

CHINA TIBETOLOGY RESEARCH CENTER
AUSTRIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Vasubandhu's Pañcaskandhaka

Critically edited

by

Li Xuezhu and Ernst Steinkellner

with a contribution by

Toru Tomabechi

CHINA TIBETOLOGY PUBLISHING HOUSE
AUSTRIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES PRESS



CHINA TIBETOLOGY RESEARCH CENTER
AUSTRIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Vasubandhu's
Pañcaskandhaka

Critically edited

by

Li Xuezhu and Ernst Steinkellner

with a contribution by

Toru Tomabechi

CHINA TIBETOLOGY PUBLISHING HOUSE
AUSTRIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES PRESS
BEIJING – VIENNA 2008



图书在版编目(CIP)数据

世亲《五蕴论》:梵文/李学竹,(奥)斯坦因凯勒校注。——北京:

中国藏学出版社,2008.7

(西藏自治区梵文本系列丛书;4)

ISBN 978-7-80253-033-1

I.五… II.①李… ②斯… III.五蕴-注释-梵语 IV.B94

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2008)第082682号

世亲《五蕴论》

出版:中国藏学出版社

发行:中国藏学出版社

印刷:北京隆昌伟业印刷有限公司

开本:787×1092 1/16

印张:8.5

印次:2008年7月第1版第1次

印数:1000

书号:ISBN 978-7-80253-033-1/B·59

定价:20.00元



Submitted to the Austrian Academy of Sciences
on January 16th, 2008,
by Ernst Steinkellner, member of the Academy

All rights reserved

ISBN 978-3-7001-6109-7

Copyright © 2008 by
Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna
and

China Tibetology Research Center, Beijing
Printed by Peking Lungchang Foye Print Ltd.



CHINA TIBETOLOGY RESEARCH CENTER
AUSTRIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region

founded and edited in chief by

Lhagpa Phuntshogs
and
Ernst Steinkellner

No.4

中国藏学研究中心
奥地利科学院

西藏自治区梵文文本系列丛书

创办/主编

拉巴平措

及

厄恩斯特·斯坦因凯勒
第四卷

Introduction

The original Sanskrit text of Vasubandhu's *Pañcaskandhaka* (PSk),¹ being published here for the first time, is contained in a *codex unicus* kept in the collection of the Potala Palace in Lhasa. No direct access to the *codex* being possible at this time, our edition is based on a photocopy of it held by the library of the China Tibetology Research Center (CTRC) in Beijing.

The *Pañcaskandhaka* of Vasubandhu² can be roughly characterised as a summary of Abhidharma in accordance with the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda tradition as was presented by Asaṅga in

¹ This seems to be the title of the text. The manuscript's colophon oddly calls it *pañca skandhāḥ*, but Sthiramati names his commentary *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* (V 73b1) and refers to his work as *Pañcaskandhakopanibandha* (TrBh¹ 39, 4). It seems that the Tibetan translation adds *rab tu byed pa* (**prakaraṇa*) to *Pañcaskandha*. This addition appears also in the title of the Chinese translation (T. 1612), but we have not yet found this form of the name elsewhere.

² For a comprehensive and well-balanced discussion about the question of Vasubandhu's life time, which works can reasonably be attributed to him, the alternative hypotheses of there having been one or two persons called Vasubandhu, and problems with the available information on Gupta dynastic history of the relevant period, cf. Deleanu 2006: 186-194 (in particular notes 206 and 207).

Deleanu's proposal of Vasubandhu's lifetime having been from 350 to 430 C.E., based on Schmithausen's observation that two passages in the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* most likely presuppose verses of Vasubandhu's *Triṃśikā* (Schmithausen 1992), is adopted here for the Vasubandhu who is the author of the *Abhidharmakośa* and its *Bhāṣya*, as well as the works of relevance in the present context, the *Pañcaskandhaka*, *Viṃśatikā*, and the *Triṃśikā* (cf. Schmithausen 1987: 262f, n.101).

the first chapter of his *Abhidharmasamuccaya*.³ Vasubandhu's work consists of a list of terms with succinct definitions. Together, these terms comprise all factors (*dharma*) that make up reality, and thus represent a systematic survey of this influential philosophical school's world-view. As its title indicates, the focus is on the *skandha*, the "groups" or "branches" that are the principal constituents of the empirical personality of sentient beings and the insentient world.

