Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2001
Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhist Studies
at Soka University for the Academic Year 2003
Vol.5

CONTENTS

● RESEARCH ARTICLES:

Seishi KARASHIMA:
A linguistic study of Lokaksaema’s translation of the Avadānasamāja-paññāpāramitā in comparison with the other Chinese translations and the Sanskrit version (2)........... 3

Noriyuki KUDO:
Bibliographical Notes on the Quotations in the Mahākāśyapa-bhāga (1) — Nanakṣenam — .............. 13

Akira YUYAMA:
Some Philological Remarks on and around Khodadatta’s Kṛṣṇaśrīyogabhūta (pojukā)................. 27

Seishi KARASHIMA:
Some features of the language of the Kāñṭhaśānti-sūtra............................................. 43

Stefano ZACCHETTI:
Some Remarks on the Pojukā Passages in the Daśādha-bhāga and their Relation to the Pāli Pajukapadda (1)........... 67

Noriyuki KUDO:
The Mahākāśyapa-bhāga and the Kauśīkīśa-bhāga (4): Transliterations of the Original Manuscripts Preserved in the National Archives of Nepal................................. 87

Akira YUYAMA:
Pradyota Chandra Bagchi (1928-1976): A Model in the Beginnings of Indo-Sino-Buddhist Paliology ................................................................. 135

Seishi KARASHIMA:
Miscellaneous notes on Middle Iadic words........................................................................... 147

Akira YUYAMA:
Introducing New Publications in Several Lines (2).................................................................. 153

Brief Communication:
Stefano ZACCHETTI
On the Authorship of the Koushikiji Manuscript of The Shingon Shaka zōshi jōgō 宣贄抄題記 in the Kounkōji Library.................. 157

● IRIAB BULLETIN:

IRIAB Activities.................................................................................... 159
List of Publications of the IRIAB Fellows............................................. 161
Journals Received.............................................................................. 165
Books Received.................................................................................. 167

● EDITORIALS:

Contributors to this Issue....................................................................... 174
Editorial Postscript............................................................................. 174
New Publications/Back Issues [ARIRIAB 3(1998)]
漢訳仏典の言語研究——『途行般若経』と異訳及び梵本との比較研究——（2）* 

辻村静志

はじめに

『途行般若経』、『大阿弥陀経』など後漢期至魏晩期の経典は、最も早く漢訳された大乘経典である。それらは梵本や後世の漢訳に較べてはるかに古い姿を留めており、初期大乗仏教思想を研究する上で、また大乗仏教の発展を考察する上で最も重要な資料である。しかし、独特の雰囲気があるとあって、文言解釈資料自体を対象にした文献学的な研究は難易に等しい。また仏教の成立期に成立した仏典が複数も出版されているものに対し、これら仏教の文献にははるかに不正確な観点や書き下しが存在するのである。これらに言及する過去の諸論文を見ても、不正確な解釈に基づく歪曲的な解釈が多いのが現状である。著者は、思想は言葉で表わされ、言葉で伝えられるものであること、思想はそれを表現する言葉の向こうにあるのではなく、言葉そのものに存するのである。言葉を正確に捉え、思想を正確に理解することは不可能である。資料を正確に読解できなければ、仏教史的な研究が可能になるのである。

このような認識から、筆者は、初期大乗仏教の初の姿を研究する準備として、『途行般若経』、『大阿弥陀経』など並訳仏典の解釈の作成に言及した。本文論はその断片であり、『途行般若経』（以下『途行経』略称）の言葉・語法の問題をとり上げた。論文は一部からなる。『途行経』をその異訳と比較して、後漢から宋代に亘る漢訳仏典の言語の変遷の一端を指した第一部は、『極信觀音統要記念論集』（京都 2002 年刊、丸善書店）に掲載した。第二部は、『途行経』を読む難解を読み上げる。* なお、本文論に引用した文献には、中国の観点から異義を挙げた。
(2) 『道行経若経』中の離難

『道行』には多くの注目すべき語彙・語句が見られるが、難解な語が、梵本や異訳との対照することで、意味が明らかになる場合がままある。以下にその様な例を挙げるよう。

(2.1) "離" = "離" (「全部、みな」)

離は古代漢語ではときおり「反す」の意味で使われる場合がある。漢詩文大詞典は「離冠子・天則」及び『文選・潘岳（文選解）』の例を引用している（第10冊5259頁）。また『文選』李善注は「方書」：「反、離也。」の一文を引用している(1)

。「反す」の意味の離は『道行経若経』にも二例がある。すなわち「用是故、即赤足是、詰問撰！即離足是善果。摩訶撰、當知即離足是相。诸悪悉除離（T8.459c21e）：宿命所作是於悉除離。是從是果斷経無盡離（T8.459c21e）。

『道経』では、「離」はしばしば「全部、みな、全く、完全に」の意味でも用いられている。「離」のこの意味の用法は、来験義学の『離』の用法と一致するが、辞書類には採られていない。「離」のこの意味は、文意から推測されるだけでなく、梵本や異訳の中の対応する語も訳される。例えば、

Lk410a12f 豎語揺語諸天子：「皆悉有法出於言出、赤足如幻。何以故身幻人、泥田圓如空、無所有。」
Zq484a10f幻身、幻人、泥田皆空、皆無所有。
Zm512c9f幻人、泥田圓如空、所有(「無所有」と訳すべき。)
Kj54c17f幻人、夢、涅槃無二、無別。
Xu(d).771a15f(仏化、夢境覚一切相及至涅槃無二、無別。
Xu(d).871a16f(幻有及全一切法乃至涅槃無二、無別。
Sh.591b7f(般若、夢現涅槃無二、無別。
AS.30.22f. AAA.161.f. (nirodayo) sādhyayam advadhiśkāram ... svapna ca nirodaya sādhyayam advadhiśkāram'(

仏語揺語諸天子：「皆悉有法出於言出、赤足如幻。何以故身幻人、泥田圓如空、無所有。」
Zq484a10f幻身、幻人、泥田皆空、皆無所有。
Zm512c9f幻人、泥田圓如空、所有(「無所有」と訳すべき。)
Kj54c17f幻人、夢、涅槃無二、無別。
Xu(d).771a15f(仏化、夢境覚一切相及至涅槃無二、無別。
Xu(d).871a16f(幻有及全一切法乃至涅槃無二、無別。
Sh.591b7f(般若、夢現涅槃無二、無別。
AS.30.22f. AAA.161.f. (nirodaya) sādhyayam advadhiśkāram ... svapna ca nirodaya sādhyayam advadhiśkāram'(

仏語揺語諸天子：「皆悉有法出於言出、赤足如幻。何以故身幻人、泥田圓如空、無所有。」
Zq484a10f幻身、幻人、泥田皆空、皆無所有。
Zm512c9f幻人、泥田圓如空、所有(「無所有」と訳すべき。)
Kj54c17f幻人、夢、涅槃無二、無別。
Xu(d).771a15f(仏化、夢境覚一切相及至涅槃無二、無別。
Xu(d).871a16f(幻有及全一切法乃至涅槃無二、無別。
Sh.591b7f(般若、夢現涅槃無二、無別。
AS.30.22f. AAA.161.f. (nirodaya) sādhyayam advadhiśkāram ... svapna ca nirodaya sādhyayam advadhiśkāram'(

仏語揺語諸天子：「皆悉有法出於言出、赤足如幻。何以故身幻人、泥田圓如空、無所有。」
Zq484a10f幻身、幻人、泥田皆空、皆無所有。
Zm512c9f幻人、泥田圓如空、所有(「無所有」と訳すべき。)
Kj54c17f幻人、夢、涅槃無二、無別。
Xu(d).771a15f(仏化、夢境覚一切相及至涅槃無二、無別。
Xu(d).871a16f(幻有及全一切法乃至涅槃無二、無別。
Sh.591b7f(般若、夢現涅槃無二、無別。
AS.30.22f. AAA.161.f. (nirodaya) sādhyayam advadhiśkāram ... svapna ca nirodaya sādhyayam advadhiśkāram'(

仏語揺語諸天子：「皆悉有法出於言出、赤足如幻。何以故身幻人、泥田圓如空、無所有。」
Zq484a10f幻身、幻人、泥田皆空、皆無所有。
Zm512c9f幻人、泥田圓如空、所有(「無所有」と訳すべき。)
Kj54c17f幻人、夢、涅槃無二、無別。
Xu(d).771a15f(仏化、夢境覚一切相及至涅槃無二、無別。
Xu(d).871a16f(幻有及全一切法乃至涅槃無二、無別。
Sh.591b7f(般若、夢現涅槃無二、無別。
AS.30.22f. AAA.161.f. (nirodaya) sādhyayam advadhiśkāram ... svapna ca nirodaya sādhyayam advadhiśkāram'(

