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法華経における如来全身

梶山 雄一

I 序：般若経と法華経

（1）般若経の立場

「八千部般若経」（以下「千部経」と略称）と「法華経」との間では、仏塔 stupa（あるいは塔堂 caitya）とその周辺物との考え方において最少なものがある。「千部経」第三章から「般若経」の基本的な立場を捉えてみよう。帝釈天が、人が「智慧の完成（般若波羅蜜多）」を招き集め、善者の形にして安養して、花・香・衣・服・旗・灯明などを供えて、種々の形でこれを敬愛し、賛美するのと、他方で、この上なく正しくさとりを得た仏陀が般若比喩時にその遺骨を仏塔のなかに安置して、種々に供養し、敬愛し、賛美するのと、いずれがより多くの福德を得るであろうか、と世尊に尋ねる。世尊はかえて帝釈天上に、如来には一切智者の如-support する道について学んで一切智者性を得たのと、図る。帝釈天は、如来は般若波羅蜜多について学んで一切智者性を得たのと、答える。そこで如来はいう。

そういうわけで、仏教の千部経の名目、その身体（atmabhūtakarma）を得ているから如来が如来とばれるわけはない。一切智者性を得ているからこそ如来とされるのである。如来の身体の学」と言え、一切智者の智の容器（stupa）となっている。その容器を壊し所として一切智者の主体を外観しているのであり、仏陀の身体が現れ、仏の身体が現れ、僧侶の身体が現れ、一切智者の如来の如来が現れている。だから、この体の如来は一切智者性の主体である。一切智者性の容器そのものであるから、「出する」如来にとって資格 stupa そのものの

b この九ッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッッ้
『八千部』の第三、四番には、如来の身体そのものを鏡にたたしたストゥーパも、それらが仏役仏装束によって作られた仏相であり、その遺骨であるからこそ、人々によって尊敬され、供養されるのである。その原因である仏教仏装束そのもののものと、諸仏の母である仏教仏装束そのものであるから、さらに多くの敬愛され、供養されるべきである。良く言葉を形を追い求めている。このように、「八千部」においても如來の遺骨を収めたストゥーパよりも仏陀・一切智・智・断・忍・無着の二法を主にねね言うこと、および「事業」あるいは「みちからの身体」を表すのに uniqhira・saraと仏教釈迦四門は何れを重ね重ね言うこと、およ び、saraという言葉については、「身体」を表すときにsaraと単数形を用い、遺骨を表すときに saritriと複数形を用いることも「八千部」でも「法華経」でも同じである。『法華経』におけるこれらの用法については後に言及する。

（2）法華経第二、四巻の立場

柳原義三は「妙法蓮華経」の第十巻法師品から第二十二章如来神力品までに第一章 序品と第二品毘沙門品を加えたもの（KN．正法品など）は、本来仏か極めて私と断定されている仏教仏装束品は第十一章火炎品のほかに無数の、羅漢品は最後の第七巻に置換えられている。第一KN．法師品に従い、すなわち経文の成立史論にいわゆる第二巻[14]と、『法華経』におけるこれらの用法については後に言及する。

14 如来的身分「はあゆる得主によって創造そのものである」というこの一見は仏教を含むすべてのArya講説にかかわらないから、おそらく11巻が成立後に変更に従われたものであろう。

15 Aso,210-23、八千部（1859年）は、45の章の内容においてhemaという語を用いるためにある。"sara"の解釈がある。本稿の引用によって引用する。
若経の思想を導入していることは誰学者の指摘してきたところである。第二巻に
おいて、仏の遺骨を収めたストゥーディオと呼ぶ『法華経』の経文を尊重され、
なかでもこの経文の書写が勧められることを周知のことである。その立場を説く
経文を第十六章別版の結品から一つだけここのにあげておく。同品には次の経文に先
立って同じ趣旨をより詳しく説いた文章もあり、『関係』(昭和17年版）のなかにも
説かれているが、いまはもっとも簡潔なものを選ぶ。

KNI 339, 6-9: ya sanm dhammaparamitāvatt dosa parinirvānā dharmad vācakāya
vā devatāvah kāya vā śatāpāya vā dānakāya vēcā parinirvānā na satuṣṭa
taya parinirvānā dharmatāyati kāyāgamh na saṅgappati.

如来が彼が失ったとき、この法門（結品）には『法華経』すなわち第十五章
『仏果の品』を支え、説を、表現、書写、著しい結果、著者がせき
たりする人があれば、私は、アジャマ、このような仕方でこういう、彼は著者が
失った私のために、遺骨を収めたストーウーバを手にとり、御田への供養をしたり
する必要ない、と。

『法華経』第二巻の、仏骨塔よりも根従、そしてその書写をより尊重する立場が、
仏塔より般若波羅蜜をより崇拝する『般若経』の立場に近いことがこの経文から知
られるのである。もっとも本巻では空想想一般と『法華経』との関連、及経にお
ける経文崇拝を断言しようとは意図していないので、治略でみた『般若経』の仏骨塔
と『法華経』のそれとの比較に専心することにする。

II 法華経：法師品

『法華経』第十章は法師品には次のような記述がある。

（1）「また、摩羅呂、地上にある場所で、この（法華経の）法門が述べられた
り、説かれたり、書かれた、書き物とされたり、飾られたり、不敬されたりする
ならば、摩羅呂、その地上の場所は如来の聖堂、宝石づくで、大きくなり、高
く、これが必ずように、逃げできなければならぬ。しかし、ここにはじめて如
来の法門が受入れられているわけではない。それは何か、ここには如来の身体が
現れて開かれているからである。」

KNI 211, 7-11: su kah parsi hibhajjapiva pherupagdāta kah dharmaparamitāvatt
dos aukha vā lābhya vā pākāsagāya vā satāpāya vā dos aukha,hibhajjapiva pherupagdāta
tathāgatacāndraya kāyajānaya mahānasa ranatamyam ucca prajñāh, na ca tassasa avajjaya
tathāgataśrīniṃśi pratibhāpāvāya, tata kapati, kahagnam eça tassasa tathāgataśrīniṃśi
prakāśhaya.

G(A,B,C) 水にはこの嶺を水居している。

Kak 219,6-220, 4: 34 にみえ yamna... dos aukha になったり、dharmaparamitāvatt
garunagāyaの場合は通常なり、動詞などに多少の増幅があるが、恬静的な文脈は等しい。
ストゥーパ（仏塔）とチャイティヤ（祠堂）という二語は、学者によっては異にする人物を指し、ほとんど区別なく用いられるとする人物もいる。『妙法薬』ではチャイティヤをも常に「塔」と訳している。梵書も、多宝仏の場合は、その収録するものは多宝仏の遺骨ではなく仏身であるにもかかわらず、塔 (stupa) の語を用いている。しばらんこの両語の相違にこだわらないことになる。『法華経』は、この種具が読かれ、書寫して書物とされ、読誦され、拝倒したりした場には如来の祠堂が作られるべきである、その祠堂の中に仏の遺骨 (ūtissvānu) を安置する必要はない、という。その理由は、その中にすでに如来のの一塊となった身体 (ūtiya)、如来の全身がすでに置かれているからである、という。塔により収録されているのは遺骨ではない、遺骨の遺骨を供養し、供養をよ、ということとなっているのではない点で、それは「般若経」の思想にきわめて近く、しかし「般若経」が般若波羅蜜を崇拝せよ、ということにおいては、『法華経』は、一塊となった如来の全身を崇拝せよ、ということ。書寫された『法華経』の写本から、諸抄片が一部に連なる遺骨やミイラを安置せよということである。遺骨 (ūtissvānu) ではなく、一塊となった如来の身体 (ūtiya) がそこにあらゆることである、というのである。梵書にいう「一塊となった如来の全身」、摩竭樓はいう「如来の全身」には何なのであろう。その両面の意味を捉えるために、以下はもっぱら文献を踏まえておこう。とくに『法華経』は第十一章に現れるストゥーパ中の多宝 (paribuddha) 如来を予想しているかのようである。「如来の全身」こそここ法師経のようなである。
上の多宝塔の説明を続けて、釈尊は下方に無数の世界を超えた度に宝乗（Ramavimochana）という名の如来がいた、という。その多宝如来は「法華経」を説いた後に始めて、この上ない正しいとし（隆上等座）を得ることができた。多宝如来はその教義（入頌）に臨んで衆生たちにこう言えた。

（3）「比丘たちは、私が説法した時には、如来の身体の形のための一つの大寶像を作りなかった。まだその時の大乗仏を私たちのために作り上げたい。」　

KN. 241. 6f: (bāhava praḥatārastu... evam ivoraci) nama sahit bhūkset parārūtpatayā saha ghatagrāmadhāvāvīghasrayo bhaṭtramātstap kaurāyā. ēshā prahādāhī purāṇādī kaurāyā. 　

G(B) 214, 10-11にはこの個所の後半が「tathāgatādhāvāvīghasrayo」以下のみあるが、KN. とまったく同文である。

Kak. 229, 6ff. も意味においてKN. とほとんど同じであるが、tathāgatādhāvāvīghasrayo...
「多宝如来」の形状はこうであった。「実に、他の仏像仏舍利において仏像・仏像たちはこの“台座のような座り方”の法具に似て見られ、他の仏の形状を示す者たちが“台座のような座り方”の法具を見ることには、これら仏像たちはこの“台座のような座り方”の法具を見るために、それらの仏像たちのつながりである。さらにそれら仏像仏像たちが、「座を聞いて、私の身体の形を現像した」という時には、それらの仏像たちは、身体から化粧した仏像の身体で、かつその仏像仏像によってそれぞれ異なった名件で現在に教えているものが多くて集められて、身体から化粧されたそれら仏像の仏像たちとつながったようなので、その中で、私の仏の身体の形を現像して現像に示されればならないこと。」

だから、私の仏像仏像、もまた、大楽説よ、大楽説よ、その中の世界の仏の
この仮骸の多宝如来の本尊の文章の最後にある「成就梵音於此仮骸」は重要である。諸如来・四観音のみ仏陀如来を見て、みなともにこの仮骸を供養する。というのは、仮骸とともに仏陀中の多宝仏であるが、その仏陀は仏仏仏とよばれている。仏陀中の多宝仏の身体は仏仏仏な形で化され、仏仏仏である。当仏法が高名し
たのではない限り、この仏はそこ Hemp 以外に方法がない。この仮仏仏という仏の重要性については仏の末法で再論する。
大乗仏教著者大士の、まず釈迦牟尼仏の化作した如来の分身をえたい、という要
諸があったので、観音はその白骨を光に廃せた。その光明によって、東方のガ
ンガーの砂の数にも等しい世界にある仏陀たちとその国土を見られ、ついで東南・
南・西南・西・西北・北・東北・上・下の世界の無数の仏陀とその国土も見られ
た。それら十方世界の仏陀たちとその菩薩たちは、多宝如来の塔を見るために、娑婆世
界の観音のもとへやってきた。その時、この娑婆世界全体は浮士と化した。宝樹・
宝石・宝香・花々であったが、法華を始めると九山八海もなくなくれて平坦と
なり、この集会に参加した者たちを除いて、六道の衆生はすべて他の世界に移され
た。仏世界から集めた仏・菩薩たちの数は多すぎたので、観音はさらに二度まで
もこの世界を周辺へ拡大し、それらの国土を清掃し、平穏にし、山も河もなく、
六道の衆生もなく、宝樹・宝石・螺旋・香料で飾られた浮士に化して、三千大千世
界からきた仏師の化した分身の如来たちの席を設けた。ここに見えるように、
『法華経』では観音仏の浮士はこの娑婆世界に現する。それらの如来たちの
使者たちが観音のもとへ来て、多宝塔を聞かせることを願った時に、観音は中空に昇っ
て、巨大な多宝塔の席を読いた。

（6）「その大きな宝塔が聞かれるやいかに。仏師・多宝（如来）・仏師・阿羅
漢・正等覚者を獅子座に坐し、経巻を児に読んで、地蔵をしていない仏師をもち
（aparimska-gitrāhā）身体は化粧せず（samghatiśīkāyāh）、あたかも三つに入っ
ているかのように見られた」（毘盧遮那記）の語り。
この箇所についての現代の学者の意見には次のようなある。

1. F. Edgerton (HSHS, 1983) は sanbaghita を「繋がった」(contracted) の意味に解し、結核症死の身体が縮小していることに考えている。彼はこの疫を「縮んだ」の意にたどったが、観察の kne ma (g-pa pa) の頭を doam (粗面) と読んだからであるが、その節、それを繋ぐ g-pa pa は首を斜めにしていないので、それをどのように処理したかはまだ不明である。少なくとも台北で医師は、kne ma g-pa pa と読むから、Edgerton の解は成立しないと考える (Yuen 1989) 参照。

2. 菅谷信隆 (Kenji[1963], 138-139) は sanbaghita が「繋がった」の意味であると解し、aparajikira と読む。sanbaghita もそれは読じていないが、妙法華の「全身不動」 (+ sauṣṭhūlayātīka) に似ているようである。

3. 鷲田信徳氏 (Saigusa[1989], 140) は菅谷氏の解を改めて、「四肢は首を斜めにしてなく、身体は動かない」 (aparajikira sanbaghita) (「萎縮」) と読む。

4. 菅田常文氏 (Taku[1979], 4-5) は観察に近い二種を aparajikira sanbaghita と読むべきである (『四肢では sanbaghita は書かれているが、aparajikira を「動かない」の意味にと、妙法華および般若の「全身不動」の解は定訂に対する「動かず、動かない」の解を理解すべきであるという。

5. 藤本啓治氏 (Takami[1986], 162) は aparajikira と読んで、「四肢は結核をこ
仏のなかに見出しされている。

IV 稲妻多ツ多品

KN - 正法華経などの宝塔品の後、いわゆる妙法華経布の第十二章で僧伽多品では、釈尊が在位、自分が国王であったこと、王子を王位につけると、自分はこの上ない正しい国を得ることに専念した。と結ぶ。ひとりの聖者がいて、もし自分に仏道として仕えるならば『法華経』を閉ざせようというもので、国王は数々の有していた装飾として聖樹に出た。釈尊は自分こそがその時の国王であり、聖樹とは僧伽多であった。自分は僧伽多のむかげで王等観者となったのである。といつ。釈尊はさらに、僧伽多は未来世において天王（devas）如来として、寿命は二十劫であり、般若経ののち二十中劫のあいだその教えが存続するであろう。という。そして、釈尊はさらにこういう。

（7）「天王如来が完全な僧伽に出たと、[著者の]手は揺らばなかった遺体と　して分けられず、その身体は完全な一塊として、七宝よりもできたストーパのなかに入っているであろう」

KN 239, 11f. devasriyaka... tathāgatasya paramārthaṃ... na ca śārim dharmadhenu bhavyatī ekākṣam cāsyā śārim bhavyatī saṃpratasaṃsāpavastam...

GdB 242, 4f. na ca śārim dharmadhenu bhavyatī ekākṣam cāsyā śārim bhavyatī saṃpratasaṃsāpavastam...

Kad. 299, 11f. devasriyaka... tathāgatasya paramārthaṃ... na ca śārima dharmadhenu bhavyatī ekākṣam cāsyā śārim bhavyatī saṃpratasaṃsāpavastam...

Thib. 239, 11f. de bhuh bhūhi povi bhūhi cīry povi yugsi sāsya aśī bho 'dā na... de'sa bhūhi ng ishā bho 'gīr yugsi bho ai'gīr dhīrg lāh ai'gīr dhīrg gūd're' 'dūn pāre 'gīr se, ai po che sia bhum gi mād lāh, bhō ngāse..."

砂礫玉（僧伽多品）35, alh.「時に天王仏般若経の後... その身体あり、七宝の塔を　起す。」

要領 169, b14-f. 稲妻多品に同

正法華 105, b29ff. 「仏の仏、諸天の後、身体を安養せず、全ての苦楽を合わせて、　七宝を起す。」

経巻分部品談 71. IX. 197, b34ff. 天王仏般若経の後、七宝を起せず、一般的に「七宝塔を　起す。」

尾張にはこの相方に相当するものはない。

V 如来と神变

II - IV 卷(1)から(7)までの引用のうち、(2)から(6)までは多宝如来の般若経後に七宝塔の中に残されているその身体、般若経後にも常に『法華経』を聞くために出
他は「原始的な仏身」という言い方をしているという概念で、その真理の象徴とし
ての仏身の全身がただに描かれているのである。いわば「仏法身」の真理、これによ
くて、身体を具えた仏として現れたものなのである。このように、ここ、仏教に
で発見された仏と仏の馴れは次の宝塔品でさらに展開されることになる。

宝塔品では多宝如来とそのストーリーである超常的な物語が始まる。多宝如来
は、多数の百・千・コーティ・ナサカリダ（クト）といわれる仏及び涅槃した過去仏である
のに、七宝塔の中に現存して、そのかならかな声を出して、仏の世界において「仏法身」
を讃える仏を導かす頒表彰する。一方、仏教はこの仏の世界に、全宇宙の仏土に敬
在して教えを教えている仏の化身の仏に他ならない仏を集合させたために、
この頒表彰された仏の世界を三世までを浄化し、拡大して、仏土に変えてしまう。自己的
仏化をすべてその仏土に集めたうえで、仏主は多宝如来の七宝塔の扉を開く、
その扉が開かれるとき、騎乗の象に乗った、身長は鷲をもせよ、風化していらない多宝如
来が、あたかも仙人脚踏して仏像を持っているような姿で現れる。仏の全身の
尊厳大士たちが、仏天の過去に仏涅槃に入りたかった多宝如来が生き生きとして現
れたことに驚嘆する。仏が対立仏と多宝如来との二人の仏は塔中に並進して一体
となる。

仏法に見られる塔・宝塔（仏塔）を含む）に至るまでに描かれる塔中の仏身、第
十五（85巻の第160章）摩璃如来の宝塔品における仏塔及び仏の壽墓に仏法を提供している、
摩璃如来は貴族の百・千・コーティ・ナサカリ物の高の音に無上正等覚をなして
仏を行く、今後もその傍にもある時間にわたって生き続け、常に現存して、
完全に涅槃に入ることはないし、しかしこの衆生を救うために完全な正実現をもたら
して見せるのである。ivia、燃え竹を始めるとする過去の諸仏はすべて仏の仏化を含ま
たしたものに他ならない、という。
たちの数風呂をも（読いたが）、それは私が巧みな力で利用する方法を示すために作化したものである。

『法華経』の後の注解家たちは、そして現代の学術者たちも、『法華経』に描かれた多宝如来や迦葉毘尼仏を仏院の「三身仏」における「親仏」（使用例）に同定しようとすると。ただし、ここには言及を避け、身体をもたない多宝如来や仏像の過去に成立し、それらを救うための変相として以外は、かつて著述名をとることなく、仏教をもう、それ以降現在の仏教とは虚無のところに唯一にして常住であるなら、色もなく、形もなく、われわれの認識や言語を超えた仏教に対して、変動する主体をもち、苦悩たちの会合において言説する仏身仏を考えて考えられる理由がある。しかしこの「仏身・仏色（mga-kaya）からなる「二身仏」は「法華経」（独立して興行している『十地経』『入法界経』などを含む）や『大般涅槃経』などによって理解がされ、恐らく三世三劫における成立のように政治的であり、仏身・仏色・仏諦（仏教、仏像、仏教の変化）の三身仏（法身仏、仏身仏、仏色仏）からなる三身仏（成立、各教界分の出現を含む）であるのではなく、四世紀末半から五世紀中頃を待たなければならない。36 とすれば、「法華経」の仏身を親仏とするのは時代錯誤といわならばならない。私はこの問題はむしろ、声聞乗仏教以来、古く、長い伝統をもつつ仏教の超自然的能力、神通力あるいは神変（śāhā, ṣāhīh, pūrṇa, āsāhīśvā, adhānā, etc.）の思想を介して理解すべきであろうと思う。

パーティー文献、中世聖典にある銀行仏教（Kyūryōjījhrue）は、名称は出自ないけれども、後の二乗や密教の通教を語るしているが、「一にしてしかかも多なり、多になり終わらぬとならない、[或いは]現れ、[或いは]間れ、[或いは]対してうなずき」と通教あるいは仏道におけるものを捉える。『七大経』における仏端の役割を示すものであると考えられている。なお、聖典の解釈における仏の現象については、Kajiyama [1996]を参照。本稿においては必要に応じて、関連文献を参考にし、仏道の伝統を示す。
なんだるすわけではなく、時を異にすることもできる。さらに仏はその存在中にの
み化身を長いあいだ留めておいて、死んだ後にもその化身を留めておくこ
とでもある。この解釈は「法華経」における多宝如来の塔中の身体、さらに教義の
十方一切世界（法界）における仏たちを理解することができる。
「大智論」では如意通じ到達・変身・如意にして分けて論じるが、後者の者が化
身に起る、化身には大きなものと小さく、小さいものを大きくし、一つのもの
を多数にし、多数のものを一つにするなど、種々のものを組み変化させることが
できる、異教徒たちの場合、その変化はもっとも古いときでも七日以上は続かない
が、仏およびその弟子たちの変化は自由自在であって、長い、短いという期限はな
い。如意通じは外観の六種の対象（衣、坐具、香炉、火、飲物を供給されるもの、考えられ
るものの）のうちの、遠く、近く、深く、浅く、斬れるもの、考えられないものを、よく観察する事によって、清浄
ならしめ、逆に、速く、老らかなものを観察して、不浄なものにすることができる。
この聖如意は仏だけが所有している[106]。このいい法は「法華経」における釈迦牟尼
仏の浄土の現実を思わせる。
大乗典籍のうちで成立の早い「維摩経」（108-150ころ成立）仏仏仏子仏に対し
て世尊はこういう。ある人々には仏の国が彷徨をもって御来られていることが見
えない。それは彼等の無知による過失であるから、仏の世は必ず近接しておるよで
はない。仏の仏仏仏子仏が清浄であるにもかかわらず、仏仏仏子仏にはそれが見えないだ
けのことである。という。世尊がこの三千大千世界の上に坐ると、此の世界は
無量・百・千の宝石を集め、伺み重ねて飾られたものとなった。人々がこれを見て
このとおり、正しいさとりの心を起こたのちに、世尊が神聖を収めると、この仏土は
仏が創った以前の状態にもどった[107]、という。「法華経」で釈迦牟尼仏がこの創られた星図
土を現れた浄土に変化させたとも、上の「維摩経」の場合と変わらない。
「狸摺庵三味楽」は、説詞に現存するものは喫用篇謡詠のみであるが、その原典
の成立は二世紀の始末と推定されている。この始末のにいてくして異解深い話が
ある。対案対案がつぎのよう資質する。肇 фонの三味に入れば、声間を聞かもの
には声間の声を示し、線覚を聞かもののは線覚を、大覚を聞かもののは大覚を示
しながら、しかも遠かに声間っても、線覚を聞かも入れず、仏の教えを教ってい
ても取扱いすることもなく、さらに三味によって開いた言語を文間にかいて伝えられ
て、荒率に去住し、飽わさず、出家し、苦行を誇め、魔に打ち払ち、仏徳の
座につき、仏座を混ぜし、発心の助善によって道の先に転ずることを現し、仏の釈
涅槃を行いたるためのすべてを現し、釈涅槃を現して、しかも永遠滅しないことを
できるのか、という問である。仏はこの問いに対して、仏教が仏師三味に入れば
それが可能になることを答え、その音楽の三昧を表現するものであるが、「作法書」の看過を предмет に鰐れなかった。」

これは最高位の音楽の音楽三昧を実現するものであるが、「作法書」の略奪を предмет に鰐れなかった。授業経験者に会見しながら、八百蔵の生活を眺め、また乗車を敢行するために駅

混雑を示しはないほど、つねに現存する。ということを常念を同じするものであろう

ここでは、「作法書」と略奪、音楽三昧との年代的先後に関与する意義はない。

このように考えると、上記の III (5) に示された生活三昧事作法書書 (2001, a3f)
の多宝院如来の本願の中心にある「僧伽如来及び四部衆頂持自転、随方十一方所四部、皆
当得見、成仏供養於此化像」という文脈がそぞろえめて深い意味をもってくる。ここで

は、釈尊によって化作された十方の諸仏諸菩薩を如来たちやその四部衆はその化像に従っ
て多宝院を見ることができ、みなもとに、その化像、多宝院如来によって化作された
仏、妙仏身のいわゆる如来分身を供養した、という。この文脈に正念に対応する梵
文文いずれの梵文ももない。ただ仏に、多宝院如来の本願および釈尊如来のこと
ばが残ったので、大賢（大賢）音楽の三味の「きい」ことdistinctly, ××××××××

是本の教由、私たちは、「徳仏如来の身体から化作された如来の化像をすべて拝見し、
すべてを礼拝いたします」という言があるのみである。如来法華の「徳仏如来に
言う、世尊、我等も見た。世尊の分身仏堂を現、礼拝供養せよ願願す」(32, 27-
29) となっている。法華はこの文を多宝如来の本願のなかに巻き入れた、とも考え
られる。この多寶如来の本願の処所は、梵文ぐらべるべく、妙仏身、正法書の両漢
訳にはともに認識のするが、ことに、この多宝如来の「化像」を供養する、というの
が法華の解釈であったとしても、釈尊如来に化作した十方の如来たちが説経される
ているのにあてて、多宝如来をも仏仏が多数存在すると、ということは行き過ぎた
考え方とは決していない。仏自体を仏堂に与えようとは、遺骨もしくは、書物で
もなく、多宝如来の化作した如来の実である。とも、本願を実現する道筋をなって
いて Umbrella[2001] を踏むことができた。仏教養仏は本願 III (5) に所有した多宝如来の本願 (KN.
243, 556c) の中にある「身体から化作された仏（分身仏像）を釈尊如来の分身ではなく
て、多宝院如来 aids the 分身と解釈し、その理解の基礎を為す KN. 245, 8-10 の文言と、その時までは
仏教的な仏再びどの方見もまた太さづけかかっていないのでに。在観念において理解している。本願
でこの仏の考えへ授業経験者に否定的に学校経験者であるのでに、その意思に対してこの仏の考えを述
べるべきであると思うが、それを踏むうえはかなりの紙質を重く、なりよびに文献的余白がの

VI 付論 省見備品のチケット問題にある付加文について

(20) Kazuho[1991], 15 省見備品、大正、XV, 632n, 6 教科。
中村瑞穂氏校訂の『チベット史』
の見本冊品の始め、多重複が現れ出
中空に立てば静止して、その貯蔵から声が聞こえる所、同校刊の 190、2
（KN. 240, 3）に多重複の声の最初の部分として、次のような付加がある。
中村氏は
のチベット文を注釈を記入している。同氏によればこの部分はデルグ・ナルタン・フラ
の三版にのみある。私のこの付加文が中村氏の書簡書にのちにデルグ・ナルタン・フラ
の三版に文章を確認したが、さらに御教示の御手でより、それがトク・パ
雷斯版にも存在することを知り、同氏よりのコピーを入手することができた。
また
氏より Newark Museum 所蔵のルームスのパタン（Batang）からの写本の
『チベット史』、MEO ID: BSE A 240, 278; Kanji (New)等にも付加部分が存在する
ことが分かった。北京版、チョム版、Phug brang Bika "gyur、およびウィーン大学の
Institut für Tibetologie und Buddhismusforschung より調査された Tabo 諸文フィルムに
は存在しない。British Library Or. 0704、Shel dikar Bika "gyur のマイクロフィルム
には『法密教』そのものが欠落しているようである。この付加文は、何時、何文で、
いかにして、成立あるいは挿入されたのかはまったく不明である。
中村氏の校訂に
いもつ陥そpentooと関連があるので、ここにデルグ (D)・ナルタン (N)・ラサ (L)・ト
ク・パレス (T)・Newark Museum の五版に、中村版 (N) を据えて校正した（ただし、
ジャドおよび pa、bs、du などの異体は、重要なものを除外し）、「にそれを和訳して、コメントを付けておくことになる。New、著特に和訳と異同が
多い。"}

(19) Peter Skilling 氏が国際仏教学会等で発表され、卒業論文で考察された著者誤ったフィルムの
による、同氏に直下を参考する。なお、本研究所「年表」第4号掲載の Skilling 読者参照。
チベット文同名で時々loggum チベットを含むが、New の spudd lam（如書）である。
このことは、「よいかな、よいかな、感謝に足りるよ、あなたは、この「暗夜のよ
なすわぐれた教え」の法器を巧みに説明されました。それはそのとおりです。世尊よ。
それはそのとおりです、感謝よ」という宝塔の声に続く。「二重のことば」という
のは「よいかな」という護摩の声と「そのとおりです」という説明の声で
であろう。
この付加部分に語られる趣旨と関係が深いと思われる経文を少しあげておこう。
いずれも中観教所属の経・論である。

「如来経略旨」：「ジャンナマティーよ、如来が仏上に完全なさりと見っ
たその菩薩、[生存]に拘泥せずに動かすするその両、その中間において如来
によっては一部も発せられず、皆なれたな故に、彼は憎しむ、説かねであろう。
しかも、あらゆる衆生は、それぞれの心の傾向、多様な種類の志趣に応じて、様々
な如来のことばが流れてくると聞く、彼らの一人一人には、「この如来のわ
われためにこの甚深を説いてきたる、われわれの如来の教説を聞いている
のだ」という考えがあるが、そのとき如来は思惑せず、説かねない、というのは、
ジャンナマティーよ、如来はあらゆる尊貴の概念の義を説（説教）より生ずる
多様なことが聴かれるからである。」(MMK, 195, 195-196)

同上：「またかも魔法の実体が風に薄れて魂が生まれるが、それにいかなる養
育もいないのに、音が流れてくるように、仏のことはは、本来清晰なるために、
あらゆる衆生の心の傾向に動かされて流れて出るか、彼（仏）にいかなる果報もな
い、このまざの声はいつも外にももらえないが、中人の主（仏）のことはその
ように、内に心も外にないではない。」(MMK, 366, 366-367, 368)

観音「中尊」：「あらゆる諸説は仏教の教義を紛らわし、多様なことが（praepado）を説きって、
平安である。仏はいかなる法義でもあるかしてても、いかなる教えをも
説かなければならない。」(MMK, XXV, xii)

奔雷 (Blasiusvika)「仏教の教義」：「仏は法義は思惟のないものであるけれども、
空と慈悲であったとき、あらゆるものが利益を与えるとして喫及び、他者
のために利益と幸福を成就しようとする最善心による傾向と不動心とのもとづ
いて、それ（如来身）から化也が流れる所である。それによって説教の頌と文に
記述される部分で、物事（仏）と人を自在（アートマ・実相）でないという、
あらゆる非我、声、識覚と肉身のないものを明らかにすることばば、
（六）教義標系を成すために真の上の真理を行く者たちに対してあ
れる。それを大師という、義教としての仏教（仏果）があるときに（仏化を
義理として）説教のことが生じるのであるから、教義を説いた教義（仏果）が
として存在すると認められる、だから世間の真理を責むこともない。」 (PP, 23)
『法華経』見宝塔品の中には多宝如来の善根であったときの智顕（木本）がしばしば供される。私はVの末尾で宝塔の中に供されている多宝如来の化身化仏如来の全身である。とったが、それに関連して、次の説文（Santideva）の仏教を最後に引く yöntとしておこう。

「見宝塔貢論」：「（如来本と如来像）は人々の願いを満たすのに、供養（所化者の善行）と『仏の善行と善行の』装飾によって、仏の仇の影が附けられる。

であから盤撲い。」（仏法を用いて）柱を彫刻化して死を続けるに、彼の死後も長い期間、その柱が死んだ木の柱。柱の状態がそのまま持続するような。」（BCA, IX, vv. 36-38）

この付加部分に、如來を虚空に喚さる。『華厳経』などでは法身はしばしば虚空に喚さるから、ここでも如来は二身法の一つである法身として見られてい るようである。同じことは、この後に如来は如性・実際・法界と一視されて いる。ここでも如来は人格としてよりも真理あるままの無量身自体として捉えられ ている。これも如来を法身と見なしているようである。その法身としての多宝如来 は無限ともいえる時間にはわたって教理編入していた。その間の如来は虚空のごと くに、常と無常をともに超越した、いわば常性そのものである。その法身としての 如来は分別を離れ、ことばをも指さない。しかし多宝如来はその善根であったとき の本願の力によって、『法華経』を読むためにこの世界に来り、清浄なる法人をもつ 衆生を成熟させるために常に現る。『法華経』はそのような如来たちの巧みな方 便である。もとより、この付加文自体には『法身』という語は現われない。

この部分の成立あるいは挿入の経緯についてはまったく分からぬ。現在の梵本 のいずれにもこの場所は存在しないから、チベットで挿入されたと考えられる。もっ ともこの挿入を含んだある梵本が存在した可能性をまったたく否定することはできな い。Peter Skilling氏はNewark Museumのテキスト写本が十世紀末十一世紀のもの であるという意見を否定していない。彼の所収のア Atatürk応（写本）は十四世 紀初めに、新訳本（保）は十八世紀に開製されたものであるから。この挿 入文ももちろん後代のものであろうが、私は今回テキストの写本その他をすべて見 たわけではない。他方、なぜ仏教版の他に信者を欠けているの理解できない。けれど も、『法華経』の見宝塔を読む人々が信じているから、事実ではない、仏教 の中での多宝如来の性格、いわば法身の化身化、分身であることを明らかにしようと して、中経派の二身法に似るから、この部分が書き加えられたのだろう。
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Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guna-samcaya-gāthā-
Vyākhyā of Haribhadra
— Preliminary Remarks —

Akira YUYAMA

Prefatory

Thanks to the painstaking efforts of Professor Chiung Chung-hsin / JIANG
Zhongxin (蒋忠新) of Peking, my cherished wish to see Haribhadra's Prajñā-
pāramitā-ratna-guna-samcaya-gāthā-vyākhyā in palm-leaf manuscript has been
fulfilled at last. Without his meticulous study containing his remarks and
transliteration I could not decipher the text in facsimile prefixed to his paper.1

This manuscript is nothing but the very fragment discovered at the famous
Monastery of Žra-lu Ri-phug (索魯寺), or Žra-lu dgon-pa (夏魯寺),2 in the
region of Gás-kä-rtse (日喀則) City, by the versatile Indian Ráhula Sākṛtya
yana (09.1V.1893-14.1V.1963)3 during his second expedition to

1 Zhongxin JIANG (Chiung Chung-hsin), "A Sanskrit Fragment of the Prajñā-pāramitā-
(2000), p. 115-123, preceded by a facsimile of the fragment on a folded plate between
pages 114-115.

2 Cf. Turrell V. Wyllie, The Geography of Tibet according to the 'Dream-flying-region-lehul: Text and
English Transliteration (s. Serie Osservazioni Roma, XXV) (Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed
Estremo-Oriente, 1962), p. 16.8 (Tibetan), p. 70 (Italian), & p. 139 n. 216. — for the
present-day place names in Chinese see a concise atlas edited by the Tibetan Geodetic
Bureau 西藏自治区测绘局 (西藏自治区测绘局) ; 西藏自治区地理图集 (北京: 中國地圖出版社, 1996), p. 103
(map) & p. 105 (note). To date, I have regretfully failed to see 武陵 (主编), 西藏地名
(中國地名出版社 1996).

3 On Ráhula Sākṛtyayana’s autobiography Mori jīvan pitā see e.g.: 布施, "ラーハーラの
93(166)-929(169); also Peter Gehrke, Hindi Literature in the Twentieth Century (s. A History of
One may also see a short obituary notice touching the points by Vishva Bandhu, Vābh-
In this connection the famous Lo-sa-ba Gzhan-nu-dpal (1392-1481 CE) often referred to Zva-lu in his De-she-rgb-mlo-po, the so-called "The Blue Annals." Fortunately, the original Tibetan text has become available to us in the meantime. This background history may explain the existence of the treasured Buddhist Sanskrit materials preserved at Zva-lu Ri-phug.

To my great shame, I mistakenly cited his report as if it had been found at Spos-khan Monastery near Gyan-tse. Immediately on appearance of my book I corrected my assertion in a privately circulated paper about this incomplete manuscript fragment. Triptikückey Rávela Stänktöytsa paid a visit to a number of famous monasteries in the Province of Tsang in the year 1934, such as Spos-khan, Zva-lu, Nor and Sa-skyela. From his list of manuscripts unarchived in this area I had carelessly picked up the information about the place of discovery in an entry under Zva-lu Monastery: Volume XI, Text 4 (Serial Number 42), 20 3/4, x 2 3/4, inches in size. As is mentioned by Chiang (op.cit., p. 116f), the final note on the very last portion may well have been jotted down by Rávela himself: XI 4. ratnaagnusasvacayagāhita (patra 1).

It is therefore a great pity that this extremely important manuscript fragment was not brought back from Tibet to India in photocopy by Rávela.


4 For the corresponding original passages see The Blue annals composed in A.D. 1478 by Eggo-Lotawa Gzhan-nu-dpal (1392-1441), reproduced by Lokesh Chandra from the Collection of Raghur Vira (= Saratapaka Series, CCXII) (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1974), serial folios numbers 192, 298, 321, 321, 370, 697.


Stākṛtyāṇa. In connection with the Buddhist materials I wish to add
here that Rāhula Stākṛtyāṇa was also much interested in the works in
Tibetan.

The fragment in question seems to be now kept in the so-called China Eth-
nic Library (中国民族図書館), formerly called the Library of the Peking
Cultural Palace of Nationals (北京民族文化宮図書館). According to
Chiang Chung-hsin, it is numbered 0018 in an unpublished list of palm-
leaf manuscripts in Sanskrit preserved therein “民族圖書館藏梵文葉片經目
錄” made by Wang Sēn (王森): 47.2 x 4.4 cm, 11 lines on the obverse side and
10 on the reverse. It contains Haribhadra’s commentary on Rgya’i
sūtra s at the end of the text.

There seem to be more than two hundred palm-leaf manuscripts held in the
China Ethnic Library of Peking. Some of them have fortunately appeared
before us both in facsimile and in transliteration. They launched a new
series to publish those palm-leaf manuscripts in facsimile form. One of the
oldest manuscripts of the Lotus Sutra was thus reproduced as a limited
edition of two hundred copies around 1983. It was indeed beautifully re-
produced.

Following its publication, Professor Chiang Chung-hsin has brought out a
careful edition of the same Lotus Sutra. It is one of the most illustrious

---

11 It is no wonder that this text is not mentioned in otherwise very interesting accounts
of his collection by Frank Bandurski, “Übersicht über die Göttingen Sammlungen der
von Rāhula Stākṛtyāṇa in Tibet aufgefundenen buddhistischen Sanskrit-Texte (Fun-
de buddhistischer Sanskrit-Handschriften, III)”, Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur,
bearbeitet von Frank Bandurski, Bhikkhu Fassóka, Michael Schmidt, Bangwai Wang
(= Sammlungen zur buddhistischen Literatur aus den Tonfunden). Im Auftrage der Akadе-
mie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, herausgegeben von Heinrich Becker) (Göttingen:

10 Mention may also be made to a valuable work by Michael Torsten Moch, A Visit to Rāhula
Stākṛtyāṇa’s Collection of Negatives at the Bihar Research Society: Texts from the Buddhist Epis-
temological School (= Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhistwissenschaft, XIX) (Wien: Arbeit-
kreis für Tibetologie und Buddhistiche Studien an der Universität Vienna, 1988), 14 p
(incl. 3 photos on p. 5f).

