

## Was There Really Only One Commentator Named Sthiramati?

SAKUMA Hidenori

Professor, Tsukuba University

The name of the Indian commentator Sthiramati was rendered in Chinese as both Anhui 安慧 and Jianhui 堅慧. Since the *Dacheng fajie wuchabie lun shu* 大乘法界無差別論疏 by Fazang 法藏 mentions "Suoluomodi" 娑囉末底 (T. 1838, 44: 63c5), Jianhui may also possibly correspond to Sāramati. For the sake of convenience, I shall refer to them collectively as the commentator Sthiramati. As a result of the discovery and editing of Sanskrit manuscripts in recent years, there are now emerging conditions that call for a comprehensive reexamination of the thought of the commentator Sthiramati, traditionally considered to have been active at Valabhī. First, regarding persons named Sthiramati who are mentioned in inscriptions from Valabhī in connection with the establishment of monasteries there, Tsukamoto Keishō 塚本啓祥 considers the Sthiramati mentioned in inscription no. 7 (C.E. 588) and the Sthiramati mentioned in inscription no. 21 (C.E. 662) to have been different people, while Njammasch believes that the Sthiramati mentioned in inscription no. 21 refers to the Sthiramati mentioned in inscription no. 7, and regards them as the same individual.

When one examines the contents of texts attributed to the commentator Sthiramati in connection with several of the topics addressed in the Vijñānavāda theory of the Yogācāra school, one finds points that would seem to support Tsukamoto's view. For example, in the history of the development of Vijñānavāda thought the content of the commentaries on the *Madhyāntavibhāga* and *Triṃśikā* may be considered to predate inscription no. 7 (C.E. 588), while the content of the

commentary on the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra* may be considered to date from around the time of inscription no. 21 (C.E. 662) since it bears close similarities with the Faxiang 法相 doctrine contemporaneous with Xuanzang 玄奘 (e.g., the *Fodijing lun* 佛地經論 and *Cheng weishi lun* 成唯識論 translated by Xuanzang). When we take these points into account, if we go back to the Sanskrit manuscripts of the works attributed to Sthiramati and compares them with their Tibetan and Chinese translations, doubts thus arise as to whether these texts were really the work of a single commentator named Sthiramati. Problems also arise when one carefully examines both the reliability of the Chinese travel accounts *Da Tang xiyuji* 大唐西域記 and *Da Tang Daci'ensi sanzang fashi zhuan* 大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳 and the Tibetan histories of Buddhism by Bu ston and Tāranātha, which were the main sources for the historical traditions pertaining to the commentator Sthiramati. There are also problems with the reliability of the content of the traditions of East Asian Faxiang doctrine formulated in the *Shuji* 述記, etc., including the views on the structure of cognition attributed to Sthiramati, Nanda, Dignāga, and Dharmapāla, who are said to have considered it to consist of one part, two parts, three parts, and four parts respectively.

In this paper, I have added the above factors to my previous observations on the works of the commentator Sthiramati regarding *āśrayaparivṛtti* and the connections between 四智 (four kinds of purified cognition) and 八識 (eight consciousnesses) and I have suggested that the time may have come to reconsider the previously-held position that there was only one commentator named Sthiramati at Valabhī. I would here like to present this approach as a starting point for future research on Sthiramati's thought.