仏語揺語諸天子：「皆悉有法出於言出、赤足如幻。何以故身幻人、泥田圓如空、無所有。」
Zq484a10f幻身、幻人、泥田皆空、皆無所有。
Zm512c9f幻人、泥田圓如空、所有(「無所有」と訳すべき。)
Kj54c17f幻人、夢、涅槃無二、無別。
Xu(d).771a15f(仏化、夢境覚一切相及至涅槃無二、無別。
Xu(d).871a16f(幻有及全一切法乃至涅槃無二、無別。
Sh.591b7f(般若、夢現涅槃無二、無別。
AS.30.22f. AAA.161.f. (nirodaya) sādhyayam advadhiśkāram ... svapna ca nirodaya sādhyayam advadhiśkāram'(

仏語揺語諸天子：「皆悉有法出於言出、赤足如幻。何以故身幻人、泥田圓如空、無所有。」
Zq484a10f幻身、幻人、泥田皆空、皆無所有。
Zm512c9f幻人、泥田圓如空、所有(「無所有」と訳すべき。)
Kj54c17f幻人、夢、涅槃無二、無別。
Xu(d).771a15f(仏化、夢境覚一切相及至涅槃無二、無別。
Xu(d).871a16f(幻有及全一切法乃至涅槃無二、無別。
Sh.591b7f(般若、夢現涅槃無二、無別。
AS.30.22f. AAA.161.f. (nirodaya) sādhyayam advadhiśkāram ... svapna ca nirodaya sādhyayam advadhiśkāram'(

仏語揺語諸天子：「皆悉有法出於言出、赤足如幻。何以故身幻人、泥田圓如空、無所有。」
Zq484a10f幻身、幻人、泥田皆空、皆無所有。
Zm512c9f幻人、泥田圓如空、所有(「無所有」と訳すべき。)
Kj54c17f幻人、夢、涅槃無二、無別。
Xu(d).771a15f(仏化、夢境覚一切相及至涅槃無二、無別。
Xu(d).871a16f(幻有及全一切法乃至涅槃無二、無別。
Sh.591b7f(般若、夢現涅槃無二、無別。
AS.30.22f. AAA.161.f. (nirodaya) sādhyayam advadhiśkāram ... svapna ca nirodaya sādhyayam advadhiśkāram'(nihayta)
（2.2）“苦”と“懐苦”、“怒苦”と“帯苦”（「難難、苦しみ」）
『道行般若経』には「懐苦」という言葉があるというがしばしば出るが、これは「難難、苦しみ」の意味の連続だ。例えば、
Lk.4286b16f. 『利説経』卷四前「“苦”は“懐苦”の前と後篇に言及する事であり、著者は懐苦と解釈せよ。各種般若では、懐苦と解釈せよ」など教える。懐苦行は懐苦行、懐苦行は懐苦行、懐苦行は懐苦行と解釈され、この場合懐苦は懐苦をなす、あるいはこれに依存するためにあらゆる苦を受けることができるのか
または、
Lk.4286b16f. 『普賢経』卷四前「懐苦と解釈せよ。懐苦は懐苦の前と後篇に言及する事であり、著者は懐苦と解釈せよ」。懐苦行は懐苦行、懐苦行は懐苦行と解釈され、この場合懐苦は懐苦をなす、あるいはこれに依存するためにあらゆる苦を受けることができるのか

【注】
・（訳）の注記文は「懐苦、懐苦心念如是：徳上 устройство перевод не поддерживается системой. Рассмотрите способы манипуляции с текстом, которые можно выполнить вручную. В случае необходимых переводов, используйте русскоязычные ресурсы для актуализации информации. Применяйте правильные синтаксические конструкции и стилистические элементы. При необходимости уточняйте ключевые слова и фразы, а также использование словарных баз данных. В рамках текста обязательно учитывайте контекст и особенности русского языка. Если возникнут сложности с переводом, обратитесь за помощью к профилюм специалистам в данной области. В противном случае, полученные результаты могут не соответствовать требованиям и стандартам. Пожалуйста, убедитесь, что текст правильно отформатирован и его содержание объективно и точечно. Всегда следует учитывать специфику текста и его назначение. Если вы обнаружите ошибки или неточности, немедленно сообщите об этом, чтобы корректно отреагировать на данную ситуацию. В заключение, будьте аккуратны и ответственны в своей работе, чтобы обеспечить высококачественный результат. Если вам потребуется дополнительная информация или советы, не стесняйтесь обращаться за поддержкой. Мы будем рады помочь вам в этой важной задаче.】
まだ、

Lk 452b12f. 聖書説言：『述べる者は世界に特別な恩恵をもたらす』 佛言：『仏
説法(2.1)を、安楽、於世間慰、於世間興、於世間喜、於世間害、於世
間悲、於世間論。』

Zg 49b3f. 聖書説言：『僧侶(1.1)を恐ぎ、欲無上正真道者。』 佛言：『如是説
(1.1)を恐ぎ。』

まだ、

Lk 458c23. 聖書説法(1.1)作足楽、不中退取文。

Zg 49c715. 聖(1.1)苦作足楽、不中退取文。

Zf 53c11cf. 聖書、摩訶般泥洹作足楽、不中退取文。

Lk 443a1f. 聖書般泥洹作足楽。

Zg 48c8c6. 聖(1.1)苦作足楽心、足楽。

Zf 53c4e. 聖書、摩訶般泥洹作足楽、不中退取文。

『道行』中の「苦行」あるいは「懲苦」は梵本の「Arukara」として読む。「苦」、「懲苦」、「道行」といった言語を用いている。上述の「道行」における「懲苦」という表現は、仏教教義において重要である。最後に挙げた三例から分かるように、『大般泥洹』と『道行』の読者たち、「懲苦」と「懲苦」という言葉を用いている。上述の「道行」においては、仏教教義における「懲苦」という表現は、重要な役割を果たしている。
苦”・“慢苦”は当時の口語表現であったかと思われるが、この点に関してはさらなる検討を要する。

“苦しみ”という意味の“苦労”の例は、すでに『後記・親愛下』に見られる、“今歳有褪脱、甚多有訳苦苦辞、轉訳誤謬者中”である。『漢語大辞典』はこの用例を引いて、“勤労困苦”と解釈しているが(第2冊、818頁)、この解釈はおそらく正しくない。勤労にくも“苦しみ、患し”という意味があるが(16)、おそらく“難苦”は二つの中文義を重ねた語で、“苦し”を意味する考えられる。

“苦し”を意味する“苦労”は『道行』に数多く出、牧牛に難がいか、以下に一例を挙げよう。

Lk.446b7e 善男子能知不? 具道無殺、有具實、多頂、五(“文”の誤りか)空澤。我

(2.3) "正" = "極"(“はて、限界；極めて、とても”)

『道行』には、”正”が“限界、はて”を意味する場合がある。この意味は文脈か

Lk.427c29e, 佛語後 minWidth: ”摩訶衍 (おそらく仏字)。摩訶衍者、無有正法、不

この句の“慢苦、苦し”の意味ではないというので、さらなる検討を要する。

この用例を引いて、“勤労困苦”と解釈しているが(第2冊、818頁)、この解釈はおそらく正しくない。勤労にくも“苦しみ、患し”という意味があるが(16)、おそらく“難苦”は二つの中文義を重ねた語で、“苦し”を意味する考えられる。

(2.3) "正" = "極"(“はて、限界；極めて、とても”)

『道行』には、”正”が“限界、はて”を意味する場合がある。この意味は文脈か

Lk.427c29e, 佛語後 minWidth: ”摩訶衍 (おそらく仏字)。摩訶衍者、無有正法、不

この句の“慢苦、苦し”の意味ではないというので、さらなる検討を要する。

この用例を引いて、“勤労困苦”と解釈しているが(第2冊、818頁)、この解釈はおそらく正しくない。勤労にくも“苦しみ、患し”という意味があるが(16)、おそらく“難苦”は二つの中文義を重ねた語で、“苦し”を意味する考えられる。

(2.3) "正" = "極"(“はて、限界；極めて、とても”)

『道行』には、”正”が“限界、はて”を意味する場合がある。この意味は文脈か
"無有正"という句は、『道行』中には、さらに二度出てくる。即も:
Lk.425a26f.菩萨行般若波羅蜜。一切法不染。是故三味無有過、無有正。60
Lk.425c18f.菩萨摩訶薩一切法不染受字。是故三味無有過、無有正。61
これらの"無有過"は、異訳の"無著無相、無量、梵本のaparamaṣṭ（置きられない）、aparamañña（無量に対する）に対応している。このことから、"無有正"の"正"は"止"と同義で、「限界、きわめ、はて」の意味と推定される。62

『道行』では、"正"が動詞や形容詞の前について、程度の軽いことを示す場合がある。63 例えば:
Lk.425a6f.摩訳別於天、天下人中、正に守立者、
Zq.481a19f.大乘、般若、天、人、賢者、諸世俗、出、
Zm.510b23f.摩訳別、摩訳別者、於天下人中、正、
Kj.539b4f.所言摩訳別、摩訳別者、出於一切聞天、人、阿修羅、
Sh.596a32b.に、若者、彼大乗言一切聞天、人、阿修羅中、形、定、
AS.12.16 – AAA.106.7f. mahāyānaṃ mahāyānaṃ iti bhagavatān aṣṭa, so deca-
manavatān lokam adhiyakṣatāṃ nirvāṇaṃ ("世尊、大乗は「大乗」と呼ばれ、
全世界——神、人間、阿修羅を含む——を超える")

