. What is perceived by the latter is colour having different shapes.⁴⁸ Remarkably, Sthiramati adds that according to ultimate reality (*paramāṛthataḥ*) *varṇa* — in the same way as *saṁsthāna* — is not the object of the faculty of seeing. He argues that this is due to the fact that mind (*viññāna*) does not have any outer objects, because the existence of (colour) atoms, like that of shape, is not possible from the viewpoint of that level.⁴⁹ This remark by Sthiramati is one of the very few indications found in the *PSkV* pointing to the idealist doctrine of “mind-only” (*viññaptimātratā*).

The classifications of sound (*śabda*), the object of the faculty of hearing, differ in the *PSkV*, the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. In this context it becomes obvious that Sthiramati in some cases refutes the traditions of the *Abhidharma-samuccaya* and of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and develops his own theories. All three texts agree on two kinds of sound:⁵⁰

1. the sound caused by the basic elements (*mahābhūtahetuka*) that are appropriated (*upātta*)
2. the sound caused by the basic elements that are not appropriated (*anupātta*)

The first kind of sound is identified as the sound of the voice (*vāc*) in the *PSkV*, the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, and the *Abhidharma-samuccayabhāṣya*. The *PSkV* and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*

⁴⁷ *PSkV* 8a*4-7 (The scribe has erroneously omitted a part of the text, which was subsequently added on an additional folio. As both folios are marked as folio 8 in our manuscript, for the sake of clarity I refer to the additional folio as 8* in the present article.): *na ca niravayavatvāt paramāṇūnāṃ dīrghādīrūpeṇa parasparato bhedo yuktaḥ tasmān na nīlādiparamāṇūvad dīrghādiparamāṇavaḥ sanīttīl ataś ca saṁsthānaparamāṇusamudāyo 'pi dīrghādisaṁsthāna-paramāṇvabhāvāt ... tasmān nāsty eva dravyataḥ saṁsthānaṃ*.

⁴⁸ *PSkV* 9a2f.: *dravyasadviṣayatvāc cakṣurādīnāṃ saṁsthānasya vijñāpteś ca prajñāpti sattvān na cakṣuṣo viṣayatvam asti. katham cakṣurviṣayatvena rūpam ucyate atra hi lokānuvṛtyā varṇaḥ saṁsthānaviśeṣaṇaś cakṣurviṣayatvena vivakṣitaḥ tathā hi saṁsthānaviśiṣṭaś cakṣuṣā varṇo gṛhyate*. Sthiramati also describes *viññapti* as shape that arises from the intention of which it is the object and that is called *viññapti* because it makes known [to others] the intention by which it has been aroused (see *PSkV* 8a6f.: *tadālabhanacittajaṃ kāyamahābhūtaśrayeṇotpannaṃ kāyasya saṁsthānaṃ svasamutthapakacittaviññāpanād vijñāptir ity ucyate*).

⁴⁹ *PSkV* 9a6f.: *paramāṛthatas tu saṁsthānavaṇ na varṇo 'pi cakṣuṣo viṣayaḥ saṁsthānavat paramāṇor anīṣpannavā vijñānasya bahyārthāviṣayatvāt*.

⁵⁰ *PSkV* 9b4, *AKBh* 6,4, *AS** 4,3 (*AS** 53b5) and *ASBh* 3,19f.