13 See for example The Catalogue of the Tibetan Texts in the Bihar Research Society, Purna. Volume
1: Miscellaneous Sūtras, edited by Asvaghosa Jha (ed.) compiled by Goepf Raman Choudhury
(Purna: Bihar Research Society, 1963), xvi, 233 p., 3 frontisp. (Stākṛtyāṇa’s photo).

14 For details see Jiang, op. cit., p. 116: §1.3.
philological works to be published out of these rare materials to date.\textsuperscript{18}

On this occasion it is eagerly hoped that such facsimile and critical editions will appear in quick succession. And there seem to be still many more important Buddhist texts in manuscript form in a dormant state in China and her surrounding regions.

Let us hope to see those remains of our human cultural heritage appear at no distant date! We must also remember that a great number of fragile materials are decaying! It is therefore to be regretted that these same specified persons and/or institutions have monopolized such rare treasures.

\textbf{Title of the Text}

Rāhula Sinkūtryāsa cites the fragment as \textit{"Ratna-guna-saṅcaya-gīthā-vaśāhyā"}, and remarks that it is to be found in Tibetan translation as re-constructed "Bhagavad-gūna-ratna-saṃcaya-gīthā-paśijākā",\textsuperscript{117} It may simply be a misprint for \textit{"ratna-guna-"}, as is rightly given in the Tibetan Tsurjur texts: e.g. Pekig edition No. 5190, Derge edition No. 3792: \textsuperscript{18}\


Here arises a question whether Haribhadra wrote a \textit{"vaśāhyā"} or \textit{"paśijākā"}. The colophons of the last two chapters in the fragment read as follows:

\textsuperscript{18} 舒春燕(编著)：民族文化遗产书筒藏，梵文《妙法藻华经》写本(拉丁字母版写本)(北京·中国社会科学院出版社, 1988) [徐振林·译]。

\textsuperscript{117} A Sanskrit Manuscript of Saladamrapadārṇamāma kept in the Library of the Cultural Palace of the Nationalities, Beijing, Romanized Text, edited and annotated by Ji Xianlin in the preface by Ji Xianlin (Beijing: China Social Sciences Publishing House, 1988), v. 16, 440 p. (including a plate of the opposite sides of folios 133-137).


\textsuperscript{19} Rāhula Sinkūtryāsa, op. cit., p. 31 n. 2.

\textsuperscript{18} Bum-gyur, Sūrya-phye Pekig edition No. 5190, Ja 141-3 (+ Reprint edition, XC, p. 2153), Derge edition 3792, Ja 118. For the Derge edition reference may be made to the Koyasan Microfiche Sheet Nos. 1281-1282, Tokohu Microfiche Sheet Nos. 2044-2046. Cf. also Nishinomori Tanjūr Ja 1-88x (Mibu Catalogue p. 86).

And the scribe notes: // // miror vyakhyaya likhita // // "Copying the Vyakhyâ of the Mother, ..." (verso, line 10). This may possibly have led Rahul-ji to think that Haribhadra's original title as it contained the word vyakhyâ, not pâñjikâ as is seen in the Tibetans version.

In this connection it is a pity that an Indic original of Buddhârañjâna's commentary on the Rg, i.e. Saññayagadha-Pâñjikâ, has not yet been unearthed. It exists in the Tibetan Tanjur: Saññita-yâ-gâ-thâ-pâñjikâ, translated by Vidyakarasimha and Dpal-brtanlegs Peking edition No. 5196 Na 1135b5-223a8 (Reprint edition, XCI, p. 118-153); Derge edition 3798 Na 116a7-189b1: // vyasa-gos-skad-bu // saññita-yâ-gâ-thâ-pa-tatsi-ka (D: pa-tadzi) // bod-skad-bu // srad-pa tshogs-du bsad-pa'i dka'-gyur (Peking Na 1135b5, Derge Na 116a7)

Whether Haribhadra's commentary was named vyakhyâ or pâñjikâ still sounds uncertain to me. I must leave the question for my future research. And it is not my intention here to discuss textual problems.

It is nevertheless worth citing the catalogue compiled in 1322 C.E. by Sten Rin-chen Grub (1290-1364) in his famed work Bde-ras greg-pa's ihsan-pa's gyur-byed cho'i 'byun-grub grub-rab rin-po-che'i musod, or (Bsl-gon) Cho'i 'byun in short. This treasured work had long been known but regrettably kept from sight. 20

The so-called Lhasa edition of this rare masterpiece became available to the public at last in 1971. 21 To my great delight, Soshâ Nishihara has carefully...

20 Cf. A Catalogue of the Tokushu University Collection of Tibetan works on Buddhism, edited by Yenbo Karakura, Ryujo Yamada, Tohaku Tada and Yaksu Hidano (Sendai: The Seminary of Indology, Tokushu University, 1993), p. 72b; No. 5197.
21 The Collected Works of Bu-mo, Part 24 (YA), edited by Lokesh Chandra from the Collection of Raghv Vira et al. (Sanjûketsu Series, LXV) (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1971), folios 635-1005 = YA 1-71a. The same text was separately circulated with a title Bu-mo's History of Buddhism (New Delhi 1971). On other editions see e.g. Bu-mo's History of Buddhism in Tibet. Critically edited with a comprehensive index by Janos Szterb (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 569 Band)(= Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, Nr. 5) (Wien 1999), p. XIII-XV.
edited this text. In it one finds some brief but precise information, i.e., Bu-ston’s Catalogue Nos. 518 (Haribhadra) and 519 (Buddharājñāna). Needless to say, Bu-ston offers no title in Indic:


In Appraisal of Haribhadra

It has always been regretted that Rāhula Śāntkṛtyāya did not bring a photocopy of the fragment back to Pāṇa. It was therefore an unprecedented pleasure for me to hear the news about the rediscovery of the manuscript in Peking. Let us pray for a future discovery of the remaining portion of the very manuscript!

Even with this amount of the text it gives us the flavour of Haribhadra’s commentatorial works. Unfortunately, with the exception of the first word(s), he has not cited the original passages as it must have been.

In the case of Candrakīrti’s Prasannavadī, for example, he has quoted a number of passages as they had been available before him. He has thus helped us a great deal to edit the original version, in many cases: Rg V II 3d = Pras p. 167 An 4; Rg V II 4 = Pras p. 353.7-354.2; Rg V XX V = Pras p. 166.11-167.2; Rg V XXI 6 = Pras p. 524.1-4.

Needless to say, Haribhadra’s commentary offers us a lot of hints concerning...


23 Nishioa reads the second snot as snot, which he explains to bitha (II p. 50 fn. 8).

24 Cf. e.g. A. Yuyama, “Candrakīrti’s Prasannavadī”に引用された Prasannavadī rasamānuśamānasāgī (Rg V as quoted by Candrakīrti in his Prasannavadi: IBK / JBS, XXVII, 1 (Tokyo 1978), p. 396(17)-493(24).
ing how we should understand the text. This is not always possible by con-
sulting only the Tibetan version.24 Therefore, I wish to edit this portion of
the Tibetan text in close comparison with the Sanskrit version in the near
future.

The Tibetan version did certainly exist most probably as early as the begin-
ning of the ninth century C.E., as is attested in the Denkarma Catalogue
(Serial No. 518).25 (rovzgs-pa’i dkar-pa’i rgyud-po’i bka’-ga’ gi’ grod pa 6. 1800 Bp. 6.)

The year (rovzgs-po’i) dkar-pa’i rgyud-po’i bka’-ga’ gi’ grod pa’ (6. 1800 Bp. 6.)

The year dkar-po’i, in which the Denkarma was compiled, could be every
twelfth year in a range from 788 to 848 C.E. Accordingly, there are six theo-
ries about the year of compilation. I am not going into this complicated
question.

Textual Questions

My expectation of finding the original text cited by Haribhadra has often
been disappointed. He has quoted the first word(s) of every verse, i.e.
the beginning of the first padas. The passages shown in this folio are from XXXI
5 to XXXII 6. The first word(s) of these verses are most probably the same
as those in the two recensions A and B. At this stage I have thus lost the
criteria to judge whether Haribhadra depended for his commentary on
Recension A or B.27 It is really a great pity that Haribhadra did not quote
more passages from the original texts.

25 Cf. Yuyama, Bgr. f (Cambridge 1976), p. li: §VIII.1.b.4. — for further details see Shiyu-
ki Yoshimura, The Denkar-Ma, an older Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon (Kyoto:
Rikoku University, 1950), p. 90 (Section XVII). This book has been photomechani-
cally reprinted in his collected works: 芳村敬喜. インド仏教思想研究 (京都・岩波, 1974),
p. 165. One may rather refer to Marcelle Lalou, "Les textes bouddhiques au temps du
Koi Khri-srong-lde-bdan: Contribution à la bibliography du Kanjur et du Tanjur", Journal
Statistique, CCXLI (1951), p. 331 (Section XX): Rababs, Catalogue de Phurbang Lhak-
arma [by h-i i gFe’i zhag pa’i the ma’i (v. The Dalai Lama Tibetological Series, XVIII)
— The editor of the lac publication maintains the name “Lhasa-drak” instead of
“Lhasa-drak”. This may not be the place to enumerate the works by Ernst Steinkefner
on this topic, e.g. his "Parokshadhatu-Texts", Buddhism and its Relation to Other Religions: Essays
in Honour of Dr. Shoton Kunzis in his Seventieth Birthday (Kyoto: Heirakakai Shoten,
1985), p. 216, cum 221 n. 7 also l (with extensive remarks), and his subsequent works from Vien-
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Furthermore, there has been a query regarding the problem of its canonical status. The next question is whether the tradition about the revision of the Rgs made by Haribhadra is true or not. These questions will have to remain unanswered at the present stage. Needless to say, I shall have to continue to investigate carefully such questions.

Recension A is represented only by one single manuscript: MS No. 10736, Asiatic Society (of Bengal), Calcutta. I have no doubt that this Recension A offers better readings in many verses.

It was Edward Conze, who for the first time drew the attention of scholars in the relevant fields of study. Every scholar engaged in related subjects owes much to his prodigious efforts.

In this connection one cannot forget to mention the name of Franklin Edgerton, who shed light on this literature. His work has induced me to study this particular text. In the meantime I have always felt uneasy at having only a single manuscript and was anxious to see a second manuscript (or more manuscripts) to offer Recension A. None has so far appeared.

At present there are five versions of the Rgs, if not recensions, i.e. two Indic, two Tibetan and a Chinese. There is another text, which had made me presuppose a third Indic version. It is a small torso fragment of the so-called Peking street edition kept in the Turfan Prefectural Exhibition Hall (吐魯番展品館). This tiny fragment offers a unique reading.

Textcritical Hints from Haribhadra

It is hoped that the *Rg.-Vakhyā* of Haribhadra may offer precise emendations of some verses. At the same time, the utmost care is always needed. Chiang Chung-hsin has demonstrated the following example. 35

māssaryā pṛetā bhuvaṭe utsapapāyaṇaṭī (Rgs XXXI 11c)

"Both editors of the Recensions A and B do not comment on this reading. Seemingly, they do not see any problem with it. However, it is strange that there isn't any noun or pronoun as this sentence's subject, while two almost synonymous verbs, namely bhave and utsapapāyaṇaṭī, stand next to each other. Such a sentence does not make sense. Therefore, the reading is hardly acceptable, and should be emended. ..." (Chiang p. 117f)

Based upon the reading by Haribhadra (recto, line 1), i.e. te māssaryā pṛetā-bhavaṭe-utsapaspāyaṇaṭe, Chiang emends this pāda to:

māssaryā pṛetā-bhvaṭe te utsapapāyaṇaṭī.

And Chiang continues: "This reading, having a subject te and only one verb utsapapāyaṇaṭī, is syntactically normal and its meaning is also clear, and therefore gives us no difficulty in translating it." (p. 118)

Needless to say, two such synonymous verbs will bother any serious Sanskritist. It is not really strange to see the pāda missing the subject. It is quite apparent even when omitted.

When editing the text, these two verbs had naturally annoyed me a great deal. After all, I had to take them as a synonymous repetition. I may perhaps have had to confess this textcritical problem somehow in my footnote.

The question is not that simple! Haribhadra has commented in a generalized form using the plural. But our text apparently intends a singular form. This is clearly seen also in pāda d, whereas Haribhadra again generalized it all in plural forms. One may thus easily compare pāda d:

athaṃ manuvṛṣī tato bhūte dvaradā-bhūte (Rgs XXXI 11d)

Tib. A3 ci-sti (only X. ji-.) mir shyes-na-yān de-the dwal-por [gyur.

Incidentally, the reading bhonti in MS. K (for bhuti, so other MSS = Ober-

---

35 Cf. Chiang, ARIRIAB, III, p. 117f.; §1.5 (on Rgs XXXI 11c).
miller-Vaidya) is the only one which seems to be simply a scribal mistake.

It is too complicated to discuss all these questions here. How much more so when comparing with the other versions (see my footnotes to my edition on p. 116). In order to make it simpler, I will herewith quote the Tibetan and Chinese versions without notes:

Tib. B *ser-ma-can-ni yi-*dvags* gnas-*ru* skye-*bar* *gnyor*.


Tibetan A has doubtless understood this *pāda* better than B. In consultation with them, I would at the moment rather take this *pāda* c as follows. No doubt it satisfies the *Vacanaśilakā*-metrical without any problem:

māṇḍarīya *preta*-bhavane upapadhyayati (*Rg* XXXI 11c).

The emendation of the *ākṣara* "ta" to "na" is not unusual graphically as attested in Indic manuscripts. Thus, *preta-bhavane*, loc. sg., sounds more probable. I must now delete *preta*, loc. sg., from my grammar. In editing a Buddhist Sanskrit text it is always painful to see a singular oblique case in the stem form ending in -a. In the case of *bhava*- one may rather expect "bhavi, loc. sg., in our text. The plural *te* with a singular *upapadhyayati* is not impossible. It sounds nevertheless implausible in this case.

To be sure, there is an example of non-agreement of the subject with the predicate verb (*Rg* XXX 8b-d; cf. Yuyama, *RgGr* §5.6). But the confusion of numbers is relatively rare in our text (cf. Yuyama, *RgGr* §5.1-5). A very interesting example of transmission is to be found just before the verse in question, e.g. *Rg* XXXI 2c parināmanvānti, 3 pl., is expected in the plural structure of Recension A but MS K reads *yāanti* (at the end of the *pāda*)! But all MSS belonging to Recension B read *yāanti* / *yānti* 3 pl., while the singular structure expects *yāati*. Obermiller and Vaidya follow the manuscript reading of *yānti, where *yāati* is a much better reading!  

Incidentally, it is to be noted that either "atī or "anti (and "tie or "niti preceded by other long vowels) is often seen at the ends of pāda and (and lines). This phenomenon must be expressly preferred, for it is metrically different either way: e.g. apanāpanati XIX 2e, apiadāyati I 25a, XXX 1c, kurumāyati XXIX 1b, nidadarśayati XXI 1c, niśāmyayati XXIII 10c, patai XXVII 6e, pramudāyayati XXIII 1c, prāpāyati XIV 6b, XX 10c (v.l. "anti = Obermüller-Vaidya), XXVII 8d, XXX 7d, marātī XXVII 8b (cf. Yuyama, RGr § 33.7); upāstutahati XXIX 14d, janeti XXXI 5d, bhūti X 5c, XIX 2b, XXV 5a, 6a, XXIX 1b (cf. Yuyama, RGr § 33.6); anubuddhayanti XII 4c, janeti XXXI 2a, purnāmyayanti XXVI 1c, prārthāyanti XXIX 6c, samahāyanti XV 5a, samānta XXII 15a, samādhamanta XIX 3a (cf. Yuyama, RGr § 33.10); parbhāyayanti (v.l. "anti = Obermüller-Vaidya), 3 pl.fut., XI 2c (cf. Yuyama, RGr § 33.11 & 36.15). The following may also be referred to in this category: uttahānī XXX 14c (cf. Yuyama, RGr § 33.14), nānti XXIX 3b (but XVIII 5d nānti, m.c.; cf. Yuyama, RGr § 33.5).

Certainly, there may have been a confusion of numbers in the course of transmission, e.g. as already mentioned above, MS K bhonti must simply be a scribal mistake for bhūti as all MS belonging to Recension B (= Obermüller and Vaidya). It seems to me that the singular is clearly prevalent throughout this chapter! In context, furthermore, there is no reason why this particular pāda should be read in a plural manner.

It may make it much clearer if Haribhadra's commentary is here: with quoted in full (recto, line 3-4 = Chiang p. 119.22-23):

\[\text{euk et te mātsyayār preṣa-bhuvanesvapāpyayante } \text{atavā (Cāsag: ata sā)
}
\[\text{kathā-cin (Chiang: kathā cin) māṇyātāqapāq, }\text{dyante ta[ā]ddh bhavanti dāryāya-prāpāḥ} /\]

In translating the commentary of Naribhadra (Sa-gr hān-po) into Tibetan Sāntihhadra and Śikṣyā's "had put this portion on the line of Kanjur text:

..., /de-thid-byte phyur ser-ma-can de-dag-ni yi-dray (D: "dag") (2) gnas-la skey-bar 'gyur-la / bros-la ci-stie nor skey-na-yun de-tho dbyad-por 'gyur-ha (D: "gyur-ste) stobs-po (D: tsho-b-) / (Tanigar - Ser-pyin: Peking 5190 Ja 88b1.2 - Reprint ed., Vol. XG, p. 271.4.1-2), Derge 5792 (Koyasan copy) Ja 746b.

In this case the Peking edition seems to offer a better reading. To my regret,
I have not been able to consult the other editions of the Tibetan canon.

In any case, the translators have naturally mistaken Haribhadra's understanding of mitārthā as an ablative form, which should be the original meaning. As a matter of case, this is a rare example of the ablative ending in -e of the a-stem nouns (cf. Yuyama, RGr §8.37). Once again I would repeat here: This kind of text critical study needs more careful investigation. And I wish to revisit the matter in the near future with more reference materials, analyzing it with more care. Buddhaisrijâna's commentary may become some of those materials to consult.

It is also to be noted here that the verses in Chapters XXIX-XXXII of the Rgyu do not have text: corresponding to those of the Aṣṭaṭhaṅga Vaiśeṣika Pārāśāraṇitā. This fact is extremely important when we consider the formation and the status of this literature.18

Haribhadra's Citations

In the table appended to this paper I shall present Haribhadra's citations in comparison with those of the two recensions. He cites the first word(s) of each verse, i.e. the beginning of the first pādās. As mentioned above, Haribhadra has quoted the text faithfully. In some cases it is naturally indifferent with regard to the metre, e.g. either tadd or sada with the following tv-ad of the stock phrase of commentaries: i.e. tady-tadi XXXI 12a.

Needless to say, some citations in his commentary are exactly the same passages as found in our original texts written in the Buddhist Sanskrit language: yasa na XXXI 8a,19 ye eva- XXXI 9a,20 abha- XXXI 11a,21 tada XXXI 12a.22


19 Cf. Yuyama, RGr §28.16 yasa, gen.

20 Cf. Yuyama, RGr §58.3: ye, nom., regardless of Sandhi; §2.126: eva-, cpd., for evam-.

21 Cf. Yuyama, RGr §5.2: abha-, eva, cpd-stem., for abh; cf. abha-sampi XXXI 6c, abha-saṃpita XXXI 8a, also abha-saṃpe: XXXI 1c, 6c, 7b (see Yuyama, RGr §57.1 = 57.3).

22 Cf. Yuyama, RGr §3.33 tada, m. c., for tadā.
In the case of XXI 15a Haribhadra has cited apparently सवुण्ट, as seen in युक्तमत्ता-अः (text 6). This is exactly the reading of Rosennien B (so read all MSS = Oberzeller and Vaidya). The Calcutta MS reads however सवुण, which looks almost like a generalized form regardless of the genders in our text. Needless to say, the following masculine plural सरव त्रिभवे नृक्तिस्म निर्देशीति, te sarvi ... would normally expect the corresponding सवुण्ट (for सवुण्ट):

सवुण्टी (B सवुण्टी) सरव त्रिभवे नृक्तिस्म निर्देशीति (B अः)

te sarvi datā dasadaṃ anamata-kāpāṁ / XXI 15a

It is thus paraphrased by Haribhadra: सवुण्टतः-अः / सवुणेऽहि सत्वाः ... त्रिभवे ... नृक्तिस्म सम्प्रभवनेति / te ca sarvi dhānam dasaṇy (Chiąng: dasaṇṭi) anamata-kāpāṁ ... (recto, line 6: Chiașg p. 120)46.

43 Cf. Yoyama, RGe ... 23.1 for सवुण (instead of सवुण), m.c. also Yoyama- XXXI 13b.
44 Cf. Yoyama, RGe §42.14 for परिज्ञातनि g.e., with non-causative -अः (cf. Yoyama, RGe §4:6). The same example is to be found at XII 1d (end of line).
45 This Buddhist Sanskrit gēramā is not unanum, but is to be noted: cf. Yoyama, RGe §42.14.
47 Cf. Yoyama, RGe (Cambridge 1976), p. 146 under "Index to Pāda".
48 In this sentence dasaṇy is grammatically and metrically expected to be dasaṇy. It may well be a scribal mistake. Unfortunately, from the present, I have not been able to judge definitely to the manuscript reads dasaṇ or dasaṇy. Incidentally, for the peculiar form of dasaṇaṁ (Rg XXXI 15b) see Yoyama, RGe §45.8;
Closing Remarks

As is shown here, it is not easy to identify the original version on which Haribhadra based his commentary. It will be my future task to find it with a more careful study into the text in this fragment. A careful comparison of both Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of this text may help us understand not only Haribhadra's points but also the original Rg.

In this paper I have tried to show only a few philological problems with regard to the Rg and its related literature. There are still limitless questions. Many of them could be solved with the help of the historians of Buddhist ideas. I do not know why they do not pay much attention to this literature of vital interest.

It is therefore once again strongly hoped that the remaining portion of this commentary will show up among the heap of scriptural treasures, in particular in the libraries of Tibetan monasteries. This cultural heritage, common to every human being on earth, must be allowed to exist free of political barriers. Buddhist philology is, after all, for scientific progress in humanities and the bright future of human beings.

In concluding my humble remarks I wish herewith express my sincere gratitude once again to Professor Chiang Chung-hsin for his untiring service to the world of human knowledge.
## Haribhadra’s Citations from the Rgs

in comparison with the two Indic recensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rgs</th>
<th>Haribhadra*</th>
<th>Recension A</th>
<th>Recension B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXXII.8</td>
<td>yarva nā</td>
<td>yarva na</td>
<td>yarva ati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.9</td>
<td>yo ega</td>
<td>yo ega</td>
<td>yo ega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10</td>
<td>āhāra</td>
<td>āhāra</td>
<td>āhāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.11</td>
<td>aha</td>
<td>aha</td>
<td>aha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.12</td>
<td>tada</td>
<td>tada</td>
<td>tada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.13</td>
<td>dānāma1</td>
<td>dānāma</td>
<td>dānāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.14</td>
<td>na ca</td>
<td>na ca</td>
<td>na ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.15</td>
<td>yāvanta</td>
<td>yāvanta</td>
<td>yāvanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.16</td>
<td>yal ca</td>
<td>yal ca</td>
<td>yal ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.17</td>
<td>kācaya</td>
<td>kācaya</td>
<td>kācaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.18</td>
<td>yadi</td>
<td>yadi</td>
<td>yadi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XXXII.1
dānena
dānena | dānena |

| 2 | śilena tīrya-gati1 | śilena tīrya-gati | śilena tīrya-gati |
| 3 | tīrya hanka2 | tīrya hanka | tīrya hanka |
| 4 | parjñāya3 | parjñāya | parjñāya |
| 5 | parjñāya4 | parjñāya | parjñāya |
| 6 | vaisāyottama joga5 | vaisāyottama joga | vaisāyottama joga |

### Notes to the Table

* Haribhadra’s citation is naturally followed by ity-ñi (regulated by sāndhi rules).
1 *evo-cpl.stem,m.pl.*; cf. n. 40 above!
2 Haribhadra’s dānem is simply followed by ity-ñi; dānem is metrically correct!
3 For this generalized form dānem in Recension A see above (cum n. 47).
4 Haribhadra’s tārya- is unmetrical (for tārya-); cf. n. 43 above!
5 Haribhadra’s parjñāya is metrically possible as discussed above, cf. also n. 44-45 above.
6 Haribhadra’s parjnapa must simply be a Sanskritized form; cf. Yogasa, Rgga 54.14.
The Sanskrit Saddharma-pundarikaśūra fragment in the Manneheim collection (Helsinki)

Kjell Wille

The journey by the Finnish Baron Carl Gustaf Emil Manneheim (1867–1951) through Central Asia and the northern provinces of China lasted almost two years from 29th of July 1906 to 20th of July 1908. Being a cavalry officer in imperial service C.G. Manneheim was chosen by the Russian General Staff to obtain geographical and military information about the Chinese borderlands. To cover up his mission he had to join the members of the Pelliot expedition. But he parted company with them already in Kashgar and travelled via Yarkand to Khotan on the southern Silk Road. From there he went back to Kashgar and then along the northern Silk Road via Kulja, Qarašahr, Urumči, Turfan, Hami, and Anxi to Dunhuang and further on until he finally reached Beijing.

Interested in scientific studies, Manneheim got in contact with Otto Donner, then the President of the Finno-Ugrian Society. As a result funds were obtained from the Finno-Ugrian Society, and also the Trustees of the Antell Fund put aside funds to purchase from Manneheim expected archaeological and ethnographical material as well as manuscripts for the State Historical Museum, later renamed the National Museum.

Reading through Manneheim’s “Records of the journey” one comes across only a few references to his own archaeological excavations or investigations. The yield of antiquities, however, was rather poor. He found bones, pieces of clay vessels, and large clay jars, but not a single manuscript and only occasionally he

2 Cf. the map in Manneheim 1940, vol. I (reprint is Raita 2000), Sandberg 1990, and the exhibition catalogue of the Museum of Cultures (cf. note 5).
3 Manneheim 1940, vol. I (Manneheim wrote his diary originally in Swedish. According to Haldén 1999: 59, the English version is not always accurate); pp. 130 ff.: 12th to 15th February 1907 (Kobile village), pp. 220 ff.: 30th April 1907 (Kulja).
mentions the purchase of archaeological and ethnographical material as well. Concerning manuscript fragments he just refers to his largest acquisition from local inhabitants in the Turfan oasis. These fragments are supposed to be found in Yarközo, Idiqtābah, and Čitkin. Among these purchases Chinese fragments are by far the majority, viz. about 2000 fragments. Some of them have texts in Tibetan or Uigur on the verso and one has some Brahmi characters on the verso. Next in number are the Uigur fragments, some of which have Chinese text on one side. Besides these there are some Middle Iranian fragments in Sogdian script, one Mongolian fragment in 'Phags-pa script, and one so-called taṣkīrā document in Eastern Turki.

During his stay in Khotan and its vicinity from 29 November till 10 December 1906 Manneheim bought with the help of Badruddin Khan, the Aksatal of Indian and Afghan traders in Khotan, besides some antiquities also eight so-called taṣkīrā documents in Eastern Turki from local inhabitants. In his "Records of the journey" he does not mention any other purchase of further manuscripts. Never-

---

1 The most recent survey is found in the exhibition catalogue of the Museum of Cultures: C.G. Manneheim in Central Asia 1906–1908, Helsinki 1999. The Museum of Cultures is a part of the National Museum of Finland.

2 Manneheim 1906, vol. I, p. 350: 25th September 1907 (Türân), p. 365: 5th October (Čitkin); in this context Manneheim states (p. 350): "It is more difficult, however, to secure ancient objects here than in Khotan and the prices are considerably higher"; cf. also Halén 1999: 47ff. and Halén 1999a: 59.

3 Cf. Halén 1978: 118ff. (no. 461); for the identification of some of the fragments see Halén 1999: 48ff.


9 Badruddin Khan also sold many manuscript fragments to the British consul general Sir George McCurney in Kashgar, to S. H. Godfrey during his stay in Lah between 1894–96, to Sir Aurel Stein during his stay in Khotan on his three expeditions between 1901 and 1916, to Albert von Le Coq during his stay in Kashgar in December 1913, and to August Hermann Francke and Hans Körber during their stay in Khotan in August 1914.

10 Manneheim 1940, vol. 1: 89ff.; for the taṣkīrā documents see Halén 1978: 100ff. (no. 350) and Halén 1999a: 54ff.
theless, there are altogether eleven fragments in Bṛhatīśī script which were acquired by Mannerheim in the Khotan region and then handed over to J.N. Reuter for edition. At that time it was not possible for Reuter to say anything definite about the find-spots of the fragments:

“It is an unfortunate circumstance that the locality where these Mannerheim fragments, as I propose to call them, were found or acquired by purchase cannot be determined. The objects sent home by Baron Mannerheim were accompanied by notes giving the find-place and other data, but when the present fragments were handed over to me for inspection, no such notes, with one exception, came into my hands. The necessary data might, however, have been easily supplied from Baron Mannerheim’s notes, then in the possession of Senator Donner, had not the unexpected death of this distinguished scholar and ardent promoter of Oriental, and especially Ural-Altaic research, made the identification of the notes impossible.

I am not even quite certain as to what fragment the exception mentioned above has reference; but to the best of my recollection, it is that fragment 6. It was found, together with one coin and three button-like ornaments, in the sand, from which the topmost layer had been blown away, at Hango (in some maps called Yangi) six stations South of Khotan.”

The find-spot of six other fragments is Khādālīq near the oasis of Domoko (Duma-qua), about 115 km east of Khotan. Since 1971 the fragments are housed in the Helsinki University Library as a deposit of the Finno-Ugric Society.

Among the eleven fragments, fragment 10 is a Sanskrit-Khotanese bilingual, whereas fragments 11 is in Khotanese only and was identified by Sen Konow as belonging to the Sanghatāśūtra. The texts of fragments 1–9 are in Sanskrit: fragment 3 belongs to the Kātaśasupaparivarta (identified by F.W. de Jong), fragment 5 to the Saddharma-pundarīkasūtra (identified by J.N. Reuter), fragment 6 to the Swarabhāṣṭottarasūtra (identified by J.N. Reuter), fragment 7 and 8 belong to two

15 In a letter from Katagar to Otto Donner Mannerheim speaks of only seven fragments (cf. Halén 1999a: 54). Besides these, Mannerheim must have bought also some forged documents (cf. Halén 1978: 153 no. 473).
16 Reuter 1918; according to Halén 1978: 71 (no. 213), a short survey of the fragments is found in Donner 1934: 70–71, illustrations between pp. 40 and 41.
17 Reuter 1918: 1 f.
19 To the same folio belongs the fragment Hoenle 147 NS 112 to the Oriental and India Office Collections (British Library, London); cf. Canevaicini 1993: 250f.
20 To the same folio belong the fragments Hoenle 143 S.B. 38 and Hoenle 143 S.B. 39 in the Oriental and India Office Collections (British Library, London); cf. de Jong 1977.
different manuscripts of the Śatāsahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā (identified by J.N. Reuter)\(^1\). Attached to Reuter’s edition are the complete facsimiles of fragments 1, 6, 10, 11, complete facsimile of only the reverse of fragment 4, only specimen of fragments 7–9. For fragments 2, 3, and 5 no facsimiles are given. Most regretfully there is neither a facsimile of the Saddharma-pundarikasūtra fragment nor a transcription of the text. During my recent work on several Central Asian Sanskrit fragments of different manuscripts of the Saddharma-pundarikasūtra I found the reference to that Mannheim fragment in several surveys of extant fragments and decided to give a transcription of it. Looking at the photos of the original I can only admire Reuter’s skillfulness in reading the due to abrasion almost illegible script and identifying the text more than eighty years ago.

Description and Identification by J.N. Reuter:\(^2\)

"Fragment 5. (Not figured) Length about 8 1/2 in.; breadth 3 1/8 in.; about one third of the right-hand side torn away; string-hole 3 1/8 in. from left-hand edge. Paper light yellow, thin, even texture, longitudinal waterlines. Script very good, but so worn as to make it almost illegible, especially on obverse. Six lines on each page.

This is a fragment from the Saddharma-pundarikā, printed text p. 40\(^7\) to 41\(^8\), beginning thus: dékṣāyasāramyaññav-samākhyaññau lokadhatuṣu etc., and ending: vidvāvā dharmam ātājayānti. The reading of the fragment, as far as it [was] possible to decipher it, appears to differ but slightly from the edition. In the fragment lokadhatuśu is fem.; for Śrīparuṇa the fragment has Śrīvattpu, for samādāpana : samādāpanam, for nāmaśādhatvā : aneṣādhitvā; saddharmaḥ is written sādhammah; in the phrase satvānām dharmam deśītavāntaḥ the fragment leaves out dharman."

One may add that the blank space for the punch hole lies is the third and fourth line and is marked by a circle. According to an information by Marja-Leena Hänninen, who also supplied the photos, there is some thin protecting paper on the recto of the original.\(^3\) The foliation number is illegible. The script is the South Turkic East

\(^{1}\) For a parallel to fragment 8 recto, line 1–7, see Abhisamatālakārāsūtra Prajñāparamitā-vyakhya, The work of Haribhadra, together with the text commented on, ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo 1932 (repr. 1973), pp. 159.22 ff.

\(^{2}\) Reuter 1918.7.

\(^{3}\) The same procedure has been applied to the Uğur and Chinese fragments; cf. Hašé 1978: 99 (no. 344), and p. 18 (no. 463), and Sims-Williams/Hašé 1980: 3 ("... the fragments had been preliminarily restored and attached to thin sheets of rice paper or between them.").
Brahmi (main type).24 For the diacritic sign -e both the "Indian" -e and the "Central Asian" -e are written. Once the superscribed Khotanese "r" is found.

It is not easy to assign the text of the fragment to one of the recensions of the Saddharma-pundarika.25 For comparison we have evidence of only two other Central Asian manuscripts, namely the so-called Kashgar manuscript and one of the Lājūm manuscripts. The text of our fragment definitely differs in many cases from the text of the so-called Kashgar manuscript. Of the corresponding fragment of the Lājūm manuscript A, which belongs to group I, only scraps of some words are extant.26 Our fragment seems to belong to the Gilgit/Nepal or Gilgit/Khotan/Nepal recension (group III).27 The reading sāradvatiputra instead of sārīputra (line v 1) is found only in the Gilgit manuscripts, whereas the readings samādāpya instead of samādāpya (line r 6) and anekadātvāvadya (lines r 4 and v 6) are found only in the so-called Kashgar manuscript.

The text of our fragment covers the following passage in the KN edition (KN 40:15–41:14):

ye 'pi te sārikāputrāte 'dhvany ahūtvam dāsau (ṛ i)sky aprameyasya asanikhyeyasya lokadhiśu tu tathāgaṭa arhatara samyakṣaṃbuddhā bahujanahītya bahujanasaṃ (r 2)khāya lokānukampayai mahato janaktyasyārdhāya hitaśa sukhāya devanām ca manusyaṇām ca | ye (r 3) nāṇābhīnirārārdeśavividhabhuktakaranidarśanānramaṇa

25 H. Toda [Saddha(C); lv–lvi] established the following groups of Central Asian manuscripts: 1. The Khotan recension: a. The so-called Kashgar manuscript represents the most complete manuscript of this text; b. The Pāṭhā-Bīg manuscript is very similar to the Kashgar manuscript, the Devadatta portion, however, is not included, neither as a part of the eleventh chapter nor as a separate twelfth chapter. c. Manuscripts which mainly agree with the Kashgar manuscript (group II of Toda). d. Manuscripts which are much older and generally shorter than the Kashgar manuscript (group I of Toda). e. Manuscripts which are very similar to the Gilgit/Nepal recension (group III of Toda).
26 Cf. note 35.
27 According to Toda 1984: 21), the twelf palm-leaf manuscripts from Nepal can be classified into three groups: Group I: C3, C4 (fols. 1–107, 118–140), K, N1; Group II: C5, C6 (fols. 76–78, 83–131); Group III: T2, T6, C4 (fols. 108–117), C6 (fols. 1–75, 79–82), B, T7, N2, N3. He further points to the similarity of the Gilgit manuscripts with the group I of this subdivision, and assigned the palm-leaf manuscript from Beijing to this group I (cf. Toda 1985: 245). For the classification of the paper manuscripts into eight or nine groups see Toda 1998 and 1997 respectively. However, our fragment cannot be assigned to one of these subdivisions.
ram anabhinnatvam pravartanam eva

Parallels: Ka 47b.5–49a.1; Otani (Lushing) SLLMC A-1 r 1; KN 40.15–41.14; SMSR II-170–184; Todt 1999
5 [ya] . . . (n)[â][n] ca [na]nusyaînâm ca ye\textsuperscript{43} n[â][n][â]hînir[h][â] . . . (n)[r][d][\v]{e} . . . (\v){i}vîddhahatukârâ\v{(}a\textsuperscript{44} . . . + + + + + + + + + + + + +
6 [ku] . . . [i][y][\v]{a}[k]\textsuperscript{45} n[\v]{a}[n]dâmîhmukântînî satvâ[n]în ane[kadha]\textsuperscript{46} . . . . . yâ[n][â][m] àsâyâ\v{n} (n) vi\v{d}îvî\v{d}hînàm de\v{d}(a) + + + + + + + + + + + + +

Symbols used in the transliteration

() restored àkṣara
[ ] damaged àkṣara
+ lost àkṣara
. . . illegible àkṣara
| dândâ
· punctuation mark for visarga
* vîrāma
. . . avagraha, not written in the MS
O punch hole

Abbreviations

Ks so-called Kashgare manuscript of the Saddharmopadarsākārā actually found in Khâshiq but purchased in Kashgare. Facsimile edition: Saddharma-pada\v{d}arṣika-sā\v{r}a. Kashgare Manuscripts, ed. Lokesh Chandra with a foreword by Heinz Bechert, New Delhi 1976 (Sâts-Pâtha, Series, 229) [repr. Tokyo 1977]. Transliteration in Saddh\v{p}(C).

KN Saddharma-pada\v{d}arṣika, ed. H. Kern and Bunji Nunjiö, St.-Petersbourg [1908–1912] (Bibliotheca Buddhica, 10).


\textsuperscript{43} Ks 41.12, SCSR II-182 (R, T9, A 2.3): ye ca; SCSR II-182 (K, Pk, C 1.2,3,4,5, B, P1,2,3, T2.3,4,5,6,7,8, A, N1,2,3, D1,2): ye; Ks 48b5: \v{m}a\v{v}ir.

\textsuperscript{44} Ks 48b5: nâdâmîhmukântînâmā\v{d}râ\v{d}elâ.

\textsuperscript{45} Ks 48b6: "kosal\v{e}\v{b}hi; all other MSS: "kau\v{d}alay\textsuperscript{a}" (v. l. "yak\v{u}k\textsuperscript{a}"/yi\v{k}).