また:
Lk.429a23f.正使是奉行梵語者、近代梵師、我等不れた、正使取中正尊法。正使使上佛。
Zq.482b15f.……欲使取法及尊法、使上佛。
Zm.511c27f.……欲使取法及尊法、欲使上佛。
Kj.540a21f.上人應求上生。
AS.17.18 – AAA.133.1... vijñapti khe bijarmeṇa bhūyanāmā dañjāram
advayāntaṃāṣṭā ("尊顕に勝れた法が、成仏しなければならないから")

注目すべきことに、『大明度経』と『経論』の中訳者たちは『道行』の"正"を"極"で
置き換えている。第一例の"正（過）"は「はるかに（超越している）」、第二例の
"尊"は「極めて（厳格な）」の意味と推定される。64

(60) 『道行』の"無有過"に対応する異訳・梵本の詣に対する書き方: Lk.479b7.無有過、
Zm.509a17f. Kj.537c13. 無量、無量、無量は、AAA.49.21. aparamaṣṭ（無量的に無量）。
(61) 『道行』の"無有過、無有正"に対応する異訳・梵本の詣に対する書き方: Zq.480a5.無量、
Zm.509a5.無有過、無量、無量、無量は、AAA.49.21. aparamaṣṭ（無量的に無量）。
(62) この点に関しては北京大学言語教授の御教示を受いた。中古漢訳の文献では、「正」は単に二
字ししばしば用いられる。conde 1986: 167-168; ZYXL.645f. AAA.491.30-31; GRLX.811 等を参照。
(63) ZXYL.645f. GXH.811 を参照。
『通行』には、「底」が「はて、極み」の意味で使われた例が二十以上ある。「底」のこの意味は（注），文脈からだけでなく，異訳・梵本の対照からも確かめられる。例えば

Lk.40c.16: 復次，指摘！法無常，復無常，無有中邊，無有盡時。底常，無底。

Zg.48b.76: 異知：法無常，人無常。異知：法無常，身無常，復無常。是故當知之：興大等無異，無中邊，亦無盡常，不可限量，一切不可得，以是故，明度無常，無底。

Zn.51a.27: 仏次，指摘！法者無際，無底，無有極，無有中間，無可尚者。

Kj.54b.66: 仏次，指摘！講述無際，前際不可得，中際，後際不可得。是故，緣無邊，假若波羅蜜無邊。

AS.23.21f. = AAA.176.23f.: panur aparaut Kauiyaka yamam satvadharma manvat aparutena na tajam atra va madhyam va paravyasamva vadatthakate tasmats
Kauiyaka manat-paryantam yad usta pajit-phanimititam（「さらに，カウシカよ，万物は無辺，無際で，それらの初まりも中間も果ても認識されない。だから，カウシカよ，彼若波羅蜜は無辺の波羅蜜なのだ。」

また

Lk.43o.20: 人無常底。假若波羅蜜無底。

Zg.48b.22人無常底，明度無常無底。

Zn.51a.21人無常極。異是想念假若波羅蜜。

Kj.54b.22人無常底。假若波羅蜜無底。

AS.24.11 = AAA.181.67: samyac sandaheteyya namba-paryantam yad usta pajit-phanimititam（このように，衆生が無辺であるから，假若波羅蜜は無辺の波羅
蜜なのだ。）

『通行』の底が梵本の"anta"（「はて，極み」），"paryanta"（「はて，極み」），異訳の"極"，"底"，"辺"，"尽"などに対応していることが分かる。従って，上の例の「底」は「はて，極み」を意味し，「底常」は「果てしない，無辺」の意味であり，第一例中の「底常」は仏義を重ねた語と推定される（注）

（注）『南伝大続鏡』巻四百八巻「金花女」に「金花女子，変りに，仏家延生声喫」と引いて，「毘婆，
八品」と解釈している（南傳大筆記1218頁A.10）。『漢証大字典』は仏典「元皇帝貞徳文」に解釈する。見
在しい底，仏家延生との関連を引いて見ると（南傳大筆記1218頁A.10）。また，「種種，凡常」
などの表現を参考にする。

（注）『正法華経』に「底常」では「はて，極み」という表現が多く出てくる（正法華経906.522を参照）。こ
れも二つの同義語を重ねた表現である。
AAbiriimmayalamah\'iloka, \textit{Raja\'gajahamunayakka\', the Work of Harischandra}, together with the text commented on, ed. U. Wogijara, Tokyo 1932; The Toyko Bunko, Reprinted Tokyo 1973; Sanbiko Buddhist Society Ltd.

AK = \textit{Azhaiyadarraka\' Pragijapuro}, ed. P. P. Vaidy, Debbuanga 1960


Kj = \textit{Hadi\'catturaka\' Pragijapuru\'s Commentary on the Long Version of the Tilokapali\'gan\'Dharmasutra\'s} (T.I., No.1[11], P-115-1178)

Lk = \textit{Hadi\'catturaka\' Pragijapuru\'s Commentary on the Short Version of the Tilokapali\'gan\'Dharmasutra\'s} (T.I., No.12[12], P-125-1278)

Sh = \textit{Hadi\'catturaka\' Pragijapuru\'s Commentary on the Mahavagga\'samadhi\'gan\'Dharmasutra\'s} (T.I., No.13[13], P-135-1378)

T = \textit{Hadi\'catturaka\' Pragijapuru\'s Commentary on the Mahavagga\'samadhi\'gan\'Dharmasutra\'s} (T.I., No.14[14], P-145-1478)

AA = \textit{Akhisamayalamah\'iloka, \textit{Raja\'gajahamunayakka\', the Work of Harischandra}}, together with the text commented on, ed. U. Wogijara, Tokyo 1932; The Toyko Bunko, Reprinted Tokyo 1973; Sanbiko Buddhist Society Ltd.

AS = \textit{Azhaiyadarraka\' Pragijapuro}, ed. P. P. Vaidy, Debbuanga 1960


Kj = \textit{Hadi\'catturaka\' Pragijapuru\'s Commentary on the Long Version of the Tilokapali\'gan\'Dharmasutra\'s} (T.I., No.1[11], P-115-1178)

Lk = \textit{Hadi\'catturaka\' Pragijapuru\'s Commentary on the Short Version of the Tilokapali\'gan\'Dharmasutra\'s} (T.I., No.12[12], P-125-1278)

Sh = \textit{Hadi\'catturaka\' Pragijapuru\'s Commentary on the Mahavagga\'samadhi\'gan\'Dharmasutra\'s} (T.I., No.13[13], P-135-1378)

T = \textit{Hadi\'catturaka\' Pragijapuru\'s Commentary on the Mahavagga\'samadhi\'gan\'Dharmasutra\'s} (T.I., No.14[14], P-145-1478)
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Mabūkarmavibhānga 所引経典研究ノート (1)

— Nandikāśāstra —

工藤 稔之

0. はじめに

ある一つの文献が発見され、それに対する研究が行われることで、仏教史・仏教
思想が解明されていく。その行為は止ることなく、時にはあらためてこれまでの先
学諸氏によって蓄積されてきた多くの成果を再検討することも必要になってくる。
それは例えば近年の仏教経典資料の発見とそれに対する纏密な文献学的考察の公
表を毎日する場合もあれば、経典資料そのものに立ち戻ってなされる場合もある。

1932年に出版された Mabūkarmavibhānga もまた例外ではない。これは、二十種
の経典文が 96 回宛て引用され、校訂者 Sylvain Levis はテキスト出版に際し
て当時提出される類の文献を網羅し、詳細な訳注を付し、多くの所引経典・平行文献
類を明らかにし、その後の MKV 研究において Levis 稿本の出版に際し発見された。
それまでは原本の存在が知られていなかった文献は発見された。複数の文献を用
いながら橋渡しの所引経典類が研究されてきた。その一つの結果は、本稿難定はさ
れていないものの、MKV の所属関係に関して、かつては有部・非有部論という
混乱的な評価であったものが、現在の所では懐部・正覚部所属の可能性を最も高
いとすら見方が有力になってきていることである。

さて、本稿では MKV 所引経典を取り上げていく。経典名を明示し且つ複数回
引用されているものを以下に挙げる四種である。

(1) Nandikāśāstra (pp. 32, 42, 44);
(2) Puruṣottamānandaśīstrā (pp. 39-40, 67);
(3) Cakresvaratīnāstrā (pp. 94, 103);
(4) Devasāstrī (pp. 89, 94).