In the manner how the Abhidharma system is presented and because of the Yogācāra elements it contains it is clear that the *Pañcaskandhaka* is related to the *Triṃśikā*, a pure Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda work from Vasubandhu's last period. At the same time it is, with regard to most of the traditional Abhidharma terms, closely related to the *Abhidharmakośa* and its *Bhāṣya*, which present the Sarvāstivāda system and deviating "Sautrāntika" notions. There are several instances where certain definitions of terms given in the *Pañcaskandhaka* can also be found in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, but are introduced there as deviations from standard Sarvāstivāda definitions and attributed to *apare* or *anye*.⁴ Definitions of this

³ With this text, Asaṅga may have created a new Mahāyāna Abhidharma compendium on the basis of common Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna material (Kritzer 1999: 13), and was not necessarily only under the influence of the Abhidharma of the Mahīśāsaka school (as assumed in Frauwallner 1994: 110f; 1995: 144; Anacker 1984: 58).

⁴ This seems to be evident in the case of the definitions, e.g., of *śraddhā* (§ 4.1.11) which is referred to in AKBh 55,6f as that of *apare*; of *praśrabdhi* (§ 4.1.18) which AKBh 55,9-11 understands as a Sautrāntika conception (cf. AKBh_v 2. 157, note 5); of *āhrikyā* and *anapatrāpyā* (§§ 4.1.38,39), introduced as that of *anye* in AKBh 59,24 and accepted as such (cf. AKBh_v 2. 171 with note 2); or of *vitarka* and *vicāra* (§§ 4.1.50,51), connected by Yaśomitra with the citation of *anye* in AKBh 61,10f (cf. AKBh_v 2.175, note 2).

kind have been traditionally dubbed as “Sautrāntika”. Robert Kritzer, however, assumes that a number of these may better be taken as “Yogācāra *abhidharma* in disguise” (Kritzer 1999: 20). For words of caution with regard to this interpretation, cf. Dhammajyoti 200?.

Because of Vasubandhu's considerable importance for all later Buddhist thought on matters ontological, psychological, and religious, etc., the *Pañcaskandhaka* has often been studied and translated,⁵ although until now only on the basis of its Chinese and/or Tibetan translations.⁶ The exemplary lucidity and conciseness by which it is distinguished, and which has been already attested to these translations by Frauwallner in 1956 (Frauwallner 1994: 110), can now be finally appreciated in the unambiguous language of the Sanskrit original.

There are no certain conclusions to be drawn from such evidence. The source of these references in the AKBh may well be the same that Vasubandhu used when composing the PSk.

⁵ The Tibetan translation has been translated into Japanese in Kiyoi 1935 and Shimokawabe/Takayama 1976, into English in Anacker 1984, and into Sanskrit in Shastri 1956; part of the Chinese translation has been translated into German in Frauwallner 1994 (¹1956), and the entire Chinese translation into French in Dantinne 1980.

⁶ T. 1612, P 5560. In addition to the edition of the Peking version in Dantinne 1980 there is a critical edition in Takigawa 1996 on the basis of the Peking, Derge, Cone, and Narthang versions. The Tibetan text presented in Appendix 1 is based on the new Tanjur edition of the CTCRC and takes advantage of the editorial proposals made by Takigawa. The Chinese text in Appendix 2 has been taken from its Taishō edition. For the reader's convenience, paragraphs have been introduced into these two translations in accordance with the Sanskrit text.

