

Sthiramati and Śīlabhadra*

Noriaki Hakamaya

This paper reports an identity of the two passages on the *dharmakāya* or *dharmadhātu-viśuddhi* — one from Sthiramati's *Sūtralaṃkāravṛttibhāṣya* (SAVBh) and the other from Śīlabhadra's *Buddhabhūmivyaḥkāna* (BBhV) —, and points out some possibilities and problems drawn from the identity¹⁾.

Sthiramati quotes a passage under the title **Buddhabhūmisamādhiṭkā* (*Saṅs rgyas kyi saḥi tiṅ ñe ḥdsin ti ka*), which he regards as the authority of his interpretation on the MSA IX-60²⁾. The passage is as follows:

³⁾ *thog ma gñis paḥi gnas yin shes bya ba la thog ni chos kyi sku la bya ste| chos kyi sku ni rdsogs loṅs spyod paḥi sku daṅ sprul sku gñis kyi gnas nas rten yin no shes bya baḥi don to||*

de bas na Saṅs rgyas kyi saḥi tiṅ ñe ḥdsin ti ka las kyaṅ “de la chos kyi rnam graṅs mthaḥ dag thos paḥi bag chags yoṅs su smin pas ma lus par bsgoms pa rg-yu[r] gyur paḥi rtag tu sems can thams cad la phan pa daṅ bde ba skye baḥi phyir ñe bar gnas paḥi tiṅ ñe ḥdsin daṅ| gzuṅs kyi sgo dpag tu med pa daṅ| bsod nams daṅ ye śes kyi tshogs daṅ ldan pa śes bya daṅ ñon moṅs paḥi sgrib pa thams cad las dben pa ni chos kyi dbyiṅs rnam par dag pa ste| chos thams cad kyi de bshin ṅid do|| phyin ci ma log paḥi raṅ bshin yin no|| ḥphags paḥi chos thams cad kyi skye baḥi rgyuho|| de bshin gśegs pa thams cad kyi bdag ṅid do” shes bśad do||

The same passage as underlined is found in the BBhV of Śīlabhadra which runs as follows:

* This paper is substantially the same as the 2nd section of my article: “Shōjō-hokkai kō (A Consideration on the Dharmadhātuvīśuddhi, in Japanese)” contributed to the *Nanto bukkyo*, No. 37 (unpublished).

1) It is a pleasure to express my gratitude to Prof. D. Seyfort Ruegg, who made many helpful suggestions when I had asked about the identity of the two passages in the SAVBh and the BBhV (March 18th, 1972).

2) S. Lévi, ed., *Mahāyāna-Sūtralaṃkāra*, p. 45, l. 4, “prathamas tu dvayaśrayaḥ.”

3) P. ed., No. 5530, Bi, 152b²⁻⁶.

4) ji skad du snar bśad pa bshin de la chos kyi rnam grañs mthah dag thos paḥi
bag chags yoñs su smin pas ma lus par bsgoms pa rgyur gyu pa| rtag tu sems can
thams cad la phan pa dañ bde ba ñe bar bskyed par bya baḥi phyir ñe bar gnas pa
tiñ ñe ḥdsin dañ| gzuñs kyi sgo dañ bsod nams dañ ye śes kyi tshogs gshal du med
pa dañ ldan pa⁵⁾| śes bya dañ ñon moñs paḥi sgribs pa thams cad las dben pa chos
kyi dbyiñs rnam par dag pa ni chos thams cad kyi de bshin ñid phyin ci ma log paḥi
rañ bshin ḥphags paḥi chos thams cad ñe bar bskyed paḥi rgyu stel de bshin gśegs
pa thams cad kyi bdag ñid yin no||

There can be no doubt about the identity of the two passages underlined⁶⁾, from which we will be able to suppose the two possibilities.

Possibility 1: Both Sthiramati and Śīlabhadra have quoted from the same source, namely the **Buddhabhūmisamādhiṭkā*⁷⁾, which the former indicates by the actual name but the latter suggests with the words “*ji skad du snar dśad pa bshin.*”

Possibility 2: The title **Buddhabhūmisamādhiṭkā* was in general use as an alternative to the *BBhV* of Śīlabhadra. Sthiramati had quoted it under the former title. In this case, the passage has to be by Śīlabhadra originally. Therefore, the words “*ji skad du snar dśad pa bshin* (as mentioned above)” do

4) P. ed., No. 5498, Chi, 300a¹⁻⁴. Kyoo Nishio, ed., *The Buddhabhūmi-Sātra and the Buddhabhūmi-Vyākhyāna of Śīlabhadra*, (Nagoya, 1940), p. 60, II. 1-13. In this paper, reference to this text is according to the former, for the latter seems not to be available for Western scholars.