\textsuperscript{46} Ks 48b 6 f.: nâmâmâhātvadâsā\v{y}ânâm anekahâtvadâsā\v{y}ânâm satvâ\v{n}âm dhârtvadâsā\v{y}am vi\v{d}îvâr yâhâhâtvadâsâ\v{y}ânâm satvâ\v{n}âm dhârmanâm dâsā\v{y}i\v{s}yau\textsuperscript{a}; Ks 41.13f. and all other MSS: nâmâmâhâtvadâsā\v{y}ânâm (v. l. "âs\v{y}yâ\v{n}âm") dâsā\v{y}am (v. l. âs\v{y}au\textsuperscript{a}) vi\v{d}îvâr dhârmanâm dâsā\v{y}i\v{s}yau\textsuperscript{a} (v. l. d\v{e}\v{r}\v{a}dâdâs\v{y}au\textsuperscript{a}).

\textsuperscript{47} MS: vi\v{d}hârâ?
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Random Remarks
on and around the Mannerheim Fragment of the Saddharma-pundarikasutra

Akira YUYAMA

These are intended to be random notes in appraisal of Dr. Klaas Wille's enlightened article printed before this "The Sanskrit Saddharma-pundarikasutra fragment in the Mannerheim collection (Helsinki)". I am also much indebted to him for his readiness to read my remarks. He has given me learned suggestions and corrections useful for my further revisional work. Needless to say, I am alone responsible for any errors of opinion or errors of fact to be found in my paper.

Whilst studying in Leiden for two years in 1963-1965, my interest in collecting the then unknown Indic manuscripts of the Lotus Sutra grew up even more than before. I wanted to make good use of my stay in Europe before my departure for Canberra in June 1965. I was able to see a number of manuscripts kept in England and France and consequently obtained the microfilms of those manuscripts. The films were deposited for the use of my compatriot scholars.

Needless to say, I was eager to see the fragment brought back from Central Asia by the Finnish national hero, Field Marshal (the then Colonel) Baroo Carl Gustaf Emil von Mannerheim (4.VI.1867-17.I.1951). In search of the so-called Mannerheim fragment of the Saddharma-pundarikasutra referred to in Julio Natanel Reuter's article, I wrote to the Finno-Ugric Society to ask about it in my letter dated 5 April 1965.

On 19 April, in quick reply to my query, I received a kind letter from Professor Peter Aalto in his capacity as Secretary to the Finno-Ugrian Society. He informed me that Mannerheim's other notes and materials were in the possession of the Society but he could not locate the fragment in question in its Archives. According to him, the Mannerheim fragments were preserved among the papers of the then President of the Society, Professor Otto Donner, and that they were then at the Finnish State Archives. Professor Aalto added that he would try to look for them. To my sorrow, no information about the fragment has since then come to my notice.

On arrival in Canberra I felt rather uneasy at having to work with limited library facilities. Thereafter I realized the necessity of having good bibliographical information in order to pursue serious philological work. Being in the Southern Hemisphere, I also felt it important to look into the background history of Indian and Buddhist researches and to learn of the activities outside of the Continent. I began thus to devote much time and energy towards this goal. Indeed, this kind of work had led me to believe that the prime necessity is to have systematic and critical surveys of a specific topic or literature.  

With regard to the Mannerheim fragment, neither photographic reproduction nor information of its whereabouts was available. Under such circumstances I had to bring out a bibliography in order to facilitate the philological study of the Lotus Sutra with the maximum information then

---
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available to me. This worry never went out of my mind. Towards the end of August 1992 I did not want to miss an opportunity to visit Helsinki in search of the very fragment on my way to Fagersnes in Norway to participate in the Sixth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies. My cherished dream to see it was not realised! However, I am now shocked to learn that its whereabouts were known at the time of my visit to the Helsinki University Library. It has been kept there since 1971 as a deposit of the Finno-Ugrian Society. At the same time, I regret very much that the information given explicitly by Harry Halén in his meticulous work had simply escaped my attention. I must add here, however, that I learned a great deal of interesting information on the Tibetan materials like Mālo-man kept therein.

To my great regret, I have not yet seen an exhibition catalogue under the editorship of Pirjo Vajola, which seems to offer a number of important facts in this connection. It was therefore an extremely pleasant surprise to see Dr. Klaus Wille of Göttingen publishing the present enlightening article under review here. I am much indebted to him for various important facts about Mannerheim's travels and the fragment in question.

On this occasion I must regrettably acknowledge that some geographers were rather uninterested in written documents. Most of the important materials were acquired just by accident.

A famed American geographer-explorer at Yale, Ellsworth Huntington (161.X.1876-17.X.1947), obtained a small but extremely interesting fragment at Khādalik only by chance. I was much thrilled to find that the so-

1 On the Mannerheim fragment see e.g. A. Yoruma, A Bibliography of the Sanskrit Texts of the Sādharmacariniyadarśana (- Oriental Monograph Series, V) (Canberra: Centre of Oriental Studies at the Australian National University in association with A.N.U. Press, 1970), p. 29. — I have also treated Buddhist Sanskrit literature found in Central Asia in my paper: "日本アジアの梵音仏典", 東洋学術研究, XXIII, 1 (Tokyo 1984), p. 78 (exam. n. 73 on p. 91).


called “Huntington Fragment F” was nothing but a torn portion of the same folio kept then in the British Museum (now British Library). A German geographer-explorer Emil Trinkler (19. V.1896-19. V.1931) brought back nine folios of the Lotus Sutra, which were missing from the so-called Kathgar Manuscript from Khotan kept in the Petrovsky Collection in Saint-Petersburg.

Another example is the universally known Stockholm-born Sverre Hedin (19. II.1865-26. XI.1932), who brought back an enormous amount of invaluable Tibetan documents to his hometown. It is a great pity, however, that the acquisition records of some important materials are very little known. They are all indispensable texts for Buddhist philology.

In his diary on 4 December 1906 at Yarkon in the vicinity of Khotan, however, Manneheim writes about his purchase of materials. Incidentally, the village named Yarkon should be on Map 1 among the folded maps. But I am unable to spot it there.


Cf. e.g., Nils Simonsson, Inde-Studierende Studier. Die Mythen der in-indischen Verwandt, unter-

Cf. ohe Helmer Eriksen, "Tibetanska Stockholmia (L-VII)", ZTS, VI (1972), p. 901

Cf. ohe Helmer Eriksen, "Tibetanska Stockholmia (L-VII)", ZTS, VI (1972), p. 901

This meticulous work has been thoroughly reprinted in one volume with a subtitle: Handlist der deutschen Texte der Sanskrit- und der Indologieen Museen zu Stockholm.
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... Any discoveries of value had, no doubt, already been secured by the well-known archaeologist Dr. Steen, who had visited this locality a couple months before us. It was only after they had joined all kinds of relatives on me, which I brought not war of anything better, that objects in a better state of preservation were produced! I secured the best ones as I was preparing to mount my horse and leave the village. This resulted in my buying practically all that could be had. With the help of Badruddin Khan, the former Indian akhādat of Khotan, to whom Macartney had kindly given me a letter, the prices were beaten down considerably.  

It is said that Carl Gustaf Mannerheim wrote his diary originally in Swedish and that its English version is not always accurate (cf. Wille, op. cit., n. 3). Unfortunately, I have not been able to see the original Swedish version. Mannerheim's book of his travels across Asia on horseback, with its clear black-and-white photographs, is of immense interest. A Danish translation from the Swedish with a foreword by Sven Hedén, dated 20 May 1940 in Stockholm, followed by a message to the readers by G. Mannerheim (signed in February 1940), appeared in Copenhagen in 1941. 15 In this book the diary covering the period from 29 November to 11 December 1906 at Khotan and its surroundings occupies pages 74-88. A nice photograph of Badruddin Khan with his relative (child) is to be found on p. 79. I have not seen the German version.

The Dutch version of Mannerheim's travels through Asia on horseback translated from the Finnish seems to be an abridged edition with some different photos in a different order. His expeditions to Asia must have occupied an important part in his career. 16

In fact, in his memoirs Mannerheim devotes a lengthy section to the period between 1906 and 1908. Some different photographs of importance were

15 See Mannerheim, Asia, I, p. 89.
published in this book written in Swedish.\textsuperscript{15}

Incidentally, during his account of his stay in the village Yorkan Mannerheim mentions the Japanese at the end of his diary on 4 December 1906. His personal name is given there.\textsuperscript{16}

... The Japanese, who had been here a couple of years ago, and other travellers had brought up many of these interesting documents and year by year it is becoming more and more difficult to find anything of value...

Those Japanese may well be the second Osani expedition, which was conducted in 1908-1909. In fact, the young Tsuolchi Tachihara (高橋徹, 7.1.1890-4.XI.1968) and his elder partner Eizaburō Nomura (野村英三郎) were around this area. However, both of them left Kashmir on 20 August for Kashmir across the arakorum via Maral Bali and Yarkand. They arrived in Srinagar on 11 November 1908. From India Tachihara went to London, where he met Mark Aurel Stein (Budapest 26.XI.1862-Kabul 26.X.1943) after his return from the second expedition (1906-1908). He visited Stockholm to meet Sven Hedin on his return from the third expedition (1905-1908). To my regret, however, I have found no record of Mannerheim's meeting with the Japanese party. At least, they might have not met each other in Central Asia.\textsuperscript{17}

Incidentally, on his return from his expeditions Mannerheim wrote a detailed ethnological report with many illustrations on plates.\textsuperscript{18} It is interesting to note that he collected a number of Fugur words (ibid., p. 59-70), to


\textsuperscript{16} See Mannerheim, Anna. Acta, I, p. 89; in Danish version, p. 78. Incidentally, in the Dutch version no description of the Japanese is to be found.

\textsuperscript{17} In this connection I owe much to Nobuo Yamada, who has left brief but very comprehensive comments for the reprint edition of the records of the Osani Expeditions in two large volumes: 大分県県村・博物館出版 (Osaka: Kobunsha, 1984). 内藤: 山田秀夫, "解説", p. 1-28. This article is supplemented by a detailed bibliography of the Osani Expeditions by Akio Katsuura: 片山篤雄, "日本探検市場中央アジア関係文献目録", ibid., p. 29-41 (mostly the works in Japanese). Incidentally, this reprint edition has been largely reduced in size (A4) of the first edition published almost in the present A3 format under the editorship of Yoshiro Uryūka: 上田芳夫編・編集 (Tokyo: 光文社, 1939).

\textsuperscript{18} C. G. F. Mannerheim, "A Visit to the Sarò and Shera yogurt", Journal de la Société Ethnographique, XXVII (Helsinki 1911), p. 1-72 (incl. 13 photos), V tabbles (incl. 36 illus.).
which a famed Finnish Altaist Gussar John Ramstedt (22.X.1733-25.XI.1930) supplied the Mongolian equivalents (cf. ibid., p. 3). We cannot overlook the importance of the contributions to the Japanese language by the latter.24

It may be added here that Dr. Klaus Wille has given a thorough description of the acquisition and find-spots of such material in connection with the manuscript from khândak. He vividly describes the role played by Badruddin Khán of Khotan with extensive bibliographical information.25

* Wille's skillfulness in reading the fragment is to be much admired, as be himself does Reuter's. As a matter of fact, Reuter's description of this same fragment is brief but indeed necessary and sufficient. In his introductory remarks he says:

"... It is an unfortunate circumstance that the locality where these MANNERHEIM fragments, as I propose to call them, were found or claimed by purchase cannot be determined ... " (Reuter, op.cit., p. 3).

After his physical explanation of the folio Reuter writes as follows:

"Fragment 5 (not figured).

"This is a fragment from the Saddharma-pundarika, printed text p. 40 to 41", beginning... (ibid., p. 7).

Despite his painstaking research work on the Manzerheim fragments Reuter's name does not seem to appear in the writings of Mannerheim. The name Dr. G. J. Ramstedt, Professor of Altaic Languages at the Alexander...


Now, I am much pleased to see that Dr. Klaus Wille has added more to his elaborate paper. The reader will not doubt learn a lot from his writing. After a glance at the contents I herewith wish to make a few random notes.

* * *

**Recto 1 and Verso 3:** Reuter has taken *lokadithu*- here as feminine. Wille may have preferred *apramujavyasaktiyam* with *lokaditham*, loc.pl., as he reads: (recto, line 1). . . *(m)ya*. . . *(patu lok)adha*. . . and (verso, 1. 3) *apramujavya* a. . . *(y)u *(lok)adha*(a)n(a)n( fu tana)*(yan)u*. Indeed, a of *y(k)u* supports the feminine ending in -anu. He then carefully cites variant readings from Nepalese, Gilgit and Central Asian manuscripts (e.g., 27 & 41; cf. also Toda, *Saddako*, p. 24). The fragment may have preferred the feminine locative ending in -anu to masculine -anu. However, there is no evidence that the ending -anu must be the expected reading in all these cases.

In fact, “-anu” is often used both in feminine and masculine forms: cf. Edgerton, *BHISO*, p. 464a, T8.12 One can easily dig out these occurrences by consulting the indices published to date.13 Let us now hope to see a grammatical index based upon mathematical statistics, as demonstrated by the word index compiled by Zuici Iyoh and his group!14

In this connection we eagerly await the other folios of the same manuscript, so we can examine this question more precisely. In the meantime it may not

---

11 See e.g., Mennerlein, *Mima*, I (1931), p. 82 and 86.
be useless to refer to the examples found in the Turfan texts. With regard to these references we are much indebted again to Wulff’s uniting efforts, following those of his predecessors like Frau Dr. Lore Sander.15

... ga[nu]-na[ti](-da)lak-aj[i](-na)m[.](locus:)(masc.),13 -em[a]-kuva-pramānám[wa]jāb uṣmān[.](locus:-kuva-pramānám)(fem.sg/masc.pl.),14 [...] lokā-ākāsha[prājñā](locus:)(masc.),17 [...] lokā-ākāsha[prājñā](locus:)(masc.).18

**Vern 6:** The repetition of the perfect active participle *sa-sa*, closing the paragraph in the simple future form has a fresh and lively ring: *ahānum deśita-mahāniḥ* "santo (= KN 41.1-4, 3-5, 7) and *dharmaṁ dēlayīyameti (= KN 41.14, 15, 18), etc. Thanks to the painstaking endeavours of Professor Chang Ch’ung-hsin of Peking, an extremely tiny torn fragment has been made available from the Otani-Liuhshan manuscript: //\(\text{ahānum deśita-mahāniḥ}\) The photograph on page 46 makes me somewhat suspicious that the "P" on top of the akṣaras "sa" were just worn-eaten, damaged or worn out. This may be a mere guess of mine! One may perhaps read the supposed "P" on top of the damaged akṣaras as "sa"?" Then, the reading dēlayīyameti may doubtlessly be expected.

**Vern 2:** On this line are found two avagraha signs, which are not written in the manuscript as noted by Wille himself. ... te 'hi ... lokā-ākāsha[prājñā ...]

The corresponding portion, in the so-called Kashmir Manuscript from Khotan reads: (feṣṭo 48b1) ... te 'hi sarte mūta[ta]ra[na]ṭ[ā] ... lokā-ākāsha[prājñā ye pi ... hut Toda, Siddhartha(2), p. 24; ... te 'hi sarte mūta[ta]ra[na]ṭ[ā] ... lokā-ākāsha[prājñā(3)]

15 Reference is made to Sandromahānāmīsī aṣṭādaḥ (1971), begunnen von Ernst Waldbach (Versuch der vorrömischen Handwerker in Deutschland, X).


17 Cf. SHT, Teil 3, Kat.-Nr. 976, R6 (p. 318, com a. 22; auch Tafel 91)!

18 SHT, Teil 1, herausgegeben von Heinz Becker, beschrieben von Klaus Wille (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 3995), Kat.-Nr. 1643-1652, 3 A1 (p. 56).
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ye’ ye ...! In this manuscript is found no ausagrabha either.10 But the expected ausagrabhas are always shown by Toda, Siddhārya(C) as well.11

Incidentally, it is an important fact that this manuscript was actually copied in Khotan,12 Toda has corrected folio numbers and given a table of correspondence to édition Kern-Nanjio. This facilitates our study a great deal.13

Scribes often try to keep the hiatus by reading a- in a number of cases when they think it is absolutely necessary to make the meaning clear. It is therefore hoped that, when an author claims to offer a faithfully transliterated text, every door must be left open for further critical editorial work. A symbol like an apostrophe is frequently misusing, if not mistaken. Particularly when the ausagrabha denotes a negative sense, utmost care must be taken. Needless to say, this may add an idea opposite to the original intention.14

In the case of bhāvan (for bhāvāna, 3 pl. arc), though this is less probable, it could be an augmentless preterite form A possibility of bhāvān, 3 pl. perf., not bhāvānāḥ as is expected by Toda, Siddhārya(C), p. 24,15 may not be excluded (cf. Edgerton, BHSGr. §33.2). But a very strange form of bhāvān, 3 pl. perf.,

11 See the orthography of the Kathgiri Ms see Toda, Siddhārya(C), p. xii (under §2).
15 Toda has examined a number of peculiarities in the Kathgiri Ms in comparison with the so-called Kawaguchi Ms kept in the Toyo Bunko (cf. Yuyama, SP-Bih, p. 14). In the case of perfect forms he naturally reads bhāvānāḥ by sandhi. g, Kawaguchi Ms,folio 16[3]. behind, as in Kern-Nanjio 41.9 prose: 河林(河)"('It may be said that Barnabas...')";

德島大学教育学科紀要 (人文・社会科学), VIII (1973), p. 83. — Incidentally, Kawaguchi Ms, one of the oldest manuscripts from Nepal, is dated Tuesdays 12 October 1670 by Claus Vogel, "The Deed Nepalese Manuscripts of the Siddhārya-Pandora-Sūtra", Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Jahrgang 1974, p. 201.
may appear in other parts of the manuscript. It is a pity that the previous "ubhı̄taṇa (= ed. KN 40.16) or the Śike is illegible (probably missing) in our Mannerheim fragment. One must be open to every possibility!

In the case of api (for apī) the possibility of Middle Indicism must not be simply ruled out before the final decision is made in editorial work. Otherwise, this kind of "faithful" transliteration is already a half-finished critical edition. It is not always easy to decide which reading is absolutely right. In the Lotus Sūtra itself hundreds of examples of api (pi) are reported in the indexes. Two examples of api, m., are reported by Ito and others in their index: ed. Wogihara-Tsuchida p. 250.15 (XIII verse 58d) and 316.9 (XVIII vs. 68a), where Kern-Nanjio (293.6 & 373.3) read api, unmet. Cf. Kern-Nanjio p. 373 n. 2: v.l. api!

Specialists will naturally be interested to see the corresponding readings in the Gilgit manuscripts. As a matter of fact, they offer interesting readings. Group A as classified by Shōkō Watanabe reads: folio 14b1 ekām πi gātāṁ īrñāṇaṇa ... (cf. Watanabe II, p. 144), and Group B folio 97b2 ekām πi gātāṁ īrñāṇaṇa ... (ed. Watanabe II, p. 274). 37

It is worthwhile to consult the corresponding passages in the so-called Kashmir Manuscript in such a case: in the former verse it offers a different reading, i.e. around folio 28a1 (cf. Toda, Saddhp(C), p. 143). In the latter case it reads ekām gātāṁ īrñāṇaṇa-m-a-r-a ... (folio 359a2), cf. Toda's translation to ekā(ṃ) πi gātā(ṃ) ... (Toda, Saddhp(C), p. 177). The former case is the same in the Farhād-Bēg fragment: folio 258b (Honda-Deguchi, p. 77). Photo No. 106, line 5: cf. Toda, Saddhp(C), p. 246). The latter is not extant either in the F xii.7 or in the Khadalīk fragment.

In connection with the Khadalīk manuscript we are much indebted to the astounding efforts of Dr. Klaus Wille as quoted above. Fragment No. 66

corresponding to Kōro-Nanjio 293.6 is regrettably a torn folio and thus offers no aid. 19

Herewith I must frankly confess how difficult it was for me to determine if pi after -er-o must be read pi or just pi as it is read in the manuscript, when I was editing the Recension A of the Paññā-sūtra-ratana-guna-samayya-gītāḥ (abbr. Rg hereinafter). 20 As the title itself explicitly says, it is composed entirely in verse. From it we have thus collected every phenomenon of non-Sanskrit phonology and morphology (Yuyama, RgrGr cf. n. 22 above). It was done so exactly because of my wish to make such analyses on each text after the model of Franklin Edgerton's monumental work. 21

In order to satisfy the mere any form of ap in is to be found, i.e. either apa, aπ, aπ, (including 'pi after -er-o'), or even pi. It becomes endless, if semantic, syntactical or stylistic analyses are to be discussed in addition! Let me quote all these occurrences in the Rg here:
ap: 1.9a, 12b, 20a, II 9b, 10d, IV 2b, 3c, 1d (ap), 6c (stūpa), 7a (ap), V 1a, 2a (ap), 9d (lātikā), VI 1b, 9b, VIII 4b, XI 3 (dhyāna), cf. I bānīkā a, 7c (ap), 7a (ap), XII 6d (canyikā ap), XIV 6a (ap), 9b (ap), 10b (ap), XV 1a, XVI 4b (datta), XVII 1a (rājya ap), 5c (ap), 8a (ap), XIX 4b (ap), XX 8b (ap). 1.6 = 1.6cd (apa ... apa), 17c (ap), 18c (apa), 19 (āhuṭārāya), 22a, 24c (ad), XXII 8a (āhuṭārāya A), XXXI 1d (cāgamin ap), XXXV 1b (ap), 3d (dāsāsām ap, merit.), 6a (ap), 6c (ap), XVII 4b (ap), XXVIII 3b (ap), XXIX 1c (api kha pāve ...), 10a (kām api nāga ap), 12b (api kathā bhārata utt.) cf. Tib. ... . 2 ... kṣetra-utt., XXXI 5c (bhūrata ap), 7d, XXXII 5b-6 (api ... api ... tathā ...), etc. — XXXI 5c bhūrata ap. 22

ap in yadu ap: X 6c(A 'yadu ap ... tathā pi ...' (cf. Tib. kṣetra, also pi below), XVI 5a (yādy ap; ... Tōdā, Chin. 甲, Tāntā-VIII 680b24 頜). — This may have escaped Edgerton's attention (cf. Yuyama, RgrGr §3.6; Edgerton, BHS ¤3.5). 23
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This is not always easy (cf. pi). Edgerton has carefully discussed it in his BHSGr §4.1(f).

pi after anumitra (cf. Edgerton, BHSGr §4.3) XI. 1b pārthama pi (so also ed. Vaidya; cf. Skt. B pārtho pi/ pi, so Obermiller).

pi after a vowel -a (cf. Edgerton, BHSGr §4.11) - all but one case read a negative particle no, and the Tibetan version is indifferent: IV 6c no pi (so possibly nāpi?); Tsb. med-thd; V 2b, X 4d, XVII 2C, X X 1d, 124, XXVI 5d, XVII 6c, XVIII 4d, XXIX 1b na u ... for na u see Vajrana, RkGr, Appendix 56, and XXX 7a. - budhita pi XII 1c (Obermiller prints is Devanagari budhita = budhita'pi; Tsb. un-buddha-khyi).

pi, m.c., for pi: tathā pi X 6d (cf. under āpi above; Obermiller prints in Devanagari tathāpi = tathāpi; Vajrana tathāpi; un-nam: Tsb. khyi only).

pi after a vowel -a, nom.pl.masc. (cf. also Edgerton, BHSGr §4.12); buddha pi pārthama XXVII 3c (cf. Tsb. buddha-sted-khyi, B un-buddha-sted-pa'i); this may well be a result of a secondary suffix, i.e. possibly buddha'pi; for pārthama, nom.pl.masc., see Vajrana, RkGr §22.18.

In spare moments during my work on this last portion I flipped through a book which had come to my hand a few days before. It is the fruit of truly international cooperation under the able editorship of Professor Jens Braarvíg.41 I am indeed pleased to see it appear at such a high speed with this quality. While flipping through it quickly, two meticulous articles instantly caught my eye,42 since I was just then treating āpi as shown above and my immediate interest lies in the Mahābhūtā-Avadāna.43

For their grammatical analyses it may be worth looking at the Rgs as yet another good example, e.g. among many others: -eb, instr.pl. (Brokhep.p. 54, cf. Yuyama, RgsGr §§76-77, also 8.78) and its function as a locative-like instrumental (Karashima p. 236 n. 28, cf. Yuyama, RgsGr §7.26).

A new paragraph must now be made in my systematic survey of Vīṇaṣya literature. Dr. Lore Sander of Berlin is to be commended for her initiative into this identification. She has drawn the attention of many serious scholars all over the world. The Schøyen Collection indeed deserves the name of the "Dead Sea Scrolls of Buddhism". This amazing news reached these far-flung eastern isles through the able offices of Professor Kazanobu Matsuda at Bukkyō University in Kyoto.

In this connection, mention must be made also of the British Library collection of Kharosti manuscripts from Gandhara. Such discoveries are not just for Buddhics and Buddhistologists but for the world of knowledge. It had not escaped the attention of foremost specialist like Professor Richard Salomon of Seattle. This news was spread through the mass media. A good example is from the National Geographic Society in Washington D.C. Richard Salomon's comment is cited therein: "They won't revolutionize our understanding of Buddhism, but they will clarify the origins and develop-

48 A. Yuyama, Vīṇaṣya-Texte (c. Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur.) Im Auftrage der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, herausgegeben von Heinz Bechert, 1 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1979): one may please p. 40 anew §16.5.5.1: "Vīṇaṣya-Vihāra zum Bhikṣupratimoksa des Mahāvīra-bhiksū Lokottararavidīnā".
51 "和田さん、アフガニスタンからノルウェーブ——世界を動かすことになるかもしれない話——", 九州大学総合研究所論文集, No. 13 (December 1997), p. 14, 28, including 2 photos.
opment of traditions and texts.  

To our great pleasure, those materials are now being examined by serious scholars in related fields of study. A group of scholars are occupied in deciphering and editing such materials. We can see the beautiful fruit of their hard labour under the leadership of Richard Salomon, who, in this book, gives a comprehensive survey of Buddhism and Buddhist literature more in detail. The forthcoming volumes will be eagerly awaited by any scholar engaged in related fields of study.

I am very much looking forward to reading these volumes in print more thoroughly. I am personally interested primarily in the philological side of these materials. At the same time, my interest has always lain in the sphere of development of Buddhism — say, how far to the west Buddhism had spread or propagated in Central Asia. So far important archaeological excavations together with the unearthed written documentation have offered information on this topic.

The contributions begun by the Soviet Union cannot be neglected. Philologists learn a great deal from archaeologists in this regard. Epigraphical works often offer important information. The Soviet-Russian schol-

12 See e.g. Graham Shaw, "Buddhism Unrolled", The Oriental and India Office Collections Newsletter, LI-LIV (London 1997), p. 2-5, including illus.
15 Among others see e.g. Grégoire Frumkin, Archaeology in Soviet Central Asia (Leiden-Köln: E. J. Brill, 1978), XVII, 217 p., LVII plates, 39 figs., 39 maps.
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ars have revealed for us rare materials for further studies. The most welcome is their publications of the textual studies containing facsimiles of the hitherto unpublished Buddhist Sanskrit literature.

Last but not the least, in connection with the *Saddharmaparṇavyākhyā* as an issue, it is most interesting to learn of the existence of the manuscripts of this very literature in the Martin Schøyen Collection. I was thrilled to learn of it two years ago. It was announced by Professor Kazunobu Matsuda, who has really an extraordinary sharp nose to dig out unidentified Buddhist literature. Every serious scholar without exception in the related field of study must be amazed at the news and eager to learn more. Let us therefore hope to see these materials published as soon as possible! They will no doubt shed light on various unsolved problems.
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Aftermath Notes on Mannerheim's Travels 1906-1908

(1) Footnote 7: Barely in time I have just received a copy with much difficulty: C. G. Mannerheim in Central Asia 1906-1908, edited by Petteri Koskialo and Asko Lehsmukkalo (Helsinki: National Board of Antiquities, 1999), 128 p.

This book is not an "exhibition catalogue" as I expected, but two published in conjunction with the exhibitions "Mannerheim in Central Asia 1906-1908" (19.5-19.9.2001). On the copyright page is found the name of Perjo Varjola as Chief Editor of the Exhibition Catalogue at the Museum of Cultures. Contrary to my anticipation, no index or manuscript fragment is introduced in facsimile. However, it is full of invaluable photos taken by Mannerheim himself. A facsimile of his diary is found on p. 52.

The following articles are of direct interest to my present research work:

Heli Labdantusa, Marijata Parpole, Pibli Vaiponen, Asko Lehsmukkalo, "Mannerheim in Central Asia", p. 7-43:

Page 20 "Tracking the Japanese" (in the Kizian region around November-December 1906): "Despite the malaria, there was no sign of Japanese agents in the area. Mannerheim returned to Kas disparity for the New Year, and spent January 1907 making clean copies of his draft maps, developing his photographs and overhauling his equipment. He added to his collection of objects and sent what he had acquired so far by rail back to Finland." (p. 28).

— Compare my description around notes 16 and 17 above!

Harry Hein, "Baron Mannerheim's hunt for ancient Central Asian manuscripts", p. 47-51:

Offering useful bibliographical notes on p. 53.

- "C. G. Mannerheims brev till senator Otto Donner", p. 53-61:

Four letters from Mannerheim to Professor Donner, a one-time President of the Finno-Ugrian Society, from Kas disparity dated 7 January 1907, Kuldja (Kokkola / 1907) 27 April 1907, Urumchi (Urumchi) 4 August 1907, and from Lanchow (Lin-chou) on 17 February 1908.


An extensive bibliography is found on p. 76.

(2) At the same time, to my pleasant surprise, I learned of a beautiful publication of 1000 photos taken by Mannerheim in the form of CD-ROM with necessary texts cited from his diary and interactive records of sounds on the background screens. All my wanted photos are found therein:

C. G. Mannerheim — Asian Asia on Horseback (Production Group: Sari Koskinen, multimedia designer; Orri Masuikamaki, graphic designer, Johannes Rasmussen, composer - dramatizer / Film Production: National Board of Antiquities (Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society, Mannerheim Foundation, Museum of Cultures, National Board of Antiques, 2000).

— On the name in Chinese 马達漢 perfectly fits to Mannerheim's role a leaflet of the CD-ROM cites his words: "Pondering over the question of the name I was to bear, the Dians of Kas disparity seized a fine brush and added two beautiful characters after "Ma". I was now called Ma-da-han 'a horse who reaches the land of the Han people, China'".
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The Batang Manuscript Kanjur in the Newark Museum: A Preliminary Report

Peter Skilling

This report is the fruit of a preliminary examination of Tibetan manuscripts from Batang (Acc. No. 20.468–491) in the Newark Museum in early October, 1992. I thank Value Reynolds, Curator of the Oriental Collections, for her enthusiastic cooperation. The report has been circulated privately for several years, and I am grateful to the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism for now making it available to a wider audience. I hope that despite its imperfections and inconsistencies it will be useful until it is superseded by the complete and thorough catalogue under preparation by Dr. Helmut Elmer (Bonn).

Introduction

One of the many treasures in the Tibetan Collection of the Newark Museum (Newark, New Jersey) is an incomplete manuscript Kanjur from Batang in Kham, donated by the American missionary doctor Albert L. Shelton in 1920. Only 23 volumes survive, as follows:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Dad-ba (Vinaya)</td>
<td>2 vols. ga, chu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mDo ade (Sutra)</td>
<td>15 vols. ja, tu, thu, pa, pha, tu, tsha, dzu, za, thu, za, 'a, ra, la, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rGyud (Tritto)</td>
<td>1 vol. a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Dus mdo (Mahā Parinirvānasūtra)</td>
<td>1 vol. lha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phad po-che (Avatāmukśa)</td>
<td>2 vols. da, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bUgyud stong pa (Aspālhaṇerikī Prajñāpāramitā)</td>
<td>1 vol. la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Bram (Śatahaṇerikī Prajñāpāramitā)</td>
<td>1 vol. -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Olson gives the size of the folio as 7 inches by 22–26 inches. The original covers are lost. The divisions (mdo, etc.) and volume numbers (la, etc.) are given on cloth tags, which are attached to the title pages. The title (or, when a text continues from a previous volume, the first) pages are divided into three boxed areas described in orange ink. The longer central...

1 Cf. Eleanor Olson, Catalogue of the Newark Museum Tibetan Collection, Vol. III, Newark, 1971, p. 114. Olson's mention of "avatāmukṣa—6 volumes" (one of the things that originally drew my interest to the collection) refers to the 'Dus mdo, Phad po-che, bUgyud stong pa, and 'Bram of my list.
rectangle contains text written in large letters, opening with the Sanskrit title in the usual rupa pur saud da format, or with the continuation of the text from the previous volume. This rectangle is flanked by two squarish boxes; these are blank, although they may have been intended for footnotes. The text is written in silver on black, in nine lines to a regular page. The right-hand margin of the recto gives the “volume letter” and page number but not the name of the division; the divisions are thus known only from the tabs. The page numbers are written out up to 99; the hundreds are represented by a cruciform symbol or dagger plus the number. The right-hand margin, recto, and both margins, verso, are blank.

Out of the 15 volumes of Sūtra (mā krāte), 12 have tables of contents. As several of these were misplaced, either in the proper volume or in an entirely different volume, there is some hope that the 3 missing tables (for vols. za, la, and a) may still be found. In most cases the tables are placed after the title page and numbered cīg (“one”), with verso blank; such leaves are slightly smaller than those of the volume. Since the title pages are also numbered cīg the cīg assigned to the contents pages makes a double pagination; this fact, coupled with the slightly smaller size, suggests that such pages are a later addition. The paper, ink, and calligraphy are, however, similar. In two cases (za, ra) lists of contents are given at the end of the volume, after the conclusion of the last text and on the same page. Some of the tables give the volume number (ka, etc.) but none the division; they simply list the texts, gle ba how ‘di sa sde ... tshang po. Such tables are not found in Kanjurs belonging to either the Tsal pa (Peking editions, Lithang, and Cone) or the Them sngags ma (London, Tokyo, and Srog Palace manuscripts) lineages. That the practice is ancient may be seen from the fact that a similar page, opening with the identical phrase, is found in the Pelliot collection of Tun-huang manuscripts. The contents are listed at the end of some volumes of the Teng tsha (zhyad: but not the Sūtra, mā krāte) division in the Phug brag manuscript Kanjur. The Phug brag prefers the term po ni to the gle ba name of the Newar Kanjur; po r i ‘di sa ... tshang po. The single volume of Teng tsha of the Newar Kanjur does not have a table of contents at the beginning or a list of contents at the end.

3 But since ka and zha to contain only single texts, they may not have required tables of contents.

4 That is, za, la, ba, ska, nga, nga, za, ze, da, are numbered cīg, pa, zha, and za are separate pages but unnumbered.
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In some cases there is a discrepancy in text between the title page and the following page, though they seem to be contemporary (same ink, paper, hand?). Either the title or text will be incomplete, continuing on the following page with some small lacunae, or title or text will overlap, repeating some words on the next page. In the former case, missing text is sometimes supplied in smaller letters above the main text at the top of the second page. This discrepancy remains to be explained. The Sanskrit titles are very corrupt, as were the few pages of text that I have studied, which showed many lacunae, impossible spellings, and monstrous misunderstandings. The Sanskrit generally shows the older orthography (e.g. prad nyo ba ti for praśāṅgapt, shaṅ gyu for śāṅgka). The Tibetan orthography belongs to the "middle period" (for want of a more precise term): no da drag or mep, etc., but thas pa'i das, la stongs pa, etc. The Kanjur employs contractions (sadesu, bcebdas, bcosbya) and sporadically uses two dots spaced vertically, similar to the colon (•), in place of the single stroke (shad, ।). At the very end of the volumes are short auspicious wishes such as yon mched bsha shis par gyur cig, dge'o, and so on.

Since no overall dhar chag has been preserved (if such ever existed), it is impossible to know the sequence of the divisions or how many volumes they contained. The Sutra and Tantra divisions each probably had at least 30 volumes, since in both cases the last available volume is a = 30. But one of the two available volumes of Avatamsaka is also described as a; this is impossible, since the Avatamsaka takes up only five or six volumes in other editions of the Kanjur. The Newark Kanjur treats the Parinirvāṇa Sutra as a separate division (‘Dus mdo), as do the Them dangs ma (London, Tokyo, Stog, Ulam Bator) and Narhang editions, but not the Phug brag or Tshal pa (Lhasa, Peking, etc.) editions, which include it in the Sutra division.

The position and order of texts within the volumes of the Sutra division and the single volume of the Tantra division is unique: it does not agree with either the Phug brag Kanjur (which is itself unique) or with the Kanjurs of the Them dangs ma or Tshal pa lineages. The Sutra volumes do not discriminate between Mahāyāna and Śrāvakāyana texts, which are mixed together; furthermore, they include texts which other Kanjurs classify under Tantra. The only discernible principle of organization is that texts bearing similar words in their titles (pariprecchā, Brahma, nāga, dharma, etc.) are grouped together (a principle not entirely abandoned by the editors of the Tshal pa Kanjur). The point in the text a which the longer
collections (Vinaya, Parinirvāṇa, Aratamsaka) are broken up into several volumes also seems to be unique.

In common with the Them spangs ma Kanjur, the Newark Kanjur contains a number of texts which were excluded from the Tshad pa Kanjur, which relegated then to the Tanjur: the Shiwaopamamnamrapa (gnyis brtan sphyun dzing la, Vol. pa), the Karmaprajñāpā (las gsal pa, Vol. zsha) and the Lokaprajñāpā ('jug rje gsal pa, Vol. vaj). On the other hand, it contains the (Lesser) Sānyast-mahālātara (mdo chen po stong pa nyid, Vol. zha) which is missing in the Them spangs ma and Phug brag Kanjur but found in the Tshad pa Kanjur.\[9\] The Kanjur also contains one translation which, on the basis of the title, is found only in the Phug brag Kanjur: the Pho brang khor rgyong stog pa chen po rgyi mdo, a different translation of the Bhagavās-pa-pariprastā found in other Kanjurs under the title Tel khor skor gnos las pa'i mdo.\[10\] The translation of drama in the title of the Drugkgyamsaranāra-pa-pariprastā agrees with the Thēs spangs ma and Phug brag Kanjur, sgron pa, against the stong po of the Tshad pa Kanjur.\[11\] My study of the Mahāsātras suggests that the Newark Kanjur belongs to an old and independent textual transmission that predates the compilation of the Tshad pa and Them spangs ma collections. Thus, despite the many errors (surpassing even those of the Phug brag) that the Kanjur shows, it should be a valuable witness for the preparation of critical editions. Since the Sūtra division bears no resemblance to that of the Them spangs ma, Tshad pa, or Phug brag Kanjurs, it may be a copy, several generations removed, of one of the several Sūtra collections housed at various monasteries in Central Tibet. There is no doubt that many such collections existed (a number are listed, for example, in the Narthang Kanjur bkra shis [261-2] and in the colophon of the Sūtra division of the Lithang Kanjur); some of the more prestigious were used in the compilation of the Old Narthang Kanjur manuscripts.

Olson dates the Kanjur to the 16th century. Valme Reynolds to the 15th-16th centuries.\[12\] While such dates are impossible, Tibetan manuscripts in a style that lasted for centuries are notoriously difficult to date in the absence of any historical records such as colophons or local chronicles. It is certain, however, that the Kanjur is a copy of a venerable exemplar, or perhaps venerable exemplar different divisions and different volumes may have been

---


12 Valme Reynolds, Elamian Buddhist Art, Newark, 1991, p. 30 (the photograph on p. 15 gives a general view of the volumes so bound in the altar).
transmitted independently, and only later been copied as a set. Its antiquity may be seen from the orthography (particularly the transliteration of Sanskrit), the arrangement of contents, and the inclusion of texts excised from or missing in the comprehensive Tshad pa edition, which was compiled in CE 1347–51.