The *codex* kept in the Potala collection is complete except for seven missing lines at the beginning.⁷ The three sheets of the photocopy kept at the CTRC (Box 120, No.2) each bear six folio-pages with text of the *Pañcaskandhaka*.⁸ The cover page (f.1a) bears the Tibetan title of the *Pañcaskandhaka* in *dbu med* script: *Phuñ po lña'i rab tu byed pa*, but its verso, which shows no pagination and thus originally was most likely also a recto page, has eight lines of another text, not yet identified,⁹ that has no connection to the *Pañcaskandhaka*.¹⁰

⁷ In his unpublished first description of the manuscript, Prof. Luo Zhao notes under Potala, Tanjur, item no. 32, b: “8 leaves, including one black bottom leaf, complete; 28,3 by 4,9 cm; black ink, Gupta script, variously 6,7, or 8 lines.”

For Luo Zhao's descriptive catalogue and its circumstance cf. the introduction to Steinkellner's edition of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, Chapters 1 and 2 in STTAR 2, Beijing-Vienna 2007, note 7.

⁸ With the exception of the first folio-page of the first photocopy which is numbered 28 and bears six lines with text of the end of AK 8 (*samāpattinirdeśa*) and with a colophon: *abhidharmakośe samāpattinirdeśo nāmāṣtamakośasthānaṃ parisamāptaṃ*.

⁹ Beginning: *yac chāsti ca kleśaripūn aśeṣān saṃtrāyate durggatito bhāvāc ca /*

End: *svabhāva iti kalpitādih / jñānaṃ satyābhisambodhir abhijñāḥ pañca darśanaṃ /*. Cf. Appendix 3 for a diplomatic and critical edition of this page by Toru Tomabechi.

¹⁰ No pagination is visible and the page also does not seem to bear the end of a text. I therefore assume that this page belongs to the remains of a manuscript that was not continued for whatever reason, and that the blank verso of this folio was subsequently used as a cover for the few folios containing the PSk.

The text of the PSk missing at the beginning would properly correspond to seven lines on a lost f.1b.

The folios are numbered from 2 to 7, to the left of the fourth line. Most pages have seven lines with 55-58 *akṣaras*. Folios 5 and 7 have five lines with 52-54 *akṣaras*, and f.4a has eight lines with 55-58 *akṣaras*.

Two hands are discernible, the first from f.2a to f.4b, and the second from f.5a to the end. Both scripts are upright, hook-topped Nevārī of the early 12th century.¹¹ The folios show occasional marginal additions with line-numbers and *kākapada*-marks. The second scribe writes clearly with a confident hand, while the hand of the first is less self-assured. Moreover the folios with the first script show considerable fading, probably due to usage. It may be assumed that the second part was added or rewritten to complete or replace a worn-out manuscript.

Among the palaeographic peculiarities are two variants of *nu* in the first hand (f.3b4,7 in *samanupaśyato*, and f.4a2 in *vairānubandhaḥ*) and yet another in the second hand (f.6b1,2 in *anutpādaḥ*). In addition, the sibilants, mainly *s* and *ś*, are used indiscriminately, *t* is usually degeminated before *v*, and gemination after *r* is rare.

Additions: 1) The recto of the end-cover folio adds *namo buddhāya* //, seemingly in the second hand.

2) The verso of the same folio has two additional lines, also in Nevārī script, in another hand.¹²

¹¹ On the basis of the date given at the conclusion of the second scribe's work (cf. below).

¹² Only the following is legible: १ ye yam mantravidhinā ṇiṣālalātet*
tayo cchitaṃ tibhrya..vā.i.. /// (2) tata pra/yusmaśaṅkarasirathira
candrama.e ca karṣakṛ..tanasari.ukakaśaṃ..

The manuscript is dated *sa 229 cai/vai kṛ dvi*. This is short for: *saṃvat 229 caitre/vaiśākhe kṛṣṇapakṣe dvitīye*, the Nepalese era 229 + 879, which corresponds to 1108/1109 CE.