1 先行研究については語文書の Bibliography 参照のこと。
2 Cakresvaratīnāstrā は対話のところ、伝承が異なる 3 つの文献が引用されており、別に文献伝承を
考えさせる複雑な事実を反映している（巌川 1986b, 1986a 参照のこと）。
3 Devasāstrī については空梵筆伝本からテキストが複数存在しているが、MKV は全く対応して
いない。テキストは Adelheid Meroe, "Zwei kleine Fragmente aus Cakrā," in Studien zur Häologie und
Buddhismus Heft 7, (1981), 133-151 に出版されている（この文献のデサストリについては以下の松村氏に
「Devasāstrī」Dengazhinsyikha と Devasāstrī の整理 - Ramadesikanavalli 第二章の成立 -『印度軍事
戦略学研究』31-1, 1982-12, pp. (07-256). 同「印度兵法299篇と1398編をめぐって」G.S. Dharmapala
343-344 と Turpin 出土仏書文書 No. 58 の同定と Mahābhārata 13.132 の成立 -『印度軍事戦略学研究』
31-2, 1982-3, pp. (79-95).
ここで検討しようとするのはNandikastreaである。この終の全文はチベット語のみに残り、サンスクリット本もこの名を冠される対応漢訳は、むしろで「大仏聖論」、「剎利集觀百論」その注釈等にそこの一部と思惟し一節成は総名が引用されるにすぎない。本編では、漢訳文献に引用される一説の文章を再構成して得られるものと仮想する別の識者は考慮がチベット語を除けば、全体としてこれまです減われたものと考えられていてNandikastreaであるのどうかの可能性についてあらためて考察する。

1. MKVに言及されるNandikastrea

まずMKVの中で言及される識者を指していこう。L<19の当該識者は数の基に
かった注釈とも存在するので両都ともにここに述べる。

§ 1: MS[A]ゆりださないNandikastreaを訳し、「12(4)やじつたつやさや
MS[B]に、ゆりださない（やり）や、ことにくに「かの」という
「また役立てるに寄するときは過失があることが『サンディーカ教』に言及されている」

§ 13: MS[A]ゆりださないNandikastreaの注釈を示すNandikastreaに言及しない
MS[B]に、ゆりださない（やり）や、ことにくに「かの」という
「例えば『サンディーカ教』において伝されるように、殺人、強姦、略奪を
飲む場合には五十の過失があることを（ある）と知られている」

§ 14: MS[A]ゆりださないNandikastreaの注釈を示すNandikastreaに言及しない
MS[B]に、ゆりださない（やり）や、ことにくに「かの」という
「例えば『サンディーカ教』において伝されるように、殺人、強姦の過失が五十ある
ことが不実の話として知られている」とある。

Nandikastreaという識者は所謂「トッフェン・コレクション」の中にそれを見た如き片が存在
している。この片はSangkye-Apemの契約の一部である、Nandikastreaはその内容部分だけが残
るに過ぎない、SIEF Iではその内容に関する情報のないESIF 343, Kat. No. 162 [K. 446 (TK: MOR)]; 1849, その残りは文献は第4巻に示されている（SIEF IV [1980], pp. 99-100)。第1
巻によるp. 92, note 4,『僧伽領導』或は彼らの滅絶、巻三、第八五五巻(T. No. 99[83]), vol. 2, 1176(18-3160), Pali: SN, Nandikap, V. 397-9 (ed. by Fears, PTS, 1896 iep. 1896)に存在する。談話抄
「剎利集観」図書のサンスクリット片をSIEF IV Kat.-No. 162について『印度哲学史概要』,
No. 16, October 2001, pp. 325-311参考のことと。しかしこの名の識者は「大仏聖論」に引用される
Nandikastreaとは一致しない。

15-17で述べられている。チベット語Nandikastreaはそれに対応する論を考察したのは現在の成果で
あるが、残念ながらこの文ではMKVに言及する部分はなく、またYakobahの
Abhikarmastraṇajākyāに見られるNandikastreaについては触れられていない。

Read Jōkō

Read (Nandikastrea)

Read dsalh
上記3類所は、発生と飲酒によってもたらされる事態を説明するにあたってその薬物の具体的な数値を説明すべきとしてのNandikakaraを含め及んでいるのみで、残念ながら実際に統計が引用されているわけではない。この限りでは我々にはNandikakaraがどのような数量でどのように薬物を摂っているのかわからないわけであるが、発生、飲酒による過失を具体的に説き（後述は列挙する）薬物を摂り出
していればNandikakaraに当たる者は皆無である。つまり問題となるのは「発生と
飲酒による過失」、そしてこの二つの事項を挙げる文脈から当然当然されるべきで
あるが「死没の一つ一つについて解剖に認める薬物の存在」である。
身体によって為される修行を三歩報告すること、そこで飲酒加える部分に見られることに引用である。上に述べた部分には、Nambokukenには「徳所」に含まれる授受が入っていなかった、この授受が局で分けるもので、特に言及されているなかったからではないが、事件を説明していなかったことを読む必要があると思われる。後者は、「一切、摩利支・摩利支等を飲むことも許し、長く、多くをこわすことによって、身体に表現が見られ、情熱に落ち込むという文章がEにによって引用されているから、そのような文があったかもしれない。残念ながら上記の引用例からそれ以上の情報は得られない。

2.2 訳訳文献
ここでは訳訳読者を考えている。これは先の「会合関係」を除くと「大智度論」に見出されるだけである。

(1)「大智度論」巻三(T559, vol. 25, 1551-19)

『摩利支婆波密婆那婆。毘婆耶有。何宗為之。一者心悦歓喜希世不競、二者衆生憎
摩利支不喜見。三者常愁思患愁感事、四者衆生之知見見取。五者 страх心恥患不使、
六者常有善夢。七者常消時猛然無想。八者種福常命無老、九者善命常畏恐懼。十者
善命無老常遙延命。』

(2)「大智度論」巻三(T559, vol. 25, 1567-10)

「不飲酒者、有如三種、如僧迦婆密婆那婆、有如二十五人。何等二十五、一者宿世
聖物遺留、以故饮、入滅者心錦黃花、所謂等流故、二者見者之門、三者門間之本、
四者無佛無世、五者無佛無世、六者無佛無世、七者無佛無世、八者無佛無世、九者
無佛無世、十者無佛無世。以故飲、摩利支倉卒不飲、摩利支徒倉卒不飲、摩利支
倉卒不飲、摩利支倉卒不飲、摩利支倉卒不飲、摩利支倉卒不飲、摩利支倉卒不飲、
十二者常遙延命、十二者常遙延命、十二者常遙延命。十二者常遙延命、十二者
常遙延命。十二者常遙延命。十二者常遙延命。十二者常遙延命。十二者常遙延命。

「大智度論」を再考し、当該研究を参照することに当たり、著述論著の執筆及び出版に関しては、すべての権利を保持し、その使用及び公開に関する許可が必要であることを確認し、文部科学省の研究助成制度による研究助成を受けています。
もっとも、「大智度論」が重要で、飲者の悪事を列挙した後にその
内容をまとめた箇文がこの締にない。これらが「大智度論」に鈍したもので本来
あったものなのかどうか。ついで引用文献のほかは引用文書から見当た
れないが、この学術誌「Nandkohaya」と仮定するならば、ここに伝承上の増
広を考慮すれば可能であろうが、そこまででは説を確める根拠はまだない。（これ
については後で検討する。）とかも我々の限界には「Nandkohaya」と捉えるしか
ない。しかし経典を異にする資料がある。「下にこの教典の文献学的な問題点を検
討してみよう。
では顕微鏡下に観察される。外側の「習習音」の推定音声源は第一熱帯区に外果皮の外壁で生じているのでゆっくりと細かく変化する音を発生させる。これは、各細胞間で压力が高まることは、呼吸を助けるためである。1967年1月1日から4月30日までに、呼吸に影響が出ないように、外果皮の外壁には、呼吸を助けるための孔が設けられている。
6. まとめ
以上の考察から漢訳「出家縁起」について事実関係が明らかになることはない。『出家縁起』という名の文献が未訳として存在していたこと。
この『出家縁起』は『僧苑上記』に記されて安世高訳とされたこと。
その後の『出家縁起』は現在作成されたものである。

ただである。『難提迦毘羅識』という僧が安世高訳として存在しており、その訳名としては現在作成中の内容に釈義があるが、本当に存在しないのでは推測を加えて整理してみる。

訳著不明と理解すべき『出家縁起』は、その内容がすでにそれらの図式が用いられていたと考えられ、その訳名としては現在作成中の内容に釈義があるが、本当に存在しないのでは推測を加えて整理してみる。

MKV 所引経文にはサブクリック的にもあるが、時にはチケットピックに残らない文。あるいはその内容が現存する文献にトレスしきれないものが多い見出される。所引経文の多さから、考えさせてはその文献の所属訳系を決定する為の何かをここにここ見出せるものあり、まず対応文献が未だ確定出来ない（存在しない）ものについても、さらに所対文献を困難にしているのであると思う。我々にはやられるながら研究が山積している。

引用
牧田 1976:152、「この文献源流説明は、もっと早く出三藏叢書（五～一と一～五～八編）巻一の文献源流伝承についての研究を見出し、この研究に伴い、出三蔵叢書、旧 تس基南、蝨基南、以金基南、中国仏教、出三蔵叢書等による」(出三蔵叢書) 伝承の経文が引用されている。ところがこれを八十年後の八十年後（八十年）に引用された文献を比較すると、伝承の文献が一般に、一般に、文献が正確に伝えられている。それ以来の経文には一貫する伝承になりつつある。」(出三蔵叢書)
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Some Philological Remarks

on and around Kuladatta’s Kriyasamgraha(-panjika)

Akira YUTAMA

0. Prefatory:

0.0. It has been somehow my cherished desire to study this text from various viewpoints, even though I am no specialist in Tantric literature. In the first place my private interest arises from the text that is a Buddhist iconological work. In any case Kuladatta’s Kriyasamgraha has been drawing my attention for the past few decades. I am ashamed to confess here, therefore, that I have so far made no progress in this direction, as my own pace is slower than a snail’s. This paper is thus intended to be a preliminary survey of the text. It is merely an indication of my wish to study it in the future. At all events, I have no intention to investigate it from the religo-philosophical point of view.