Description of Individual Volumes

In the following I describe the volumes of the Kājjar in the order Viniyāsa, Sūtra, Tantra, Nirvāṇa, Avasaṇa, Prajñāpāramitā. The order is arbitrary since, as noted above, in overall dkar chag is available. During my brief stay in Newark, I was unable to examine the entire Kājjar, page by page. My goal was twofold: to determine whether or not the Kājjar is related to any of the known Kānjurs (as seen above, it is not), and to see whether it contained any of the texts that I was then studying. The information for the various volumes is therefore inconsistent, from the strictures of time and the bias of my interests. In some cases I was able to transcribe titles from the text itself and to note down (also numbers, in others only to note the titles from the tables of contents. Cross-references to other Kānjurs are given in some cases only.

I have used the following abbreviations and sigla:

TC = Table of Contents
IT = Indian Title
IT = Tibetan Title
tr. sol. = translators’ colophon
S = Stog Palace manuscript Kānjur: Tadeusz Szkopalski, A Catalogue of the Stog Palace Kānjar, Tokyo, The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1985 (Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica, Series Maior IV).
I have transcribed the text as it appears, without any standardization. A few restored letters are enclosed in square brackets. When the skha'i appears as two dots (see above), it is represented by a colon (:)²⁸.

1. 'DUL BA

3. 'DUL BA GA # 20.480

Opens: 'dul ba gzhi / lam po lnga bcu gsam pa: glegs bsm gsam pa lde lde nas gsas bstan gsas bstan lde ram kyi l(2a) tsho dang ldam pa sa lca la 'di skad ces anras sa il tsho dang ldam pa yul 'khor skyang gs gro gi las kri rgyu ba...

Ends: (316a) chos snyid kyi glog gis tsho l byang chub sems dba' bcom ldam 'das bsham pa de'il tsho l yang sa chen po 'di dag dgyor par gyur to l zhes bya ba nas lde ldam dag sems can gzhed yang 'dir skyes zhes bya ba'i bar gong ma bzhin du'o il yon mchod bka' shis par gyur cig il tsho ring nad med tde skid ldam par gyur cig il dge' dao il

Remarks: The opening passage is from the end of the Sman gyi gzhi (Bhaisajyavastu), the Anurātapaṇḍita, no. XIX, Svāti. In Phug brag and Stog Vol. go opens with Bampo 55, also in Sman gyi gzhi; Bampo 53 is at the end of Vol. kha (Samten 1992, p. 2; Skorupski 1985, p. 2). In Peking the Bampo and passage in question occur at ge 276a7; Vol. nge opens with Bampo 55. Thus the distribution across volumes differs. The enumeration of the volume number after the Bampo number ("Volume 3", glegs bsm gsam pa u go) seems to be an old practice abandoned by the Thams spungs ma and Tshal pa Kanjars, but found in the longer Prajñāpāramitāsūtra such as the Śrāvastivādin ("Illumination") at Newark and the Pāravidāvatāsūtra at the Museum of Ethnology, Universität of Zürich. A 13th century date has been suggested for the latter two texts.

²⁸In the present report, in most cases it occurs as the first shad of a new line. In the pages that I have studied it also occurs as the body of the text, for example after dang or 'am.


³¹ See Pratapaditya Pal and Julius Meech-Pokant, Buddhist Book Illuminations, Hong Kong, 1988, pl. 40: lower part, glegs bsm gsam pa-pa.
6. 'DUL BA CHA // 20.469

Opens: de nas bcom ldan 'das kyi gis dan de syid la buhugs bhin du I 'dal ba la nyan thos mams kyi bslab pa'i gah i gnyis pa bce (2ae gnyis pa bce) bar bsbad nas dge slong mams la bkar' stsal pa i

Ends: (270a) sa bbs dagn skyab gcig i pa'i lhung byed de bce gcig pa drangs ko li yon methog bka' shis par gyur ng l

Remarks: The volume probably belongs to the Vinayavilahaṅga.

IL MDO BSÖE 17

7. MDO BSÖE JA // 20.491

[1] ('phugs pa) 'jam dpal gni mthanan yang dag par brjod pa
D360 (rgyud ka-1); F410 (rgyud ka-1); S427; U492.

Last ('phugs pa) chos kyi phung po zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo
D245; F212 (mdo dza), F555 (mdo gyu/ka); S114; U164,
translators' colophon; ye dharna ...; bka' shis par gyur cig.

TC: separate leaf, ja l cig, "23 texts":
glegs bsm pa 'di la
[1] mthanan brjod dang
[2] 'phugs pa 'jam dpal gnas pa ches bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
D196; P863; S91; U141.
[3] 'phugs pa 'jam dpal gyis dris pa zhes bya ka theg pa chen po'i mdo dang :
D172; P839; S56; U104.
[4] 'phugs pa 'jam dgra gyis brtan pa zhes bya ba theg pa ches po'i mdo dang
D177; P844; S92; U142.
[5] 'phugs pa 'jam dpal gnyi mthshan brya rtsa bgyad pa dang
D462; P129; S511; U578.
[6] 'phugs pa mar me 'buls ba zhes bya ba theg pa ches po'i mdo dang
D206; P870; S78; U126.
[7] 'phugs pa srid par 'pho ba zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
17 So sent consistently on all tags.
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D226; P892; S237; U286.

[8] 'phags pa gsar 'od dam pa mdo sde'i dbang po'i rgyal pa(?) zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang l
D556; P175; S240; U289.

[9] 'phags pa chos tham'd yang dag par sna'd pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
D238; P904; S113; U163.

[10] 'phags pa chos tham'd 'byung ba med pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang l
D180; P847; S234; U283.

[11] dam pa'i chos kyi rgyal po zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang :
D243; P909; S216; U265.

[12] 'phags pa chos kyi inshul zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang :
D244; P910; S112; U162.

[13] 'phags pa chos tham'd kyi yon tan bkod pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang l
D527; P782; S486; U533.

[14] 'phags pa don dam pa'i chos kyi rgyal pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang :
D246; P912; S131; U181.

[15] chos nyid rang gi ngo bo nyid las mi g'yo bar tha dad par than'd la snaog ba'i mdo dang l
D128; P796; S193; U242.

[16] 'phags pa chos dang don ma'm par 'byed pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang l
D247; P913; S116; U166.

[17] 'phags pa chos kyi phyag rgya zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang :
D203; P869; S185; U234.

[18] 'phags pa chos gsum pa zhes bya ba'i mdo dang :
[19] 'phags pa chos btsi pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang l
D230; P916; S117; U167 or D251; P917; S133; U183.

[20] 'phags pa chos btsi zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang l
see preceding entry.
[21] 'phags pa chos btsi bstan pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang :
D49; P915; S132; U182.
[22] 'phags pa chos tham'd snying po'i gnas btsi(?) bye brag bshad pa sgra brgyad khyis 'byed
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pa (') dang 
D—; F—; S--; U—.
(23) 'phugs pa'i chos kyi phung po zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang 
D245; P911; S114; U164.

nyi shu rtsa gsum bshugs go?
Remarks: § 1 opens the Tantra division in both D and F, and also opens some mDo maugs collections. In Bu ston's Chos byang it opens the second section of Tantra in general as the Kriśñ Tantra, §§ 1–5 have Mahāstuti in their titles; §§ 6–8 are miscellaneous; §§ 9–23 have dharmas in their titles. I have not traced § 22 (of which the title is not entirely clear) in other Kanjars. All texts belong to the Mahāyāna.

9. MDO BSIDE TA // 20.408
[1] 'phugs pa bcom ldan 'das ye shes rgyar pa'i mdo sde rin po che mtha phyin pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo 
D99; F83 (pa-whole volume); S43; U96.

Ends: ye dharma; yon mchod bkra shis par gyur cig gi guungs rab zhal(?) gro dbar gyur cig i om ma ni padme hum hri. 
TC: separate leaf, ta / cig, "3 texts": 
 slegs bams ta pa'i nang du!
[1] bcom ldan 'das kyi ye shes rgyas pa'i mdo sde rin po che mtha phyin pa dang 
D99; F767; S49; U96.

[2] rgyas po go pa bual ba dang : 
S—. Read rgyal po?
[3] de bo rhin sahegr pa'i stying po zhes bya ba'i mdo' dang 
D258; P924; S72; U120.

mdu 'di grum pa'bu s'ho !

10. MDO BSIDE THA // 20.473
[1] 'phugs pa rin po che'i mtha' zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo
D118 (so); F315 (kuh); S163; U213

Last mdo chen po ugyu ma'i dra ba zhes bya ba (Māyājāla)

Ends: verse praṇidhāna. 
TC: separate leaf, geig pa'o, "3 texts"—but 18 in volume:
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glegs ban tha ma 'di la
[1] 'phags pa rin po che'i mtha' zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[-967] D118; P786; S163; U213.
[2] 'phags pa yang dag par spyod pa'i tshul namkia'i namkha' mdog gi 'dul ba'i bzood pa
zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang ;
[987–11369] D263; P929; S111; U161.
[3] gyi do gsal pa zhes bya ba thig pa shes bya ba (?) thig pa chen po'i mdo dang
[114a1–]
[4] 'phags byang chub semdâ'i snyod yul la naam pa 'phral pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i
mdo dang
[-168b9; no tr. col.] D146; P813; S246; U294.
[5] 'phags po byang chub semdâ'i snyod pa bstan pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[6] byang chub semdâ'i so sotr thar pa'i chos bsahi bkshub pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i
mdo dang
[174b1–84a, tr. Dipamkara, etc.] S109.
[7] 'phags pa sa lu ljang ba zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang :
[184a–190b2]
[8] 'phags pa dkyil 'khor bskyed pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[190b2–229b]
[9] yang 'phags pa dkyil 'khor bskyed pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[229b–230a]
[10] 'phags pa btsa shis bskyed pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[230a–231b2] D778; P944; S100; U150.
[11] 'phags byams la' jag pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[12] 'phags phun po gsal po zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[226a1–192b7]
[13] 'phags pa sky gsal pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[102b7–203b7]
[14] 'phags pa ode ba can gyi bkod pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo' dang :
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[203b7-106b27]
[15] mdo' chen po dus pa chen po zhes bya ba dang
[106b2-112a10] see Skilling, Mahāśāstras, No. 8.
[16] bsem gias gsang ba'i mdo dang
[1-115a] not in DFPS.
[17] shinggs ha phan sems kyi zhes pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo' dang
[115b-116a]
[18] tdo' chen po tseg ma'i dra ba zhes bya ba'i mdo dang
[117a-] see Skilling, Mahāśāstras, No. 1.

spyan mdo sas sgryad bawug po

Remarks: The pagination of the volume is confused. Titles containing the word bhalisattva (§§ 4–6) and titles containing the numbers eight (§§ 8–10) and three (§§ 12, 13) are grouped together. The volume contains two Māhasāvastivādins Mahāśāstras (§§ 15, 18). The Mahāvīra-mahāśāstra (§ 15) is classified under Tantra in Karjera other than the Phag brag. In the Dzam ditar ma it is classified with the other Mahāśāstras under a class of that name. In Bu ston's Chos 'byung (Nishioka § 12) it is classified under bhanvyina stīras.

13. MDO BSDE PA // 20.477
[1] "phags pa sogs rgyas kyi stobs skyed pa'i cho 'phrol pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo
Ends: (304a) gnas bstan spyan drang ba dzogs s'h o il tr. cdl.; ye dbyar mi; yon mchod bkra shis par gyur cig; om ma ni pad me tsem hril 'dge'o
TC: separate leaf, unnumbered, "13 texta";
plegs bam (tsegleple) 'di la
[1] "phags pa soga rgyas kyi stobs skyed pa'i ye shes cho 'phrol rnam par bstan pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
D147; F303 (kha-1); S41; 5/88.
[2] shabs mthabs pa chen po sogs rgyas drin lan bshad po'i mdo dang
[3] "phags pa thubs mthabs pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[4] "phags pa ma skyes dgra'; gyod pa bsal ba zhes bya ba'i mdo dang
D216; F289 (ke-3); 5233; U272.
[5] "phags pa pad pa'i stobs skyed pa la 'jug pa'i phyag rgya zhes bya ba'i mdo dang
[6] "phags pa nges pa dang ma nges pa' 'go ba' phyag rgya la 'jug pa zhes bya ba theg pa
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chën po'i mdo dang

[7] 'phags pa 'jig rten gyi rjesu 'jug pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[8] 'phags pa rdo 'phags pa'i mdo dang
[9] bso'c naams kyi stobs kyi rdo'i pa brjod pa dang
D347;F213 (dza); S253;U301.

[10] 'phag mo'i rdo'g(!) brjod pa dang
D345;F312 (shi-end); S254;U302.

[11] arya bkres tuoa zhus pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang

[12] khang bu brisgegs pa'i mdo dang
D332;F148 (parbja); S258;U306. See Bentor.

[13] gnas brtan spyan drung ba dang
Bu 895;D4199 (Tanjur only); F92 (cha-5 = last); S269;U317.

spyr mdo sa bceu gsum bzhags so

Remarks: In addition to Mahāyāna sūtras, the volume contains Śrāvakayāna texts: two Avadānas (§§ 9, 10), the Kālīgūra-sūtra (§ 12), and the Śrāvastivāranamānastra (§ 13). The last named is classed under sūtra in the Thang spangs ma and Phug brag Kanjurs, but is excluded from the Tshal pa Kanjurs, which classify it under Tanjur.

14. MDO BSDE PHA // 20.487

Énde: ye drhma ...; dge'o dge'o dgago(?); bca shis par gyur cig.

TC: sepāna Lebanon, pha / cig. "7 texts": glegs ba pha'yi nang du:

[1] 'phags pa bco gros rgya mchhos zhus pa dang
D152 (pha-1); F153 (pha/cha-1); S134;U184.

[2] 'phags pa klu'i rgyal po ma gros par zhus pa dang
D156;P823; S309; U355.

[3] 'phags pa ma gros pa'i rgyal po kus dris pa dang

[4] 'phags pa klu'i rgyal po rgya mchhos zhus pa dang

[5] 'phags pa sprin chen po dang:
D232; P898; S81; U131.

[6] 'phags pa sprin chen po'nga rlung gi dkyil 'khor kyi le'n dang:
D658; F335; S614; U683.

[7] klu thams cad kyi serying po zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo
17. MDO BSDE TSA // 20:482
Ends: no matgal, etc.

TC: separate leaf, cig gong ma, "is texts":

(ghets' bsum (! = bam tsa) pa 'dla
[1] 'phags pa klu'i rgyal po tsha ba rgya mtshos zhus pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[2] 'phags pa klu'i rgyal po 'bya bya mtshos zhus pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[3] 'phags pa tshangs pas zhus pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[4] 'phags pa tshangs pas byin gyis zhus pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[5] 'phags pa khyad par sems kyiis zhus pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[6] tshangs pa'i dra ba'i mdo dang:
[7] 'phags pa mi'i (= mi 'am?) cil'i rgyal po'i lion sio zhus pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang

[8] 'phags na la'i tha'i (!) bu rab rnal sems kyi zhus pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[9] 'phags pa rnam par 'phoval pa'i rgyal po'i zhus pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[10] 'phags pa dpal dbyig gis zhus pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang

D162: P829; S261; U809.
[11] 'phags bram ze mo dpal klan mas zhus pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[12] 'phags pa sobs pa'i 'do gros kyi zhus pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[13] 'phags pa byeck'kis zhus (or dus?) zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang

D165: P832; S308; U354.
[14] 'phags pa byarax pas zhus pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[15] kun tu gnyen sen ri'jongs kyiis zhus pa'i rdo dang
[16] 'dus pa chen po meg pa chen po'i mdo sde las il de byin gelegs pa'i dpal gyi dam tshigs ces bya ba'i mdo dang

mdo sna bcos dpal bzhugs s'ho il
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Remarques: All texts in Vol. tsa contain -paripinchā (thsas pa) in their titles except §§ 6 and 16. The Brahmatālā-sūtra (§ 6), has been placed among paripinchā texts containing Brahma (tshongs pa) in their titles (§§ 3, 4, and, in its full title, § 5). The Brahmatālā and the Dzamcho-saka-paripinchā (§ 15) belong to the Śrāvakayāna, the remaining texts to the Mahāyāna.

18. MDO BSDE TSBA, // 20/472

[1] TT: a bhi ni skra ma ma ca tr
TT: mgon par byung ba'i mdo\[a\]
[4] (138a2 fol.) IT: l las gtags pa
kon mchog guSUM la phyang 'shalo il sasig na ched du byas dang sema pa dang l 'das pa dang ni dge ba dang l dmigs pa dang 'dod pa'i khams tshigdi bcad dang las budu ba'i di skad bdag gis thos pa'i dus geig na l bcom klan 'das mthun du yod pa na eyag bi byed kyi tshal mgon med zas byin gis kun dga' ra na na brhungpo II de nas bcomdas kyi dge slong nams la bka' stsal pa : ege slong dag nga ni ched du byas shing l btags pa'i nams par smin pa nyamsu myong bar srong te l ... (ends 186a8) chos mgon par las las gtags pa bsad pa tshig bce geig pa ste l las gtags pa bsad pa guSUM par dzogs s'hoe l
[5] (186a9) IT karma bi bha ga : TT las nams par 'byed pa l
Ende: (260a) yon mchod bka shis gyur cig l tsho ring bar gyur cig l nad med par gyur cig bka shis bstan sum 'bshogs par gyur cig l
TC: separate leaf, cig, "8 texts":
\[a\] gregs ban tsha pa'i di pa l
[1] mgon par 'byung ba'i mdo dang l
[1-10b5]
[2] 'phags pc choi kyi rgyal mthun zhes bya ba thug pa chen po'i mdo dang l
[104b6--105a3] 5802?
[3] 'phags pa nga bo che chen po'i le'u zhes bya ba chen po'i mdo dang l
[105a3--138a2] 594
[4] las gtags pa zhes bya ba'i mdo dang l
[138a2--186a8: no tr. col.]
[5] las nams 'byi'ld pa'i mdo dang l

18The section of the Abhisamagranena corresponding to the Dzamcho-saka-paripinchā mahāśūtra is 72a-76a2: see Skilling, Mahāyāna, No. 28.
[186a9-; no tr. col.]
[6] ’phags pa las kyi sgrigs pa rnam par dag pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po’i mdo dang l
[203a3-] $128
[7] ’phags pa las kyi sgrigs(!) pa rgyun good pa zhes bya ba theg(!) pa chen po’i mdo dang l
[213a4-; no tr. col.] $79
[8] ’phags pa zung gi mdo’i chos kyi rnam phangs dang
[220b3; no tr. col.] $76.

bseg yead ezhags so

Remarks: Texts with the word k arma in their titles (§§ 4–7) are grouped together. The Abhinalakrama-striya (§ 1), the Karmokhtho (§ 5), and the Karmapa’gri-atopi (§ 4) belong to the Srivakayana. The last named belongs to the (Molu)sarvastavadin Abhidharma; it is included in Srtra in the Them spangs ma Kanjurs, but excluded from the Tshal pa Kanjurs, which relegate it to the Abhidharma division of the Tanjars.

19. MDO BSDE DZA # 20.483

[1] IT / aya pra san ta pa na sa tsu ya pra ta hai rya na ma sa ma dhi ma ha ya na sa tra
TT ’phags pa rab tu zhi ba rnam (2a) ting nge ’dzin ces bya ba theg pa chen po’i mdo

Note: The rest of the title has been added at the top left of 2a. It is worn and not easy to read; the superscript vowels are effaced. I transcribed gar ngsa’i cham ‘phal rgya , for par nges pa’i cho ’phral gyi?

Ends: (272a4) yon nchod bza shis par gyur cig.

TC: separate, slightly smaller leaf, cig, “16 texts”;
leg tarn ‘di’i naa l

[1] ’phags pa rab tu zhi ba rnam par nges pa’i cham(!) ’phral gyi ting nge ’dzin ces bya ba’i mdo dang l
D128; F797; S68; U116.
[2] ’phags pa de bhzin gshogs pa’i ye shes kyi phyag rgya’i ting nge ’dzin ces bya ba’i mdo dang l
[3] ’phags pa dkon mchog sprin ces bya ba’i theg pa chen po’i mdo dang l
[4] ’phags pa dkon mchog ’byung gnas zhes bya ba’i theg pa chen po’i mdo dang :
[no tr. col.]
[5] mdo chen po gzungs(!) can snying po bhrung(!) ba zhes bya ba dang l
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[2004–2200b]: see Skilling, Mahāsūtras, No. 2A.
[6] mdo chen po kun tu rgyu dang l kun tu tshul ma yin bu dang l mthun pa’i mdo dang l
[2200b–231a1; no tr. col.]: see Skilling, Mahāsūtras, No. 9.
[7] ‘phags pa rgyal ba don ‘grab kyi mdo babs po gsum pa’ dang l
[8] ‘sten cing ‘brel bar ‘byung ba dang l mnam par phyed pa’i gsum pa zhes bya ba dang l
[9] ‘lung ba sgo lnga’i mdo dang l mi dge ba’i ‘bras bu btag pa’i mdo dang l
D304; P970; S301; U347.
[10] ‘phags pa rta rdzogs cas rabs tu shi drup byed pa’i gsums dang l
[12] shes pa thams cas mthar phyin pa’i ‘bras mchod rten ces bya’i gsums dang l
[13] ‘phags sa shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa yig cig ma dang l
[14] ‘phags pa legs nyes kyi rgyud dang l ‘bras bu bstan pa zhes bya’i mdo dang l
[15] legs pa (!) rdo rje smnying pa zhes bya ba’i gsums dang l
[16] ‘phags pa’i rnam par mi stong(!) par ‘jug pa zhes bya ba’i gsums dang l
D142; P810; S170 (mdo dza-4); U220 (see Bu § 227, with note on Sūtra status).

bcu drug bshungs s’ho l

Remarks: Volume dza contains Mahāyāna and dharani texts (§§ 11, 12, 15, 16); the latter would be assigned to the Tantra division in other Kanjurs. The volume contains two Millasavatāvādīn Mahāsūtras (§§ 15, 18); the Aṣṭāṅgīya-mahāsūtra (§ 6) is classed under Tantra in Kanjurs other than the Phug brag. In the Dun dikar ma it is classed with the other Mahāsūtras under a class of that name (Lalou § VIII); in Bu rtön’s Chos byung (Nitenka § 15) it is classed under śrīnāyana sūtras.

20. MDO BSDE VA // 20.490
[1] TT lo ka brad ngya ba l:

‘tug ‘grol mchog pa l

F430 (gnau-na-2) ‘gig mten gsalas pa thams cas mchog pa la phyag ‘tshal lo l
641 ‘gig mten bshags las bcu gsum pa’o l
776 ‘gig mten bshag pa la(!) ‘shig bcu bram pa ste rdzogs s’ho l

Ends: conclusion of a matigala-gāthāl, om ye dharma; yon mchod … : beginning of a verse: gang gis lus nub chos dang la l

TC: at end, “16 texts”19
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glegs ba m 'di nang na

[1] 'jig rten brthag pa'i mdo
[2] 'phags pa theg po chen po'i man ngag dang l [776-7]
[3] 'phags pa chos kun tu' grub ba dang l
[4] da(?) brhin gshigs pa'i 'gro ba dang : [7-229a7]
S182.
[5] mdo chen po stong pa nyid dang l [229a8-238a7]: see Skilling, Mahâsâtrat, No. 4.
[6] mdo chen po lha gaum pa dang l [238a8-246a8]: see Skilling, Mahâsâtrat, No. 7.
[7] gsal rgyas (read rgyal) kyi tshigs su bcad pa dang [246a-7]
[8] mchod rten bakor bu'i tshigs su bcad pa dang :
[9] bka' shis pa brjod pa ti tshigs su brjod(!) pa dang l
[10] bka' 'shis kyi tshigs su bcad pa dang l
[11] de brhin gshigs pa'i lha gc'a'i bka' shis kyi tshigs su bcad pa dang l
[12] bde legs kyi tshigs su bcad pa dang l
[13] dkon man (?) chos(!) gsun kyi bde legs kyi tshigs su bcad pa dang l
[14] bka' shis dam pa gang gang zhib gi rten pa dang l
[15] yang bka' shis dam pa rtags dang :
[16] bde legs su tshigs su bcad pa dang l
bcu druk bthigs so l yon mchod bka' shis par gyur cig l l

Remarks: Volume va contains an Abhidharma text (§ 1), two Malasarvâstivâdin Mahâsâtrat
(§§ 5, 6), gâthâd (§§ 7, 8), and matgala gâthâd (§§ 9-16). The Lokapaññâpi (§ 1) belongs to
the (Mâla) Sarvâstivâdin Abhidharma; it is included in Śīla in the Therma spangs ma Kanjurs,
but excluded from the Tshul pa Kanjurs, which relegate it to the Abhidharma division o' the
Tanjur.

21. MDO BSĐE ZHA # 20.481
[1] pho brang 'khor skyong theg pa chen po'i mdo
Cf. Samten 1992, p. xviia; P296 (mdo ke)

Ends: ye dharma; yon mchod bka' shis par gyur cig l zhus so l dge'o dge'c'o l l
TC: separate unnumbered leaf, "21 texts":
glegs ba 'di la l

A transcription and translation of the contents by Shelton is attached to the title page.
[1] pho brang 'khor skyong theg pa chen po'i mdo dang!
[2] 'phags pa 'du ka ye shes kyi mdo theg pa chen po'i mdo!
[3] 'du shes bui bsean pa'i mdo theg pa chen pa dang (?)
[4] mi rtag pa nyid kyi mdo dang:
[5] sangs rgyas kyi sde sntod sthal khrims 'chul pa'i? tshar good pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang:
[6] sangs rgyas kyi mdo rads bshad pa'i yi ge'i te'u:
[7] 'phags pa sangs rgyas thams cad kyi yul 'jug pa ye shes snaug ba'i rgyan ces bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo(!) dang!
[8] 'phags pa sangs rgyas kyi rtag pa brjod pa shes idan kyi mdo dang:
[9] 'phags pa sangs rgyas kyi sa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang!
[10] 'phags pa sangs rgyas mi sngags ba zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang!
[11] 'phags pa sangs rgyas dban pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang:
[12] 'phags pa sangs rgyas sngag pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang!
[13] sangs rgyas bcag pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[14] 'phags pa sangs rgyas bcag-is [= bcu gryis] pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang!
[15] 'phags pa sangs rgyas rjeus dang pa dang!
[16] 'phags pa phyir mi ldog pa'i 'khor lo zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang!
[17] 'phags pa sngags su bstan ba'i 'khor lo chen po zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo' t
[18] 'phags pa mthsan mo brang mo zhes bya ba'i mdo dang!
[19] 'phags pa bsam gnyis mi khyab pa'i mdo rgyal po'i mdo zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang!
[20] snaug sngag pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang
[no tr. col.]
[21] mdo'i(?) chen po stong pa nyid dang:
See Skilling, Mahāsātras, No. 3.
[22] mdo' chen po rgyal mthsan ces bya ba stes bya ba dang
See Skilling, Mahāsātras, No. 6.

nyer nyis bzhugs sh'o II

Remarks: Volume zha contains miscellaneous Mahāyāna sutras including a group of
Buddha in their titles (§§ 5–15), along with Svāvasthāya sūtras (§§ 3,4) including two
Mahāsātras (§ 21,22). The Śāvyutā-mahāsātra (§ 21) is missing in the Them spangs ma and
Phug brag Kanjurs.
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22. MDO BSDE ZA // 20.475

[1] 'phags pa dge ba'i rtsa ba yongs su 'dzin pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo
D101; 384 (nga/za-1); S93; U143

Last: 'phags pa de brthin gshags pa'i gtags brnyan gshags pa'i phan yon yang dag par bstan
pa zhes bya ba'is chos kyi rnam grangs
D320; F127 (na); S232; U281

Ends: 'phags pa de brthin gshags pa'i gtags brnyan gshags pa'i phan yon yang dag par bstan
pa zhes bya ba'is chos kyi rnam grangs rtags s'bo ]. tr. col.: yon mchod bka' shis par gyur
cig l, dge'o; ye dharma.
TC: not available.

23. MDO BSDE 'A // 20.479

[1] 'phags pa dam po'i chos dran ba nye bar gzhag pa l (2a) sems dpa' dang i rang sangs
rgyas dang i 'phags pa'i nyan thes thams cad la phyag 'sthal lo l'di skad ...

Ends: (271a) de'i ihus su sangs rgyas so l yon mchod bka' shis par gyur cig i.
TC: available: gtags bam 'di'i nang du dran pa nye bar gzhag gi bato 'dsh.

Remarks: The table of contents, which bears no marginal volume or page number, was
found in 20.476 (Avatamsaka Aga). It is impossible to say whether it was to be placed at
the beginning or end. Since this is the first volume of the text, the second volume should have
occupied Vol. 24 (aa), which is missing. The text could only have taken up two volumes,
since Vol. 25 (aa) opens with a new text.

25. MDO BSDE RA // 20.487

[1] IT i aya su rya gartha sa na ma ma ha ba'i pu lya su'tra l
TT i shin tu rgyas pa chen po'i sde nye ma'i sgying po zhes bya ba (2a) bam po dang
po'i sangs rgyas dang i byang chub chen po'i khab na'i 'od ma'i thsal bya ka lau da ka ...

Ends: ye dharma; menstras
TC: at end (249/67).

'phags bam 'di la l

[1] 'phags pa a li tu rgyas pa chen po'i sde l nye ma'i snying po zhes bya ba'i mdo dang l
[2] 'phags pa shin tu rgyas pa chen po'i sa'i snying po 'khor lo bua na zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo dang l
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3. 'phags pa 'u(?) (250a) 'phags ma lnga brgya ces bya ba 'theg pa chen pa dng s
4. 'phags pa zhes rab kyi 'tha ral tu phyin pa lag na rdo rje zhes bya ba 'theg pa chen po'i mdo dng s
5. 'phags man pa gro 'dans las byangs ba'i yon tan bstan pa zhes bya ba dng s spyi mdo sde lnga 'thugs s'ho l

Remarks: Numbers 1 and 2 contain Mahāvaiṣṇava (shin tu rgyas pa chen po) in their titles. Number 5, a translation of a chapter of the Vimaññatāra or Vimaññamagga, belongs to the Theravadān school.28

26. MDO BSIE LA // 20.468
1) IT l pi rno mu kha a ba da na fa ta ka
Ends: continuing text (no ndongs'hö) bira shis par gyur cig; mantra.
TC: not available.

30. MDO BSIE A // 20.478
Tag: mdo bude pad dikar
2) IT l sad dharma phu da ri ka l na ma ma ha ya na sr' tra l
TT l dam pa'i chos pad ma dikar po zhes bya ba 'theg pa chen po'i mdo l
Ends: (196a) don dam pa bstan pa 'thogs s'ho l tu co l; ye dharma; yon mchog bira shis par gyur cig l I ma gha lam l bskal pa 'hurug(?) 'das sa'i dus kyi bshe l
TC: not available

III. RGYUD

30. RGYUD A // 20.485
1) IT l ka ta sa sa na ga dza la da ho to ta sarba kama v ta shi ka ma tan tra (*Kroshchac'-ngagjyul ... sarvakarma ... tantra?):
TT l khrö bo'i rgyal po klu bsng par byed pa l las (2a) thams cad kyi khrö bo 'byung po 'dus byed kyi igyud
Not in DFPSU or Bu ston
Ends: (238a?) dpal khrag 'thung chen po mngon du 'byung pa zhes bya ba : phyi ma'i phyi

me'i rgyad kyi rgyal po ste t brtags pa bgyad po rdzogs'ho l rgya gar gyi mthun po gya na ka za ka ti l bhan de'i zhal snga nas dangi dge slong bsdod rams rgyal bas bsdug cing zhus nas l gian la phab pa l drig'o yon mchod bkra shis par gyis cig l
Cp. D374 (ge-1), F439 (rdo), P21 (gso), S339 (skar-3), sgrubtsod dbang rgyal par 'byung ba. This seems to be a different translation by Advayavarja and Chings Yon tan 'bar. In the borge dkar chag the text is described in rnal 'byor ma'i sgrub kyi rgyal po.
TC: not available.

IV. 'DAS MDO KHA 20.486
Openes: 'phags pa yongs su mnya nglan las 'das pa chen po'i mdo' il bjam so bcu gcig pai
Ends: (226a) mnya nglan las 'das pa chen po'i gcig zhes bya'o il om ye dhar ma ... il om ma ni pad me bris.
Remarks: In Stog (S333) Vol. kha opens with bampu 15. In Peking (P87) bampu 11 is in the first volume (ju); the second volume (rnyi) opens with bampu 29.

V. PHAL PO CHIF

5. PHAL PO CHE NGA 20.476
Openes: sko'os tu rgyas pa chen po'i mdo' il sangs rgyas mam dag ca'i ces bya ba las 'ig len las 'das bili (sac) je tu bjam po dang po
Ends: (S151a) dge ba'o; yon mchod bkra shis par shog.

30. (!) PHAL PO CHE A 20.471
Openes: shin tu rgyas pa chen po'i mdo i sangs rgyas mdam ga ca ses ces bya ba las i sdom (2a) bu nor bzung byams pa sema ces gyi khams tshad med par t'gyas par sgrang bas sems dang ilane pai
Ends: shin tu rgyas pa chen po'i mdo' il sangs rgyas phal po che zhus bya ba la byang chub sems dpe'i sde snood kyi nang nas sdom po bgyan pa zhes bya ba'i il las la nor bzung kyi dge ba'i bshes gnyen byung khor ba'i spyod pa phabsrog gcig sti ci snyed pa rtags so il om ye dha ma he du gra bili he dun te i san tu thaba to bu va tad te safi sa yo ni lha e pam bha ti ma ba sa ma na ye sviin'i l dam chos 'di bzhing(?) bsa'o nams kyi)ils yon mchod bkyis shis

22 Stog (p. 41) adds chos kyi rnam grangs chen po.
23 Stog (p. 41) adds transliteration' chos kyi rnam grangs chen po.
VI. SHES PHYIN

[BRGYAD STONG] KA // 20.474

According to a note on the box ("no cover"), the title page—and hence the tag—is missing. The Sanskrit title is missing. The first page is ka gyur, which gives the Tibetan title equivalent to Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā: "Phags pa shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa brgyad stong pa l, followed by bam po dang po l ling rgyas dang byang chub sems dpa' dang l 'phags pa nyan theg dang l rang sangs rgyas thams cad la phyag 'thab la l. A second ka gyur opens with byang chub sems dpa' thams cad la phyag 'thab la l 'de skad bdag gis thos pa'i dus geig na l .... The last page contains continuing text only. The volume is either incomplete or carried over in another volume. In all known Kanjars the brgyad stong pa dwells in a single volume.

[BUM] // 20.484

The title page has two miniature Buddhas; it has been discussed and illustrated by Vakar Reynolds.23

Starts: shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stong phrag begya pa l glegs bam inga pa bum po dang po li dimigs (2a)

Ends: continuing text. Verse blank.

23 See The Newark Museum Tibetan Collection Ill., p. 151.
The Textual History of the *Rāstrapālaparipṛchā.*
Notes on its Third-Century Chinese Translation

Daniel BOUCHEX

This paper is but a brief prospectus of a larger, ongoing study of an early Mahāyāna sūtra, the *Rāstrapālaparipṛchā.* My interest is this text stems both from its provocative content and from the availability of an early Chinese translation that promises to tell us much about its Indian history. I will sketch some of the more interesting features of the text as well as note some of the data from the earliest Chinese translation that provide evidence for the shape of the Indian text in the late third century.

The extant materials for research on the *Rāstrapāla* are manifold. A seventeenth-century Nepalese Sanskrit manuscript, edited in 1901 by Louis Finot,¹ may now be supplemented by additional, albeit still very late, manuscripts from the German-Nepali Preservation Project. It is my intention to recedit the Sanskrit text in light of these new manuscripts as well as our better understanding today of the nature of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. The early ninth-century Tibetan translation was edited nearly fifty years ago by Jacob Emann as an appendix to his English translation of the Sanskrit,² but his edition could hardly be called critical by the standards of today’s Kanjur studies. All four of his textual representatives derive from the *Tibal pa* or Eastern recension branch. Thus, a new edition that takes advantage of the *Them spangs ma* or Western representatives would be an obvious desideratum.³ We also have at our disposal three Chinese translations. The earliest, by the third-century Vaisrī monk Dharmarakṣa, has often not been

I would like to thank Prof. Jan Nattier for her judicious comments on an earlier draft of this paper. Her suggestions, large and small, have done much to make this a better paper, and when I have failed to adopt them, I fear that I have done so at my own peril.

¹Finot 1901. For a review of Finot’s edition, see La Vallée Poussin 1903.

²Emann 1952. Reviews of Emann’s edition and translation can be found in de Jong 1953, Eugen von 1954, and Shankerental Bailey 1954. The overall conclusions of these reviewers point to the desirability of a new translation of this important work.
recognized by Western scholars as a translation of the *Rājapalita*. The stūra was retranscribed in the late sixth century by Jñānagupta and again in the late tenth century by Dipānīkha. We have then a considerable variety of witnesses to the shape of the *Rājapalita* over some fourteen centuries.

### The Indian Text

Many of the major concerns of the *Rājapalita* show it to be closely allied with a significant strand of early Mahāyāna literature, namely, the sharp criticism of sedentary monasticism and the elevation of ascetically-inclined forest dwellers. This strand has been encapsulated perhaps most clearly and succinctly in a recent article by Paul Harrison:

> Far from being the products of an urban, lay, devotional movement, many Mahāyāna stūras give evidence of a hard-core ascetic attempt to return to the original inspiration of Buddhism, the search for Buddhahood or awakened cognition... they also display a strong and positive emphasis on the dhātu-pānas (extra ascetic practices) and anuṣaya-nātha (dwelling in the forest or jungle), which is surely rather strange in the documents of a supposedly lay-dominated movement (Harrison 1995, 65).

---

1. Work on the occasional history of Kannār texts has made rapid advances recently, due notably to the work of scholars such as Helmut Eimer and Paul Harrison, among others. For an overview of the significance of this work, see Eimer 1992; Harrison 1992a and 1992b.

2. *Dharmapalī ngā bing* (T. 170, 4.412-418). Most of the studies in the West, including Eriksen’s translation, have not been cognizant of this early translation. In Japan, T. 170 has been recognized as a translation of the *Rājapalita* at least since its 1938. De Jong also drew attention to the importance of this early translation in his 1953 review of Eriksen independently of him, whose work he had not seen (cf. de Jong 1967, 3, n. 3).