To support the linguistic shape of the *Pañcaskandhaka*'s definitions, preference has been given to those testimonies that represent the Abhidharma tradition of the Yogācāra-Vijñāna-vāda school, above all Asaṅga's *Abhidharmasamuccaya*,¹³ to support the meaning of the definitions also the *Yogācārabhūmi* (T. 1579, P 5536-5543) and the *Hsien-yang shêng-chiao lun* (*Xian-yang sheng-jiao lun*, **Āryadeśanāvikhyāpanaśāstra*) (T. 1602) have been drawn upon.¹⁴ For many traditional Abhidharma terms and definitions Vasubandhu seems to draw also on the *Prakaranapāda* (T. 1542). It was, moreover, particularly helpful to have had the opportunity of referring to the *codex unicus* of Sthiramati's *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* in the form of a photocopy held by the library of the CTTC (Box 120; Nr. 3). This is a clear manuscript of 73 folios, each with six lines of approximately 55 *akṣaras*. It was written by a single scribe in upright and elegant Proto-Bengālī script, and bears occasional marginal corrections by another hand. For the most part the *Vibhāṣā*'s *pratīkas* and explanatory sections support the readings of our edition. All deviations, preferred or not, are duly reported in the critical apparatus.

Another valuable source for our text is Sthiramati's *Trīṃśikā-vijñaptibhāṣya*, since here Sthiramati re-uses many passages al-

¹³ Where the text of the AS is not based on the Sanskrit manuscript, an asterisk is added before the reference.

¹⁴ The references to the Chinese and Tibetan translations of the latter texts have been kindly provided by Robert Kritzer.

most verbatim from his *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*.¹⁵ References to this testimony are, in the first place, to the edition of Sylvain Lévi (TrBh¹), and secondly, in brackets, to the new edition by Hartmut Buescher (TrBh²) published Vienna 2007.

Only where formulations from these Yogācāra texts were not available, or differed too greatly, did Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa(bhāṣya)* and other texts from this Sarvāstivāda or "Sautrāntika" tradition serve as support resources. In general, it was not our intention to comprehensively refer to the definitions available in all Abhidharma texts, both earlier and contemporaneous, and thus no more were added when the critical text was sufficiently supported.

Since the unidentified text on the verso of the front-cover folio (cf. above) will possibly never be found again, we decided to include its diplomatic and critical edition by Toru Tomabechei in Appendix 3.

In conclusion we acknowledge our gratitude to our colleagues who helped in producing this publication: to Helmut Krasser for checking the Tibetan translation, Horst Lasic for taking care of the layout, Toru Tomabechei for typesetting the critical text in Devanāgarī and for editing Appendix 3, Cynthia Peck-Kubaczek for correcting the English text of the introduction and Chu Junjie for translating it into Chinese, as well as Hisataka Ishida for providing a number of Japanese articles. They, as well as Pascale Hugon, Heidrun Jäger, Shinya Moriyama, Cristina Pecchia, and Masamichi Sakai participated in our Friday "Arbeitskreis" in the springs of 2006 and 2007, and contributed with numerous remarks and observations that improved the results of our cooperation considerably. Last, but not least, we would like to thank Robert Kritzer for helping us

¹⁵ Referred to as *Pañcaskandhakopanibandha* (TrBh¹ 39,4).

by identifying parallel passages in the *Yogācārabhūmi* and the *Hsien-yang shêng-chiao lun*, Lambert Schmithausen for a last examination of the introduction and the Sanskrit text as well as for identifying parallels in the *Prakaraṇapāda* and other texts, Ven. Vinita Tseng for checking the *Prakaraṇapāda* passages. For financial and other support we are grateful to the Austrian Science Fund and the Austrian Academy of Sciences.