5) According to K. Nishio, the passage is divided here into two parts. See, Nishio, *ibid.* and his *Bucchikyōron no kenkyū* (A Study on the *Buddhabhūmivyākhyāna*, in Japanese), pp. 210-211. However, this division is unfit in comparison with the quotation in the *SAVBh*.

6) Some differences between the two are attributed to their translation. Ex. “*skye baḥi phyir* (SAVBh)”, “*ñe bar bskyed par bya baḥi phyir* (BBhV)” = upapattyartham. “*dpag tu med pa* (SAVBh)”, “*gshal du med pa* (BBhV)” = aprameya. “*kyi skye baḥi rgyu* (SAVBh)”, “*ñe bar bskyed paḥi rgyu* (BBhV)” = upapatti-hetu, etc.

7) The *Fo-ti-ching-lun* (佛地經論, *Taishō* ed., No. 1530) is said to have been written by **Bandhuprabha*, etc. (親光菩薩等造). Therefore, there seems to have been another commentaries on the *Buddhabhūmisātra*, one of which is called the **Buddhabhūmisamādhiṭkā*.

not introduce a quotation, but indicate his own passage mentioned above.

Between these possibilities, it seems to us that the former is more suitable for the already-known facts though we are not able to have any information about the **Buddhabhūmisamādhiṭka*. The latter, however, presents a difficulty about the relationship between Sthiramati and Śīlabhadra. According to Prof. E. Frauwallner, the lifetime of Sthiramati is fixed as 510–570 A. D. and his field of activity was in Valabhī⁸⁾ while Śīlabhadra was 30 years old in the 558 A. D. when his teacher Dharmapāla had retired under the Bodhi-tree⁹⁾, that is to say, he was born in 529 A. D. Thus Sthiramati in 19 years older than Śīlabhadra. Therefore it is not impossible but difficult that the former quotes the latter as the authority of his interpretation. The difficulty seems to reject the possibility 2. But the possibility should not be neglected flatly, because the words “*ji skad du snar bśad pa bshin*” may prove that the passage below them is written by Śīlabhadra himself if they indicate his own passage mentioned above¹⁰⁾. The words “*snar ji skad du bśad pa bshin*” or “*ji skad du snar bśad pa(ḥi) bshin*”¹¹⁾ in another places of the *BBhV* would rather indicate the foregoing passage than introduce a quotation.

In this paper, we cannot draw a decisive conclusion only from the identity of two passages in the *SAVBh* and the *BBhV*, but we have pointed out the two possibilities. If the possibility 2 is strengthened by some way, it would be open to re-examine into the relationship between Sthiramati and Śīlabhadra.

(July 30th, 1976)

8) E. Frauwallner, “Landmarks in the History of Indian Logic,” *WZKO*, V (1961), pp. 136–137. H. Ui puts Sthiramati in 470–550 A. D. But his view on the date of Sthiramati has not accepted today by most Japanese scholars.

9) E. Frauwallner, *ibid.*, p. 133. H. Ui puts Śīlabhadra in 529–645 A. D. It agrees with Frauwallner’s. But, according to the former, it was in 634 A. D. that Hiuan-tsang met his teacher Śīlabhadra in Nālandā.

10) It seems to me that the words indicate the foregoing passage, namely Chi, 299a–300a, especially, “*chos kyi dbyiṅs la dmigs pas thos pa ma lus par ḥdsin pa danṅ sems can thams cad la bdag danṅ gshan mñam pa brñes pa danṅ yaṅ dag paḥi chos rab tu ston paḥi thabs danṅ gshan la phan ḥdogs paḥi rgyu niḥo*|| (299a⁷⁻⁸)”.

11) See, Chi, 287a⁴ and 298a¹. Concerning the latter, Nishio (*op. cit.*, p. 208, n. 1) notes that the words indicate the foregoing passage, Chi, 294b²⁻⁶.