5. More precisely, this is a critique which permeates the entire history of Indian Buddhism, being co-opted in particular ways by some compilers of Mahāyāna stūras. In an interesting though not unproblematic monograph on this theme, Reginald Ray notes: “These *Mahāyāna* forest texts do not present their kind of Buddhism as anything new. Instead, they see it as simply a continuation of the normative forest ideal established by the Buddha in the beginning, which they understand to be his highest teaching. For them, this is the original Buddhist Buddhism, and they understand it as nothing other than original Buddhism in its most quintessential form” (Ray 1994, 407). This point has also been made by Jonathan Silk in his recent study of another Mahāvamsa text, the *Rumati* (Silk 1994). For example, in Chapter Three of his study (65-96), Silk discusses numerous passages from the *Rumati* and related texts that voice the practice of the disappatikas, and here particularly, the wearing of the ceñna rūpe, to be emblematic of the serious renunciation.

94
Be that as it may, few early Mahāyāna sūtras rail quite like the Rājappātā. The author and/or compiler of this text repeatedly characterizes his contemporaries as given to arrogance, envy, conceit, and pride. Such monks constantly engage in backbiting of their fellow recusals while shamelessly soliciting wealthy patrons in towns and villages. Indeed, our author tells us:

A householder is not as covetous with passions as these [corrupt monks] are after going forth. They would have wives, sons, daughters just like a householder.

At which house they are favored with robes, alms, and requisites, they are desirous of the [householder's] wife, for these ignoble ones are always under the power of defilements.  

What makes such behavior by these monks all the more reprehensible, he continues, is their hypocrisy:

They always say to householders: “These passions are not to be followed; they will cause you to fall into the realm of animals, of the pretas, or to the hells.”
And yet, they themselves are undisciplined and without composure.

Such corrupt monks are said to regularly fawn after the lāyikis, exacting alms and seeking prestige through trickery and boasting. Even within the monastery these monks are said to be no less self-serving. Forsaking meditation and study, they busy themselves with monastery affairs. They reserve dwellings and materials for their companions, meanwhile turning away virtuous monks. And perhaps most damning, they make no engagement in the property belonging to the sangha, to the Buddha (i.e., the stupa), or to individuals.

If our author’s description of his fellow monks seems harsh, he is no less reticent in having the Buddha predict the ultimate consequences of their behavior.

---

1 Patna 29.11-14: gṛhīti gṛhi na sākā>Vācān yāhīn sāvah pravrijam tam gṛhīti | bhūtajīvāḥ naḥ dharmān ca tān bhūtvā pṛthivimnukaḥ // yatrāne vaktvā tāne tā naṃgṛhitajīvāḥ bhūtvā bhūtvā mṛgayat gṛhīti

2 Patna 29.15-16: kṣaṇa mo bhūtvā na svayam pravāha tīryaḥ prajñāpāparntuḥ // vaktvātur ca sākā gṛhitam te ca sāvah adhama anupāda bhūtvā //

3 Patna 31.1-2: bhavat gṛhitajīvāh bhūtvā naḥ bhūtvā dharmān pravāha // mṛdayaḥ pituvah parpitum // (Having given up meditation and study, they are always engaged in the affairs of the monastery. A variety of dwellings, scowling [at others], they are surrounded by undisciplined pupils.)
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This teaching of mine, a treasure of virtue, the source of all good qualities, that which is most delightful, will now pass away to destruction on account of the failure of morality and the sins of envy and pride.  

Such a destruction of the dharma occurs during the dreadful final period. And these undisciplined monks will cause the ruin of this teaching of mine.  

One can see in those few citations, which could be easily multiplied, that the tone throughout is severe and ascetic. But I should note here also that this virulently is not specifically directed at Arjuna-śāṅkara. This is not, in other words, a Mahāyāna critique of the so-called “Lesser Vehicle.” The author is clear that these very pitfalls also await the bodhisattva who lets his guard down, is slothful, or who remains uncommitted to enlightenment. Instead, these criticisms are directed at monks of all stripes, perceived to be all too complacent in the comforts of monastic life.  

We must agree, I think, with Finot in seeing these charges—all too graphic and precise—as reflecting real conditions known to and, in all probability, affecting the author or subsequent editor(s) of the text. As we learn more about the social and economic life of Indian monasteries, due in no small measure to the recent studies an
the Mālaṃvintivibhāṣa-sūtra
d by Gregory Schopen, our author’s complaints become a little easier to understand. If what Schopen has termed the Middle Period of Indian Buddhism, roughly the first half of the first millennium, can be characterized by a highly organized, sedentary monasticism with a complex administration governed by an equally complex legal system, and if the monks living in these monasteries were bound in a tangled web of relationships to lay donors and their fellow monks, relationships that required the constant negotiation of property rights and ritual obligations, then the strident objections of the Rāmapala are not only understandable, but almost predictable. 17
The Rāmapala, and other Mahāyāna sūtras participating in this “renunciants” genre, may well reflect minority voices crying out for the good old days, a time when life was simpler if more rigorous, when public expectations of monks were few.

In such a context, we might expect that the strident criticisms of the Rāmapala would not have been well received by many of the author’s contemporaries. Indeed, in what is a striking interpolation within a Mahāyāna sūtra, the editor of the extant Sanskrit text loses sight of the fact that his teacher—and his teacher’s teacher—called the very authenticity of the Rāmapala into question:

My teacher was an ocean of knowledge, very learned, the best of exponents [of the dharma]. And yet this [sūtra] was forbidden by him, for he said it was by no means the word of the Buddha.

Moreover, he also had an aged teacher, possessed of an unlimited abundance of virtues, and this [sūtra] was also not accepted by him. "Do not apply yourself to it; it is false." 18

Mahāyāna sūtras compilers regularly allude to the fact that their contemporaries refused to accept such texts as buddhavacana, often ridiculing those who circulated them. 19 But this passage above from the Rāmapala is extraordinary in that it demonstrates that a later

17Cf. Schopen 1995a, 477: "Unless we know what led, institutional monastic Buddhism had become when Mahāyāna sūtras were being written, it is difficult to understand the attacks on "abuses" associated with sedentary monasticism found most stridently in Mahāyāna texts like the Rāmapalapariprapcha, it is also difficult to understand similar, if less severe, criticisms in Mahāyana texts like the Kālacakraparivarta, or the constant calls in such texts to return to a life in the forest, or why long sections of the Sūtradhāraṇī-sūtra are given over to extending ascetic practices, and why the incoherence and value of these same practices is a topic of deep debate in the Abhidharmakosa-paddhatī-sūtra.

18Final 28.7-10: | dārśā na se prānapātā kāthikāryamānaḥ | | | | se prajñā ca pramādayo bhāṣyate tatra kathavāsā // | param ātyohātyās ca vyahṛtā saṃśaya parah ca amala-prajñāh // | tathā nāma hi ghatitā jñātā praṇipatitā vistāram stut // | On the reading amala-prajñāh (MS: śraddha-), see: Shadbolt Bailey 1954, 8; Tibetan reads dpag med phyin ma.
editor or compiler, already circulating some primitive version of the Rājatapāla, had difficulties convincing his personal teacher of its validity. In this regard it seems difficult to assume, as some have tried, that exponents of Mahāyāna strata—those who authored the texts as well as those who circulated or recited them—lived in entirely separate dwellings from their mainstream (i.e., śrāvakāśrama) conferees. Indeed, this passage confirms what has by now become a consensus among Western scholars: monasteries in classical India—and here we mean roughly Schopen's Middle Period (ca. 0-500 CE)—were multiracial places, housing individuals of different persuasions and spiritual orientations.20

Needless to say, such cohabitation was not always harmonious.

Even assuming some exaggeration on the part of the author or editor of the Rājatapāla, it is clear that Buddhist monasteries in his day had become animate parts of the religion, social, and economic lives of many Indian towns and villages. Dating these criticisms then from the Rājatapāla—and by extension the circumstances to which they respond—would be of some value for the history of Indian religions generally and for Buddhist monasticism, not to mention Mahāyāna literature, specifically. Here we are dependent upon the Chinese translations for fixing more precise dates to developments within the text. And we are particularly fortunate in this case to have an early translation by the Chinese translator-monk Dhamarakṣa.

Dhamarakṣa's Third-Century Chinese Translation

Dhamarakṣa was born at Dauhoun, where his family had been settled for

20 Cf. Fisht 28.3.6: abhi bhavayati ima pravrajā kaśvan mitra mā ca tadānām | abhisamānjanaṃpadā tva mitraigukadadvaitāh kathāvadāntāḥ // dharmavedakṣa mā ca ahāryaḥ saṁyaktāḥ śraddhāvādāḥ | sarvāt sa dharmam ma litram naiva jñātāḥ svam abhidhānani // (There will be arguments when these contemptuous groups—concerned with nothing but food and sex and always overcome by sloth—begin this teaching at that time. These ignoble ones, who are hostile to the Dharma, who offer against the teaching, and who are devoid of good qualities, declare that it is not spoken by the Victorious One when they hear this teaching [Dharma]). For the last compound of the first verse, Fisht reads saravādāntvā (they possessed of hundreds of doctrines), though in a note he indicates that the MS reads adhvaśāntvā. The Tibetan confirms the above reading: kha nae pad yin rgyan 'jogir (lit. "docile like a cow").

21 The scholar who is perhaps most relevant to consistently arguing for the institutional independence of these first (identifying themselves as bodhisattvas in Akka Hirakawa; see Hirakawa 1957; 1963; 1989-90, esp. 108 ff.; 1990. 270-74). Hirakawa's opinion is, of course, directly connected to his view that the first Mahāyāna adherents were located among groups of lay followers, particularly those who congregated in the vicinity of Buddhist stupas. For a critique of Hirakawa's views on this question, see Schopen 1979; Silk 1994, esp. J-31; Saakaki 1995; 1997; Jan Nattier has a forthcoming study and translation of the Ugoyapajāryanāṃsāhāra which will also discuss Hirakawa's theories in detail. Vs. 6-11 has text. For alternative opinions, especially those recogizing that monks of different persuasions inhabited in the same monasteries, see Buehler 1973; Hartnack 1995; Mittal 1996.
generations, and studied there under an Indian teacher during the second quarter of the third century. He was the most prolific of the early translators, rendering over 180 texts into Chinese over a forty year career. His translation of the Kāratapāla, dated to the year 270, stands out as one of the earliest of his works as well as one of the few for which there is an extant Sanskrit version. I would like to suggest here two ways in which Dharmarakṣa’s translation may provide important clues about an earlier state of the Indic text.

Composition and Structure

First, the composition of Dharmarakṣa’s translation differ significantly from our Sanskrit manuscripts, Tibetan translation, and later Chinese translations. There are numerous passages and whole sections which have no parallel in his third-century translation. These missing sections can be charted in outline as follows (numbers refer to page and line of Finot’s edition):

Chapter 1:
I. 1.7-4.19 (verses eulogizing the Buddha)
II. 5.7-8.6 (Kāratapāla’s verses in praise of the Buddha)
III. 10.10-11.2; 11.6-17; 12.4-15; 13.4-15; 14.2-12; 15.1-8; 17.7-17; 18.6-16; 19.4-15; 20.1-10; 20.16-21.8 (verses recapitulating the various sets of the four kinds of dharmas)
IV. 21.9-27.18 (allusions to 50 jihadas)
V. 28.1-33.3 (reproaches of corrupt bhikṣus)

Chapter 2:
VI. 37.13-39.7 (verses by Siddhāvatākṣāyiḥ gods to Punyarami)
VII. 50.7-53.18 (verses by Punyarami eulogizing the Buddha Siddhāśrayabuddhī)
VIII. 54.12-56.2 (verses by King Arcismat eulogizing Siddhāśrayabuddhī)

Missing parts of Chapter One include stanzas eulogizing buddhas, verses recapitulating prose descriptions of the virtues and pathśalas of the bodhisattva career, a large set of verses detailing the Buddha’s heroic efforts as a bodhisattva during fifty of his former

\footnote{For a fuller account of Dharmarakṣa’s life and translation career, see Zürcher 1959, 65-70; Taskanoto/Hoppe 1985, 193-230; Bousher 1996, 22-43.}
lives, and a section containing the most strident reproaches of monastic corruption. Missing from Chapter Two are three sets of verse recapitulations of interactions between the bodhisattva Puyāraśī and the Buddha Siddhārthaṃbuddha. In all, approximately 50% of our extant Sanskrit recension is not represented in our earliest Chinese translation. Most noticeably omitted are some 248 of 153 verses, reminding us that the often assumed historical priority of metrical sections in Mahāyāna sūtras may need to be qualified. Many of the strongest criticisms of the Sanskrit text—insultive aimed at arrogant and greedy monks—who usher in the imminent destruction of the dharma—are missing, giving Dharmarakṣa's version of the Rāṣṭrapalī a decidedly less caustic tone.

Given our current state of knowledge about the earliest period of Mahāyāna sūtra literature, it may still be premature to assume that Dharmarakṣa's translation represents a kind of Ur text to which recensions were subsequently added. But with Jñānapātra's Chinese translation of the late sixth century, the Rāṣṭrapalī appears to undergo fewer changes by the time of its ninth-century Tibetan translation, its tenth-century Chinese translation by Dānapāla, and its much later Nepāleśe Sanskrit manuscripts. The crucial period then for understanding significant developments in the history of the text can be placed roughly between 270 and 550 C.E., corresponding approximately to the Indian Gupta period. We should expect then that further research will enable us to corroborate some of these developments with changes in Gupta-period Buddhism.

Dharmarakṣa's Source Text

Secondly, Dharmarakṣa's translation may also inform us about the language of his

---


30Cf. his long 1977 with regard to the textual history of the Kāvyasamāptavatā: "The Kāvyasamāptavatā, in which the verse parts are later than the prose parts, offers an interesting example of a text in which the verses, written in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, are definitely later than the prose parts, the language of which is much closer to standard Sanskrit" (255).

31This is true to say, however, that there are no significant differences between the versions post-dating Dharmarakṣa's translation. A detailed account of these differences will be provided in my future study and translation.

32Gregory Schopen has led the way toward appreciating the important developments of this typically underappreciated period of Indian Buddhism. His work, particularly on the Mahāsthāndevadāna-sūtra, has attempted to demonstrate, successfully in my opinion, that much of what we today think of as classical Indian Buddhist monasticism developed only in this Middle Period (ca. 0-500 CE), and not, as commonly asserted, in the generations immediately following the death of the Buddha. See, for example, Schopen 1994; 1995b; 1996.
underlying Indic manuscript. Most valuable in this regard is the evidence for misreadings of his Indic text that suggest confusions in the Chinese rendering which cannot be described as free or loose interpretations of an Indic location. That is to say, these are instances where Dharmarākṣa's translation departs from our extant Sanskrit and Tibetan versions in ways that are neither predictable nor in most cases even sensible. Because of the multiple problems involved in discerning the relationship between the extant Chinese translations and their underlying Indic source texts, I will focus here only on a few examples that appear to reflect graphically-induced misreadings of an Indic text, misreadings which allow us to discern the underlying script of Dharmarākṣa's source text.

The first example is drawn from the middle of the first chapter in a set of verses recapitulating the ways in which a bodhisattva may purify his course toward enlightenment:

Fnos 16.15–16: pratipada|| gritty ca bodhisattva as tu pratibhāpyate dānaśya ca / dhārani/pratilabhām evamāt eva uṣṇa ca dukkhanirūgam gamabhibhāt. || 
(As he sets out on the path to enlightenment, he always purifies his intentions. Seeking the obtainment of dhārānī's, one who desires good qualities endures hundreds of afflictions.)

Db 413a,5–6: 巧貨便如世意 常為清淨無疑離 
續持無一其心 忍一切苦不疲勞

(if he obtains the aspiration for enlightenment, he will always be pure, without doubts or difficulties. With dhārānī's and eloquence he purifies his mind and endures all miseries without thinking of recompense.)

As one notices immediately, there are a number of problems in Dharmarākṣa's rendering here, not all of which are easily explainable. The phrase I would like to call to attention here is in pāda c, dhārānī/pratilabhām evamāt, "seeking the obtainment of dhārānī's," rendered by Dharmarākṣa as "with dhārānī and eloquence he purifies his mind." First, it would appear that Dharmarākṣa's Indic manuscript read -pratilabhām, "eloquence," or as Graeme MacQueen terms it, "inspired speech," instead of pratilabhām.12 Dharmarākṣa's reading, moreover, is confirmed by the Tibetan and Jñānagupta's translation.13 More problematic, however, is Dharmarākṣa's misconstrual of evamāt, a present middle

---

12MS reads pratisvadān: Faxian (1952, 17, n. 89) reads pratipada, largely on the basis of the Tibetan translation (sog hgyur).

13On the term pratilabhām in Mahāyāna sūtra literature, see MacQueen 1981 and 1982.
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particle, as seemingly eka-manaa, "of one mind, concentrated." Certainly these two words are not semantically confusable, but if we assume Dharmaraksa to have been reading a kharosthi manuscript, then it is not impossible that he could have come across some later forms of the akṣara 跛 with those of sa 跛. This would have been especially likely if his kṣa resembled the later form found on such inscriptions as the Wardak Vase and in some of the recently discovered kharosthi manuscripts held in British Library.  " Such a misreading, to say the least, wreaks havoc with the teaching translation.

A second example is drawn from early in the second chapter, where the faults of those who claim to follow the bodhisattva career are enumerated at length. The Buddha contrasts these shortcomings with his own exaction and heroic sacrifices during former lives. To illustrate his former commitment to the dharma, the Buddha declares:

Finot 36.11: mahāprāptānām y-avalam bhaktānām mahāprāptatāḥ pūtīna 'ma pūrve / pratad ca sarmin pārmanīyey abhis vishāya sarvātā prājaśeyey //
(Formerly I fell into a great abyss that was abhine and on fire for the sake of the well-spoken [doctrine]. After listening to it and relinquishing all that is dear and disliked, I was established in good conduct.)

Dk 414a.4: 有大光明無能見 我本求索善義說 通義所教即奉行 斷絕一切諸妄欲 (There was a great illumination which was unable to be seen [sic]; I formerly sought the superb and righteous doctrine. Just as I heard the teaching, so I put it into practice, cutting off all desires.)

Clearly Dharmaraksa did not see the first pāda as the object of the verb paṭtiṃ 'saw (I fell). This may have contributed to his misreading bhaktānām, literally "oblation-exenter," thus "fire," as utarntāk pāṇa 無能見 (unable to be seen). If Dharmaraksa was unfamiliar with this Indian metaphor, it is not inconceivable that he could have read the initial kṣa in a kharosthi manuscript as 跛, which, with normal Prakrit voicing of the intervocalic dental, would have led him to recite the text as a-dāyājānām (invisible).

20The Theravāda greatly distracts paṭṭāya paṭṭāya na (Duayanik 1952, 73.19) and Sāntānagga (1805.18, 12.460.3) reads 當陀羅尼及體力 ("teaching dhāranī and eloquence").

21For the Wardak Vase inscription, see Bosworth 1999, 165-70 and esp. pl. XXXIII (e.g., line 1, Kamaglyiputra) and line 3, avādājānām. Some of the British Library manuscripts use, albeit only intermittently, the later form of sa with a stroke curving from top to lower right; see Salomon 1999, 116-17 and Salomon 2000, 63.
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In a final example, also from the beginning of Chapter Two, the Buddha elucidates the karmic consequences that insolent, conceited monks can expect:

Footnote 35.19-20: *apāyaśhāhām gatim ākṣoṣṣaṇo duvaratam niśkṣepapapato / jāyantu saunākṣhobhāyaḥ*  "The insatiable, conceited monks will fall into an evil state, a destiny among inopportune rebirths, poverty, and rebirth in a lowly family; they will be blind from birth and weak, having little strength."

Dh 413c.21-22:  "不見過往種種行 生於貧窮供養家
在難忍中無能為力 僅餘貧乏惡緣障
(Not seeing the stage of enlightenment, they follow corrupt practices and are born in a poor and lowly family, into an ugly state, without strength. They fall on account of their conceit to the level of stupidity.)

Once again there are several syntactical problems that make Dharmakasita’s rendering difficult to understand. For our purposes, I will only note the possibility that the initial *apāya*—may have been read as *apāya* or “not seeing,” given the very close graphic similarity between late forms of the *kharṣṭa* ya ṭa and sa ṭa. These *ākṣara* in fact are often nearly indistinguishable in records dating from the beginning of the Common Era.⁹ There are other examples elsewhere in this text as well as in other translations by Dharmakasita that exhibit this same confusion between ya and sa.¹¹

These examples are by no means unambiguous, but they do demonstrate that Dharmakasita had great difficulties in reading its Indic manuscript of the *Keturopadi*. We are not dealing here in most cases with true textual variants, although obviously Dharmakasita’s text looked quite different than the Sanskrit version that has come down to us. In fact, passages like those cited above strongly suggest that a number of the

⁹This confusion assumes that the *sa* in Dharmakasita’s manuscript had been damaged or that the vowel *a* and *a* at the base of the *ākṣara* were indistinct. There may be an analogy for this in the recently cited Gāndhāra *Kharovacīra-sūtra* in which one instance of a *sa ākṣara* closely approximates the form of the unmarked vowel a, see Solomon 2009, 70.

¹⁰Here the Tibetan reads byang gnyen ya (dharmakāra), confirming Dharmakasita’s and chos klong in 难忍中, “into an ugly conditions.” Mingyur’s (p. 38) "(of bad appearance)" would also seem to support this reading.

¹¹On the close graphic similarity of these two *ākṣaras* in *kharṣṭa* records from the first century C.E., see Keon 1929, 182 ff; Rayson and Noble 1929, 388; Faivre 1989, 465; Salomon 1994a, 35; and Salomon 1999, 116-17.
transliteration inaccuracies within Dharmasakas's translation of the *Rājāpala* can best be explained as misreadings of a *khaṇḍhika* manuscript.

This assumption, however, requires some immediate caveats. First, evidence for an underlying *khaṇḍhika* manuscript is necessarily evidence for an Indic text in Gandhāri Prakrit, which has been presumed by some scholars. It is entirely possible, as I have suggested elsewhere, that a Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit manuscript could have been transmitted in *khaṇḍhika* script, as evidenced by Nya documents 530, 511, and 523 as well as by fragments brought to light more recently from the Pelliot and Schwyzer collections. Given the absence of Mahāyāna texts in the recently acquired British Library *khaṇḍhika* manuscripts, our most significant find of Gandhāri Buddhist literature in a century, it is likely that a careful use of the early Chinese translations will go a long way toward filling out our knowledge of Buddhist literature originating from—or at least transmitted through—northwest India and eastern Afghanistan.

The Translation Process

Additionally, we must never lose sight of the problems afflicting the production of these texts in China, particularly during the translation process itself. We know from

3For a detailed discussion of one such example from Dharmasakas's translation of the *Saddharmapुrabadhavamsāsūtra* see Bouscher 1998, 499-500 and Bouscher 2000, 12-14. There are two other examples of possible misinterpretations of *khaṇḍhika* prakrit in the *Rājāpala*, though both are somewhat more ambiguous. The first occurs at Prat 14:14-15, *pratiprastāraṇavadharmaketa* (see Dharmasakas's apocryphal *vadāna*), where a shift from the ancient *pratiprastāraṇa* (taking pleasure in both body and soul) to the modern *vaddhārujanā* (taking pleasure in the doctrine here only for profit). Dharmasakas renders this as follows (4.41[9]:9-10): 感受妙法心遠不遂彼 (happy to receive scriptures, his thoughts are not attached to wealth or benefit). Obviously something is actually amiss here. Dharmasakas's text seems to have confused *pratiprastāraṇa* with *prajñā* (P. *pramāṇa*) and his *vaddhārujana* (mishandlings, deceits, etc.) may have been the result of a mistaken reading (for *vaddhārujana*) which itself appears in the Gandhāri *Buddhismādītana* (for Bouscher 1962, p. 94, 70, 77, 123, and 236). Another, also ambiguous example can be found at Prat 34:11, *ālakhāyaṃ mukto vāpyaṇyakṣaṇo* (they will take pleasure in the doctrine here only for profit). Dharmasakas reads (4.13b:16-17): 其所行無不勝於此 (wherever they are, they will not be a cause). If we support that Dharmasakas mistranslated the *mukto* as *ālakhāyaṃ* as (with long vowels typically unmarked in *khaṇḍhika* script), then it is possible that he understood this clause as *ālakhāyaṃ vāpyaṇyakṣaṇo*... Such a miscalculation—and that is all this can be—also accounts for Dharmasakas’s unexpected negative reaction (for 57), which is not representative of the extant Sanskrit or Tibetan. Neither of these two examples are without problems.

4For an edition of Nya 510, see Boyer et al. 1927, 184-45 and also Hansulek 1997; for Nya 511, see Boyer et al. 1927, 165-87 and Hansulek 1996; on Nya 523, see Boyer et al. 1927, 191 and Boyer et al. 1918. I have argued elsewhere for the possibility of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit texts transmitted in *khaṇḍhika* script see Bouscher 1998, esp. 498-303. For examples of *khaṇḍhika* manuscript fragments from the Pelliot collection written in Sanskrit, see Salomon 1990c. Mark Allen and Richard Salomon have more recently touted on a partially Sanskritized Gandhāri version of the *Mahāparāvīrtisaṃvada* preserved in the Schwyzer collection; see Allen and Salomon 2000. 104
numerous colophons and indigenous bibliographies that Buddhist translations in China were carried out orally and by committee, often by individuals of very questionable expertise, to put it charitably. Although no colophon to Dharmaraksita’s translation of the *Rajāpala* appears to be preserved in our extant records, we do have a record of the translation procedures for a text within Dharmaraksita’s corpus, the *Suvarṇarānasindhinv detachāpariprasthāna*. This text was completed approximately three and a half years prior to his translation of the *Rajāpala*. The intrinsic interest of this colophon and the possible light it may shed on the only slightly later translation of the *Rajāpala* merit its citation in full.

Xuanchen tamsu jing [Suvarṇarānasindhinv detachāpariprasthāna]. On the eighth day of the eleventh month of the second year of the Taishō period [= December 21, 266], in the White Horse Monastery (haima sūraśāna) inside the Aṣṭacak Gaya in Chang’an, the Indian bodhisattva Dharmaraksita (tāmpadaćha 唐摩遮那) orally conferred and issued it (kou shou chu zhi 得授出之). At that time the one who transferred the words (chāmunyarde 順言者) were Bh Weihui 弇唯慧 and Bo Yuxin 步玄心. The ones who took it down in writing were Nie Chengyan, Zhang Xuanbo, and Sun Xindu. It was completed on the thirtieth day of the twelfth month [= February 11, 267] during the second watch of the afternoon.


We have only a brief record within Sengzhao’s list of Dharmaraksita’s translations noting the title and translation date of the *Rajāpala* and the *Chu sanming yu li (Outline Memories of the Translation of the Chinese Yana, henceforth CEYI) (T.2145) 55%]. The date for the completion of the translation is recorded as the sixth year of the Taishō reign period, sixth month, thirtieth day (October 31, 710).

The text reads taikō 大處 here for taikū 奉處 a mpa period encompassing the years 265-274 CE.

Yokawa 1938, 611 assumes that this is a mistranslation, having conflated some monastery in Chang’an with the famous Monastery of Longyang. I have difficulty, however, in finding anything approaching an explanation in his remarks. I see no reason why a monastery in Chang’an could not have been named after the famous translation center of Han Buddhism, especially if it too served as a regular site for Dharmaraksita’s translation work.

This is the only colophon to my knowledge that identifies Dharmaraksita as an Indian. All other sources regard him as Younlu. We might expect the fact of his Indian origin to have led to such a confusion, but his Indian monastic name is here transcribed without the use of the suffix.

It is difficult to know exactly how to take chu here. For a more detailed discussion of the significance of chu in these colophons, see Boucher 1996, 89-94 and Boucher 1998, 487, n. 73.

The text reads here shou chu 手受, but this almost certainly must be a mistake for shou ruo 聞受 which occurs throughout Dharmaraksita’s colophons to designate those who wrote down the oral translation.
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There are several points with regard to this colophon that deserve to be highlighted. First, Dharmaraka is described as “orally conferring and issuing” the Indian text. The record does not tell us whether he held an actual manuscript in his hands or recited the text from memory. What the colophon does emphasize, however, is that Dharmaraka is the principal translator precisely because he is able to recite the text from its Indic script—to draw it out of its foreign guise and into a form that can be transformed into literary Chinese. It does not—and this is an important point here—tell us that Dharmaraka translated the text himself, at least not in the sense we speak of “translation” today. In fact, the colophon is explicit in naming two collaborators, the Partian An Wenhu and the Kucha an Bo Yuanxin, as those who “transferred the words.” That is to say, it seems almost certain that it is they who listened to Dharmaraka’s recitation of the Indic text and converted their understanding of his recitation into vernacular Chinese, presumably while conferring with Dharmaraka concerning the precise meaning of certain words and phrases. These are the individuals, then, who we would normally take to be the real translators. Finally, the colophon tells us that these individuals, all presumably native Chinese, shared in the task of “taking down with the brush” the oral rendering of the bilingual intermediary. This must have involved some kind of conversion of the oral draft translation of the Partian and Kuchean assistant into the semi-literary text that has come down to us. It may also be the case that these scribes would have contributed in important ways to the substance of the translation, both in their own limited apprehensions of Dharmaraka’s recitation of the Indic text as well as by

“...in a separate notice to Songjun’s list of Dharmaraka’s translation corpus [CSZU 55(6):9-11], An Wenhu and Bo Yuanxin are described as “receiving [the text] with the brush” (bihou 彼受), not as those “who transfer the words”; no mention is made of the three scribes of this colophon. Given the apparent incompleteness of this separate notice in comparison to the colophon translated here, it seems preferable to accept the wording of the colophon.”

“Colophons to other translations, for example to those of the Sūtra of the Great Power of the Brahma World and its translated versions, state explicitly that Dharmaraka held an Indic text in his hands and conferred a recitation of it upon a scribal assistant. For a translation of these colophons see Boucher 1996, 65-88. Though it can not be proven in the case of the Sūtra of the Great Power of the Brahma World, I presume that here too Dharmaraka worked from an actual Indic manuscript.”

“The Kuchean layman Bo Yuanxin would continue to be an active participant on Dharmaraka’s translation committees. He is named, for instance, as one of the collators of the finished translation of the Sūtra of the Great Power of the Brahma World; on this colophon, see Boucher 1998, 485-89.”
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interpolating native Chinese understandings of Buddhist technical terms.\textsuperscript{37}

Given that the Sanskrit vaivarttanarasapproparipraca-nitva was translated very close in time to the Ratnapala, we have good reason to believe that the circumstances of translation would not have been dissimilar. If that is so, then we may be in better position to understand the source of some of the translation confusions we encountered above in the final product of these committees. We can assert with considerable confidence, for instance, that the confusions between abhayas with close graphic similarity in the khaṇḍapāñcā śāstra can only be due to misreadings by Dharmaraka, who, we have reason to believe, we-ald have been principally responsible for the revising of the Indian manuscript and its recitation to the bhāṅgāḷī intermediaries who collaborated with him. That such mistakes remained in the finished work— as they did in subsequent translations for years to come— suggests that no member of the translation team was in a position to check both the Indian text and the literary rendering of the Chinese scribes. In fact, colophons to other translations appear to indicate that Dharmaraka’s skills in Chinese would remain questionable for many years to come, necessitating his reliance on translation assistants from India, Central Asia, and China.\textsuperscript{44}

There is also evidence that some of the translation anomalies could have resulted from mishearings of Dharmaraka’s recitation of the Indic text by his collaborators. Consider the following verse, the first in Dharmaraka’s translation:

Finot 8.14-15: \textit{budhipratyutthāna niseriṇā tatvam aṣṭaṃ maniṃ ye ’ya sambhavah / \pada\ padeśagataḥ vinayasyam bhāṅgāḷī māna jña nanuṣṭhāna //

(May the Victorious One, the Most Excellent of Men, relate to me a dissertation, a narrative containing an ocean of knowledge, on the well-determined bodhisattva career which has its origin in truth.)

\textsuperscript{37}The fact that the Chinese translations are usually always attributed to one, usually foreign, translator, in our case Dharmaraka, and not to members of his committee has more to do with concerns for legitimation and orthodoxy in China than with historical accuracy. Antonio Forte has aptly observed: “The assignment of the responsibility for a translation was an extremely important matter in its purpose was to rescue the Buddhist establishment and the government of the full authenticity and orthodoxy of a work. This need to make one person responsible often meant that the actual contribution of other members of the team tended to be unacknowledged. The paradox thus often arose of the accursed translator, usually a foreigner, being unable to speak or write Chinese, while the actual translation received so little attention that, but for the colophons at the end of number of translations, we would often not have even known their names” (Forte 1984, 316).

\textsuperscript{44}For examples of both kinds of scribal intrusions, including some from the Sudākṣeravīraṇarasapproparipraca-nitva, see Boucher 1996, esp. 489 and 497-98.

\textsuperscript{45}On the development of Dharmaraka’s linguistic skills as evidenced by our extant colophons and prefaces to his translations, see Boucher 1996, esp. 88-102.
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Obviously, Dharmaraka’s translation of this verse departs in manifold ways from our conant Sanskrit text. The single term I would like to highlight here, however, is Dharmaraka’s rendering of अधिनाय (adhinaya) as ज्ञेय (jneya). The 21st century translation scenarios are possible. First, if Dharmaraka’s Indic manuscript was indeed written in kharoshthi script as seems likely, then we might expect that this same manuscript would have been transcribed—although not necessarily composed—in a Gandhāra Prakrit-using environment. Under such circumstances, Dharmaraka’s Indic text could have had तपाय in place of अधिनाय, reflecting the weakening of the distinction between aspired and unaspirated intervocalic consonants in Gandhāra Prakrit, not to mention the general loss of marked long vowels. The word तपाय is well attested in the Bhārata, in an equivalent for सागर, and we know from elsewhere in the translation of the श्रीमद्भागिनी that Dharmaraka’s team used ज्ञेय to render समबधव, समाख्या (completed, accomplishmen). It is also possible that the Indic manuscript had, in fact, our attended अधिनाय, but that the translation assistants miscalculated Dharmaraka’s recitation of the word as the Gandhāri -sagha (सगम्य) and conveyed such an understanding to the Chinese scribes. This would have been especially understandable if these translation assistants had encountered the word सगम्य/sagha in other contexts with the meaning of सागर. At the very least we can appreciate the difficulties encountered by these early translators as they attempted to decipher texts reflecting an already mixed linguistic heritage, in all probability composited, transcribed, and translated across multiple regions using different hybrids of Middle Indo-Aryan and Sanskrit languages. If we have seen ways in which oral/aural confusions could have crept into the

40The loss of this distinction between aspired and unaspirated consonants, especially common in the cases of गीत and तपाय, may have been seen to the influence of Iranian speakers neighboring Gandhāri-using regions, for example, the 190s and 191s. We have no way to determine, however, the degree to which non-native readers of Gandhāri texts would have been aware of these orthographic habits.

41See through 1902, vv. 10, 106, 107, 163, and 105; for the form तपाय, see v. 30.

42V. 4.14: 慈離具足應對意識 (corresponding to 44.13: विश्वासमयत्वः).
finished translation. We should also consider the possibility that the Chinese scribes might have attempted to accommodate third-century Chinese sensibilities from their end. This would be all the more likely given that these scribes were ultimately responsible for the shape of the literary Chinese text, as indicated in the colophons. One example of a culturally responsive translation that occurs repeatedly in Dhararakas' translation of the Råtrçýpa is the bhumô súyánu ("dwelling idly") within passages calling for bodhisattvas to dwell in the wilderness (aranyasa).12 Although this bhumô is not unique to Dhararakas' translations, being known already from his predecessors, it is clear from the Chinese side that the expression súyánu has strong associations with the antimasonic reclusion so often praised in the poems and essays of such third-century literati as Xi Kang, Ruan Ji, and other members of the famous Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove.13 For example, in Xi Kang's poem Yóùfén shì ("Resentment"), we find the following line: 印象念憂樂在間房 ("Exalting Yan [Jingping] and Zhong [Zishen], who, taking pleasure in the Dao, live tranquilly.").14 While such a translation would have effectively resonated with an interested Chinese reader of the late third century, it is doubtful that it would have equally conveyed the sense intended by the Indian text. In this regard the cultural gulf between the kind of forest asceticism espoused by some early Indian Mahayana sages and the carefree wandering extolled by some Chinese literati of the Wei-Jin period (3rd-4th cents.) was lost to the Chinese scribal assistants. The author of the Råtrçýpa was engaged in an often ascetic critique of his monastic contemporaries, monks who were more interested in fawning over donors than in cultivating the path toward enlightenment. Put another way, this author, and others like him, were arguing for essentially conservative values, a return to the stricter—and in their opinion, original—path laid out by the Buddha.15 The Chinese literati, on the other hand, pines not just for a

1 Examples include the following: 41.2-4-5: 印象念憂樂在間房 (dwelling idly in the wilderness) = Finot 13.17: aranyasa ("abandoning residence in the forest"); 41.2-4: 印象念憂樂在間房 (taken pleasure in quiet living) = Finot 5.10-11: aranyasa (dwelling in the forest); 41.2-2: 印象念憂樂在間房 (dwelling quietly, tranquil and alone, without originality) = Finot 16.6: aranyasa ("dwelling in a quiet place"); 41.3-9: 印象念憂樂在間房 (enter the forest) = Finot 35.17: yamayam apne (he enters the forest); etc.

2 On the literary figures of the Seven Sages of the Bamboo grove generally, see Holmst 1956 for the essays of Xi Kang; see Hendriks 1993, see Ruan Ji, see Holmst 1976, esp. 110-36 for poems challenging conventional values is favored a life of carefree wandering.

3 Zhuangzi vernante: (p. 23): 313. I have also benefited from HANAMITA Eihe's Japanese translation (1974), 390-82. Yan Jingping was a Han literate from the state of Han who studied the works of Yuqiu Xiong and practiced devotion; he is the author of the Laozi Sho (The Commentary of Laozi), see Morishibi 1959:278. Zhong Zishen held an official post under Emperor Chung of the Han (r. 35-6 BCE) and was famous for cultivating the Dao by maintaining tranquility; see Morishibi 1959:404.
simpler life, but one free of conventional mores. In fact, an open disregard for traditional
tones of behavior became a virtual sine qua non among the most prominent figures of
this movement. By using 森林 to refer to forest asceticism, the Chinese scribes of
Dharmanaraka’s translation committee aligned, perhaps only subtly, the Ratnapalika with
this third-century rhetoric. What would have been a call to the intense discipline of the
homeless ascetic to an Indian reader is in the Chinese text made to look like the free and
easy wandering of the Zhuangzi, the Daoist classic that was read with great gusto during
this period.

Conclusion

My discussion here merely adumbrates the richness of both the context of the
Ratnapalika for our understanding of early Mahayana Buddhism and the promise of its
early Chinese translation for uncovering its textual history. My fuller study and translation
will discuss both in greater detail. At the very least, the examples cited above from
Dharmanaraka’s translation demonstrate that the complexities of the translation process
itself—the recitation of the Iodic text, its transfer via bilingual intermediaries, and its
reception by Chinese scribes—must all be taken into account if we are to use these
documents effectively for the history of early Mahayana texts literature. It should be
clear now that our early Chinese Buddhist translations represent an invaluable and
largely unappreciated repository of data also for advancing our understanding of the scripts
and languages involved in the transmission of Buddhism from northwest India through
the Tarim Basin, and for the reception of these texts in China during the first few
centuries of the Common Era.