Li, Xuezhu
(Beijing)

June 2007

Ernst Steinkellner
(Vienna)

导论

在此首次出版的世亲《五蕴论》(Pañcaskandhaka 缩写为 PSK)¹⁶的梵文原本，是保存在拉萨布达拉宫里的“仅存抄本 (codex unicus)”。目前我们还无法直接利用这一抄本，我们这个刊本的底本是北京中国藏学研究中心 (CRTC) 图书馆的影印件。

世亲¹⁷的《五蕴论》大体上说是依照无着《(大乘)阿毗达磨集论》¹⁸第一品中表述的瑜伽行派的体系对阿毗达磨所作

¹⁶ 这似乎是该文本的标题。写卷的尾跋非常奇怪地称之为：pañca skandhāḥ，然而安慧将他的注释称作 Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā (V73b1)，并且还以 Pañcaskandhakopanibandha 的形式提及他的这一著作(见 TrBh¹13, 4)。藏文的翻译似乎还在 Pañcaskandha 后加上了 rab tu byed pa (*prakaraṇa)。这一添加成分也出现在汉文翻译的标题中，但在其他地方我们还未发现这种样式的标题。

¹⁷ 关于详尽而公允地讨论世亲生卒年代、哪些著作理应归属于他、有一个还是两个被称作世亲的人的不同假说等问题、以及有关相应时代的笈多王朝历史的可以利用的信息资料的问题，参看 Deleanu 2006: 186-194 (尤其是注 206 及 207)。

依据 Schmithausen 关于《入楞伽经》中的两段文字极有可能以世亲《(唯识)三十颂》的偈颂为前提的观点(Schmithausen 1992)，Deleanu 提出世亲生活年代应介于公元 350 到 430 之间，在此我们采用这一建议，把它看作是撰写《俱舍论本颂》及其《释论》、以及与此有关的《五蕴论》、《二十颂》和《三十颂》的那个世亲的年代(参看 Schmithausen 1987: 262 以下，注 101)。

¹⁸ 通过这一著作，无着也许建立了一个基于大小乘共享资料的新的大乘阿毗达磨纲要(Kritzner 1999: 13)，而不一定只受化地部阿毗达磨的影响(像 Frauwallner 1994: 110 以下；1995: 144；及 Anacker 1984: 58 所假设的那样)。

的摘要。世亲的这一著作由术语的罗列与简洁的定义组成。总合起来，这些术语包括一切构成实事的法(dharma)，因而再现了他对这一有影响的哲学学派世界观体系的系统考察。如其标题所示，所论重点是在“蕴”，即“聚”或“支”，这是构成众生在感知世界中个体存在的主要元素。

按其表述阿毗达磨体系的方式，以及它所含有的瑜伽行派成分，《五蕴论》显然与《三十颂》(Trimśikā) 有关联，后者是世亲后期一部纯粹的瑜伽行派的著作。同时，就其大部分传统的阿毗达磨术语而言，该论与表述说一切有部体系及偏离该体系的“经部”观念的《阿毗达磨俱舍论》及其《疏》非常接近。目前还不能肯定，《五蕴论》到底完成于《俱舍论》之前还是之后。有几处《五蕴论》的术语定义也能在《阿毗达磨俱舍论疏》中找到，但在那儿是被当作偏离正统的说一切有部的定义的说法而加以引用的，并被归为“有余师”或“他者”(apare 或 anye)¹⁹的说

¹⁹ 这一点在下列术语的定义中似乎非常明显，比如“信”(śraddhā, § 4.1.11)在 AKBh 55,6 以下被归为“有余师”(apare)之说；或“轻安”(praśrabdhi, § 4.1.18)，在 AKBh 55,9-11 被理解为经部的概念(参看 AKBh_v 2.157, 注 5)；“无惭”(āhrīkya, § 4.1.38)及“无愧”(anapatrāpya, § 4.1.39)在 AKBh 59,24 中被说成是“他者”(anye)所说，而且也是如此被接受的(参看 AKBh_v 2.171, 及注 2)；或者“寻”(vitarka, § 4.1.50)及“伺”(vicāra, § 4.1.51)被称友看作是是与在 AKBh 61,10f 被引用的“他者”观点相联的(参看 AKBh_v 2.175, 注 2)。