0.1. In the second place, the author of this text seems to have been versed in the teachings of the Mahasanghika-Lokottaravadin. In his enlightening article Gustav Roth concludes after a careful comparison of the two that Kuladatta’s Kriyasamgraha is a modified version of the Siropa-laksana-karika-vivekana belonging to the Mahasanghika-Lokottaravadin.1 Needless to say, however, it is a different question whether or not he belonged to that school. At this stage it is almost impossible to judge if he was a Lokottaravadin. Furthermore, the question of whether the school had actually survived until his time will still remain unsolved, unless there appears definitely reliable evidence to prove it.

---


This article is fortunately included in his collected papers: Indian Studies: Selected Papers by G. Roth, edited by Heinz Bächtold and Petra Kröger-Pohle, published on the occasion of his seventieth birthday (= Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica, XXXII) (Delhi: Srijam Publications, 1986), p. 264. — cf. infra n. 45.
0.2. It may be further noted here that Nalinaksha Dutt has seen in it some Vinya elements of Mahāyāna Buddhism. I believe, however, that this issue must be carefully reviewed. It may be necessary to collect more materials in this category.

0.3. In any case, if Kuladatta’s Kṛṣṇaśaṅkhyā is a text in the lineage of the Mahāśāṃghika-Lokottaravādins, it will be highly important to examine its linguistic features, whether grammatical or glossarial. So far the language of that school is entirely written in the so-called Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. It goes without saying that the language he had used is one among other complicating factors in determining his position.

0.5. Before going on to tackle these problems, I would herewith like to make a brief critical survey of this peculiar literature.

1. Indic Original in old Manuscripts:

1.0.0. Kuladatta had been known as the author of the Kṛṣṇaśaṅkhyā-patiyāka, consisting of eight chapters (prakaranas), the last being on the stupas. It was in 1882 that Rajendralal Mitra introduced it for the first time in his monumental work. He had found it in two manuscripts not always intelligible (op. cit., p. 109, p. 107). This work may afterwards have not attracted the proper attention of specialists for some time.

1.0.1. In his well-known catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts kept in the Asiatic Society of Bengal at Calcutta, Har Prasad Sastri paid the careful attention to this rare text and gave more detailed information of the

---


contexts of the two manuscripts. One of them is a palm-leaf manuscript numbered 79. According to Hara Prasad, seventeen folios are missing out of 176 of this manuscript. He makes a further note that it is incomplete at the end. In fact, he guesses that it is copied in the Newari character of the sixteenth century. It is a great pity that this manuscript seems to be missing Chapter VIII. This is a manuscript copied in Panam in Samvat 373 and has been carefully verified for 1252 CE. This manuscript offers another interesting fact. Since it is an incomplete manuscript at the end, the colophon is missing and therefore no date is obtainable from it. A paper manuscript copied from it and kept in St. Petersburg bears the so-called Pratitya-

"samuddapada-gatha" and the colophon reading the date. It means that this manuscript may well have been a complete one when the secondary copy was made on paper.6

1.0.2. Speaking of an incomplete manuscript, I am wondering if another old palm-leaf manuscript kept in the University Library at Cambridge may well be on the same line. It bears the title Kṛṣṇa-pathyākā on Kaladatta. Unfortunately, it is an incomplete manuscript. The date is estimated to be XIII-XIVth centuries. These two must doubtless be very important from the


9 Cf, for details N. S. Mironov, Katalog 'indijskoj' rossijskoj publichej bibliotreki. Sobranie I. P. Mininova i Nekogora Druga. Ypobukh I. I. Ishen' Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk (Peter-


10 For further details see Luciano Pette, Medieval History of Nepal (C. 700-1492) (c Siete Ori-


12 Cf. Ceril Set-Ing, Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cam-

viewpoint of textual studies.

1.1.0. There seem to be quite a few old palm-leaf manuscripts kept in various places. In carrying out historical studies of Nepal the dated manuscripts always offer indispensable source materials for establishing chronology.

1.1.1. The oldest manuscript is that one in the Field Marshal Kaishe Collection in Kathmandu: No. 109. In 1956 Gadhin M. NAGAO (長尾雅夫) made an investigation into this collection in collaboration with Masaki HATTORI (服部正明). Later on he published a preliminary report on it. This manuscript is recorded therein. As usual, Luciano Petech has recorded the colophon carefully and verified it for Thursday, 11 February 1216 during the reign of King Aniruma (CE 1153-1216, r. 1200-1216, less possibly 1200-1231).\(^{11}\)

\(^{11}\) *samvat 326 mākha-kṛṣṇa-cācāryam brhapaṭapī-dīna / tri-rājādhirāja-parametvavaram-śrimatā [Regmi: triśat.-] Aniruma-devasya vijaya-raje [read "raje?" putakām tādāgātā cii] ॥\(^{14}\)

1.1.2. It may be noted here that a Japanese specialist named MITUOTOSHI MORIGUCHI (森口光俊) made an energetic investigation in 1975 in search of Tantric Buddhist manuscripts and published his research fruit in a catalogue. It offers the texts in Indic alphabetical order with their original catalogue numbers, microfilm numbers at the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (NGMP) as well as facsimiles of a certain amount of manuscript folios. He lists ten manuscripts of the *Kṛṣṇa-gaṇapati-paṭika* of Mahāpandita-Kaladatta (NGMP: No. D.2531; cf. infra §4.2). Four out of them are palmleaves. The palm-leaf manuscript, kept formerly in the Kaishe Library, is also recorded in his catalogue.\(^{15}\)

1.2.0. Among some five items held in the National Archives of Kathmandu is


\(^{15}\) Cf. also Regmi, Medieval Nepal, Part I (Calcutta 1965), p. 206.

the second oldest dated palm-leaf manuscript (No. CA-318: 146 folios) written in the then fashionable Bhujimo script during the reign of King Abhaya-malla (CE 1183-1255, r. 1216-1255; cf. Petro, op.cit., 1st ed. 1958, p. 89, 2nd ed. 1984, p. 86). It seems to have formerly been kept in the Durbar Library. Thanks to the painstaking efforts of Moriguchi, the colophon of this manuscript has become available in facsimile. It is now clear without doubt that "This is the book belonging to Vajrācārya Udayārika", as noted also by Regmi (op.cit., I, p. 212).16

(1464) sameas 337 jyotsha-fudha-pārma-māyām roma-dine ((3) tri-rājadhirāja-parametvara-parama-bhaṭṭāraka-rimat Abhayamalla-deśaya vijaya-rāya lekhanam in // 170 // vajrācārya-udayārikāya pustako“Youam” // o //

After this colophon reads a 2-line memorandum in a very modern bad hand. Unfortunately, it is illegible on the photo. It looks nothing but a scratched scribble.

1.2.1. It is verified for Monday, 22 May 1217 CE.18 To my regret, I have yet seen none of these manuscripts. They are all very important both in the history of Nepal and in Buddhist philology. Sylvain Lévi directed his attention to this period on the basis of the manuscripts in his well-known work (op.cit., II, p. 214f.). According to the well-known chronicle Gopala-raja-vamsa-viśva,19 King Arimaladeva reigned for 25 years and 10 months, and Abhayamalla 42 years and 6 months. Based on a palm-leaf manuscript Dilli Ranan Regmi (1926) published a reliable edition of this text.20 And a very interesting new edition with facsimiles of this manuscript has appeared, thanks to the painstaking effort of Dhanavajra Vajrācārya (*1932) and Kamal

16 See Moriguchi, op. cit., p. 30 (a description of No. 111: 10 Ms) & 31 (a reproduction of Ms ca.318: folios 145b & 146a).