[2] This case of early Mahayana texts literature should be seen as essentially conservative polemic,
arguing for a retreatment of monastic excesses and a return to the rigorous life of the forest, has generally
gone unnoticed in most discussions of the early Mahayana. A strong case for this view has been made most
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The Mahākarmavibhaṅga and the Karmavibhaṅgasūtra (3):
Transliterations of the Original Manuscripts
Preserved in the National Archives of Nepal
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Symbols used:
+    lost akṣara
( )  restored akṣara
|    damaged akṣara
<    omitted akṣara
{ }  superseded akṣara
<< >> interlinear insertion
.    illegible akṣara
*    single element missing
ο    punch hole
οο double circle with a rosette used to indicate the end of a chapter
ṣ    unclear mark appears as combination of amaruṣa and vṛ̤ma
'    sanagraha
;    vīraṅga-like sign to fulfill a blank, mostly at the end of line or before a punch hole

Abbreviations follow the system established by H. Bechert, Abkürzungsverzeichnis zur buddhistischen Literatur in Indien und Südostasien, Göttingen, 1989 (Samkritis-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Bellett 3).

In addition, quotations marks — straight or not — have been added to the text for convenience of reading, especially in case of the covering in the text.

In the footnotes, all the references, whatever related closely or not, concerning to the prakrit forms or orthographical/sound-oriented mistranscriptions are given. Bibliographical references which seem to be parallel to the quotations in the text are also given in the footnotes but their reading will be taken into a consideration at the next stage of a critical revision.

The present writer gratefully expresses his thanks to the former Director of the National Archives of Nepal, Professor B.D. Dangi, for his kind support in providing him with the microfilms of the MSS and other forms of assistance.
1. ta
ta Enough

prənətipəraḥ <1> prənəti(t)(10v-4hyā)3 samanumocdadsspam1 prənətitəpəsya
vərən2açıdlı4 amitəmər<sa>əbihməndənən1 amitterəmərənəsya samələpənən1
amıta(10v.ş)məncəvarəvənişə1 ərəbəxəsənən1 ərəbəxəsənəsya vərənəxənişə1
əştənədə|prənətitəpəsya| (1) yetəra[bavara]2 prənəti3 gəhayante (1)
ma-həpasənədə(11r.1)karakəkəntəldəyas taxya yələnpərvərtəkəsya pətrə1 pətrəş cənəyəs3 ca
jənədə yələntəntəno5 bəhayəbəxti cənosvərtəm ku(r)vənəbə satəvə5 nirəxətsə:6 ...12;

1 For prənəti. *. Interchange between n- and s- is found elsewhere in this MS. Hereinafter, this type of
orthography will not be mentioned.
1 Read prənətitəpəsya.
1 Read amitterəmərənəsya vərənəxənişə.

2 For səb- for səb- Cfr. BHSG §2.61. Consonant cluster -s t(b) , whether it appears in case of one word or in
case of the eremal sandhi, is written as - s t(b)- elsewhere in this MS. Hereinafter, this type of orthography
will not be mentioned.
3 For yəna.
4 For bənat(s).
5 Read prənəti (< prənəti>.
6 For parəti(s).
7 Read cənəyə.
8 For pətrəhəntə. Cfr. BHSG §1.39. r for l. However, in this case, this happens not due to the metrical
reason but to a mere verbal error: the vowel sign i is usually attached to the left side of the base letter and
the sign v (which is attached to ašwa ya, in this case) is also placed on the left side (but with slightly
curved lines).
9 For sa(j)tehəntə. [maphax] BHSG §8.92. The word səna is normally written as səna in this MS. No
further note, except a reconstruction, will be given hereinafter.
10 Read nirəxətsə. 
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1. தாருகாணா கள் சரண கிடையார் செத்துப் பிரார்த்திகளின் வழியாக வாய்யாலியாக வருகிறது பிரார்த்திகளின் வழியாக வாய்யாலியாக வருகிறது

1 For *kaṭamahate
trezasiyam
t在一起

1 Read (of *ek pageranāthā).
MS(A) No. 4-20

a) (11r.2) [yathâ] Kasmirâyānâ' mahângârâ' bhukṣah kî, lârâhan anyatramśâminâ' ghradvâc̣ tiṣṭhâti | tasya ghrâsya pârvânavâ' r̥jas̥patam ōč (11r.3)na pâṣâ' ēva-râmati-nîyâtmaṁ
1
sa bhukṣu' tam devâya ☉

"hâhā dhīk kaṣṭuṁ" āt vadati |
purushâ prachâry

"ārya kîm ayaśīn dhīk kaṣṭasahādaṁ" āt i1

---

1 For Kasmirâyān. Though Lévi reads this MS[A] as Kasmīrâyānā in his footnote 11, p. 32, the ligature mi is clear.
2 For mahângârâ [Fig.1.1:] Cf. BS3S §6.15-17: "one gender agreeing with nouns of another."
3 For anyatramṣ́ min or anyatrasmin. BS3S s.v. anyatram. It says: "as equivalent of Skt. anyatram (which is also used in BHS in the same way, notably in Drav and Avy)" [p. 41].
4 Read pârâbasu. A careless mistake by the scribe.
5 For pâṣâ. The form pâṣa shows a drop of a pause without the lengthening of a preceding short vowel (cf. BS3S §3.44) or if itself is m.sg.N. form? Cf. BS3S §12.13: m.sg.N. form of a-stem.
6 For ayaś [3rd.sg.]. Cf. BS3S §7.30.
7 For bhikṣu(b).
8 This donate is written on the right margin of this side.
a) yathā Kāśmirāyam mahañagarayam bhikṣu¹ kilātrān sarvayatanasmin grhaiveda sthitāt <1> taś[yu]i[(7:1)] + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + vanāno nīyate 1
sa bhikṣus tam ḍrayvā (1) āha!
"hā dhiḥ" kaṣṭam" iti iti
puruṣaṁ tam pṛçchanti 1
"aryas kiṁ syam "hā dhiḥ" kaṣṭam" iti śabdāh iti"

¹ For Mūlki(p). ² It is impossible to have such a long passage here as is found in MS(A): (gahaye pūrveda nīṣṭānāḥ teṣa patreṇa).
"Na vaktravam\(^1\) etad aśīśdhiśānir 1 kāryāra(⊥)rha(1) tu brāvimi 1 ya esa pātryam\(^2\)niyate 1 anena purā śāvareṇa\(^3\) śūhāvā śthā(11r.5)ṣaṃśāpita\(^4\) 1 sāvatsarak\(^5\) ca pūjotāj Śrī\(^6\) pravartita\(^7\) 1 tāritācena bahavaḥ (⊥) dhasa\(^8\) gayātita\(^9\) 1 maṇḍakāle ca pūtrānā lōhā(11v.1)ṣya 1 "pṛth\(^10\) yady aṣṭi mayi snehaḥ 1 ya esa mayi śāuturaśāk pūjotāj Śrī pravartita\(^7\) 1 esa mayi kālāgata śupraśaṭāvya\(^11\) iti 1 pu(11v.2)trais "sthațā\(^12\) iti pūtraśaṭāvya\(^11\) 1 sa kālāgata\(\)s tena mohajena prānāśūtāṣṭa śvaghte pūṣi\(^13\) pṛtyāṣṭa\(^14\) 1 sa jē(11v.3)tau jētau gayātita\(\) 1 adheṇa\(^15\) ekasvagitaṃ samājitaṃ nādīāyate 1 "

"svayam eva te thūḍālaḥ\(^16\)(11v.4)ṣṭaḥ\(^17\)svayam eva yajñāḥ pravartitaḥ 1 bahavaḥ\(\)bāla pāśa gayātita\(\) 1 ki\(^18\) rāvase svavān nirathaka\(\)m\(^19\) 1 "

\(^1\) For tathāyaṃ. Cf. BHS: §64.
\(^2\) Read kāryārthaṃ.
\(^3\) Vowel sign -a is confused with -a (cf. BHS §3.9). For a and initial ra of the succeeding word is lost?
\(^4\) For śāvana. Cf. BHS §3.8; for i before a consonant cluster.
\(^5\) Read pṛtvā. Orthogonal confusion between pra- and pa-.
\(^6\) For aśīṣāḥ. Caution: this -āḥ is probably mistranscribed into -aḥa.
\(^7\) Read pāṭhaḥ. A mere scribal mistake.
\(^8\) For “pṛthāḥ. BHS: §3.14; j for y.
\(^9\) Read pāṭhaḥ. This ahara puḥ is probably mistranscribed into iha-.
\(^10\) Read pāṭhaḥ. A mere scribal mistake.
\(^11\) For “pṛthāḥ. BHS: §3.14; y for j.
\(^12\) Read pāṭhaḥ. A mere confusion due to the repeated appearance of the word pāṭha-.
\(^13\) For pāthāḥ.
\(^14\) For pūṣiḥ. BHS: §64; y for j.
\(^15\) Harman remains.
\(^16\) For (ā)nāpāṭhaḥ. BHS: §2.12; cf for sth.
\(^17\) For kṛtass. Is this phrase “(ā)nāpāṭhaḥ kṛtass, which takes m-aq. N. ending, intentionally synchronized with anīṃ phrase “sāsāḥ pravartitaḥ”\(?" The order of short and long vowels in this set agree each other: ā-ā-ā-ā-ā-ā-ā-ā-ā-ā.
\(^18\) For kiḥ(ṃ). Cf. BHS §21.12; k for kṛm.
\(^19\) For niḥnirathakaḥ.
sa 1ha 11

"na vakrayam ca ad aśrīdāhinām kārya(T.7)++ + + + + + [1]ya pat[1]r avamāha
njāte [1] anena pūca vaśīkṣa[1]ya bhūtāvādha amaraṇītātma 1 samavartika'ni
[1]ya[1]rya śrīya, 1ha 11 "pratītya yady asti māyāṃ hiti saṃvatika'ni pañcājīhā
(T.7) + + + sa bhūtakam tama pañcāhena[1]satya[1]mañca 1ha 11

b) yal evanvidham sthānāḥ (ṣa.6) + + + . . . śūpamataṁ tatha yuddhādaraśānām 1 yatra
bahavoḥ satvā ghāryante hastyantānāmasyaśakāyaṁ yuddhāpratitāhuddhāroṣān ā ca śacetāṁ
abhiranditavajānṛ[am 11

c) yathā coktam Bhagavatā Vaiśāyikā Kālīkā ... ' (3) (ā)tiṣṭīpaḥ (āvī.13) + āśeṣito
āhālikroṣa narakasannvartanāy bhuvati 1 tīryagguṭhiṣṭanvartanīya Īśvāre Īśvāre
tathā daśādānaṃ Nandikāśtrēṃ uktah pra(124)aśāśāstāyaḥ 11
idāṃ karmnaḥ alpaśāṃ sa(m)varutta-cañcāya 11 11

1 This stava, as is noted by Lèvi ([1912], p. 13, fn. 12), seems to survive neither in Sanskrit nor in Chinese

In Tibetan translation (1) alone is available (see the French translation of a, Leon Feen,
"Fragments Extraits du Kanśöyö", in: Aratošu E. Haute, Terme l, pp. 244-245). Although we do not
have any complete Sanskrit or Chinese text of this stava, there is a quotation in the Dhākālīkā: "A-{gūzewśu}
wherein the Buddha told "ten evil results of murder" to a layman Nandika (Nāndikā, नांदिका): "If
men are prevented from killing, they will be saved. If killing is done, one will suffer evil results.
Two or three goddesses will not be able to save three. Three goddesses will not be able to save
three, four goddesses will not be able to save four, five goddesses will not be able to save five.
Six goddesses will not be able to save six, seven goddesses will not be able to save seven. Nine
goddesses will not be able to save nine, ten goddesses will not be able to save ten."

As for the translation of above passage and other references, see Lassoued, Migyi (La Traité
de la Grande Versa du Sageru De Nāgārjuna (Makāyukpākāntamālaya)), tome III, pp. 792-793 and a
footnote 1 of p. 792. (This passage is also quoted by other Chinese texts containing its source as the
Rules) which kindly allows to use his Tathāgato-Tripūta CD-ROM (updated on the base of the first edition of
the Tathāgato-Tripūta, vol. 1-55 + 85, Bigl. CJK). References to the Tathāgato-Tripūta are found by
searching on his CD-ROM.

In the Tibetan manuscript collection, a part of fragment is identified as the Nandikāśtrēṃ although
it has only a beginning portion of this stava (Kat.-No. 162 [R. 446 (THE MQIH), 109-9]). In SHT I (1965),
only its description is given whereas its transcription is supplied in SHT II (1980), pp. 99-100. This

This text, according to the information in SHT I (p. 92, note 4), corresponds to the Ch. Zhānshīluò (釋詁疏
Notes) 十三, n. 2, 索引 第十一 (i.e. Guanabhadra, 431-483 CE), T. No. 99 (815), vol. 2, 217c-218a (Pāli
Sūtra, Nandika, V, 87-8 (ed. by Feen, PTT), 1998 (pp. 1970)). Unfortunately, these do not correspond to
the MKV nor to above quotation in the Dhākālīkā since there is no story about "ten results of
murder."

We have different story related to Nandika. It is included in the Schubartāgāthā (ed. by H. Hecker, 
BRP [Bruchstück hinduistischer Versammlungen aus zentralasiatischen Sandsteinkriegen, 1. Die
Amaratagāthā und die Schubartāgāthā], 1961, pp. 156-158). In Chinese parallels, as shown by Hecker,
see the Fuhsházhúdānliáoqí (佛说跋陀蘆利抄, n. by L. (Bhārtrākya), T. No. 199, 
vol. 4, 471a-471b and the Gehrkečābāshābāgāthā Pāli Tripūta (Pāli Tripūta - only available in Pāli), n. by D. (Yīng), 
T. No. 1448, vol. 28, 18-24). For the name Nandika is translated in the former as “Ninnū (νηννοο)
(Nandī) and in the latter “Vīśā (वीशा). This story of Nanda/Nandika does not correspond to our
MKV. For the details, see above BRP.

1 Hattori remains.

126
d) [6] ِاللهُ خَلَقَهُمْ (7:2) + ... ِكَبَّرَتُ الْعُيْنُ ِ[6] ِبِلَاكَ أَرْضَتْهُ "1"

لا أَصَمُّ لِلَّهُمَّ الْعُيْنَ مَنْ تَأْمُرُهُ ِّ[6] ِبِلَاكَ أَرْضَتْهُ. 11 11

---

1. Read (مَّثَّلُ).  
2. Read (نَهُذُ).  
3. Read (نَهُذُ).  
4. Cf. RBSG §6.79 how this phenomenon is concerned to "mainly in verses m.e. mean-al
shortening of the preceding."  
5. حيَّام.  
6. حيَّام.  
7. 11 11
2. *tatra katamati karmaṭi dhāyaḥ|lisaṃ|vartanāyaḥ iva ucyate 1

(12v.5) prāṇātipātanavrīrtis tadbhavavādadāh 1 \ tatra samādipitam 1\ tadbhavavādadāh 1
vadhyapraitātinān manasāyapātisvkara'kukkuṣādānān (isa) (12v.1) <parimocanam 1>
bhātānām svātānām 1 abhayaprāparādānām 1 antahkārānām svātānām marthe 5 kārmaniratattā 1
ghānu 7 savānā 7 madhyē maitracitattā 9 1 anayē vā bālayāddhānā 7 (12v.2) teṣām eva
bhojanaprāpānām 1 pratīkāntā 6 su maitracitattā 6 1 eva eva phvokram (1)
kućkudāpākṣaṇa vuddhā 6 dānāntari 9 1\ tathā stupa 6 (a) 7 (12v.3) tvayāvihārānāṁ
vīśīcchāyaḥ pratisaṁjñākāraṇān 1 tatra evokram 1\ akalanyutrer nma 10 bhavet tasya
yo bhagadūnapanān 10 pratisaṁjñākāraṇān 1 (12v.4) 1

---

1 This danda is written on the right side margin.
2 For "ntṛṭṭa": Addition of -r after a vowel -r is common phenomenon in this MS.
3 For "vāla:
4 For "vāla:
5 For "nāka": Cf. BHSG §3:93: r for ś.
6 For sarvāntā: Cf. BHSG §2:69.
7 For antahkāraḥ(ḥ) 7
8 Read madhyē.
9 For kāryacakārtā.
10 For gānaḥ (nī).n
11 For sa(nte(a)ḥ) (nī).
12 For "(e)jñātā.
13 For bālayāddhānaḥ(ḥ).
14 Originally written: "ntṛṭṭā. Vowel sign -r is erased.
15 For a? 7
16 For yuddhā.
17 Read "ādīl.
18 For māra. Cf. BHSG §3:46.
19 For viśīcchāyaḥ.
20 For u. Duplication of a consonant after -r.
21 For dhīyaṃ.
2. tatra haram karma dirghayuksamvartanaiyam <i>rejate</i> 1,1

pranitipathi nivritthe 1,1 prajnitiipataniyrittham varne(7v.3) + + [a] 1,1 tatra samādāpanam
1,1 advaṇya-vādita 1,1 vadhya-prapātām manuyapāsādaka(3) rakṣakakāriyam parinocanam 1,1 bhitāṁ namam abhayapradāman anāthānām satvānām madhye kāruṇyacittam 1 (7v.4) + + + + ,tvānām madhye maitracittam 1 aneṣān ca bālavṛddhaṁ 1,1 tesi eva bhojiyapradām <i>postigrāhaṇasu</i> maitracittam 1 tad eva pūrvakam satvāṁ kośalapakṣena yuddhādarsanādi <1,1 tathā sthapaṇyam(7v.5) + + + + [tījānuṇāṁ
pratisnāsakarāram <i>sā</i>, at eva coktam 11

akālaṁ(7v.6) ni bhavet(a)10 [tasya
yo bhagnāśirñam pratisamākaro] 1
a) tathā śrāvakapratyekābrahmānaṃ 1 varṣayaṇāṃ 2 cī sāma 1 tena kila 2 pāśīhātena pācābhiṣgena 3 teṣaṃ aattachā sārāpanāḥ apābhr̥ṃ 1 (12v.5) tasyopari ēdhī 1 vāraṇāṃ 4 pītītāṃ 1 tathārthā tathā Bhagavatā gītā hāṣṭā ni 11

tat vṛtpaṃ 2 12 śraivaṃvat 2 vśāpnaḥ 2 vibuddhaḥ 1 11 nāmarnāmi 11 1

śātra 2 (11c.1) 11 rbhe bodhisattvah 14 sārāhañō (Jayōī) 1 1

ya Enkūle jnātanā gṛhītām 12


2 Hāṃsā remains.

3 For: nītāṇa.

4 Read taraṇaṃ (pat) śākṣa (pat) pākṣa (pat) anārayaṇa. Or these ending "sī" a for Génitive case ending? Cf. CBHS §10: ending a sī a Génitive case.


6 Read sarvam (aus), not sarvamā (training).

7 Originally written: pātra. An abhāra nose is rewritten on the sign m (combination of anusāra and yadra).

8 For: māma(ā). Cf. CBHS §8:66.

9 The second half verse is merrily incomplete while in MS[1] it is complete. Two short syllables are necessary after vibuddhaḥ. See Pali: "saṃ kariṇāṃ tattvacaryavāh 1 māyāputrālāve ma amaśyām ā tā Ch. is". (12,19) Pāla: "saṃ kariṇāṃ tattvacaryavāh 1 māyāputrālāve ma amaśyām ā tā Ch. is"

10 This folio has four lines per side.

11 Lévi [1932], p. 34, fn. 10 notes: A nārapāpaḥkāsūtraṃ. His reading is based on some misunderstandings of the letters: he reads "ā tā ē " for "ā tī tā ē " (both signs -a and -ā are written on the left side of the base abhāra but the latter is slightly curved). Dependence so does not exist.

12 Pāli: saṃ etikaṃtum ātātāmā kītām 1 (Feure ed. p. M4, Sarmanāśa ed. p. 313. In the footnote of the former, we have a variant of eṃ" for eft and in that of the latter jnātanā for ātātāmā. Ch. do not have.
MS[B]: No. 1-1697

s) varahi ca Pratyekabrahmasūtraṁ varṇaṇayanti 1 tena kila riṣi bhūtāna [1] (7v.6) ++
++ ++ ++ ++ [97]. sārthasaṣṭya pañcabhrasastasyoparād idāhā vatsām pātātīm (1) tadārthaṁ ca

tat te purāṇam vrataśālyavṛttaṁ (1)
svaṁ pādubholo (7) haṁ iha smaśaṇi 11
tatra ca sārthaḥ bhūtān

1 Read ‘Baha/pratyekabrahmasūtraṁ.
2 For riṣi: C.f. BHSG §1.94.
3 Read ‘pañcabhrasastasya tattvamāyayati’
4 Hāriva remains.
5 For varahi.
6 MS[B], folio 7 ends here: Following 8 folios are missing.

131
Eni nāma na'īf yaxānnułle' rājā kačit' gehitā' <1> pratyamātānca Hima(34.2)vantiṣam
anuprasyaś (1) sahavāhānaś su rājā'śaṃ<naa> eka vadhyaprayāptāb sahavāhānaś'(1)
tena' yobhātārā' ekkhiyā vātavaraś' muktān <1> (11.3) sa co'pāyena pratyamātānanaśāyā
vibhūra'śaṃ<naa> 11 sa rājā muktitā 11

tak te diviṣyam vrataśavattam <1>
svapnāḥ vibuddho 'yaḥ 34.4yusmāraṇāni 1'

sa ca rājā bodhinatvo bābāvā 11

gantāotās'8 navā gehitā' <1>
nāyena ghorona mardhikena' 14

sa ca tadā mār Ga<34.1>gānkele' 11 mahārāddhihāt puśchilbīṣṭāḥ pratissarati' 11 tena' je' 18
kāyaḥ kramāñcānā jīvānā mirālas tato mōṣṭāl' 11

1. For pāṇi 'ambāi'. Cf. BHSG. § 1.41-46 u for. id.
2. For sahavāhānaḥ(1).
3. Hīṃcānīnām.
4. Hīṃsā remains.
5. For evamāna-ya(1).
6. This akṣaras are in a worn-out but original letter cannot be read.

7. This die verse is the same as previous one. Ck.: it is outside the āśvamedha of the āśvamedha of (24.5c-4). Āśvamedha of it is outside the āśvamedha of (24.5c-4).

9. Read maṭha-jalakena. See the preceding āṣaṇyā.

10. It is probably a circum-ambience of the āśvamedha of (24.5c-4). Ck.: in front of it, in front of it, in front of it, in front of it, in front of it, in front of it, in front of it, in front of it.

11. For sahā. Cf. BHSG. § 1.46 u for id.
12. For pratissarati.
13. Read c.
14. For moktiṣṭāḥ. Cf. BHSG § 2.36.

132
"tatre’ ‘tṛṭyāṃ (1v.2) vrataśīlēyāttam <1> svapanā bhiṃbbutāḥ‘uṃśaśma’cāritāṃ 11 2

2 tasyāḥ ca nāvīṣyām tuṣṭvānī bhiṃbhisvas tuṃ kālaṃhām* 11 c(1v.3)ramśviṃdham te
tirvidham karmā kṛtam <1> teśātiśva dirghāpah 11

b) yathā keśvād alcāyāḥ karhayām āti

Buhaṅgarā āha 1 bhūtāḥ(1v.3)pūrvāḥ 1 bhūṣaṅa Covent Jambudvīpe sarvājananapada‘māri
tvaṅtate seva 1 atkhānyatāraṇa satvenīvaśakādhātāh śhāṭena‘ dākhamatāh sakāśā(1r.1)c
chruṇam 1 yathā Jambudvīpe sarvājanapada‘maṣā‘heti 1 tena ketaṇapujyena prajñāḥānām
krāmāḥ 1 "Jambudvīpe upag-pa-dhrayām 1 sarvājananām vāyudhīpa ‘prā(1r.2)mōjaś‘ni 1
va uṣtragopānāhāḥ 1 yenaśva sarvāṣva śīlaśaḥ pāṇīyaḥ vāyudhīnāṃ 11 1 ye ca bhūṣaṅāś
śrīśaḥ bhaktā(1r.3)kṣa vāyudhīnāṃ nāṣayām 11 1 evam yena yasyarthānām 16teśvaśa
[kṛyā] tasyāḥ vāyudhīnāṃ 1

1. Read as ṛ. Originally written:Ệr, and then only the vowel sign on right side is erased (ṛ-ṃ). 2 Read rehaṭtuḥvā.
2. Pāli: the verse is the same as the first one. Ch.: Bhūṣaṅa sakeḍāvāravā nāvīyaḥvai ṭikāmaḥ 19(1r.1). This Ch. has only ṛa ṛa ṛa ṟa ṟa ṟa ṟa.
4. On this akṣara we can see it is sort of sign which is apparently not a stam of the follo, but it does not seem
      to indicate a correction of keśuḥ ṛa keśuḥ.
5. For *pārstan(ṃ).
7. Āṭantu remains.
8. For saṅkāṭe.
9. Āṭantu remains.
10. Read upag-pa-dhrayām.
11. Copyerror? Lēvi notes: upapāṭyaḥ ... prāmitaṃvajjeyi (p. 36, fn. 1) and reads: upapāṭyaḥ ... prāmitaṃvajjeyi.
12. Read ye ṛa.
13. For nāṣayām 1(ṛd.ṛg.). In this 3rd pl. form conjuṅgād in accorance to the plural forms of the relative
14. For bhūṣaṅa. HBSG §2.26 e for kā. Lēvi reads bhūṣaṅaḥ but the form bhūṣaṅa (ṣ bhūṣaṅa) is-
      possible, see HBSG s.v. bhūṣaṅa.
15. For nāṣayām (ṛd.ṛg.). In this 3rd pl. form conjuṅgād in accorance to the plural forms of the relative
16. Read yaṅṣṭrāḥ.

134
(Folios 8-10 are lost)
(Fechas 8-10 are lost)
aham (14v.1) sa bhiksvas tena kālena Sarvānandhi‘vaidyāra‘jo ‘bhūt’ 1 tasya kārmaneyo vikākena Mahādevasya yuṣṭapramāṇaṃ yojaṇītaṣṭayaṃ 1 Māt(14v.4)ndhēti‘Suletra‘bhīyam apy evaṇḍapatāṃ yoja‘yēntiṣṭayaṃ 11

idam kārma dirgāyūṣha(m)vaṭṭantviṣṭayaṃ 11 11 11

3. katamatāl kārma bhavābhād(14v.5)bhā/sanvaṭṭantviṣṭayaṃ ucyate 11

khaṭacapetapradānaṃ 1 khaṭacapetapradānaṃ‘ anumodānaṃ 1 khaṭacapetapradānaṃ yaṅyaṇaṇādānājñiṣṭe 11 tūṣṭiṃ prādāṇena tūṣṭiḥ (15v.1)‘mātipīḍitaḥ cītattāvitaḥ ruddikāraṇam 18 1 tathābyāzen pravrajitānām śīlavitā 18 cīttasambhūteṣeṣaḥ 1 amitravāydhīhānā tūṣṭiḥ 1 (15v.2) amitravāydhīhībhūteṣeṣaḥ tūṣṭiḥ 11 1 vāyūdhiḥ‘tinām abhēṣja‘pradānaṃ 1 tatha‘18 aparājīnābhīṣaṣṭoṣṭayaṃ 11

idam kārma bhavābhādhausterityās(15v.3)sanvaṭṭantviṣṭayaṃ 11 11 11

1 For Sarvananda. Cf. BHS G §3.78: s for au.
2 Read ‘oiṣṭa‘.
3 Read yojaṇīṣṭayaṃ. A simple scriptural error attested by the nearest appearance of this word which is corrected by the scribe himself.
4 Read ‘acchita‘.
5 Vowel sign is rewritten. ‘it‘ + ‘i‘.
6 For bhavābhāda‘.
7 For khaṭa‘.
8 Read ‘pradānaṃ’ [sC.].
9 This sūtra has four lines per side.
10 Originally written - bh Viṣṇya is erased and amantraya is added. After this abhava there is an open space for approximate 8 letters.
11 For ‘vaiṣṭaya‘.
12 Read atmaḥ, otherwise this does not match to the context.
13 For abhēṣja‘. Cf. BHS G §3.67-68.
14 Hasta remains.
15 For bhavābhāda‘.
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Folios 9-10 are lost
4. कातमान् कर्मम् अल्पाभुद्धासुन्यवात्तनियायम् तुच्छे त

कहा कुपेत्राप्रदलनान् नियत्वे 1 तता सामालः 15.3.4शुनान्ति तद्वर्णविविधा 1
tadahāvyunamodhānām 1 ghnāminām mitātiprīyānām uperihānakaranām 11 tad apy ariṣṭa 2
grahasthapravrajitānā 1 ami 15.35travyākhyātānmūrtā(मुर्ति)समाधानकरत 1 तस्य
vyantrabhena cattamansakāra ni bhaisajyapradānam 1 pariṣiṣṭāhobhajat ca 11

idam karma alpā(15.2.2)ādhaśasunyavattanīyān 11 11

5. कातमान् के कामपुर्णαसुन्यवात्तनियायम् 11 11

kuṭodhā 11 upanayanāh 1 mrakah 1 pradādyāh 1 ma(15.35)tipirrav avarsyaśvādātā 1 anyesāṁ
cakṛhā(क्रियाब्धर्मात्य) bhavāvāpaśvādātāna 10 bhavāvāparsātma 16 ghnāvikṣeṣānāṁ ca bhūme(15.4.1.8)
vāsodhā 15.4.9.11 stītaśā 15.7.11 pratimānāṁ ca dipavyucchahā 1 dvāravāṇāṁ catvāraṁ

avahsaṇām 1 tathā caukṣamsamudācāratā 11

idam karma dvāravāṇasamvartta(16.1.8)ānīyān 11 11

---
1 For alpaḥd̐ātha 1.
2 For bhūna 1.
3 For niśra(क)थ.
4 For anyesāṁ.
5 For tāṇā(न)थ.
6 Here is an open space for approximately three letters.
7 Read alpaḥd̐ātha 1.
8 For dvāravāṇa 1.
9 Read pradāyaḥ.
10 For tāṇā(न)थ.
11 Read caucyuccha 1.
12 For bhūme(र)थ.
13 Read bhūme(र)थ, otherwise it does not match to the context. Or bhūme(र)थ सद्भक्त(न)थ?
14 For tāṇā(न)थ.
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1. Verses in the *Uttama-parivarta*

The Śloka-verses in Chapter XII, the *Uttama-parivarta*, in the *Saddharmapundarikakāvita*, give us a great deal of evidence as to the composition of the Lotus Sutra. However, their importance for the historical research of this scripture and consequently that of so-called Mahāyāna Buddhism has not really been taken into true consideration. I assume that the prime reason for this is that not only modern translators of the Sanskrit version, but also the authors of ancient Chinese commentaries on Kumārajīva’s translation of the Lotus Sutra, whose interpretations have significantly influenced Japanese Buddhist scholars and consequently Western translators of the Chinese version, interpreted these verses incorrectly.

1.1. Sanskrit Text

The verse in question in the Kern-Nanjio Edition of the *Saddharmapundarikakāvita* read as follows:

\[\text{KN.271.9-274.6} \]
\[\text{ākāśādānaṃ tarjanaś caiva dāṇḍa-udgāparāṣṭra ca} /\]
\[\text{bālānāṃ samākhayiṣṭaṃ 'dhibhūkṣyaś caiva nāha} / 3\]
\[\text{darbuddhinaś ca vāṃbhā ca tathā bādālīmānāśca} /\]
\[\text{aprāpta prāya-sampuṣṭa cau ghoṣa kālāmi paścime} / 4\]
\[\text{aranyavṛttakaś caiva kumbhām pravāryaś ca} /\]
\[\text{saṃrekhāvacāra autoś ca} \text{eṣuva vukṣyaś caiva dārmaṃ} / 5\]

\[\text{I hereafter, I shall refer to the readings of five relatively old manuscripts only when their readings differ significantly from those in the Kern-Nanjio Edition. They are namely:}\]
\[\text{3. D1 = Gilgit MSS. of the *Saddharmapundarikakāvita*, kept in the National Archives of India (New Delhi), the British Museum (London), and in the possession of Mr. M. A. Shah (Lahore). Facsimile edition and translation: Watanabe 1972-1975. Verses 1-5 are missing in D3.}\]
\[\text{5. F = the Sanskrit Manuscripts of the *Saddharmapundarikakāvita*, discovered in Farhat-Big, romanised in Toda 1981: 229-238.}\]

Moreover, the sign "****" is used here to designate a missing portion in a Sanskrit manuscript. Pk, D2, D1, o, F, and O differ significantly in the reading of the verse. The Sanskrit manuscripts are a composite of many different manuscripts. The verse "ākāśādānaṃ tarjanaś caiva dāṇḍa-udgāparāṣṭra ca" is the oldest among the Sanskrit manuscripts, while D1 and D2 are the latest. The verse is divided into three parts: the first part describes the actions of the Buddha in the sky, the second part describes the actions of the Buddha on earth, and the third part describes the actions of the Buddha in the sky again.
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12. Kern's English translation
Kern translated these verses as follows (1884. 259-261):

3. We will suffer, patiently endure, O Lord, the injuries, threats, blows and threats with sticks as the hands of foolish men.

4. As that dreadful last epoch men will be malignant, crooked, wicked, dull, conceited, fancying to have come to the limit when they have not.

5. 'We do not care but to live in the wilderness and wear a patched cloth; we lead a frugal life,' so will they speak to the ignorant

6. And persons greedily attached to enjoyment will preach the law to laymen and be honoured as if they possessed the six transcendent qualities.

7. Cruel-minded and wicked men, only occupied with household cares, will enter our retreat in the forest and become our calumniators.

8. The Tirthikas, themselves bent on profit and honour, will say of us that we...
are so, and—shame on such monks! They will preach their own fictions.
9. Prompted by greed of profit and honour they will compose Sūtras of their own invention and then, in the midst of the assembly, accuse us of plagiarism.
10. To kings, princes, king’s peers, as well as to Brahmans and commons, and to monks of other confessions,
11. They will speak evil of us and propagate the Tirtha-doctrine. We will endure all that out of reverence for the great Sivas.
12. And those fools who will not listen to us, shall (sooner or later) become enlightened, and therefore will we forbear to the last.
13. In that dreadful, most terrible period of frightful general revolution will many mendicant monks stand up as our revellers.
14. Out of respect for the Chief of the world we will bear it, however difficult it be; girded with the girdle of forbearance will I proclaim this Sūtra.
15. I do not care for my body or life, O Lord, but as keepers of thine intrusted deposit we care for thine.
16. The Lord himself knows that in the last period there are (to be) wicked monks who do not understand mysterious speech.
17. One will have to bear frowning looks, repeated disapproval (or concealment), expulsion from the monasteries, many and manifold abuses.
18. Yet mindful of the command of the Lord of the world we will in the last period unhesitatingly proclaim this Sūtra in the midst of the congregation.
19. We will visit towns and villages everywhere, and transmit to those who care for thine intrusted deposit, O Lord.

1.3. Kunārajiva’s Chinese translation
In Kunārajiva’s translation of the Lotus Sūtra, we find verses corresponding to the above-cited Sanskrit ones (Taishō, vol. 9, No.262, 3623–37a)36. I shall cite only the part, parallel to Sanskrit verses 5–11, here.

36 Burnouf translated verses in question (i.e. 5–11) as follows (1852: 161–166):
5. «Ne songeant qu’au désert, couverts d’un manteau d’eroffe, nous passerons notre vie dans la pauvreté; » c’est ainsi que parleront les intrus.
6. Décrivant avec avidité tout ce qui flotte le goût, et pleins de cupidité, ils veulent honorer, quand ils enseigneront la loi aux maîtres de maison, comme s’ils possédaient les six connaissances surnaturelles.
7. Pleins de pensées cruelles et de méchanceté, exclusivement occupés des petits se leur maison et de leur fortune, ils pénétreront dans les retraites des forêts pour nous accabler d’ostrogés.
8. Avides de gain et d’honneurs, ils nous parleront d’une manière conforme à leurs sentiments; ces religieux Tirthakas nous exposent leurs propres pratiques.
10. Antres des rois, auprès des fils de roi, auprès de leurs conseillers, auprès des Brāhmānas, des maîtres de mots et des autres Religieux.
11. Ils nous brouilleront dans leurs discours, et feront entendre le langage des Tirthakas; mais nous supporterons tout cela par respect pour les grands Rishis;”
36 In another Chinese translation of the Lotus Sūtra, namely Dharmakīrti’s Zhāngzhāng Jīng 正章經, one can also find relevant verses. Taishō, vol. 9, No.263, 106629–10708.
Harvitz translated these Chinese verses as follows (1976: 205-206):

Or there are śānyākas [forest-dwelling hermits], clothed in patched rags and living in the wilderness, who say of themselves that they are treading the True Path, holding mankind cheaply. Because they covet profit and nourishment, they preach Dharma to white-robed laymen, and are held in humble reverence by the world, as though they were arhats of the six penetraions. These men, harboring evil thoughts, constantly mishandle the affairs of the world, borrow the name of śānyākas because they love to display our faults. Then they make such talk as this: “These bhikṣus, out of greed for profit and nourishment, preach the arguments of external paths. Having themselves created this scriptural canons to deceive worldlings and lead them astray, in the quest for name and renown they preach this scripture with much discrimination.”

Since within the great multitude they ever wish to ruin us, turning to kings and great ministers, to Brahmanas and householders, and to multitudes of other bhikṣus, they slanderously speak evil of us, saying, “These fellows of wrong views preach arguments of external paths.”

Out of veneration for the Buddha, we will endure all these evils.

1.4. Who slandered whom?
The Sanskrit and Chinese verses which are given above is boldface, have been wrongly
undertood, as I shall explain in the following sections.

In particular, there is a great deal of confusion between those who slandered and those who were slandered, which is found not only in the modern translations of the Lotus Sutra but also in any Chinese commentaries, resulting presumably from the lack of marks or words which would indicate a quotation (such as iti in Sanskrit or 訳 in Chinese), in the verses in question. The cause of this confusion may also be attributed to these modern translators’ insufficient understanding of past antagonism between wilderness and village monks.

In the following section, we shall see the dichotomy and antagonism between these two groups, found in various texts.
2. Antagonism between wilderness and village monks
2.1. aranyā ("wilderness") and grāma ("village")

Since Vedic and Brahmanical times throughout the Hindu tradition, we find a dichotomy in Indian culture, namely aranyā ("wilderness") and grāma ("village").65 Regarding this, Olivelle writes:66

... the two religious paths, Vedic ritualism and asceticism, are symbolised by the places — village and wilderness.

This opposition is also to be found in the Buddhist tradition as we shall see below.