从这些证据还不能得出什么确定的结论。这些在 AKBh 中引用的资料的来源很可能与世亲在撰写 PSK 时所用的一样。

法。诸如此类的定义传统上被标作“经部”。然而 Robert Kritzer 则认为，其中一部分最好被看作“伪装的瑜伽行派阿毗达磨” (Kritzer 1999: 20)。

由于世亲对所有后来佛教的本体论、心理学、及宗教等等方面的思想有相当重要的意义,《五蕴论》经常被研究和翻译²⁰, 尽管到目前为止, 这些研究和翻译还只能依照中文或藏文译本进行²¹。该论十分突出的特点是其堪称范本的清晰与简练, 这一点弗劳瓦纳 (Frauwallner 1994: 110) 已在 1956 年就这些译本作了证实, 现在终于可在梵文原文毫不含混语言中欣赏到了。

²⁰ 藏译本在 Kiyoi 1935 及 Shimokawabe/Takayama 1976 中译成日文, 在 Anacker 1984 中译成英文, 并且在 Shastri 1956 中译成梵文; 部分中译本在 Frauwallner 1994 (1956 第一版)中译成德文; 而整个中译本在 Dantinne 1980 中译为法文。

²¹ 中文见大正藏版 1612 号, 藏文见北京版 5560 号。除了 Dantinne 1980 中的北京版外, 还有在 Takigawa 1996 刊出的根据北京版、德格版、卓尼版及那塘版所作的校勘本。附录 1 中的藏文本依据的是 CTRC 新出的丹珠尔版, 并使用了 Takigawa 校勘建议。附录 2 的中文本则依据大正藏版, 为方便读者, 两个附录都按照梵文本作了段落划定。

藏于布达拉宫的这件抄本除了开始的七行外²²，是完整的。保存在 CTRC (第 120 匣，第 2 号) 的三张影印纸，每张印有《五蕴论》的六叶面²³，封面 (叶面 1a) 用藏文“无头” (dbu med) 字体写有藏文的“五蕴论”标题：phuñ po lña'i rab tu byed pa，但其背面没有页码标记，因此极可能原本也是正面，这面有另一文本的八行字，内容尚未确定，²⁴与《五蕴论》无关。²⁵

这些叶片在第四行左边标着从第 2 叶到第 7 叶的叶码，大部分叶面有七行，每行 55 到 58 个字母。第 5 及第 7 叶有

²² 在尚未出版的对写本所作的首次描述中，罗炤教授在“布达拉宫，丹珠尔”，第 32 条、第二项下作了如下记录：“共八叶，包括空白底叶一叶，完整；贝叶长 28.3 厘米，宽 4.9 厘米：每面墨书‘笈多’体梵文，六、七、八行不等。”

关于罗炤的解题目录及其相关情况，参看 Steinkellner 的校勘本《Dharmakīrti's Pramānaviścaya，第一章及第二章》中的“导论”：STTAR 2, Beijing-Vienna 2007，注 7。

²³ 除了第一份拷贝的第一叶片页码标为 28 并且带有六行含有《俱舍论》第八章《定品》(samāpattinirdeśa) 末尾段落以及结束语：abhidharmmakōśe samāpattinirdeśo nāmāṣṭamakōśasthānaṃ parisamāptam。

²⁴ 开始部分是：yac chāsti ca kleśaripūn aśeṣaṃ samtrāyate durggatito bhāvā ca / 结尾部分是：svabhāva iti kalpitādih / jñānaṃ satyābhisambodhir abhijñāḥ pañca darśanaṃ /。关于此叶的转写版及校注版，参看附录 3。

²⁵ 没有明显的页码标记，该叶片似乎也不含文本的末尾。因此我假定该叶片属于由于某种原因而没被继续写完的某个写卷的残留部分，而该叶片空白的背面随后又被用作含有 PSK 几个叶片的封面。