



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## A Textual Study of the \*Lakṣaṇaṭīkā

Yonezawa, Y.

### Citation

Yonezawa, Y. (2019, October 24). *A Textual Study of the \*Lakṣaṇaṭīkā*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/79823>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/79823>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/79823> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

**Author:** Yonezawa, Y.

**Title:** A Textual Study of the \*Lakṣaṇāṭīkā

**Issue Date:** 2019-10-24

Propositions for PhD Dissertation “A Textual Study of the \**Lakṣaṇaṭīkā*”

Yoshiyasu Yonezawa

1. A Tibetan called Dharmakīrti took notes on Abhayākaragupta’s lectures at Vikramaśīla monastery in India in the beginning of the 12th century CE, which constitute what is conventionally called the \**Lakṣaṇaṭīkā*.
2. The present MS of the \**Lakṣaṇaṭīkā* is not Dharmakīrti’s autograph but might have been copied and brought to Tibet by another Tibetan called sTeng lo tsā ba Tshul khrims ’byung gnas in the middle of the 12th century CE.
3. One of the most unique features of the \**Lakṣaṇaṭīkā* MS is the script switch from Indian *Brāhmī* to Tibetan *dbu med*, which suggests that the scribe was very pressed for time in copying the texts.
4. The \**Lakṣaṇaṭīkā* is one of the earliest evidences for a classification of the Mādhyamakas into *rang rgyud pa* and *thal ’gyur ba*.
5. Among the Indian Buddhist scholars labeled as Mādhyamikas in the later Tibetan tradition, no other than Bhāviveka and Candrakīrti had the self-recognition as such.
6. One of the authoritative *mahāyānasūtras* for both Bhāviveka and Candrakīrti is the *Dhāraṇīśvararājaparipṛcchā* which is quoted in the *Ratnagotravibhāga*, a Tathāgatarbha treatise.
7. If Candrakīrti followed Bhāviveka’s usages of the term ‘reasoning’ (*anumāna*) which is synonymous with ‘proof’ (*sādhana*) for Dignāga, it is not valid to postulate the term ‘independent syllogistic reasoning’ (*svatantrānumāna*/ *svatantram anumānam*), since the term *svatantra* is to be interpreted as an adverb.
8. For the scribe of the Sanskrit MS, the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* seemed subordinate to the *Jñānālokalāṃkāra*.

9. Concerning the titles of the Buddhist texts, except for the ‘*Prātimokṣasūtra*,’ ‘*mahāyānasūtra*,’ and ‘*Vinayasūtra*,’ the term ‘*sūtra*’ is seldom used as the latter part of the compound in the colophons of the Sanskrit MSS.

10. The *Vinayasūtra* is based on the Buddha’s sayings not only in the *Vinayavastu* and *Vibhaṅga* but also in the other sections, namely, the *Kṣudrakavastu*, *Nidāna*, *Muktaka*, (*Upālīpari*)*prcchā*, *Vinītaka*, *Kathāvastu*, etc. of the *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya*.

11. The *Vinayasūtravṛttyabhidhānasavyākhyāna*, Guṇaprabha’s auto-commentary on the *Vinayasūtra*, was circulated through the Magadha region in India.

12. A close look at Sanskrit MSS preserved in Tibet contributes to elucidation of not only Indian Buddhism but also a history of its transmission to the Tibetan cultural areas.