2.2. Āratiṇāvāt (wilderness monks) vs. Gāmaṇikaṇ (village monks) in Sri Lanka

In ancient Sri Lanka, three schools of monk, namely the Mahāvīraṭa, the Abhayagiri and the Jetavana, are known to have existed which are often mentioned in Pali chronicles. According to Rahula67, long before these, records from around the latter part of the first century B.C.E. show there were two groups of monks, known as Pāmukkālika (lit. "one, who wears clothes made of rags") and Dhammakayaka (lit. "one, who preaches the Dhamma"). The former maintained that the practice (patipatti) of the Dhamma was the basis of Buddhism (sīvana) while the latter held that learning (paññàpati) was of more importance. They argued with each other, bringing forth reasons in support of their theories, and, in the end, the Dhammakāyaka won.68 It must be remembered that they were not two different schools but rather two groups of monks living in the same community, holding different opinions and leading different lifestyles.69 However, when the three schools — namely the Mahāvīraṭa, the Abhayagiri and the Jetavana, were later formed, they had their own Pāmukkālika.70 As well as this,

---

65 The Sanskrit word aranyā is usually rendered as "forest", but, following Sropecoff (1981, 1984) and others, I use the English word "wilderness" for aranyā in contrast to grāma ("forest") in this paper. Citing P. Thévenot's definition of aranyā: "Si ist dabei — nicht ein wenig unordentlicher Dschungel, sondern — an eine unersehnliehe, menschenleere Stuppanschaft zu denken, die schließlich wegen ihrer Einnahme und der bei Eintritt der Dunkelheit drohenden Angriffe bisweilen Wogen die Fruchtbarkeit erregt und das Bewußtsein der Gefahr erzeugt"., Sropecoff, himself, describes the picture of aranyā as follows: "In aranyā gibt es beträchtliches Gebüsch (ätta) und Dickicht (gebāta), rückliche Erholungsplätte (hāthā) und Gruben (āphā); Dornen und Splinter durchbrechen die Füße dessen, der sich dorthin traut." (Sropecoff 1981: 33-34). Cf. also von Hasekier 1996: 106. The Vinayadhatu (P.C.V. ed., p. 72; L. E.), however, gives us other definitions: 1. "A forest (grāma), according to the Vinaya method firstly, in described thus: 'Except the village and its precincts, all is forest' (Vin iii.46). According to the Abhidhamma method it is described thus: 'Haven gone out beyond the boundary post, all that is forest' (N Dh, 251; Ps,176). But according to the Sutta method its characteristic is this: 'A forest alde is five hundred long-lengths distant' (Vin vi.183)."Nissanki (1956: 71). 66 Cf. Malmsjö 1976; Olivelle 1990; Sropecoff 1981, 1984. 67 Olivelle 1990: 131. 68 Rahula 1956: 195. 69 Rahula 1956: 118-119. 70 Rahula 1956: 195.
according to Rahula, from about the 6th century C.E., another "pair" of groups of monks, namely the Aranāhavāsī (Skt. Aranyavāsī; lit. "dweller in the wilderness", also known as Panāhāsī ["forest dweller"] and the Gāmavāsī (Skt. Grāmacāsī; lit. "village dweller"), are referred to in Pali chronicles as distinct groups, though not as separate schools.66 He tells us that the Panāhāsīka and the Aranāhavāsī, both of which were practitioners of the dhātugānas (ausetic practices), were regarded as separate groups67, though he remains silent on the relationship between the Dharmakāśikā and the Gāmavāsī.

Therefore, from Rahula’s study, it is clear that since olden times, there have been, broadly speaking, two types of groups of monks, namely, those who, practising dhātugānas, lived outside the village in the wilderness, and those who lived in (or nearby) towns and villages.

2.3. Aranāhavāsī (wilderness monks) v. Gāmavāsī (village monks) in Myanmar

Though Rahula’s study does not say anything concerning the attitudes of the two groups towards each other, a later Pali chronicle, the Sāsanaṃsas, written in Myanmar in 1861, reports of a separation and conflict between wilderness monks (aranāhavāsī) and village ones (gāmavāsī) in the Marattha-sangha or the Community of Myanmar.

In the thirteenth century68, a king, named Ujana, built seventy-seven monasteries (sīhara) and dedicated many fields and much land (khetra-vattha) in support of these monasteries. Then, monks began to quarrel on account of these fields and land. On hearing of the quarrel, one elder, who was a holder of the teaching (sāmarādhārata),69 and two others, who were exhorting themselves (pārakkamadhera), left there and took up residence in the mountains. They were called those who walked alone (ekacāra), while the remaining monks were known as village-dwellers who walked with many (gāmavāsī kañcakāra). Since then, there have been two groups of monks, namely wilderness dwellers (aranāhavāsī) and village dwellers (gāmavāsī).

Much later, in 1698, an elder monk (thera), named Gunabhikṣunārā, ordered his novices to cover only their left shoulders when entering a village, which the tradition70 thought as an offence against monastic rules. He, also, did not allow them to use palm leaves for head-dresses, which seems to have been the custom of village monks.71 After

66 Rahula 1956: 196.
67 Rahula 1956: 196.
68 Rahula 1956: 197.
69 Sāsanaṃsa 83.1ff. An English translation of this part is found in Law 1952: 91-92
70 Sāsanaṃsa 118.1ff; Law 1952: 123ff; cf also Himber 1995: 39ff.
71 Cf. Sāsanaṃsa 116.27ff; Law 1952: 122.
this happened, Guntbhilläma's group, which was named "the group which covers one shoulder", and the traditionalists, known as "well-covered", began disputing and quarrelling over this matter. As the "one shoulder" group could not find any textual evidence supporting their stance, they bribed (latticham datā) a lay devotee to compose a book (gandha) in accordance with their views. This quarrel was intensified by a conflict between village monks (gâmântakas), who used palm leaves for their head-dresses, and wilderness monks (arathikas). A group of village monks (gâmânt związâkhâkâgana) was reported to have destroyed this book (gandha) and driven the wilderness monks out from the place, saying: "Let there be no suspicious monks in the religion (śâma), who do not put on head-dresses". Then, other village monks took up arms and also went forth to drive away the wilderness monks who were at that time dwelling in a monastery (viharâ). The king, having heard of this matter, sent a royal writ stating: "The group of village monks is one and that of the wilderness is another. The former should not harass the latter. They should dwell in their own places according to their own views." Thus, the wilderness monks could live happily. However, even after these incidents, the "one shoulder" group and the traditionalists still continued the dispute until it was finally settled by the king in 1784.

Here, we can see an instance of antagonism between village and wilderness monks, which even took the form of an armed attack. It is also noteworthy that a group forged a text — in this case a text of discipline — and another group destroyed it.

The Śāmakeśa also tells us of a well-learned elder monk (ṭera), who had formerly been a village monk and followed the tradition of his teacher, but later gave up such a practice and became a wilderness monk. From this, we learn that it was possible for a monk to alter his mode of living in the midst of his religious practice.

The dichotomy of wilderness monks and village ones is found not only in the history of Sri Lanka and Myanmar, but also in Thailand.\(^{34}\)

2.4. Arathikas (a wilderness monk) and gâmântavâbhârî (a village monk) in Pāli literature

In Pāli scriptures, we come across some instances in which arathikas (a wilderness monk) and gâmântavâbhârî (a village monk)\(^{15}\) are mentioned along side each other. For instance:

Vin. III 171-2f. ye icchati arathikasa hetu, ye icchati gâmânta vâbhâravu, ye icchati pūrâpihdhâ hetu, ye icchati niyamanayam sakhyena, .... (*Whoever wants, let him be a

\(^{15}\) Śāmakeśa 116.275f; Law 1952: 122.

\(^{34}\) As to the evolution of this dichotomy in Southeast Asia, cf. Tambiah 1976, 1984.
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wilderness monk; whoever wants, let him dwell in a village; whoever wants, let him be a beggar for alms; whoever wishes, let him accept an invitation—"

MN 1:10.3f. "kukkuṣaṁ ti bhiṣṭānāhā panditaṁ, panditaṁ sudhāmaṇḍrī, sudhāmaṇḍrī bhūkkuṇī-sammattasā, atthā kassato samiddha-miṁ sa sakkārana..." kukkuṣaṁ ti bhiṣṭānāhā panditaṁ sudhāmaṇḍrī, sudhāmaṇḍrī bhūkkuṇī-sammattasā, atthā kassato samiddha-miṁ sa sakkārana... ("Then for all he may be a forest dweller, a forest-dweller of remote abodes, an almsfood eater, a house-to-house seeker, a refuse-carrying settler, a carrier of goods, robber, and thief in the holy life do not honour, then for all he may be a village dweller, an acceptor of invitations; a carrier of goods given him by householders, yet his fellows in the holy life honour—"

[Mahāsāṃghika 1995: 112])

MN 1:473.1-3. "arādhakāraṁ bhāvamettā āvāsambhavaṁ daṁ samāyāya vatacastāha, payuva gāmamattakārayā" ("Friend Mogallana, these things should be undertaken and practised not only by a forest-dwelling bhikkhu, but by a town-dwelling bhikkhu as well") [Mahāsāṃghika 1995: 576].

The following scriptures show explicitly that the opposition between wilderness monks and village ones existed in early times.

Anguttara-Nikāya III 341f runs as follows. The Buddha, on hearing the tumult of the people who came to pay homage to him, told his attendant Nāgīra that he preferred the bliss of seclusion to baniaga. He said further: "Whosoever cannot obtain the bliss of seclusion, of calm, of enlightenment, should enjoy profit, honor and praise (ākāsa-saṁkhāra-sukha; sukha) which is to be likened to the pleasure of drying or filthy pleasure," then he disparaged life in villages in the following way (AN III 342.1f):

"When I see a village monk (gāmamattaka), seated in concentration, I think: 'Presently, a monk attendant or a novice might deride and distract him from his concentration.' Therefore, I am not pleased with his dwelling in the village (gāmamattakārayā).

When I see a wilderness monk (gāmamattaka), seated in meditation, I think: 'Presently, he will get rid of this sleepiness and fatigue, and surely ponder on the wilderness as a single object.' Therefore, I am pleased with his dwelling in the wilderness (gāmamattakārayā)."

Or I see a wilderness monk, seated in a composite in the wilderness, I think: 'Presently, he will compose his uncomposed mind, or will keep his mind composed.' Therefore, I am pleased with his dwelling in the wilderness.

Or I see a wilderness monk, seated composed in the wilderness, I think: 'Presently, he will liberate his unraveled mind, or will keep his mind liberated.' Therefore, I

10 The Viśuddhimagga (PTS ed., p. 71, l. 46f) defines the Pali word gāmama as follows: "sama rūpam udbhuddhena gāma parà gāmamattamam" ("herein, a village abode is the village itself with its precincts") [Mahāsāṃghika 1995: 78]. Cf. also SN IV 57.11-14. kukkuṣa gāmama viharāna śārīre bhikkhū bhikkhunīyā bhikkhu-vihāra (the monks, nuns, laymen, laywomen, kings, royal ministers, brothers of their followers) as he is called 'one, who dwells alone.'
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am pleased with his dwelling in the wilderness.

Or I see a village monk, who, having obtained robes, alms, beds, chairs, medicaments and utensils, and delighting in their profit, honour and praise, abandons the solitude, the wilderness and woodlands (arāhā-samāpāthāna), solitary lodgings (samāthā-samāthana), and then enters a village, town or the capital, and dwells there. Therefore, I am not pleased with his dwelling in the village.

Or I see a wilderness monk, who, having obtained robes, alms, beds, chairs, medicaments and utensils, but warding off their profit, honour and praise, does not abandon solitude, the wilderness, woodlands, solitary lodgings. Therefore, I am pleased with his dwelling in the wilderness."

We find a similar description also in AN IV 343.23f. These two scriptures are apparently on the side of wilderness monks, disparaging the lifestyle of those of the village.

In contrast to the above, a scripture named Migāḷāna in the Saṃyutta-Nikāya (SN IV 35.46) seems to pay due respects to life in the village. Being questioned by a monk named Migāḷa about the meanings of "dwelling alone" (cakatiḥārya) and "dwelling with a partner" (sadadāyi-vihārya), the Buddha replied in the following way:

"There are forms, sounds, odours, flavours, tangibles and mental objects which are wished for, desired, agreeable, and provoking lust. If a monk delights in them, welcomes and clings to them, pleasure and passion will occur to him, and finally, he will be bound with the fetter of pleasure. Such a monk is called 'dweller with a partner'. Even if he frequents the wilderness, woodlands, solitary lodgings, which are free from sound and uproar, hidden away from people (manana-sāna-sāna-yayu), and fit for solitary meditation, he is still called 'one, who dwells with a partner'."

On the contrary, if a monk does not delight in agreeable forms, sounds etc., pleasure and passion will not occur to him, and he will not be bound with the fetter of pleasure. Such a monk is called 'one, who dwells alone'. Even if he dwells in a village (gāmanā), crowded with monks, nuns, laitymen, laywomen, kings, royal ministers, heretics and their followers, yet he is called 'one, who dwells alone'."

From these descriptions in the Pāli scriptures, we learn that the opposition between wilderness monks and village ones already existed in early times.

2.5. Āranyakas (wilderness monks) v. Gramāntikas (village monks) in the Aṭṭhasaṃcārīka-Dharmā

In the Aṭṭhasaṃcārīka-Dharmā, a portion of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lekuttaravūccha- Vinaya for which we have an extant Buddhist Sanskrit text (I am preparing a new transliteration and an annotated German translation of this text), we find very good descriptions which may help to clarify the relationship between these two groups in olden times.66

A chapter in this text deals with rules of conduct of wilderness and village monks concerning having meals.67 Namely, the following rules were laid down by the Buddha, after knowing that these two groups of monks quarrelled on the occasion of the common
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meal (économique): When both groups have meals together, whether it is in a monastery of wilderness monks (anayakas - nibhāra - anayakas - śrīyamsa) or that of village monks (grāmāṅgika - nibhāra - grāmāṅgika - śrīyamsa), residing monks should wait for any visiting ones until the very last moment and, even if the latter do not appear, the former should keep food reserved for them; When a lay devotee (akārkika) invites the community (samgha) for a meal, noising village monks inform wilderness monks about it, the former should inform the latter and the latter should go there on time; When someone invites village monks for a meal, they should ask him also to invite the wilderness monks, and so on.

The Buddha also told the two groups not to abuse one another but to please each other in the following way:

Now, wilderness monks must not revile village monks in any situation (by saying):
"You have much to do, you are very busy, (because) you seek for the most tasty (foods) with the tip of your tongue." (Wilderness monks) rather should please the (latter) by saying: "Of venerable ones, you do good. You do much by bearing burdens (and) by preaching the Dharma. You take care of chaitras, burn incense, please (lay) families (so that they become Buddhist)." Thus, (village monks) should be pleased."

Now village monks must not revile or abuse wilderness monks in any situation (by saying):
"You live in an empty house, (hoping) to gain fame. (However), jackals also live in the wilderness. You sit (there) all day long, while you (just) accumulate (the number of) years (counted since ordination). (Village monks) should say to (the latter):
"It is hard to live in lodgings in the wilderness, which are secluded, isolated, devoid of humans (āvatsa-jānapada), in which one can dwell, hidden away from people (mamāya-rāka-śrīyamsa), (and) fit for solitary meditation. It is difficult and unpleasant..."
for one (to stay) or one (to stay) more nights in solitude, controlling one’s mind or one’s own self.” (and also) “O venerable ones, you do good; you take care of lodgings in the wilderness. The Blessed One also said: ‘As long as monks shall dwell in lodgings in the wilderness, only an increase in good things is expected not a decline. With you, not even Mara, the Evil One, will find an opportunity of using the true doctrine to disappear (and) confusing (you concerning it).’ (Village monks) should please (wilderness monks) in this manner and leave.”

From the above descriptions, it is evident that there was antagonism between wilderness and village monks, who belonged to one and the same community.

2.6. Wilderness monks v. village monks in Mahāyāna texts

2.6.1. Praises for the Aranyakas in the Śikṣāsamuccaya

As Ray (1994: 251f.), Mochizuki (1988), Silk (1994) and others have demonstrated, there are several early Mahāyāta texts which praise seclusion in the wilderness.

For instance, the eleventh chapter, i.e. the Aranyakamardana ("Praise of the Wilderness"), in the Śikṣāsamuccaya or A Compendium of Buddhist Doctrine, attributed to Śāntideva of the eighth century, cites many passages from early Mahāyāna sutras, which praise seclusion in the wilderness. 40

2.6.2. Praises for the Aranyakas in the Ugraprajñarāṣṭra

One such early scripture, the Ugraprajñarāṣṭra, which is also completely preserved in Tibetan and Chinese, proclaims that a bodhisattva should enter the wilderness in order to attain enlightenment.

40 An excellent analysis of the chapter concerning wilderness and village monks is found in Ray 1994: 251-254.
“Bodhisattvas who stay at home will never be able to rightly attain supreme enlightenment. All of them, having left their homes, thinking of the wilderness (dgon pa), applying their minds to the wilderness, go to the wilderness and then attain supreme enlightenment. The multitude (rogs) of (bodhisattvas) was thus formed.”

In another place in this scripture where the twelve dharmaganas (ascetic practices) are explained in detail, “living in the wilderness” is included in the following way.

“An ordained bodhisattva, having realized merits, should not stop dwelling in the wilderness as long as he lives.”

The text also tells that a wilderness monk occasionally visited village monks and even stayed in their monastery primarily to learn.

“Then, householder, if a bodhisattva, who dwells in the wilderness, goes to a lodging in a village (grangani cha lozma) wishing to listen to the Dharma, to meet teachers (dzarmja) and instructors (apdral), or in order to visit a sick person, he should think: ‘I should go back in the evening.’ If he, relying on others in terms of instruction (apdrel) and reception (rinphung), stays in a monastery (nдра), should keep the wilderness and fullwoods in his mind. When he thinks of the wilderness (at the sight of) everything, and seeks the Dharma unceasingly, it is regarded as a (true) wilderness life (phrenggna).”

“When we ordained bodhisattvas go amongst the multitude (gna) for the purpose of (receiving) instructions (uzdlo) and reception (rinphung), he should be courteous there, respectful towards teachers and instructors, he should respect (in terms of years since ordination) elder, middle-ranked, and newly-ordained monks.”

A wilderness monk is also said to practise the six perfections (phrul chen) in the wilderness. After having done so together with other practices, and “having established a root of good (dul ba), then he will enter a village, town, market-place, kingdom and capital and preach the Dharma.”

From these descriptions, we learn that wilderness monks, dwelling alone, practised the six perfections and meditated, while village monks engaged in preaching the Dharma.

48 bsngs-chub gsum dpal phyin na gnyas te blo ma mad pa yang dag par rtags pa’i byung chub mugmen par rtags Par sngs rgyas pa’i yang yang mugmen pa yang na dgen pa la rgyal. Dgen pa’i yang yang mugmen pa yang na dgen pa la rgyal. Dgen pa la sbyod, dgen pa’i yang yang mugmen pa’i yang yang mugmen pa yang dag par rtags pa’i byung chub mugmen par rtags Par sngs rgyas pa’i yang yang mugmen pa yang dag par rgyal na dgen pa la rgyal. Par sngs rgyas pa’i yang yang mugmen pa yang dag par rgyal na dgen pa la rgyal.

49 tsung chub gsum dpal phyin na gnyas te blo ma mad pa yang dag par rtags pa’i byung chub mugmen par rtags Par sngs rgyas pa. Par sngs rgyas pa’i yang yang mugmen pa yang dag Par sngs rgyas pa’i yang yang mugmen pa yang dag Par sngs rgyas pa’i yang yang mugmen pa yang dag Par sngs rgyas pa’i yang yang mugmen pa yang dag.

50 Sksa.200.7f; cf. the Tibetan translation of the Ugaragamcica Stutus, D(T), vol. 9, p. 326, 555f.; Q, vol. 23, p. 269, 3226f.


2.6.3. Wilderness bodhisattvas v. monastery monks in the Rāstrānaparipravchā Śāstra

Another early Mahāyāna text, also cited in the Śikṣāsamuccaya, praising life in the wilderness, is the Rāstrānaparipravchā Śāstra, which is preserved in Buddhist Sanskrit — edited by Louis Finot (1907) and translated into English by Ensink (1952) — as well as Tibetan and Chinese translations.

In this scripture, those who seek enlightenment are advised to dwell in mountains, the wilderness (aranya) or caves. Bodhisattvas thus abandon their homes and dwell in a deserted wilderness, in which they find pleasure. They live alone without the company of women or men, like a rhinoceros. They are satisfied with whatever they obtain, like birds they do not store up things, they have no home anywhere in the world. They are indifferent to gain or respect (dāblā-saṅkāra) as well as obtaining acquaintances with good families (bula-santastva). They, who seek the Buddha's wisdom, abide in generosity (dāna) and self-control (dama); they have attained the perfection of meditation (dhyāna) and the virtue of energy (cīrāgya). The practice of the six perfections is said to be one of the main factors which leads to Buddhahood. A bodhisattva lives with his mind, centred on emptiness (ūpāyatā) and "causelessness" (adhimitta), delighting in tranquillity (śāma) and self-control (dama). The Buddha tells us that in his former lives, he gave his flesh, skin, marrow, blood and everything forming his body as well as all his possessions, thus he practised generosity along with good conduct, patience, vigour, meditation, expedience and wisdom. In short, he practised the six perfections and expedience. He also practised dhyāna (ascetic practices) constantly, when he was a bodhisattva.

Therefore, to sum up, in this scripture, true bodhisattvas are expected to dwell alone in the wilderness, mainly practising dhyāna, the six perfections and meditation without associating with lay people. They are not expected to preach to people. A passage: "they do not look for the uttering of Dharma-preachers (dhamma-bhāsaka)"

Ray (1994: 260f.) has gathered descriptions concerning the wilderness bodhisattvas from this text and carefully summarised them.


RP. 13.6-7 (Ensink 14).

RP. 16.5-4 (Ensink 17).


RP. 13.10-11 (Ensink 14).

RP. 7.17 (Ensink 21).

RP. 16.13-14 (Ensink 17).


RP. 27.18 (Ensink 28).
may also indicate that their way was different from that of the latter, as Ray points out (1994: 263). Thus, in the *Rājapālaśāntipratīcā Sūtra*, ideal bodhisattvas are depicted as wilderness monks

This scripture also tells us that these monks had antagonists. When bad monks, we are told, see a patient one absorbed in meditation, they expel him from the monastery, beating him with sticks. 78 They are said to be intent upon worldly things, alms-bowls and robes, and always zealous in obtaining acquaintances with good families.66 They, desiring gain, are thus bound by the ties of such acquaintances.61

This text also describes in detail the activities of degenerate monks in later times, when the Dharma decays (RP.28.17ff.). They are said to serve householders, holding the banner in their hands; having abandoned the multitude of virtues which the teaching brings, they always carry a scripture (lekha) with them. 62 They go around to houses in villages (gāmikabuleṇa), intoxicated by alcohol and pride.69 "You should not indulge in delights", thus they always tell householders, but they themselves are uncontrolled, groups of their pupils are equally uncontrolled; they spend days and nights with talk of food and sexual intercourse.69 Even when they live in the forest (vana), their minds still dwell in the village.69 Having abandoned meditation (ādhyātma) and study (adhyātma), they are always occupied with the administration of monasteries (śīhāvatārman), desirous of a dwelling, surrounded by unrestrained pupils; they say: "I am not a worker (karmika) in the monastery. It is built for my sake. Only the monks who are obedient to me shall get a room in the monastery."; they are not kind to those who conduct themselves well and are well-restrained, they say to the latter: "This cell (śāla) is allotted to me, this for my fellow-pupil, and that for my companion. Go away, there is no dwelling place for you. Lodgings (śīhāvatāma) are completely distributed, many monks are taken in here. There is also no chance of getting anything here. What will you eat here? Go away, monk!"; they do not allocate lodgings (śīhāvatāma), but store up things like householders, possessing many utensils and attendants.66 Being maltreated and despised in this manner, true bodhisattvas leave villages and capital cities and dwell in the wilderness.

78 RP. 15.11-12 (Ennink 14).
79 RP. 18.8 (Ennink 19).
80 RP. 19.10 (Ennink 21).
81 RP. 21.1 (Ennink 21).
82 RP. 29.3-4 (Ennink 29-29).
83 RP. 29.2 (Ennink 28).
84 RP. 29.15-30.2 (Ennink 29).
85 RP. 30.13 (Ennink 30).
86 RP. 31.1-12 (Ennink 30).
In brief, in this scripture, the antagonists of wilderness bothbhavas were those who stayed in monasteries in or near villages and associated with lay people and gave them teachings. Also, judging from the description of allotments of lands, we can assume that both of them originally belonged to the same community.

26.4. Dhatzaguna monks v. village-oriented monks in the Sarvadharma-pravrtti-nirdeśa Sātra

Recently, Sanskrit fragments of the Sarvadharma-pravrtti-nirdeśa Sātra have been discovered in Afghanistan which are now kept in the Scheuen Collection in Norway. Prof. Jens Braarvig has meticulously edited them in juxtaposition with their Tibetan and Chinese parallels as well as an English translation, mostly from the Sanskrit (Braarvig 2000: 1-166). This text, which, according to Braarvig belongs to the middle period of the Mahāyāna sutra literature, provides a very remarkable testimony to the antagonism between dhatzaguna-practising monks and village-oriented ones.87

The antagonism is demonstrated in the two yākaraṇa parts in the text, namely §6 and §12, based on Braarvig's division of the text. The first one (pp. 125-131) is about a dhatzaguna-practitioner called Cāritramati and a Dharma-preacher (dharma-bhāṣaka), Viśuddhācārita. There was once a monk named Cāritramati, who believed in very severe practices (dikṣādikṣāmukta), was persuaded in the rules of the most pure morality, had attained the fivefold worldly supernatural knowledge, was an expert in monastic rules, and was a practitioner of severe austerity (agra-bhāsa). He founded a monastery (cāhāra), where he stayed, practising meditation.

The Dharma-preacher, Viśuddhācārita, came with his followers to the monastery where the monk Cāritramati lived, and stayed there. From there, they went into the town out of compassion, and when they had conducted the rituals of monks, they returned. He and his followers thus made many people believe in Buddhism, while Cāritramati and his followers were only intent on meditation, without going far rounds in the town.

Cāritramati, on the other hand,嗤rated these other botheunūs, prohibited dwellers in the monastery going to the village, while, at the same time, criticised Viśuddhācārita and his followers for not practicing properly, not talking too much. Saying that the Buddhist praised life in the wilderness (dTapo), he urged them to practise meditation without going into the village.

After three months, Viśuddhācārita and his followers moved to another monastery, from which they went again to towns, villages and the capital in order to preach the Dharma to people. Knowing Viśuddhācārita's activities, Cāritramati blamed him, saying: "He has bad morality, perverted monastic life. How can he attain enlightenment?"

87 I wish to thank Dr. M. J. Vamshyana-Deysurosaya for directing my attention to this text.
His enlightenment is far away. He lives associating with lay people (āduṃ dānaṃ dhanuṣaṃ paśu).

Because of this misdeed, Ācaramātra later fell into the great hell of Avici.

The second story (pp. 158-164; cf. also pp. 84-85), of which no Sanskrit fragment is extant, is about a śrutiśāgarpa-practitioner, Jayamati by name, and a Dharma-preacher, called Pramūdendriya.

There was a dharmarājanaka named Pramūdendriya, who did not teach the people the practices of small passion, contentment, restraints (ādau paśu), solitary life, disassociation from lay people (ādu dāna maviṣṭhaḥ), but rather taught that all dharmas had the nature of craving, aversion and ignorance, and that they were, therefore, by no means hindrances. He taught also that all practices were of one characteristic (type).

At that time, there was a bodhisattva named Jayamati, who was also a Dharma-preacher. He had attained the four states of meditation and practiced the twelve śrutiśāgaras. One day, by mistake, he visited a householder who was an adherent of Pramūdendriya, and praised the practices of small passion, contentment, restraints, solitary life, disassociation from lay people, blaming Pramūdendriya for teaching hereby. The intelligent householder asked him in return about craving, whereupon he answered that craving was an impurity. The householder, however, said that craving was to be found nowhere, hence, there was neither an impurity nor a purification.

Jayamati became angry and dandered Pramūdendriya, saying that the latter taught the Buddhist teachings the wrong way round, and then he left the house.

Having returned to the wilderness (ādau paśu), he criticized Pramūdendriya in front of other monks for teaching pervaded ideas. Pramūdendriya, thereafter, elucidated his teaching in the form of 43 verses. After having heard these, many of those present gained intellectual receptivity into the truth that states of existence have no origination (utapatīka-dharma-kiṃati), others attained emancipation of the mind which is absolutely free from afflictions, whereas Jayamati fell into a great hell.

In the verses uttered by Pramūdendriya, we come across the following expressions which dispense the practices of wilderness monks:

"For someone, who, reflecting in a lodging in the wilderness, praises himself, despises others, and (thus) sticks to the false view concerning the wilderness, there is no (hope to attain) heaven, not to say of enlightenment." 124

"If a layman with the five qualities of desire (kāmapāramitā) hears teaching but does not become afraid, he is superior to one who, after entering this religion, holds the (heretical) view of (reliance on) imagination (upalambha-dvijita), and boasts of the qualities of dharmas." 125

From these stories, we learn the following points:

124 gama' dha' pare sana' la rucpya sena' sima' smud' pec' sa' 7 (Bhavnavig 2000: 160).  
125 te' de' de' para dhi' dha' gma' gma' pac' sa' 7 (Bhavnavig 2000: 163).
(1) Wilderness monks also built monasteries in the wilderness.
(2) There were Dharma-practitioners who dwelt in the wilderness and entered villages to preach to lay people.
(3) There were Dharma-practitioners who kept moving from one monastery to another.
(4) There was antagonism between practitioners of dhatuagarana, who also practised meditation in the wilderness, and Dharma-practitioners who entered villages to preach.
(5) From the second story, we learn that traditional Buddhists and Mahayana monks used to dwell together in monasteries, and schism each other.

Thus, in this text, dhatuagarana practitioners are antagonistic towards monks who dwell in the wilderness, possessing village-oriented minds. The rivalry depicted here is different from that in the Ugrapariprsechā and Ratnapalipraprsechā Sūtras. I assume that the descriptions in this text reflect more or less the realities of the situations at that time when so-called Mahayana Buddhism was gradually forming in and around monasteries. We can assume, in conclusion, that this Sutra was composed by those who belittled dhatuagarana practices. We shall, henceforth, call such monks, who themselves did not dwell in villages but were inclined to be active there, "village-oriented monks".

2.6.5. Antagonism between wilderness and village-oriented monks in Mahayana texts

As we have seen in §2.6.2 and §2.6.3, the composers of the Ugrapariprsechā and Ratnapalipraprsechā Sūtras were themselves presumably wilderness monks or at least their sympathisers. Apart from these Mahayana texts, the Kātyāya-parisūlta and the Ramanātikā were also evidently composed from the point of view of these monks, as both of them, praise more or less the dhatuagarana or ascetic practices, as dwell in the wilderness.

These sutras of "wilderness monks" show antagonism towards those who stayed in monasteries in or near villages and associated with lay people, and they present a picture of conflict between "wilderness monks" and "village monks" not only with regard to the living areas but also to their activities. The wilderness monks were preoccupied primarily with meditation and the dhatuagarana, while village monks associated with lay people, taught the Dharma and managed monasteries. The conflict within these two groups as well as the antagonism between them are basically the same as those described in the Abhimicārikī-Dharmatis which we have already seen above.

On the other hand, the two opposing groups in the Sarvadharmāpryutvair etāt Sūtra, namely the dhatuagarana-practitioners and the village-oriented monks, dwelt together in monasteries in the wilderness, though the latter did not seem to have stayed there
permanently. Therefore, the dual structure of wilderness / village monks does not exactly fit in here. However, if we pay attention to the division of their activities, namely dhuesgenes and meditation on one hand and preaching and association with lay people on the other, the opposing theme found in this text is exactly the same as that of wilderness / village monks.

3.1. Further to the verses in the Utsaha-parivarta
Now, we shall return to the verses in the Utsaha-parivarta in the Lona Sutra. As there is no quotation marks in the Sanskrit original, it is quite difficult to discern the spoken word from narrative description, which has confused not only modern scholars but also the ancient Chinese and Tibetan translators. If we take the antagonism between wilderness and village(-orient=)d monks into consideration and, at the same time, pay attention to the use of the form forms (dėlayi, dēlayaṁ, cū małe) with an optative meaning, which presumably mark the spoken word here in contrast to future forms in the narrative parts, we may translate verses in question (5-11) as follows:

Ignorant practitioners of austerities[1], who dwell in the wilderness[6] and wear patched garments, will say of us as follows[8]: (vs. 5)
They, greedily attached to tattva (tattva), preach (dēlayi) the Dharmas to house-holders. (vs. 6ab)
They (i.e. the wilderness monks) will be honoured as if they were those who possess the sixfold supernatural knowledge (cādākkhyā)[9], (vs. 6cd)
They are (in reality) cruel-minded, wicked, occupied with thoughts of hoeses[4] (vs. 7ab)[10]

[2] avatsārakāta-. Nepalese and Gāhā MSS. read avatsārakāta- ("reflecting upon [the life in] the wilderness").
[3] aṃcacakāyam (-ī); F: aṃcacakāyam (-ī); D2: aṃcacakāyam (-ī). The form aṃcaka appears in the so-called "Kashgari" MS. not only as a nominative but also as an accusative plural form of the first person, e.g.: K.N. 147.10. aṃcaka / aṃcaka / K: aṃcaka (nominative); K.N.190.12. aṃcakā / O: aṃcaka (accusative). The aṃcaka in F. is probably its hyper-sanskritized form. For the accusative plural form aṃcaka in D2 (here the initial vowel is lost in sandhi), see BHSG §30:45. The phrase aṃcaka (or aṃcaka) in this verse is similar to that of vs. 8: aṃcakān ca ca va (Pn, D2: avatsārakā ca ca va) vakyaṃ. The expression aṃcaka (or aṃcaka) in the verse in question is comparable also with verse 12: ye cañmān kṣaṇayām (suddhi). Therefore, I take aṃcaka (or aṃcaka) not for the nominative but for the accusative, though the Tibetan and modern translators took it for nominative.
[5] gṛha-avatsārakāta. Or: "thinking upon house and property" (gṛha-avatsārakāta, see note [8]).
Having entered (their) retreat in the wilderness, our slanderers, (vs. 7cd) //who are (themselves) bent on gain and honour //08, will say of us as follows (enamā): (vs 8ab)

“For sure these monks are heretics! They preach (dārya) their own verses (kāyāyanī) (vs. 8cd)

Prompted by (greed for) gain and honour, they compose sutras by themselves and preach in the midst of the assembly (parpa).” (vs. 9bc)

Our revellers (vs. 9d) 09 will speak evil of us (vs. 11a) to kings, princes, kings' ministers, Brahmanas, householders, as well as to other monks (vs. 10) (saying): "They are propagating a heresy!" (vs. 11b)

We shall endure all these out of reverence for great seers (i.e. buddhas; (vs. 11cd)

The part, parallel to this in Kumārajīva's Chinese translation, can be understood in a similar way. 10 On the other hand, the Tibetan parallel differs from my understanding concerning verse 6ab. 100

---

08 I cannot exclude the possibility that verses 6cd and 7ab could be also slanderous words uttered by wilderness monks towards “us”.

09 enamā (compare vayam bāha-sat-kāri-bhikṣāyām. Or “They will say of us as follows: (There are) bent on gain and honour... ”. This interpretation goes with the Tibetan translation: bāyag ca ta mā tā chad maḥī “ramped dānyān kāra na gāt pūrṇa, aya dāṅgā tā dāṅg mā muṣtā ca, bāyag gī tāng hī rāt ti ‘chad’.”

10 see note (10).

100 Vs. 6 of the Tibetan version reads: rampa dāng mā kāra ni’ pūrṇa / rāng gī mok mā ko ṣa ṣa na va / "khe sā ḍī māt ma ṣāt ma ṣā tā ni’ pūrṇa / (They abuse us greatly: “Having composed sutras by themselves &c the sake of gain and honour, (they) explain (them) in the midst of the assembly.” Here, I temporarily follow the Tibetan translator’s interpretation. However, I cannot exclude the possibility that this verse is not slanderous, spoken by wilderness monks, but a narrative description concerning these monks. If that is the case, then we may translate verses 8-9 as follows: “(The wilderness monks say of us: ) ‘For sure these monks are heretics! They preach their own verses’ (However,) our revellers (themselves), being prompted by (greed for) gain and honour, compose sutras by themselves and preach in the midst of the assembly.”

10 The parallel verses in Kumārajīva’s translation can be interpreted as follows:

Or there are wilderness monks, wearing patched rags and dwelling in the wilderness, who claim that they are practising the True 7th, and despise (monks who dwell) amongst people (AR7), (saying): “Because they desire gain, they preach the Dharma to lay people”. (Wilderness monks) are revered by people, as though they were sages who possess transcendental powers. (However,) they bear evil thoughts, constantly thinking of worldly matters.

In the name of wilderness monks, they like to expose our faults, saying: “These monks, out of greed for gain, preach heretical doctrines.

Having themselves composed this scripture to delude lay people, they preach it, hoping to obtain fame.”

Wishing to define us in the assembly, they slander and speak evil of us towards kings, ministers, Brahmanas, householders and towards other monks saying: “These are of wrong views and preach heretical doctrines.”

Because we revere the Buddha, we shall endure all these evils.

---

* The word “AR7” in Chinese has meant “amongst people; in the world” since olden times, while in Japanese, it means “human beings”. However, all the modern translators of Kumārajīva’s Lotus Sutra, including Horiyū, have interpreted this word incorrectly to mean “human beings”.
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Though I must admit that there is still uncertainty as to the distinction between slanderous words and descriptive parts, we can still learn the following points from these verses:

(1) Wilderness monks⁹⁹ blame "us". (vs. 5-6a); (vs. 7c)
(2) Wilderness monks are ignorant (darmatari). (vs. 5d)
(3) "We" are blamed for preaching to householders. (vs. 6b; vs. 8c; probably also vs. 9c)
(4) "We" are blamed for composing scriptures. (vs. 4a, probably also 8d)
(5) "We" are blamed for being attached to tastes. (vs. 6)
(6) "We" are Buddhist monks. (vs. 8c)

Apart from these, we learn another two facts from verses 18-19 in the same chapter (cited in §1.1 and §1.2):

(7) "We" shall preach this Sutra, i.e. the Lotus Sutra, in the assembly. (vs. 18c)

¹⁰⁹ The Tibetan translation reads here as follows (Nakamura 1986: 272.3-273.8):

digyupa dag la thar sso dang lhos (l. zhom) bo dag kyung bshes nor nes /
'byul bsdug bral byong tzul dpal dba zhes / bo negen de skad snaa bar gnyer // (vs. 5)

m经营者 chos dang chen po rnam bzhin dan pa dag la sbe kyang 'bshad /
meton serno dang sem jo rnam dku bstein dang dag kyung byed par gnyer // (vs. 6)

gnyen yis' svmo dang sdom dang sem lhan bzhin dan na la rnam par sros /

agam pa dben par rab zha la bsdug cag rnamo la shur pa lde / (vs. 7)

bzhag cag la ni 'ki sbyad mchog rgyal dag bshes bzhin gnas pa nor /

dge shing 'ki dag mug tangs sem bzhag gi gnyen tre ba rna / 'shad // (vs. 8)

rgyal pa dang na lugs dangs (l. chos) mugs rgya mtsho sde bshes nor nas /

'zhur gyi bzhin la (bshad gnyor ser bsdug cag rnamo la thun sdech) l. t. (l. bsdug // (vs. 9)

rgyal pa dang na rgyal bu dang / de tropho rgyal po bzhin pa dang /

brum sde dang ni bzhin dan bzhag dag gshes dngos dag drang du ni / (vs. 10)

bshad (l. dag) cag rnamo la ni bzhung sgrub rgyal ma byed can sbe sbyin kyung gnyor /

srong sma la sbe zos nu. thams cad bzhag cag tshab par byeg // (vs. 11)

The following is my provisional translation of the Tibetan parallel:

Thinking of the wilderness and also wearing patched garments, the wicked-minded will say:

"We practise the minimum of necessities." (vs. 3)

Those, who are attached to tastes, also preach the Dharma to householders.