additionally mention the sound of the (clapping) hand (*hasta*). The sound that is not appropriated is, according to the *PSkV* and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, the sound of the wind (*vāyu*), of the trees (*vanaspati*), or of the river (*nadī*).⁵¹ The categorization of the remaining types of sound appears to have been controversial. The *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and the *PSkV* distinguish a third category of sound: the sound that is both, *upātta* and *anupātta*. As an example for this kind of sound the texts mention the sound of a hand and a drum (*mrdāṅga*), i.e., a hand hitting a drum.⁵² Remarkably, this class of sound is rejected in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* as a separate category. There it is stated that “others” (*apare*) say that a sound can be appropriated and not appropriated at the same time, but this is not accepted, as it is not admitted that one atom is based on two tetrads of the basic elements (i.e., the four basic elements of the hand and the four basic elements of the drum).⁵³ This rejection of the sound that is both, appropriated and not appropriated, in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* is remarkable insofar as the author of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* is generally accepted to be identical to that of the *PSk*.⁵⁴ What is more, two other kinds of sound mentioned in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* are absent in the *PSk*. In *AKBh* 6,24 the class of sounds of living beings (*sattva*) and, finally, the sounds not belonging to living beings are listed additionally. The first of these two classes refers to the “making known” of speech (*vāgvijñapti*), the second is described as including all other kinds of sound.⁵⁵ The *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* adds that all four of the mentioned sounds can be pleasant (*manojñā*) or unpleasant (*amanojñā*), which makes a total of eight different categories of sounds.⁵⁶ In contrast, the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* lists five additional classes of sound besides the two categories mentioned above. They include sounds known in the world (*lokaprasiddha*), i.e., common talk (*laukikabhāṣā*), sounds produced by the *siddhas*

51 *PSkV* 9b5f., *AKBh* 6,25f., and *ASBh* 3,19. *ASBh* 3,20 has only *vrkṣa* as the sound that is not appropriated.

52 *PSkV* 9b6 and *ASBh* 3,20.

53 *AKBh* 6,27-7,1.

54 See, e.g., Schmithausen [1989: 262, n. 101]. Vasubandhu does not explicitly mention the example of the sound of a hand and a drum in the *PSk*, but he clearly accepts the position of the sound that is simultaneously *upātta* and *anupātta* (see *PSk*₇ 13a5: *sgra gang zhe nal rna ba'i yul tel zin pa dang ma zin pa dang gnyi ga'i ste*).

55 *AKBh* 6,6f.

56 *AKBh* 6,24f.

(*siddhohanīta*), fabricated (*parikalpita*) sounds,⁵⁷ sounds belonging to the common practice of the Āryas (*āryavyāvahārika*) or to the common practice of the non-Āryas (*anāryavyāvahārika*). All these sounds can be not only pleasant or unpleasant, as indicated in the explanation of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* mentioned above, but also neutral.⁵⁸

The sections on odour and taste consist of only three lines in the *PSkV*. Nevertheless they are noteworthy as they differ from the respective passages in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. The latter mentions four types of odour: good (*su-*) and bad odour (*durgandha*) which can both be either constant (*sama*) or inconstant (*viṣama*). It is added, however, that in the *śāstra* (i.e., in the *Prakaraṇa*) three kinds of odour are taught: good, bad, and neutral (*samagandha*).⁵⁹ An almost identical statement is made by Vasubandhu in the *PSk*, the “neutral” odour being indicated with the phrase “other [odours]”.⁶⁰ Sthiramati does not mention this triad in his commentary, but instead refers to another definition, which describes the odour as natural (*sahaja*), like the smell of sandal wood (*candana*), as arising from contact (*sāmyogika*), like the smell of incense (*dhūpavartī*), and as arising from change (*pāriṇāmika*), like the smell of ripe mango fruits (*pakvāmrāphala*).⁶¹ All six types of odour are listed in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, and in its commentary the last three are illustrated with the same examples of sandal wood, incense, and ripe fruits.⁶² That means that the triad of *sahaja*, *sāmyogika*, and *pāriṇāmika* was probably unknown to the author of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and also to the author of the *PSk*. In his commentary Sthiramati, possibly following the tradition of the *Abhi-*

⁵⁷ The *siddhohanīta* and the *parikalpita* sounds are explained in *ASBh* 3,21 as sounds communicated by the Āryas (*āryair deśitah*) on the one hand or by the non-Buddhists (*īrthyair deśitah*) on the other. The reconstruction of these two and the following two categories offered by Pradhan (see *AS** 4,4: *siddhohanīto vā parikalpito vā āryair deśito vā īrthyair deśito vā*) seems to be wrong when compared to the commentary found in *ASBh* and to the Tibetan translation of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (*AS_T* 53b5f.): *grub pas bstan pa dang/ kun brtags pa dang/ 'phags pas tha snyad btags pa dang/ 'phags pa ma yin pas tha snyad btags pa'o*. The phrases *āryair deśitah* and *īrthyair deśitah* do not describe additional categories but are the respective definitions of the *siddhohanīta* and the *parikalpita* sounds. The correct expression for the last two categories of sound is found in *ASBh* 3,21f: *āryānāryavyāvahārikau*.