Tadeusz Skorupski has recently made a great service to understand this literature as a whole, making a good use of Kuladatta's *Krṣṇa-samgraha-pāñjikā* published in facsimile under the editorship of Sharada Rani (cf. supra §1.2.0-3). Skorupski has offered an indispensable analytical summary of this very difficult text. It is to be much regretted, however, that Chapter VII of my chief concern is rather too briefly treated.\(^{25}\)

3.1.1. From various points of view Skorupski has convinced us of the date of Kuladatta's *Krṣṇa-samgraha-pāñjikā*, saying: "... it may be assumed with some confidence that it was composed in the second half of the eleventh century." (Skorupski, op. cit., p. 181). I fully agree with him. Furthermore, it is really interesting, therefore, that his work had begun to spread among the population in manuscript form in Nepal soon after the composition. It is eloquently attested by quite a few old manuscripts, which have survived until today (cf. supra §1.1.1 & 1.2.1).

1.4. Almost at the same time Ryugen Tanemura has brought a revised version of his M.A. thesis submitted to the University of Tokyo in 1993. It is a critical edition of Chapter VII of Kuladatta's *Krṣṇa-samgraha-pāñjikā* by collating ten manuscripts, six of them being copied on palm-leaves.\(^{26}\) One of them consisting of 146 folios (dated Samvat 337) and bearing a signature "N" by Tanemura, is said to be kept in the National Archives of Nepal consisting of 146 folios (dated Samvat 337). It may well be the one treated above (cf. supra §1.2.0-3 & 1.3.0). However, he gives no reference to Sharada Rani's edition. It is hoped that in the nearest future he will give us the benefit of more careful textual treatment. Incidentally, Tanemura has just published an enlightening article on the conservation ceremony (*pratimā-pratibhā*) on the basis of Chapter Six of Kuladatta's *Krṣṇa-samgraha-pāñjikā*.\(^{27}\)

---


\(^{27}\) Ryugen Tanemura has given a detailed analysis in his painstaking work: “One Aspect of the Conservation Ceremony of Images in Buddhist Tantrism: ‘The Ten Rites’ Prescribed in the Krṣṇa-samgrahapāñjikā and Their Background”, *Journal of the Japanese Association for South-East Asian Studies*, XIII (Tokyo, October 2001), p. 52-73 (with a Japanese summary on p. 248). Extensive bibliographical information is to be found on p. 73-75.
II. Tibetan Version:


2.1. Bu-ston (1390-1464) has naturally recorded this text in his famed cata- logue (1322 CE): Text No. 1869 (Tohoku Catalogue No. 5197).20 This phan- tom-like book has at least appeared, thanks to the painstaking efforts of Lokesh Chandra and Soshū NHOSHI.21 Soon after that the late János Szerb (19188) left a very painstaking editorial work on it with utmost care. He has given extensive bibliographical remarks on various editions (op.cit., p. XIII- XVI). Only a few copies seem to have escaped his attention, e.g. three copies brought back to Japan by Enge TAKEMOTO (and others).22 Until then we had owed much to the English version rendered by Evgenij Evgen’evič Ober- miller (1901-1935) on the basis of the Bka’-ris-sis lhun-po edition.23

2.2. As for the Tibetan version of the Kula-datta’s *Kṛṣṇāyaṅgruba*, Skorupski has used the Peking edition (cf. Skorupski, op.cit., p. 181 n. 4), while Tanem u-
ra used both Peking and Dege (cf. ed. Tanemura, p. 17). From all the dated documents there seems to be no room to doubt that Kuladatta composed the Krīṣṇamūrtabha (प्रियक्षिक) in the second half of the 11th century CE, as convincingly argued by Skorupski (op.cit., p. 181).

2.3. Further investigation into other sources in search of another version or recension of Kuladatta's Krīṣṇamūrtabha (प्रियक्षिक) in Tibetan is yet expected. However, there may be no chance to find one. Needless to say, I must be very careful in making a hasty conclusion. At least, the date of his activities makes us assume that his work has not reached the Tunhuang area.

III. Krīṣṇamūrtabha as a Material on Caitya-/Stūpa-Cult:

3.0. As mentioned above, Gustav Roth concludes that Kuladatta's Krīṣṇamūrtabha is a modified version of the Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-śivaratī belonging to the Mahāsthāmaprābha-Lokottaravādins (see supra §0.1 cum n. 1). This text will then be an indispensable work on the stūpa-caitya-cult in writing at our disposal. This is most interesting from various viewpoints. On this question I have discussed in my recent paper.13

3.1. Bénisti has given a critical edition of the relevant portion from Chapter VIII of the Krīṣṇamūrtabha (प्रियक्षिक) of Kuladatta with a French translation and detailed commentary on the basis of the two manuscripts kept in the National Library of Paris (op.cit., p. 89-108). The accumulated results of her work were fully displayed in her monographic publication.14 Incidentally, Nalinnaksha Dutt used one of these two manuscripts in his article mentioned above (cf. supra §0.2). To my regret, I have not yet verified which one he had consulted.

3.2. It is sincerely hoped that this kind of work will attract more students in Indology and Buddhism among my younger compatriots scholars. I have emphasized the desirability of it before (see e.g. ARIRAB, IV, 2000/2001, p.

14 These two modern manuscripts are catalogued with detailed notes by Jean Filliozat, Catalogue du fonds indien, Fascicule I (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale / Asiaire-Maisonnette, 1941), p. 17: No. 31 (dated 1833 CE) and p. 18: No. 32 (around 1836 CE).
70, regarding Siegfried Lienhard’s remarkable work in and on Nepal). It is pleasing, therefore, to cite herewith just one brief but interesting article written out of the field works with regard to the nīpa-guṇya-cult among the Newars today (cf. infra §6.8 cum n. 58).  

IV. Some More Dated Palm-leaf Manuscripts:

4. After all Kaladatta’s Kṛṣṇaśānagṛhakahā-pañjikā seems to have been rather popular among the Buddhists particularly in the Himalayan regions. Quite a few old palm-leaf manuscripts have thus survived to date. The abundance of older manuscripts give us bright future for text critical tasks and new editorial work. I would like, therefore, to record some of these important manuscripts. In addition to the above-mentioned old palm-leaf manuscripts, I will list the dated manuscripts briefly in chronological order with references.  

4.1. The University of Tokyo Library holds seven complete manuscripts (Nos. 112-118), out of which three are palmleaves: No. 115 (Samvat 583), No. 116 (Samvat 624), and No. 117 (Samvat 385). The first two were brought back by Ekai Kawaguchi 河口慧海 (1866-1945). And Junjiro Takakusu 高倉順世 (1866-1945) brought back the third, i.e. the oldest one. Unfortunately, their full colophons are not given in this catalogue. Thanks to the painstaking efforts of Luciano Fetic, it is now verified for 8 October 1265 during the reign of Jayabhishmdeva, offering the colophon in full:  

samvat 385 atuni-badvi-ravadbhyam rajadhiraja-sri-jayabhishma-devaya vayaya rajya.  

4.2. In 1910 Ryusaburo Sakaki 桜良三郎 (1872-1946) brought back over one hundred manuscripts from Nepal. His strong interest seems to have been laid in Tantric and narrative literature. Among them is a complete palm-leaf manuscript of the Kṛṣṇaśānagṛhakahā-panjikā of Kaladatta. It is classified under the category of Tantric literature in the Kyoto University Collection.  

4.3. There are many more paper manuscripts of the *Kriyāsamgraha-paṭikkā* of Kuladatta. Owing to a limited space, I would omit them here. As is well known, every scholar in the related fields of study is indebted to the Nepal German Manuscript Project team under the leadership of Albrecht Wezler of Hamburg at present. They have microfilmed thousands of manuscripts held in the Kathmandu Valley region.\(^4^1\) In the most recently published catalogue five complete and two incomplete manuscripts in paper have so far been microfilmed and kept in the National Archives of Nepal.\(^4^2\) However, as a matter of fact, more manuscripts had been microfilmed as of 1987 (cf. supra §1.1.2). There may be far more than that number by now. It is my cherished desire now to see if more hitherto unknown old palm-leaf manuscripts are preserved in microfilm.

\section*{V. Concluding Words in Brief}

5.0. The *Kriyāsamgraha-paṭikkā* of Kuladatta is indeed an interesting text, but not an easy one. It is hoped, therefore, that the specialists in the related fields of study will join the group to try to approach the text from various different angles. It is most fortunate that the original text is available in good manuscripts. The prime necessity is to have a critically edited text to invite serious philological work.

5.1. It will be a future task to see how much Kuladatta played a role in Tibet. It is a great pity, therefore, that Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha-paṭikkā* seems to have not reached the land of the Chinese, nor the Tanhuang area (cf. supra §1.3.1 & 2.3). So far I have not found traces of it among the corpus of Chinese Buddhist literature.

5.2. Indo-Tibetan iconographical literature does not seem to have reached pre-medieval Japan (cf. infra §5.4). The iconological, iconometric and iconographical literature has since attracted considerable attention of serious scholars to date. It is hoped that Kuladatta's *Kriyāsamgraha-paṭikkā* will become a central figure in the related fields of study in the future.