Like those who possess the afofold supernatural knowledge, they will be honoured also. (vs.6)

They, who are heretics, preach self-made verses. (vs.8)

Having composed sutras for themselves for the sake of gain and honour, (they) explain (them)

in the midst of the assembly", thus they abuse us greatly. (vs.9)

"To kings, princes, king's ministers, Brahman, householders, and so many others, (vs. 19)

they speak evil of us. They even say, "They are heretics!" Out of reverence for great sons,

we shall endure all these. (vs. 11)

I take 66 verses as descriptive words by wilderness monks towards "us", while the Tibetan translator took it for a narrative which describes wilderness monks.

The word (Buddhista) monaqi does not occur here. However, from the context, it is obvious that the practitioners in the wilderness, described here, are none other than Buddhist wilderness monks.
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(8) “We” shall visit people in towns and villages in order to further transmit what the Buddha consigned “us” to do (i.e. the Lotus Sutra) (vs. 19)

In short, the “we” are monks who preach the Dharma to lay people in villages and towns, being blamed by “our” antagonists, namely wilderness monks, for the composition of new scriptures. In future, “we” shall bear and preach the Lotus Sutra.

According to the prose which proceeds the verses in question, eighty hundred thousand bodhisattvas uttered these stanzas. In the Sutra, these bodhisattvas are meant by the word “we”, but, in reality, the “we” here is none other than the composers/holders of the Lotus Sutra.

Therefore, we may conclude that those who composed and preached the Lotus Sutra were village or village-oriented monks. Also, it is to be noted that the wilderness monks’ slander against “us” in the Lotus Sutra is similar to that against village-oriented monks found in the Abhisamācāraya-Dharmab (e.g. “You seek for the most tasty foods with the tip of your tongue.”) and the Rājaprapāpariprachā Sūtra (e.g. “They always carry a scripture [ākha] with them.”).

4. Composers and holders of the Lotus Sutra assumed from other chapters
4.1. The Bodhisattvayuprāptivārasamāgama-parivarta

In the preceding section, we concluded that the composers of the Lotus Sutra were village-oriented monks, of whom wilderness monks were critical. When we understand this as the background to the Lotus Sutra, we can then realize why Maitreya and his fellow bodhisattvas were surprised at the sight of so many unknown bodhisattvas emerging out of the earth, which is described in Chapter XIV, the Bodhisattvayuprāptivārasamāgama-parivarta.

In this chapter (KN: 297ff.), we are told that countless bodhisattvas, headed by four others namely, Viśeṣacārīta, Anantacārīta, Viśuddhaśārīra, and Supratisthyasārīta, suddenly emerged out of the earth and paid homage to the Buddha, Prahlītāravana-buddha and other buddhas who had gathered at the Buddha’s assembly. Maitreya and other bodhisattvas in the assembly were surprised at the sight and wondered, whence they came and who they were as they had neither seen nor heard of them before. Thereupon Maitreya asked the Buddha about them, to which the latter replied that he, himself, had taught and converted them long before and that they were, therefore, his “sons”. Further, the Buddha gave Maitreya (= Ajita) a presentation of these bodhisattvas who had emerged out of the earth as follows:

*And these Bodhisattvas Mahāsattvas, Ajita, occupy in this Saha-world the 4 main

Mochizuki (1988: 66) and Okada (2001: 378) seem to be of the opinion that the Lotus Sutra stands on the side of wilderness monks.
of the other-element below. Only thinking of the lesson they have to study, and
devoted to thoroughly comprehend it, these young men of good family have no
liking for social gatherings, nor for bustling crowds; they ... delight in seclusion,
are fond of seclusion. These young men of good family do not dwell in the immediate
vicinity of gods and men, they not being fond of bustling crowds." ... "All have devoted themselves to a hermit life (śramaṇa-dīna-aharyakā) and are
avoidous in abiding in places of battle (āsura-patikāna); they walk detached (śramaṇa-
āsrita), these sons of mine, following my precepts in their lofty course (caryā)." (vs. 39)
They dwell in the domain of ether, in the lower portion of the field, those heroes
who, unwearied, are striving day and night to attain superior knowledge. (vs. 40)
All strenuous, of good memory, unshaken in the immense strength of their intelligence,
those serene sages preach the law (dharma kāśita), all radiant, as being my sons." (vs. 41) (Kern 1884: 292-293). The Sanskrit words in brackets are added by the
present author.

In short, these bodhisattvas were wilderness monks who practised dhāraṇagama.

In the Lotus Sutra, Maitreya is depicted as the representative of bodhisattvas who
had a close association with lay people, preached the Dharma to them, and propagated
the Lotus Sutra. Therefore, his activities were, in the above-stated system, none other
than those of a village-oriented monk.

We are told that these dhāraṇagama-practising bodhisattvas dwelt spatially as well as
temporally far away from Maitreya, and that he had, therefore, neither seen nor heard
of them before. Here, again, we come across another piece of evidence of the dichotomy
between wilderness monks and village-oriented ones, and we can assume with certainty
that the composers as well as the bearers of the Lotus Sutra, symbolised by Maitreya,
were on the side of village-oriented monks.

4.2. The Punyaparyāya-parivarta

Verses 17-32 in the Punyaparyāya-parivarta (KN, 334-336) describe the unlimited
merit (punya) for those who, upon hearing this religious discourse (dharma-parivarta)
which elucidates the duration of the Tathāgata's life — namely the Tathāgata's
pramāṇa-parivarta which precedes this Punyaparyāya chapter —-, believe in it for a
single moment. We are told this merit far surpasses that acquired by the practices of
the five pramāṇas. I shall cite here Kern's English translation to give a convenient
explanation.199 The Sanskrit words in brackets are added by the present author.

17. Let a man who is seeking after this knowledge, superior Buddha-knowledge,
undertake to practise in this world the five perfect virtues (parimitha-puṣaka); 18. Let him, during eight thousand kōvs of complete ākṣara (rūpa), continue giving

199 The Central Asian manuscripts read as follows: O. Śramaṇa-dhāraṇā-muktaḥ, F. ādhisthānakārya
200 Kern 1884: 318-319.
repeated alms to Buddhas and disciples; 
19. Regaling Pratyekabuddhas and kōts of Bodhisattvas by giving meat, food and 
drink, clothing and lodging; 
20. Let him build on earth temples and monasteries of sandal-wood, and pleasant 
convent gardens provided with walls (cankramaśīna); 
21. Let him after so bestowing gifts, various and diversified, thousands of 
kōts of kōons, direct his mind to enlightenment; 
22. Let him then, for the sake of Buddha-knowledge, keep unbroken the pure moral 
precepts which have been recommended by the perfect Buddhas and acknowledged 
beneath this; 
23. Let him further develop the virtue of forbearance, be steady in the stage of 
meekness (danaśākāra), be constant, of good memory, and patiently endure many 
censures; 
24. Let him, moreover, for the sake of Buddha-knowledge, bear the contemplative 
words of unbelievers who are rooted in pride; 
25. Let him, always zealous, strenuous, studious, of good memory, without any other 
preoccupation in his mind, practice meditation, during kōts of kōons; 
26. Let him, whether living in the forest (aranyamātī tiṣṭhane) or entering 
upon a vagrant life (ākrame abhiruvaya), go about, avoiding sloth and torpor, 
for kōts of kōons; 
27. Let him as a philosopher (ādhyāta), a great philosopher (mabhādhyāta) who 
finds his delight in meditation (ādhyātmikama), in concentration of mind (ātivyaya), 
pass eight thousand kōts of kōons; 
28. Let him energetically pursue enlightenment with the thought of his reaching 
all-knowingness, and so arrive at the highest degree of meditation (ātivyāna- 
pāramīśāh gatah); 
29. Then the merit accruing to those who practise the virtues oft described, 
during thousands of kōts of kōons; 
30. (Is less than that of) a man or a woman who, on hearing the duration of my 
life (āyana), for a single moment believes in it; this merit is endless. 
31. He who renouncing doubt, vacillation, and misgiving shall believe even for a 
short moment, shall obtain such a reward. 

Thus, the merit acquired through the practices of the perfection of giving (dana- 
pāramitā: verses 18–21), good conduct (śila-pāramitā: verse 22), patience (kṣīnti-pāramitā: 
verses 23–24), vigour (viryapāramitā: verse 25), and meditation (ātivyāna-pāramitā: 
verses 26–28) is said to be far inferior to that of a (lay) man or woman who hears the 
Buddha’s discourse, concerning the duration of his life and believes in it for even a 
single moment. In the verses, in boldface, we may clearly see that the composers of the 
Lotus Sutra depreciated the practices of wilderness monks (Kern’s “living in the 
forest”) compared to lay people’s belief in the Sutra.69 Here, again, we may conclude 
that these composers were on the side of village- (oriented) monks who supposedly
preached the Sutra to lay people in the name of the Buddha.

4.3. The Dharmaśāṅkara-parivaṁśa

In the preceding sections, we assumed that the composers and holders of the Lotus Sutra were mostly village-oriented monks of whom wilderness monks were critical. Did the composers and holders of the Sutra constitute a powerful faction in the community and hence held power in the monasteries? Presumably, this was not the case. They seemed to have been a fringe group. It is repeatedly alluded to in the text itself that the heads of the Lotus Sutra used to be rejected in the community, suffer terrible persecution, be expelled from monasteries. For instance, verses in the Vaiśeṣika-parivaṁśa read106:

"We will suffer, patiently endure, O Lord, the injuries, threats, blows and threats with sticks at the hands of foolish men. * (vs. 1) 107

"One will have to endure frowns, repeated disapproval, banishment (niṅkāma) from monasteries, manifold bindings and reviling (cīvyāvāna) * (vs. 17) 108

Passages, found in Chapter X, the Dharmaśāṅkara-parivaṁśa, also indicate that holders of the Lotus Sutra in early times, received constant rejection in the community.

In this chapter, the Buddha told a bodhisattva named Bhāsājñagaraja the following:

A Dharma-preacher in future should propose the Lotus Sutra with confidence in the assembly. The Buddha would send a magically-conjured audience who would not reject nor contradict the preacher. If (sākṣita) the preacher sākṣita in the wilderness (aranya), then the Buddha would send large numbers of gods, dragons, spirits, gandharvas, asuras, and others to listen to him preach. If the preacher forgot words or expressions of the Lotus Sutra during recitation, the Buddha would remind him.110

These descriptions, concerning the preacher of the Lotus Sutra, are repeated in verses 25–33 in the same chapter, 111 I shall cite Kern's English translation of these verses here. 112 The Sanskrit words in brackets are added by the present author.

25. Where clouds, sticks, pikes, or abusive words and threats fall to the lot of

106 The verses, cited above, are important also for the consideration of the relationship between the Lotus Sutra and prajñāpāramitā thought. In the latter, prajñāpāramitā is given the highest position. However, in the case of these verses in the Parijātahāraṇa chapter, the acts of hearing the Sutra and believing in it, are placed at the highest position. We may assume that the composer(s) of the chapter, being aware of the prajñāpāramitā thought system, modified it and gave pride of place to that of the acts of hearing and believing in the Sutra, which was usually suited for lay people.

107 KN. 285.1–2. 293.5–6.


109 suṣṭrapati or sūṣṭrapati. Cf. note (33) in this paper.

110 KN. 278.1–2.

111 KN. 234.10–235.7.

112 KN. 236.11–237.14.

preacher, let him be patient, thinking of me.
26. My body has existed entire in thousands of koṭs of regions; during a number of koṭs of regions of existence beyond comprehension I teach the law to creatures.
27. To that contagious man who shall proclaim this Sutra after my complete extinction I will also send many creations.
28. Monks, nuns, lay devotees, male and female, will honour him as well as the classes of the audience.
29. And should there be some to attack him with cloths, sticks, injurious words, threats, taunts, then the creations shall defend him.
30. And when (padāpī) he shall stay alone, engaged in study (vādābhyāsā), in a lonely place, in the forest (aśvet), or the hills (parvatas),
31. Then will I show him my luminous body and enable him to remember the lesson (vādābhyāsā) he forgot.
32. While he is living lonely in the wilderness (vama-śrota), I will send him gods and goblins in great number to keep him company.
33. Such are the advantages he is to enjoy; whether he is preaching to the four classes, or living, a solitary, in mountain caverns (vama-kandara) and studying his lesson (vādābhyāsā), he will see me.

From the descriptions in the Uṣṣaka- and Dharmabhāsīna-paṇīvarṇa cited above, we can recognize the harsh realities of those who preached the Lotus Sutra in early times. They often received rejection and were persecuted in the Buddhist community. There were even cases where they were expelled from monasteries and had no choice but to dwell in forests or the wilderness, reciting the Sutra.

There are certain scholars who take the verses in the Dharmabhāsīna-paṇīvarṇa, cited above, for indicating that the holders of the Lotus Sutra were wilderness monks who practised in recluse. However, it must be noted that the text itself reads “Even when (padāpī) he shall stay alone, .... in the forest”, which shows that they dwelt in the forest because of some special reason. Further, their practices, namely reciting (vādābhyāsā) the Lotus Sutra and preaching it to non-human spirits, are evidently different from those of true wilderness monks, namely dharmagṛha and meditation. Moreover, according to the Lotus Sutra, preachers or holders of the Sutra had (and still have) a particular mission in life entrusted by the Buddha, that is, to go to villages and towns everywhere, where there was a person who sought the Dharma, and to preach this Sutra. This mission evidently contradicts the lifestyle of wilderness monks who abstained from associating with lay people and merely concentrated on practising austerities and meditation.

233 For instance, Okada 2001: 179.
234 Vs. 19 in the Uṣṣaka-paṇīvarṇa (KN. 274.5–6).
4.4. Composers of the Lotus Sutra

In conclusion, we may assume that the composers of the Sutra as well as its holders in early times were village monks or those who dwelt outside villages while possessing village-oriented minds. They seemed to have constituted a minor group in the monasteries. They were criticised by wilderness monks on one hand and persecuted by factions in power in the monasteries on the other.

In history, we come across many cases where those who dared to state the truth loudly in public were simply ignored, or even persecuted by those in power or by the masses which were, to their turn, often manipulated by the latter. I assume that the composer and holders of the Lotus Sutra in early times were such courageous people.

The truth, which they proclaimed openly, in my opinion, was that everyone could equally obtain the Buddha’s knowledge (buddha-jñāna; or mahā-jñāna “the great knowledge” as it is also known) and should, therefore, aim at obtaining it.18 Such a view is by no means shocking to us who are familiar with Mahāyāna Buddhism nowadays but it must have been a complete antithesis of Nikāya Buddhism in those days, in which knowledge of the Buddha, that of pratyekabuddhas and arhats were strictly graded. Probably, these composers and holders were criticised and persecuted because they uttered this simple and self-evident truth openly in public.

18 In support of my assumption, we find a passage in the Central Asian MSS. and the Chinese translations of the Sutra, which proclaims that the Sutra is a scripture which shows the equality of the great knowledge (mahā-jñāna):

KN-240.3.ākṣaṁ sādhu bhagavātī Sākyamuni (= the Nepalese MSS. The Gilgit MSS. are missing here).

O. sādhu sādhu bhagavān chākyamuni[tr]pad imaṁ bodhisattvavibhāgam mahā-jñānam-samast-ākṣaṁ sarvabuddha-parthivānam dharmagurjunyām dirayasim samprakāśayet instead “Sakyamuni” (“It is excellent, excellent, Lord Sakyamuni, that you show and expound this religious discourse which is a compendium for bodhisattvas, in elucidation of equality of the great knowledge, and which all buddhas embrace.”).

LA(B-11.Bezb 7)///[fořjém Sākyamuni ya iman bi(fā)jijurvaḥ sam[graham mahā-jñānam- samast-ākṣaṁ]/// (“It is excellent, O Lord Sakyamuni, that you show and expound this religious discourse which is a compendium for bodhisattvas, in elucidation of equality of the great knowledge...”).

Kumārajīva’s translation: Tādāha, vol. 9, No.962, No.962. 赤松 �� 儒道！佛雜佛雜。佛雜佛雜。佛雜佛杂
5. Searching for the origins of Mahāyāna Buddhism

5.1. The position of the Lotus Sutra in the history of Mahāyāna Buddhism

As I have written elsewhere, I assume that the Lotus Sutra was shaped gradually to its present form. Based on results of the re-search of our predecessors as well as my own, I have tentatively divided the process of formation of the Sutra into four stages as follows:

1. (I) Tristubh-Jagāti verses, found in chapters from the Upayakusala- (I) to the Vyakarana-parivarta (IX)
2. Śloka verses and prose, found in those chapters
3. Chapters from the Dharmabhūsana- (X) to the Tattvāgama-sūkṣma-samādhi-parivarta (XX), as well as Nidāna- (I) and Anupariśnaya-parivarta (XXVII)
4. The other chapters (XXI-XXVI) and the latter half of the Saṁyogadāsana-parivarta (XI), i.e. the so-called Devadatta-parivarta

While exact dates of formation are impossible to determine, I assume that the Sutra came into existence in this order, apart from some exceptions such as the verse portion of the Saṁantabhūsana-parivarta (XXIV) which probably existed as an independent text before being later incorporated into the Lotus Sutra.

Further, I have assumed that when the prajñāpāramitā thought system developed in southern India, Gandhara region or elsewhere, the earlier stages of the Lotus Sutra, namely (1) and (2) in the above list, were composed in another area completely unrelated to it. Sometime later, and probably in North-Western India, these two texts met with the result that the Lotus Sutra was influenced by prajñāpāramitā literature and the third stage was appended to it. After that, the fourth stage was added when it came across other beliefs such as in Āvokiteśvara, Amṛtaḥa, Saṁantabhadra, dharma, and so on.

Therefore, if we compare the Lotus Sutra in the present form and Prajñāpāramitā literature, the former definitely appears much newer than the latter. However, the earlier stages of the Lotus Sutra were probably composed not later than the formation of this said literature.

Moreover, I have pointed out that there are at least seventeen instances in which

Karasima 1991, 1993. Prof. Kajiyama has cited my theory in detail in his article in Japanese, which was later translated into English by Wayne Yokoyama (Kajiyama 2000). I use his English translation here with some revision.


the Nepalese and Gâl̄gī manuscripts of the Lotus Sutra read शाखा and (buddha-, sarha-), while the Central Asia ones read शाखा, (buddha-, sarha-), instead, which lead me to the assumption that, in the earliest stage of transmission of the Lotus Sutra, the Middle Indic form शाखा or शाखा (< Skt. शाखा, शाखा) had previously stood here, and that later, some redactors back-formed it to शाखा (“knowledge”), while others simplifed it to शाखा (“vehicle”). At the same time, I have shown that there is a word play between शाखा (“knowledge”) and शाखा (“vehicle”) in the famous parable of the burning house, found in the अयुग्मय-परिवर्त of the Lotus Sutra. I have also assumed, further, that the Mahayânaist terms, buddha-शाखा (“the Buddha vehicle”), शाखा (“the great vehicle”), शाखा (“the inferior vehicle”) originally meant buddha-शाखा (“buddha-knowledge”), महाशाखा (“great knowledge”), शाखा (“inferior knowledge”) respectively, and that the term महाशाखा (< महाशाखा), which originally meant “great knowledge, buddha-knowledge” in the earliest stage of the Lotus Sutra, was later interpreted as “the great vehicle”, and was then adopted by composers of scriptures to designate the new idea of “Mahayâna Buddhism”. Presumably, the word play of शाखा / शाखा, found in the parable of the burning house, may have given rise to this misinterpretation.

117 Only when we assume in this way, we can explain the following phenomena:

(i) The अनुभवसित प्रकृतिपरमिता (hereafter as अनुभव), which has been deemed as one of the earliest Mahayâna terms, emphasizes the performance of प्रकृति in sutra scrolls but respects it for stupas, while the earlier stages of the Lotus Sutra, namely (1) and (2) in the above list, positively recommends the building and veneration of stupas. From the दिर्म-परिवर्त (X) onwards, however, the building of sutra burial mounds (सूर्य) representing the performance of प्रकृति in sutra scrolls, was recommended.

(ii) In the अनुभव, the dharma practices of holding, reciting, explaining, copying, and the performing of प्रकृति are explained, but in the fine two stages of the Lotus Sutra the practice of copying does not appear, and it is not until the third stage that copying is first mentioned.

(iii) In the अनुभव, Bodhisattvas Mahâjâna and Maitreya appear. In the Lotus Sutra, these two appear only in the third and fourth stages not before.

(iv) In the अनुभव, the term preacher of the dharma, or दिर्म-परिवर्त, appears, and it is used frequently in the third stage of the Lotus Sutra, whereas in the first two stages, there is no clear-cut instance of the term.

(v) In verses in the first two stages, अनुभवम् (अनुभवम्) is mentioned, but since it does not go beyond the treatment found in अनुभव and निभय literature, it is merely an artificial. The portion in the Lotus Sutra where we can clearly see the influence of the अनुभव thought system, is in the second half of the दिर्म-परिवर्त (V). Hence this verse portion, which is not found in Kanjôju’s translation, is thought to have been interpolated at a much later time.

(vi) The अनुभव from the beginning explains the प्रकृतिपरमिता (perfection of wisdom) as the basis of the five लोकसिद्धांत, while in the Lotus Sutra the six लोकसिद्धांत are merely enumerated. ‘२ is not until the third stage, in the प्रकृतिपरमिता-परिवर्त (XVI), that the प्रकृतिपरमिता thought system is first mentioned as the basis of the five लोकसिद्धांत.


Also, I have demonstrated elsewhere\(^\text{131}\) that the old Sanskrit fragments of the Lotus Sutra are much more Middle Indic in nature than other manuscripts, and that some of these forors show the peculiarities of Eastern dialects. These facts lead me to agree with the hypothesis of H. Lüders and Prof. Dchi Hsin-lin (or Ji Xianlin) that “the original text of the Saddharma-pundarika was written, if not in pure Māgadhi, in a 'mixed Sanskrit' which was based on that dialect”\(^\text{132}\).

As well as this, it is to be noted that the descriptions, which tell us that the composers and holders of the Lotus Sutra were rejected, criticised, and even persecuted, occur in the third stage, which means that probably the composers and holders of the first two stages, who had been, in reality, rejected, criticised, and persecuted by other groups of Buddhists, described these unfortunate experiences together with their strong resolve to further propagate the Sutra under such adverse circumstances. However, the first stages, primarily dealing with the equality of the “great knowledge”, as it is known from the Sutra’s own subtitle “An Elucidation of Equality of the Great Knowledge” or Mahāyāna-samātā-nirdeśa\(^\text{133}\), contain by no means sophisticated ideas compared with other Mahāyāna texts. The fact that the composers and holders of the Sutra with such primitive ideas were severely criticised and persecuted seems to indicate that the earlier stages of the Sutra date back to the time of the very formation of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

Therefore, in conclusion, I assume that the formation of the earlier stages of the Lotus Sutra dates back to much earlier times than is supposed, maybe even back to the period when the earliest Mahāyāna came into existence, as it is indicated above.

5.2. The origins of Mahāyāna scriptures

It is very difficult to say who were the first who proclaimed themselves as Mahāyānists: wilderness monks, village-oriented ones or others. As we have already seen, there are several early Mahāyāna texts which praise seclusion in the wilderness, like the Ugraparipṛcchā, the Rājataparipṛcchā, the Kṣaṇa-parivartaka, the Rāmasūtra, and the Akṣobhya-prajñā\(^\text{134}\). Based on this fact, some scholars have been inclined to think that the Mahāyāna originated as a tradition of wilderness (or forest) monks.\(^\text{135}\)

However, as we have already seen above, we know of two Mahāyāna suttas which reject dhutanga-pratitya in the wilderness, namely the Sarvadharma-pratitya-nirdeśa Sutra and the Lotus Sutra. As well as these, in my opinion, there are at least two more


\(^{132}\) Hoernle(sch.) 1916:62; Dchi, Hsin-lin 1944:199-143.

\(^{133}\) See note (115).

\(^{134}\) All of them are contained in the Mahāparinirvāṇa collection, which is possibly not a coincidence.

Mahāyāna scriptures which are critical of such practices, namely the *Ratnaugesamayagāthā* and the *Aṣṭasahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. 

Verses 3–8 in Chapter XXI in the *Ratnaugesamayagāthā* evidently demonstrate that the Sutra is not on the side of wilderness monks. I shall cite Conze’s English translation of these verses here:

3. If he is one who has behaved in accordance with the ascetic practices, a devoted Yogin, [Mara will tell him:] ‘Formerly [in your past lives] you have also had these very same qualities.’

4. Though he might practise quite detached from villages or cities in a mountain cave, In a remote forest, or in hiding woods,-

4. Though he might practise quite detached from villages or cities in a mountain cave, In a remote forest, or in hiding woods,-

5. Although they may constantly dwell in a village, a royal city [or] a market town;

5. Although they may constantly dwell in a village, a royal city [or] a market town;

6. If therein they do not generate longing for the vehicle of the Abhava and Pratyekabuddhas, But are devoted to enlightenment for the sake of maturing beings:

6. If therein they do not generate longing for the vehicle of the Abhava and Pratyekabuddhas, But are devoted to enlightenment for the sake of maturing beings:

Then this has been preached as the detachment of the Sugata’s sons.

6. Though he may reside in mountain caves, five hundred miles wide,

6. Though he may reside in mountain caves, five hundred miles wide,

Infested with wild beasts, for many kotis of years:

Infested with wild beasts, for many kotis of years:

That Bodhisatva does not know this [true] detachment

That Bodhisatva does not know this [true] detachment

If he dwells contaminated by the self.

If he dwells contaminated by the self.

7. When he feels superior to Bodhisattvas who practice for the weal of the world, And who have attained the concentrations, emancipations, faculties, trances and powers, On the ground that they do not course in the detachment of the remote forest,-

7. When he feels superior to Bodhisattvas who practice for the weal of the world, And who have attained the concentrations, emancipations, faculties, trances and powers, On the ground that they do not course in the detachment of the remote forest,-

8. Whether he dwells in the neighbourhood of a village, or in the remote forest:

8. Whether he dwells in the neighbourhood of a village, or in the remote forest:

If he is free from the thought of the twofold vehicle and fixed on the supreme enlightenment,

If he is free from the thought of the twofold vehicle and fixed on the supreme enlightenment,

Then this is the detachment of those who have set out for the weal of the world.

Then this is the detachment of those who have set out for the weal of the world.

As one whose self is extinct should that Bodhisatta be considered.

As one whose self is extinct should that Bodhisatta be considered.

In my view, these are a summary of prose passages found in the *Aṣṭasahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* pp. 192.1f–196.14 (Conze 1973: 230–235), rather than the other way round. From these verses and passages in which *dhyānas* are depreciated, it is evident that the *Ratnaugesamayagāthā* as well as the *Aṣṭasahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, presumably upon which the former is based, are not on the side of wilderness monks, but rather on village(-oriented) monks.

Thus, there are also several early Mahāyāna scriptures which were apparently composed by those who were critical of the wilderness tradition.

Therefore, my preliminary hypothesis is that those, who were frustrated by groups of monks who were dogmatic as well as formalistic in the community, gradually removed themselves from the latter and finally began to compose texts according to their own ideas—they could have been *dīvadagga*-practitioners, monks who were occupied with meditation, village-oriented monks or others. Though they may have been critical of the established monasticism of the day, they may have remained within the community, at least in early times, criticizing each other. The following description found in the *Ugārapariñña* presents a picture of various groups of monks living together in one community.

When he (i.e. a householder bodhisattva) enters a monastery (*vihāra*), he should discern all the practices of the community of monks: who is a learned monk? who is a Dharma-preaching monk (*dhe lông choi bhūyā pān*); who is a monk who observes discipline? who is a monk who holds the *mukkha*; who is a monk who holds the *Buddhatattva-piṭaka*; who is a wilderness monk? who is one who lives by alms? who is one who wears rag-robes, one who has few desires, one who is content with oneself, or one who lives in solitude; who is a monk who practices yogas; who is a monk who meditates; who is a monk who belongs to the *Buddhatattva-piṭaka* (*dhe lông bhūyā vassakāya* *cīn pān pān*); who is a monk who is in charge of the buildings (*lag gi bæ*, Skt. *nava-kumbhaka*); who is a monk who supervises the monastery (*chat ta kiad pān*, Skt. *paśyajñavyakaram*); who is a monk who is the head of the monastery (*dhe pān* *ta kiad pān*, Skt. *vihāra-vaṇānu״). After having discerned all this, he should dwell rightly in harmony in order to get along well with all of them.107

New scriptures, composed by monks who were disillusioned with the established monasticism, might have been later labelled as *Mahāyāna* texts all in all, regardless of their origins.

As in the case of the Lotus Sutra, each *Mahāyāna* text must have its own complex background and history. Therefore, before we can come to a final conclusion concerning the origins of *Mahāyāna* Buddhism, we need many more careful, philological studies into all the sūtras relevant to this theme.

While writing this article concerning the history of Buddhism, I have noticed anew the importance of Buddhist philology. Historical research on Buddhism is, in my opinion, like building a house, while philological study—identification, editing, translation of manuscripts, or compilation of grammar, lexicon, dictionaries—is likened to making the bricks, which must be made solid and applicable for any design, otherwise they are useless. When we possess such bricks, we can build a sound house.

---

according to our design. If we use very weak material, we merely build castles in
the air. After having baked many solid bricks myself, while possessing merely goods made by
others, I shall, one day, come back to the question as to the formation of Mahayana
Buddhism.

ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGNS

Abbreviations of the titles of Pali texts are those adopted by CPD. Editions are those of the PTS.
Other abbreviations:

BISID, G. = Edgerton 1953
(SMC Publishing 南天書局).
KN = Kern and Nāṇaṭhī 1908-12
Lā = Jiang 1997
O = the so-called Kashag manuscript of the Saddharmapundarikāśāstra, see footnote (1).
under the supervision of the Omi University, Kyoto, Tokyo 1951-1961 (Tibetan Tripitaka
Research Institute).
RF = Reprapapālapaṇḍita. Śīla du Mahāyāna, ed. Louis Finot, St. Petersburg 1901 (Academy of
Śīla = Śīlaśākārasūtra : A Compendium of Buddhist Teaching. Compiled by Śāntideva, ed. Cecil Bendal, St.
Petersburg (Académie impériale des sciences), Reprint Tokyo 1977 (Meicho-Fukury-kai)
(Bibliotheca Buddhica I).

vs = verse
= stem of a word, e.g. dharmā-.
\[ \alpha \] = except for letters, following or preceding the sign, the word is the same as the preceding one.
\[ \alpha \rightarrow \beta \] : the Sanskrit forms should be changed to \( \alpha \).
\[ \text{[1]/[1]} \] = the meaning of A is unclear.
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Brief Communication

Identification of Some Buddhist Sanskrit Fragments from Central Asia (2)

Recently, I have been able to identify the following Buddhist Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia.

(1) Two Tiny Fragments of the Saddharmapundarikakśastra

In his recent work: Fragments of a Manuscript of the Saddharmapundarikakśastra from Khōdaliq, Tokyo 2000 (Soka Gakkai) (Lotus Sutra Manuscript Series 3), Klaus Wille provides us with a meticulous edition of the Central Asian fragments of the Lotus Sutra from Khôdaliq and Turfan, including smaller but not yet identified fragments. Recently, I have been able to identify two amongst these fragments.

Fragment 108: SHT 4303.37.8 (transliteration: p. 127; photo: Plate 73) probably should be transliterated as follows:

A ḍ

3 /// & [ || ] ma ... /// 2 /// + ... vv ///

4 /// [ ] tadvipa /// 3 /// [ ] nibarta ///

5 /// + ... /// 4 /// [ ] drukṣyaṇa. || ||

We find parallel passages in the so-called Kashgar manuscript 181a5f. (Hirofumi Toda, Saddharmapundarikakśastra, Central Asian Manuscripts, Romanized Text, Tokushima 1981, p.94):

181a

5 cyaṇti // tad yathā 'pi nāma bhikkhuva iba nyā paññaśravatātādikam atavikāṅkāraṁ mokṣhāṅkāraṁ

6 puthe teṇaṁ bhānām bhjāyaṅkaṁ mahanā cātra janakkāyaḥ[|] b) pratipāno bhave ā ramadhaṁ ca gamanāye

181b

6 nivartinakāṁ cātra evam vicintayat* ma haice ime vapaścinaḥ sādyaṁ ma[|]bhjraya

7 pem na drukṣyaṇaṁ // sa taṁm anukampārthaṁ upāyakalāyaṁ pravijayaṁ* taryām atavyaṁ ma-]

My colleague, Mr. Noriyuki Kudo, found that this tiny fragment belongs to Fragment 44 (SHT 4303.11 + 4303.24). Wille op. cit., p. 68) in the following way:

(The transliteration of Fragment 108 is given in boldface)
recto
3 naśāṭi[kṣaṇa] svay[ō](ō[kāṇa](ō) o r. (ō...)) mukṣ[ha](ō) + [n]i[ya]rupathāma[+] tāṣyam . . . . . 
naṭka(th)[ō]tāṃ/tāṃ/ + + + + +
   + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + versō
3 kaḷa[kā]las [tiṃ] p(u)rasāṃ praśā o niṃvāti + [kaṇ]miṁ vīvītī[ō][ō] + [t]at[ā][ō]muṣṭīḥ
   + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
4 dēśā mahā[śrāvī[ō]advīpa]n[ā] o dṛksyaṃ[ō] [ē] + [sa] tāṣīṃ annakā/paṭraḥ[ā]
   [n]i[pāya(ō)][ō](ō)ā[ō]yāṃ + . . . + + + + + +

Fragment 117: Here the box 27:48b:8.2 is transliterated by Dr. Wille as follows (transliteration: p. 129, photo: Plate 32):

A
5 /// t... bh. ///
6 /// lokenā ///

We find parallel passages in the so-called Kashgar manuscript 177a6-7. (Hirofumi Toda, op.cit., p. 82):

157a 6 nuburastā, tatra lokāntarīkāṅ kṣamīṃ ca samaye mahātaḥ 'ubhārṣaṃ mahātaḥ c'
   atōsa prāduḥ,

7 reśaọa bhubāṣa : ye 'pi tatra lokāntarīkāṅ tassāḥ by upapannas te 'pi ten atōkṣamayasyaṃ
pā.

(2) A Fragment of the Ratnameghavasātra

Recently, I have been also able to identify SHT III 945 in Sanskrit-Handschriften aus den Turfanfundem, hrsg. Ernst Waldehnott, Wiesbaden 1971 (F. Seiner), Teil 1 (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland Bd. X, 3), p. 206–207, which had remained unidentified, as a fragment of the Ratnameghavasātra. Its parallels in the Chinese translations are as follows: T.659.246a28ř; T.660.288a14ř.

Seishi Karashina

1 A part of the akṣara b- is found in Fragment 108A3.
2 A part of the akṣara c- is found in Fragment 44 (SHT 4903,24.1 verso 4).
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活動報告

平成１２年４月以降の研究所のあゆみ

（国際仏教大学高等研究所運営委員会）を年に２，３回の割合で開催、
（国際仏教大学高等研究所運営委員会）を月２回の割合（夏期・冬期休暇を除く）で開催、
以下、月日を設けて研究会および所員の主要な活動を記す。

4月1日(土) 工藤徹之 専任講師として登任

4月3日(月) 佐藤静志教授

―東京大学東学研究所にて講演
テーマ「仏教の意思決定論――言語・方法及び文脈的観察」

4月12日(金) 早稲田大学『東洋文化研究所』
「仏教の言語と宗教の形成に関する研究」研究室研究会に出席
（장　勝光大学総合研究所）

5月19日(金) 濱埜国教授
国際東学学会総会・講演
（於：神田・東京都/東方学会主催）

5月26日(金) 第11回仏教学報発行

―東京大学東学研究所工学館博士を招聘
テーマ「仏教の言語と宗教の形成に関する研究」

5月27日(月) 濱域教授
バーリ学仏教文化学会・学術大会に参加・会員総会議長を務める
（於：東京大学）

6月2日(金) 濱域所長・専任教務・工学館

―東京大学総合研究所「仏教と宗教」研究室研究会に出席
（於：東京大学総合研究所）

5月3日(土) 小野教授
「仏教の言語と宗教の形成に関する研究」
研究室研究会に出席
（於：東京短期大学）

6月18日(水) 第12回仏教学報発行

―東京大学アジア研究所特別教授・工学館博士を招聘
テーマ「仏教の言語と宗教」研究室研究会に出席
（於：東京短期大学）
6月14日(木) 錦山教授
立正大学法文学部文化研究所・平成12年度第一回講座会出席

6月21日(木)→6月25日(月) 波津香教授 オランダ・デンマーク出張

6月24日(月) 名城大学国際学部・社会学部・文学部・総合研究部にて「オランダ・ライデン大学国際アジア研究所」教授会議に出席

7月1日(土) 平井教授
「日本学一切の基礎的調査研究と新出文書」研究会に出席

7月3日(木) 錦山教授
名古屋市立鶴舞高等学校「創立30周年記念式典」に出席

7月14日(水) ゴールデン教授
名古屋市立大学社会研究部「思春期の自然研究」研究部会に出席

8月19日(日)〜20日(月) 坂本教授 中国出張
「第20回中国考古学研究発表会」に出席

10月1日(水)〜10日(火) 藤原教授
名古屋市立大学国際文化総合研究所にて「思想的オリエンテーション」

10月10日(木) 田辺教授
名古屋市立大学国際文化総合研究所にて「思想的オリエンテーション」

11月10日(金) 三川教授
名古屋市立大学文化総合研究所にて「思想的オリエンテーション」

11月13日(月) 平井教授
名古屋市立大学国際文化総合研究所にて「思想的オリエンテーション」
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11月18日(水) 森山教授
「図書館研究会」秋期シンポジウム（論文研修）出席
（長：学術院大学）

11月20日(木) 第13回学術研究会
元タイキイ医学教育研究会のExecutive Officer
テーマ「学術・学術におけるプラーネーション体制の構築」見山博士の講演

12月7日(水) 第14回学術研究会
ベルギー・シェント大学教授川村・ウルメン博士を招聘
テーマ「統一の有能アドバイザの在り方」

22日22日(金) 森山教授・工藤教授
関東大学関東研究所「佛教と自然」研究発表研究会に出席
（長：関東大学関東研究所）

平成13年
1月10日(水)～3月10日(日) 平成12年度国務研究員
ロシコ科学アカデミー在職研究研修生

1月18日(木) 森山教授
関東大学関東文化研究所・国際研究「サンスクリット仏教史の仏教理論」に出席
「仏教仏教史の仏教理論」に出席

1月26日(金) 森山教授
関東大学関東研究所「佛教と自然」研究発表研究会に出席
（長：関東大学関東研究所）
国際仏教学高等研究所所員の著作
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