⁵⁸ *AS** 4,2 (*AS_T* 53b4f.).

⁵⁹ *AKBh* 7,6.

⁶⁰ *PSk_T* 13a6: *dri zhim pa dang/ dri na bal de las gzhan pa'o*.

⁶¹ *PSkV* 10a1f.

⁶² *AS** 4,5f. (*AS_T* 53b7) and *ASBh* 3,24f.

dharmasamuccaya, decided to go beyond Vasubandhu's definition and include the triad in his own explanation.

In the case of taste, Sthiramati (in accord with Vasubandhu's root text) follows the classification of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, where six types are listed: sweet (*madhura*), sour (*amla*), salty (*lavaṇa*), pungent (*kaṭuka*), bitter (*tikta*), and astringent (*kaṣāya*).⁶³ He does not mention that taste, according to the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, can also be divided into the classes pleasant (*manojña*), unpleasant (*amanojña*), and neutral or, in analogy to the categories of odour, into *sahaja*, *sāṃyogika*, and *pāriṇāmika*.⁶⁴

When analysing the nature of the tangible, Sthiramati again is closer to the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* than to the definition of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, parts of which he even refutes explicitly. In *AKBh* 7,9f. eleven entities are mentioned as being tangible: the four *mahābhūtas*, softness (*ślakṣṇatva*), hardness (*karkaṣatva*), heaviness (*gurutva*), lightness (*laghutva*), cold (*śīta*), hunger (*jighatsā*), and thirst (*pipāsā*). The explanation given in the *PSk* is more differentiated because, in contrast with the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, *rūpa* is divided into the matter of the four *mahābhūtas* and the matter dependent (*upādāyarūpa*) on them. As the tangible is explained in the context of *upādāyarūpa*, the mention of the four *mahābhūtas* as constituents of this category would contradict the classification (of *mahābhūta* versus *upādāyarūpa*) made earlier. Therefore it is said in *PSk* 2a1 that only a part of the tangible (*spraṣṭavyaikadeśa*) is explained in this context. The *Abhidharmasamuccaya* does not mention the *mahābhūtas* under the topic of the tangible and explains that the latter consists of *upādāyarūpa* including in addition to the seven entities softness etc. fifteen other categories like strength (*bala*), weakness (*daurbalya*), or fainting (*mūrchā*). Sthiramati explains that these additional categories are not listed in the *PSk* because they are already included in the remaining ones, like for example strength is included in hardness and heaviness and fainting in lightness.⁶⁵

The third constituent of matter dependent on the basic elements is, according to the *PSk*, the *avijñapti*. In the root text (*PSk* 2a1f.) *avijñapti* is explained as "invisible and penetrable matter arisen from

⁶³ *AKBh* 7,4.

⁶⁴ *AS** 4,7-9 (*AS_T* 53b8f.).

⁶⁵ *PSkV* 11b2f.: *anye 'pi mūrchābaladaurbalyādayaḥ spraṣṭavyaviśeṣā vidyante/ eteṣv evāntarbhūta itī prthag noktāḥ/ mūrchā ślakṣṇatvān na bhidyate balaṃ karkaṣagurutvābhyāṃ.*

viññapti and meditative absorption" (*viññaptisamādhijam rūpam anidarśanam apratigham*). A similar statement is given in *AKBh* 8,9f., where *aviññapti* is described as wholesome (*kuśala*) or unwholesome (*akuśala*) matter, having arisen from *viññapti* or *samādhī*.⁶⁶ Remarkably, the term *aviññapti* is not used in the *AS*. Instead, the term *sāmādānika* is applied to this kind of karmic matter in the context of the definition of five classes of matter belonging to the *dharmāyatana*.⁶⁷ The *Abhidharmasamuccaya* does not specify, however, what exactly the matter belonging to the *sāmādānika* category is.