5.3 Furthermore, historians of Buddhist ideas with a firm philological background can now play an active role. Without their participation, such a difficult text will not be fully understood. After all, I hope that the *Kṣaṇamukhā-patikā* of Kaladatta will invite a number of young and promising scholars to study it from various viewpoints. There exist also a number of other interesting texts within the framework of this genre. Here and there I would like to add some more random remarks on the relevant literature.

**VI. Additional Notes**

6.0 In addition to Kulastatta’s *Kṣaṇamukhā-patikā* mention may be made to Bhadravatya’s *Stūpa-lakṣana-kārikā-vivekaśāstra*. In the first place Gustav Roth paid heed to this text belonging to the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravāda as early as 1966.43 In connection with this text I have discussed the *stūpa-* *caitya*-cult in icons and writings in my previous article (cf. supra n. 3). Two more minor texts related to the dimensions of *caityas* and images in fragmentary manuscript form kept in the University Library of Cambridge; Bell’s *Catalogue* numbered Add. 1706 VI (1 folio) and Add. 1706 VII (2 folios). Neither of them escaped Roth’s attention (op. cit., p. 32).

6.1 With regard to the *stūpa-* *caitya*-cult in writing I would like to add one of the most interesting works published in recent years.44 In close relation to the *stūpa-* *caitya*-cult one cannot forget the literature on the measurement of images, particularly of Buddhist statues. In this connection mention may be made to Hans Reulius, who made a brief but very useful general survey of the relevant literature within the framework of his research into the Indian *Silpa-lāttāras.*45 There is an interesting text named the *Buddha-pratīti-lakṣana*

---

43 Cf. Gustav Roth, “Remarks on the *Stūpa-lakṣana-kārikā-vivekaśāstra*”, *Professor Syed Husain Ashari Filiation Volume* (Supplementary Issue to: *Journal of the Bihar Research Society*) (Patna 1968), p. 31-46. Unfortunately this enlightening article is not included in his collected papers (Delhi 1986). — cf. supra § 1 end.
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and its commentary Pratimas-lakshmi-viveka. A palmleaf manuscript is kept in the University of Cambridge Library: Bendall's Catalogue numbered Add. 1706.HI (7 folios) and 1V (17 folios, missing the last leaf). As for the Buddhist-pratimas-lakshmi, there seem to be yet two more manuscripts in paper at the University of Kyoto: Gohama-Noguchi's Sumain Catalogue (p. 20 with reference) numbered 70 (15 folios) and 71 (16 folios).

6.2. Needless to say, this relevant literature is beyond the scope of my present paper. I would therefore like to refer just to a detailed bibliographical survey carried out by the late Jan Willem de Jong (1921-2000). He has made a thorough observation on every work related to the literature in Indic, Tibetan and Chinese as well as a number of studies in Japanese.

6.3. After all, a stupa / cairn is an architecture product. It is thus simply related to a "dwelling, housing" technique or science, i.e., rdzaw-instead. Therefore, I cannot help mentioning a recent development of this branch of science. A hitherto less-known text named Mayurasana has appeared before us.67 Its English version translated by Bruno Dagens is most welcome.68

6.4. Another exiting publication in recent years is a text based on a palmleaf manuscript copied in Simhala script. Three Sri Lankan scholars have brought it out together with detailed studies including a facsimile of the manuscript.69 This interesting work will no doubt invite specialises to further our knowledge.


For the sake of convenience, mention may be made to a practically unavailable article by Ryoashin SAKAI cited by de Jong is now included in his collected papers (unpublished).


6.5. Herewith I would just quote one more relevant work published with a detailed introductory essay, annotations and an illustrated glossary. This text has been preserved in three volumes and offers a lot of useful information. Needless to say, it is out of our scope here to discuss the origin of the Buddha's image. At the moment our concern is how the iconometric technique has developed in India. In this regard the ākāśa-vibhāga within the framework of paintings cannot be neglected.

6.6. It is well known that Mgon-po skyabs (工布赤) translated the Tibetan version of a significant work on Buddhist iconometry into Chinese during his stay in Peking in 1742, i.e. 造像度量章 (Taisho No. 1419). He must have played a great role for a short period of stay in the capital city. It seems to have been printed in the thirteenth year of Emperor Ch'ien-lung (乾隆帝: 1711-1799, r. 1735-1795), i.e. 1747. This is yet another interesting example that the Chinese version translated by Mgon-po skyabs has since attracted the population quickly in China and its surrounding regions of East Asia due to the earnest wishand urgent need.

6.7. Incidentally, I would herewith like to cite two more recent publications, which has appeared after: a useful survey made by J. W. de Jong (cf. supra n. 40). One is a Japanese translation, which was in fact written some several decades ago.


In this connection I would just cite a work which intelligently covers this question with a glossary of technical terms (p. 81-90) and a bibliography (p. 91-94): Sīri Guṇasīṅha, La technique du liseré indien d'après les textes du Tilopa (= Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études, LXXII (Paris: Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale / Presses Universitaires de France, 1957), (viii), 96 p.


To my regret, I have been unable to see an article on the Tibetan material by Enga IRIMOTO (今本昌頻; 1870-1940), a pioneer of Japanese Tibetology, "西蔵造像造度規程と 仏像研究", 四川師報 [a monthly organ of the Tendai Sect], No. 315 (1911).

It is a great pity that a number of philologically interesting and useful shorter articles by Shinnō (alias Shirō) Sōzō (stripheidō; 須満; 1908-1988) are excluded from his collected papers published in 4 volumes: 趙吉義集要作集 譯順 (集要, 1983-1984).
ago. And the other one is an English translation published very recently. To my regret, however, these two otherwise enlightening works must be read with utmost care on certain critical matters. I am afraid that this section for my supplementary notes has got too far. I will cite only the following two enlightening papers on Indic sources in this genre published by a Japanese scholar.

6.5. It will naturally be endless if one starts looking at architectural surveys of old structures in connection with the relevant Indic literature, to say nothing of a vast extent of stūpas in Asia. There have appeared many interesting works on the stūpas literature. Recent multilateral field workers have brought out their remarkable achievements, to mention here particularly of Nepal. One always gets a valuable hint or clue from them (cf. also supra § 3.2 cum n. 37).

56 隈居修平，《波羅門城脚》，京都：大感謝出版，1987)，手写文本被编入2卷的《日本文集》44 & 62卷附录（与评论，编者，由鲁森·斯瓦，佐藤明彦），in its publication.


58 As an illustration see e.g. Bernhard Köhler, Re-Building a Stūpa: Architectural Drawings of the Sapambitala (Nepal), herausgegeben von R. Köhler und Siegfried Lembach (Berlin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag, 1992), 170 p. (incl. 23 illus.).
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Some features of the language of the Kāśyapa-parivarta *

Seishi KARASHIMA

Introduction

It was really my good fortune that I could read the Sanskrit manuscript of the Kāśyapa-parivarta (KP), which is now being kept in the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, with Dr. M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya during her stay at the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology (IRIAB), Soka University, in the winter of 2001. She had brought, from Russia, photographs of the manuscript as well as her new transliteration, being prepared for publication as the fifth volume of the Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Budhica monograph series of IRIAB. In the process of checking this and reading the text several times with her and my colleagues, I realized that there were still several peculiar forms and features which F. Edgerton had not noted in his Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary (BHSG, BHSD), though the KP is referred to in numerous places throughout this monumental work. Though many such text-critical problems have been already pointed out, especially by Friedrich Weller — whose excellent, fully-annotated German translation of the KP has been my indispensable guide to reading this rather difficult and partially corrupted text — and by Bhikkhu Pāṇḍita, we may reconsider these problems anew, based on the new transliteration of the KP as well as the knowledge of Middle Indic which has greatly grown since their time.

This paper consists of six parts: I. Orthography; II. Phonology; III. Syntax; IV. Morphology; V. Some Noteworthy Words; VI. Obscure Words. As most of the instances of non-Sanskritic phenology, morphology as well as Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit words, found in the KP, have been cited and analysed already in the BHSG and BHSD, I shall

* Here I should like to express my gratitude to Dr. M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, my colleagues Noriyuki Kudo and Stefano Zachetti for their learned suggestions and comments which fortunately I received while reading the text of the KP. Quite a few of the new interpretations, proposed in this paper, originated from our countless discussions. However, needless to say, I alone, am responsible for any misinterpretations and misreadings found in this paper. Also, thanks are due to my long-time friend, Peter Lak, who took the trouble in checking my English.

© 2002 IRIAB, Soka University, JARIN.
confine myself here mainly to forms and words which are not dealt with in the above two books.

In this paper, readings of the KP are cited from Vorobyova-Deystrovskaya 2002. Also, I follow, in principle, the conventions used there.1

I. Orthography
§ 1. Visarga (\&) or "double-dotted Daṇḍa" (§)
As Weller has pointed out, the Visarga sign was also frequently used as a kind of punctuation mark — we may say "all it Visarga-Daṇḍa" or "double-dotted Daṇḍa" — in this manuscript.

While transcribing the above, we had a great deal of difficulty in choosing between these two functions of the sign, which, in many of the places, can only be judged from the context in the KP. Yet, there are still some cases in which we cannot say which of the two was originally meant.