According to Sthiramati *aviññapti* that has arisen from *viññapti* belongs to [the sphere of] sensual pleasure (*kāmāpta*) and can be divided into four classes: (1) the restraint (*saṃvara*) of the code of precepts (*prātimokṣa*), (2) the restraint of the Bodhisattva, (3) the non-restraint (*asaṃvara*), which includes practice harming others, and (4) neither restraint nor non-restraint, which is described as the appearance of partly beneficial and partly harmful [activities] (*ekadeśenānugrahopaghātapravṛttiḥ*).⁶⁸ This classification of *aviññapti* seems to be an extended adaptation of the analysis of it as found in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. There *aviññapti* is structured into the three classes *saṃvara*, *asaṃvara*, and *naiva saṃvāro nāsaṃvaraḥ*.⁶⁹ The class of the *bodhisattvasaṃvara* is, as might be expected, missing in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. It is notable in this context that the same structure of three classes is presented in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*; not, however, explicitly describing *aviññapti*, but the divisions of karma.⁷⁰ What is surprising here, is the fact that the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* does not mention the restraint of the Bodhi-

⁶⁶ Sthiramati also classifies *aviññapti* as being *kuśala* or *akuśala* in *PSkV* 12a1. The terms are, however, missing in the Tibetan translation of the *PSkV*. There the characterization of *aviññapti* is as follows (*PSkV*_T 11a6f.): *rnam par rig byed dang/ ting nge 'dzin las byung ba'i gzugs te bstan du med pa thogs pa med pa'o*. In contrast with *aviññapti*, which can never be neutral (*avyākṛta*) (see *AKBh* 200,25), *viññapti* might be *kuśala*, *akuśala*, or *avyākṛta* (see *AKBh* 201,2 and *PSkV* 12a2). The reason for this classification of *aviññapti* as either morally good or bad might be explained by the fact that *aviññapti* was introduced to justify the karmic results of actions that cannot be perceived directly in opposition to the visible actions of body and speech (i.e., *kāya-* and *vāgviññapti*). Therefore an *aviññapti* not having karmic consequences would be ineffective and purposeless.

⁶⁷ See *AS** 4,13 (*AS*_T 54a4f.) and *ASBh* 4,4. On the meaning of this term, see below.

⁶⁸ *PSkV* 12a2-6. See also *AS** 58,8f. (*AS*_T 104b6f.). As is evident from the commentary to the latter (see *ASBh* 69,7f.), the term *naivasamvāranāsaṃvara* refers to activities that are not included in the classes *saṃvara* or *asaṃvara*, as for instance "friendly words" (*priyavacana*) or "a slap with the open hand" (*capeta*).

⁶⁹ *AKBh* 205,12f.

⁷⁰ See *AS** 57,3 (*AS*_T 104a3).

sattva either.

The first category, *saṃvara*, is divided into three subclasses in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*. The first of these is *prātimokṣasaṃvara*. The other two classes are the restraint of contemplation (*dhyānasaṃvara*) and the restraint of the uncontaminated (*anāsravaṣaṃvara*). These are the two categories that are described by Sthiramati as arising from meditative absorption (*samādhija*).⁷¹ The *avijñāpti* that arises from meditative absorption belongs either to the material [sphere] (*rūpāpta*) or is the uncontaminated (*anāsrava*) *avijñāpti*. If it belongs to the *rūpadhātu* then it originates from contaminated meditative absorption (*sāsrava-samādhija*) of the four contemplations (*dhyāna*), of [the stage] before attaining [the first *dhyāna*] (*anāgamyā*), and of the states between the [first two] *dhyānas* (*dhyānāntara*).⁷² The *avijñāpti* that is uncontaminated is produced by uncontaminated meditative absorption (*anāsravasamādhija*).⁷³

In the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* the analysis of *avijñāpti* is very comprehensive and the discussion of opposing views with regard to the nature of *avijñāpti* is rather complex and difficult to understand.⁷⁴ In this context one of Vasubandhu's main concerns seems to be to oppose the Sarvāstivāda theory of *avijñāpti* as an existing entity (*dravya*) and a component of the category *rūpa*. Naturally, both these assumptions were rejected by the Sautrāntikas, whose arguments Vasubandhu employs to support his position. Sthiramati refers only briefly to this discussion⁷⁵ and seems (in accord with the *PSk*)⁷⁶ to accept the view that *avijñāpti* belongs to the category of matter. He does not indicate, however, whether this also means that *avijñāpti* is to be regarded as *dravya*. What seems to be more controversial to

⁷¹ *PSkV* 12a6f. The same statement is made in *AKBh* 200,10.

⁷² In contrast with the *PSkV*, the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* mentions only the first three *dhyānas* as constituting this category (see *AS** 57,20f. [*AS*₇ 104b4f.]).

⁷³ *PSkV* 12b1f. In *AKBh* 201,8-11 Vasubandhu defends the view that *avijñāpti* can only be produced in *kāma*- and *rūpadhātu*, not in *ārūpyadhātu*. The arising of *avijñāpti* is impossible in the sphere without matter, as *avijñāpti* is dependent on the *mahābhūtas*, which, of course, do not exist there. Vasubandhu rejects the opponent's assumption that it should be possible to produce *avijñāpti* in *ārūpyadhātu* just as uncontaminated *avijñāpti* is produced by someone existing in the *rūpadhātu*. In contrast with uncontaminated *avijñāpti*, which does not fall under the division of the three *dhātus*, an *avijñāpti* belonging to *ārūpyadhātu* could not be produced dependent on elements which belong to another sphere.

⁷⁴ See *AKBh* 9,19-10,6 and chapter 4, e.g., pp. 196,4ff.

⁷⁵ See *PSkV* 13a5-13b6.

⁷⁶ *PSk* 13a2f.

Sthiramati is the question whether there are any other kinds of matter comparable to *avijñapti*. The manner in which Sthiramati discusses this problem shows that the boundary between material and mental factors was disputed among the authors of Abhidharmic texts like the *PSkV*, the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.

In the *Saṅgītisūtra* it is stated that there are three kinds of *rūpa*: one that is visible (*sanidarśana*) and impenetrable (*sapratigha*), one that is invisible and impenetrable, and one that is invisible and penetrable.⁷⁷ The *sūtra* does not explain, however, what exactly is meant by these three classes. The passage is quoted in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (196,8f.), and Sthiramati seems to refer to it in the *PSkV* when he explains that all matter is threefold. He identifies visible and impenetrable matter with the object of the sense of sight, invisible and impenetrable matter with the five sense faculties as well as the objects of the other four senses (apart from the sense of sight), and finally the invisible and penetrable matter with the matter of *dharmāyatana*.⁷⁸ According to the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, the matter of *dharmāyatana* includes five entities: compressed matter (*ābhi-saṃkṣepika*), matter of space (*ābhyavakāśika*), matter of commitment (*sāmādānika*), imagined (*parikalpita*) matter, and matter produced by those with [meditative] power (*vaibhūtvika*).⁷⁹ The commentary explains matter that is *ābhisamkṣepika* as the matter of atoms (*paramāṇu*), whereas *ābhyavakāśika* is defined as referring to the matter of atoms being separated from other obstructing tangible [matter] (*tadanyaprativāraṇaspraṣṭavyarahita*).⁸⁰ The term *sāmādānika* is explained as an alternative expression for the matter of *avijñapti*, and *parikalpita* is defined as indicating matter of meditative images (*pratibimba*), as for instance the image of a skeleton (*asthi-saṃkalika*). *Vaibhūtvika* is explained as referring to objects of those who are absorbed in the eight liberations (*[aṣṭa]vimokṣadhyāyi-*

77 See Stache-Rosen [1968: 73].

78 *PSkV* 12b3-5.

79 *AS** 4,12-14 (*AS_T* 54a4f.), *ASBh* 4,3-5, and *PSkV* 12b5.

80 *ASBh* 4,3f. See also *PSkV* 12b6-13a2. It is difficult to discern the subtle difference between the atomic matter of the category *ābhisamkṣepika* and that of *ābhyavakāśa*. The first kind of matter possibly refers to the ordinary atoms that constitute the material objects, whereas the second relates to the (dark or light) matter of holes, like the opening of a door or the mouth. See *AKBh* 18,11-18 for a distinction of (unconditioned) *ākāśa* from the *ākāśadhātu* which is defined as the material space of the opening of doors etc.

gocara).⁸¹ This last category probably includes the formless objects visualized during the practice of the eight liberations, such as the four colours.⁸² Sthiramati rejects four of these categories as belonging to *rūpa* and explains why he accepts only the *avijñapti* as invisible and penetrable matter. According to his argument, the first two categories, the *ābhisamkṣepika* and the *ābhyavakāśika*, refer to matter of atoms and thus belong to the category of colour (which is part of the visible matter).⁸³ The objects of the last two categories, the *parikalpita* and the *vaibhūtvika*, are nothing other than mental images and are therefore to be regarded as being part of the mind.⁸⁴ Thus in the case of invisible and penetrable matter Sthiramati explicitly rejects the teaching of five different entities given in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and follows the tradition of just one entity falling under this category of matter. This tradition is also evident in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* where it is presented as the position of the Sarvāstivādins, who state that there is no other invisible and penetrable *rūpa* than *avijñapti*.⁸⁵ It is notable that in this context Vasubandhu mentions the view of some Yogācāras who claim that an image that is perceived in contemplation is matter that is invisible and penetrable. This position seems to be accepted by the Sautrāntikas (and probably also by Vasubandhu himself who tends to favour the Sautrāntika view of *avijñapti*).⁸⁶ However, the fivefold division of invisible and penetrable *rūpa* as explained in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and the *PSkV* is not mentioned in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, possibly because it was unknown to Vasubandhu.

IV. Concluding Remarks

As one of the very few Abhidharmic works of the Yogācāra school extant in Sanskrit, Sthiramati's *PSkV* represents a very important

⁸¹ *ASBh* 4,4f. See also *PSkV* 13a2.

⁸² On the inclusion of the visualization of colours in the eight *vimokṣas*, see Kramer [2005: 147, n. 237].

⁸³ *PSkV* 12b6-13a2.

⁸⁴ *PSkV* 13a2-4: *parikalpitam pratibimbarūpam asthisamkalikādikaṇi/ vaibhūtvikam vimokṣa-dhyāyigocaram tad rūpam vikalpātmakatvād iha nopāttaṇi/ na hi tat tadākāravijñāna-pratyavabhāṣād bahir vidyatel pratibimbaṇi ca viṣayapratyavabhāso vijñānasyaiveti na vijñānāt pratibimbaṇi pratibimbād vā vijñānaṇi prthag asti.*

⁸⁵ See *AKBh* 196,12.

⁸⁶ *AKBh* 197,4-6 and 198,16f. On the question of the term "Sautrāntika" and the relation between Sautrāntika positions and the *Yogācārabhūmi*, see Kritzer [2005: xxvi-xxx].

source for the technical terminology of this tradition and contains valuable information on philosophical development and on the process of reshaping the canonical concept of the *skandhas*, *āyatanas*, and *dhātus*. In the context of the elaborate system of mind of the Yogācāra tradition, new theories such as those of *ālayavijñāna* or *kliṣṭamanas* had to be integrated into the traditional structure. In a few instances Sthiramati even incorporates into the *PSkV* some aspects of the idealistic position of *vijñaptimātratā*, for instance when he mentions that colour, from the viewpoint of the highest reality, is not the object of the eye faculty, because *vijñāna* does not have any external objects. Apart from one or two remarks pointing in this idealistic direction, it is evident that the *PSkV* basically follows the more traditional teachings of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*. Although Sthiramati does usually not explicitly mention his sources, it is obvious that his positions are closely related to those of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*. With regard to the latter, however, it is notable that Sthiramati in some cases rejects views that very clearly have their origin in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*. This is for example the case when Sthiramati explains the matter of *dharmāyatana*: He rejects its fivefold division as found in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, and instead accepts only the *avijñapti* in this category of matter. Remarkably, Sthiramati seems to follow a position here that in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* is ascribed to the Sarvāstivādins. According to the latter, only the *avijñapti* is to be regarded as invisible and penetrable matter. The contrary view, namely that meditative images are to be considered as this kind of matter, was obviously held by some (early) Yogācāras (as represented by some portions of the *Yogācārabhūmi*)⁸⁷ and the Sautrāntikas.

On other occasions Sthiramati seems to compromise on the divergent teachings of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, and as a result develops his own interpretations. A similar procedure can already be observed in Vasubandhu's *PSk*, where for instance the number of unconditioned entities is established as four — most probably a compromise between the three

⁸⁷ Schmithausen [1973: 167] explains that this position is found in some passages of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, but he also mentions that in another part of the latter, namely in the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, there is the tendency to consider the meditative images as mental (and not material).

unconditioned factors of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the eight of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*. Notable in this context is Vasubandhu's (and Sthiramati's) treatment of the object of the faculty of hearing, the sound, which is defined in the *PSk* as being threefold. This division disagrees with the respective explanation of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, in which the last of these three kinds, sound that simultaneously is *upātta* and *anupātta*, is rejected. Here Vasubandhu seems to follow the tradition of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, which accepts this kind of sound. But at the same time neither Vasubandhu nor Sthiramati mention the additional five classes of sound, like the sound "known in the world", listed in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* in the same context. This tendency of developing interpretations which are neither in accordance with the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* nor with the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* is also visible when Sthiramati denies the positions held in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* that there are more constituents of the visible (*rūpa*) than just *varṇa* and *saṃsthāna*, namely clouds, smoke, dust etc. Finally it may also be noted that Sthiramati occasionally supplements the definitions of the *PSk*, for example in the case of odour, where he lists three additional kinds that are absent in Vasubandhu's root text and also in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* but are listed in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES:

- AKBh*: *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (Vasubandhu), ed. P. Pradhan, Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1967.
- AS*: *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (Aśaṅga), ed. P. Pradhan, Santiniketan: Visva-Bharati, 1950.
- AS**: Passages of *AS* retranslated into Sanskrit (from the Tibetan and Chinese translations of the *AS*) by Pradhan.
- ASBh*: *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* (Buddhasiṃha or Jinaputra), ed. N. Tatia, Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1976.
- AS_T*: Tibetan translation of *AS*: P 5550.
- Prakarāṇa(pāda)*: T 1542.
- PSk*: *Pañcaskandhaka* (Vasubandhu) (manuscript, 7 fols., copy kept at the China Tibetology Research Center [Beijing]).
- PSk_T*: Tibetan translation of *PSk*: P 5560.
- PSkV*: *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* (Sthiramati) (manuscript, 73 fols., copy kept at the China Tibetology Research Center [Beijing]).
- PSkV_T*: Tibetan translation of *PSkV*: P 5567.
- Śaṅgītisūtra*: See Stache-Rosen [1968].
- Y_T*: Tibetan translation of the *Yogācārabhūmi*: P 5536-5543.

SECONDARY SOURCES:

Frauwallner, Erich

- 1963 "Abhidharma-Studien: I. Pañcaskandhakam und Pañcavastukam," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 7: 20-36.

Karunadasa, Y.

- 1989 *Buddhist Analysis of Matter*, Singapore: The Buddhist Research Society.

Kramer, Jowita

- 2005 *Kategorien der Wirklichkeit im frühen Yogācāra: Der Fünf-vastu-Abschnitt in der Vinīścayasamgrahaṇī der Yogācārabhūmi*, Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

In progress. *Sthiramati's Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā (Part I: Critical Edition; Part II: Diplomatic Edition)*, Beijing/Vienna: China Tibetology Publishing House – Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.

Kritzer, Robert

- 2005 *Vasubandhu and the Yogācārabhūmi: Yogācāra Elements in the Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya*, Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

Schmithausen, Lambert

- 1973 "Spirituelle Praxis und philosophische Theorie im Buddhismus," *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 3: 161-186.

- 1987 *Ālayavijñāna: On the Origin and the Early Development of a Central Concept of Yogācāra Philosophy*, 2 vols., Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

Skilling, Peter

- 1980 "On the Five Aggregates of Attachment (III)," *Linh-Son — Publication d'études bouddhologiques* 13: 30-37.

Stache-Rosen, Valentina

- 1968 *Das Saṅgītisūtra und sein Kommentar Saṅgītiparyāya*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Vetter, Tilmann

- 2000 *The 'Khandha Passages' in the Vinayapiṭaka and the Four Main Nikāyas*, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Institute for Indology and Tibetology
University of Munich
Germany