Also, we may notice that the scribe did not go to the trouble of writing a punctuation mark when a Visarga sign had been written already at the end of a phrase or a sentence. This may mean that such a sign was also used for both functions, namely as a punctuation mark (§) and as a Visarga (\&). The following instance illustrates this usage.

[833f. इम्बक्कलिते दुःसंधानात्: सरस्वतीकरमाताय; समफळप्रस्थितकरसादी: विधाकाः विद्याधामात् श्रेयोऽसुरुषुः। भारतेन स्त्रिया-ऋषिनाऽनुसारः सरस्वतीकरसादी: विधाकाः विद्याधामात् श्रेयोऽसुरुषुः।]

As my colleague, N. Kudo, is now in the process of preparing a brief article dealing with this topic, by collecting more instances in the KP, I shall confine myself to pointing

1 Some of them are as follows: [ ] = damaged akṣara(s); > = omitted akṣara(s); [ ] = superscript akṣara; [ ] = erased akṣara(s); .. = one illegible akṣara; ** = illegible part of an akṣara; * = comma.
2 Weller p. 63, fn. 3. Cf. also Bühler 1896: § 36, C.R (I wish to thank my colleague, N. Kudo, for bringing this reference to my attention), Brough 1934: 361 = 1996: 140; Mette 1997: 11.
3 Apparently without noticing this fact, Snell-Holm consistently transcribed the sign as a Visarga, resulting in such fanciful forms as ज्वलिगरिमायः (681. Weller [p. 67, fn. 2] and Pundlik [1993: 216-217] puzzled over this and took it for instr. pl., but in fact it should be read as "विपाकगिरिमायः" (861b, * "पापियसूर्यः", मायायासूर्यः, * "पापियसूर्यः", मायायासूर्यः, * "सार्वित्तिष्ठितां", मायायासूर्यः, * "सार्वित्तिष्ठितां", मायायासूर्यः). Brough 1934: 361 = 1996: 140.
out the above-mentioned observations.

§ 2. Omission of anusvāra and "pseudo-anusvāra"

Like in Kāraṇṭha documents 1 as well as in Nepalese manuscripts 2, the usage of anusvāra in the KP is rather erratic, sometimes omitted when it is etymologically needed or at other times, written in when it is not etymologically justified.

§ 2.1. Omission of anusvāra

There are dozens of such cases, for instance: 2a5. vi(c)hi=ca-ma=dayam[ī]; 3a5. apratiṣṭhāna=ca=janatāḥ; 24b5. ida=ca=; 3a5. kathā(ca=)ma=p; 65b4. para-[c]a= (c Skt. pur[ra]); 71a5, 71b5, 72b4. avocaci[ts]a=; 71b1. av[ca]=; 76b2. ca[ca]=ca=ma=natikādṛṣṭa; 73b4. acaca= ca= na.

Some peculiar grammatical forms, found in the KP, are to be ascribed to this erratic omission of anusvāra. For example, the accusative plural masculine in -a, -a, -a could be merely scribal errors for -a, -a, -a. Similarly, the genitive plural -inda=ca= (see § 9.17); the genitive plural -inda= (§ 15.4); the locative feminine tāpacya= (§ 16.1); the genitive plural masculine māca= (§ 16.3); the accusative plural masculine tāca= (§ 16.4); the genitive plural masculine tāca= (§ 16.18); the imperative 3rd singular middle -aca= (§ 18.1); the infinitive -aca= (§ 22.1).

§ 2.2. "Pseudo-anusvāra"

Among several examples of "pseudo-anusvāras" are: 23b3. ila[ma]=ravatātā mabhito; 76a2. abhirubya= (gerund; see § 21.2). The anusvāra is also used superficially before a nasal consonant, as in, 55a5. ka[ma]=ntaṃ; H/M.1. bhā[ma]=; H/M.7. -p[ma]=naṇa; Turfan MS.A2. Sama[ma]=[la] ... ; Turfan MS.B1. [ka]=ṃnti-. However, the latter specimens may reflect the actual pronunciation of the scribe, as the writing of ma seems to have further resulted in the peculiar form of ma for a single n (see §

---

3 61b2-1. kathā(c)a= ma= (a scribal error for man am man) (see pron. ace. sg.) par ja[n]aḥ ... katha=ca= man par ja[n]aḥ ... katha=ca= man par ja[n]aḥ ... Katalog cites many such instances of these endings from various Buddhist texts (BHSG § 8.02, 93). Among many ommissions of anusvāra in the KP, we find as follows: 61b3. apratīṣṭhāna=ca= pārīṣṭhāna= ca dharmāṃ sthaṛgaḥ; 36a. ca[nta] (see Skt. ca=nta) dharmas ca rājan; 36b. caritaḥ (see Skt. caritaḥ dharmas ca rājan) (vs); 36c. dharmas ca rājan (see Skt. dharmas ca rājan) (vs); 36d. dharmas ca rājan (see Skt. dharmas ca rājan) (vs); 36e. dharmas ca rājan (see Skt. dharmas ca rājan) (vs).
4 Edgerton cites many such instances of these endings from various Buddhist texts (BHSG § 8.02, 93). Among many omissions of anusvāra in the KP, we find as follows: 61b3. apratīṣṭhāna=ca= pārīṣṭhāna= ca dharmāṃ sthaṛgaḥ; 36a. ca[nta] (see Skt. ca=nta) dharmas ca rājan; 36b. caritaḥ (see Skt. caritaḥ dharmas ca rājan) (vs); 36c. dharmas ca rājan (see Skt. dharmas ca rājan) (vs); 36d. dharmas ca rājan (see Skt. dharmas ca rājan) (vs); 36e. dharmas ca rājan (see Skt. dharmas ca rājan) (vs).
5 Edgerton cites many such instances of these endings from various Buddhist texts (BHSG § 8.02, 93). Among many omissions of anusvāra in the KP, we find as follows: 61b3. apratīṣṭhāna=ca= pārīṣṭhāna= ca dharmāṃ sthaṛgaḥ; 36a. ca[nta] (see Skt. ca=nta) dharmas ca rājan; 36b. caritaḥ (see Skt. caritaḥ dharmas ca rājan) (vs); 36c. dharmas ca rājan (see Skt. dharmas ca rājan) (vs); 36d. dharmas ca rājan (see Skt. dharmas ca rājan) (vs); 36e. dharmas ca rājan (see Skt. dharmas ca rājan) (vs).
II. Phonology

§ 4. Confusion of Consonants

§ 4.1. k / g

13b1. te mītra mūlam nūgatava vuktaḥ (vs)

This nūgata- is probably a corruption of sukata- (cf. Pā. < sukṛta-)

§ 4.2. c / cb

These signs are very similar; cf. Weller p. 85, fn. 5; p. 90, fn. 19, p. 94, fn. 12. The confusion s / t is found also in other texts. The reading nūlambrīka in the following verse must be a scribal error for alambrīka: LV. 3225; probuci sata ita marakanyām nālambrīkā (vs) (but cf. BEHS 84:13). Also, SPGON.12.14. nāpalambrīkā (most of MSS. avā; SPGON.286.1. avanara / SVP): avanara.


11 In Gāndhārī, non-historic substrata r is occasionally used to indicate a geminate consonant (cf. Salomon 1999: 122-3). Alten/Salomon 2000: 267.)
§ 4.3. t/n
1b3. anatarasyām (ē anantarasyām); 19b5. upatāhāre (ē upatāsā); H/M/b7. citasaṃ na citasaṃkṣipta (ē citasaṃ na citasaṃkṣipta)\footnote{19b5. sarvajñāhākāraśāmya (ē sarvajñāhākāraśāmya) \cite{aririab_v:2002}; H/M/a1. trē (ē te); H/M/a2. ciksititi (ē ciksititi); H/M/a3. fruttaṃ bhavati[i] (ē fruttaṃ bhavati[i]); H/M/b1. +manasvāgato (ē samanvāgato); H/M/b4. dhūtagunān (ē dhūtagunān).}

§ 4.4. t/d
10b2. saprāща (ē corruption of BHS saprāsita; cf. Aṣ. saprāśa); 14b4. sata (ē corruption of pada < [m.c.] pada).

§ 4.5. eb/d/d
8a1. maṭha (ē mātha)

§ 4.6. d/dh
9a1. vidādyā (ē vidādyā); 14b5. -nīdāna (ē -nīdāna)
Turfan MS/b3. dāna- (ē dāna-); Turfan MS/b4. -dhūnasa(m)/a(i)dānaf[a] (ē [dāna]-dānasa(m)/a(i)dānaf[a])

§ 4.7. u/n/m; n/n
The instances of n/n/m are listed in § 2.2.
14a2. n/m eva (ē n eva); 23a4. satvāna (ē satvāna); 66a4. dṛṣṭāna (ē dṛṣṭāna); 76a3. nī nā (ē nī nā); 76a4. amataṃ nān (ē amataṃ nān); H/M/a1. ubhyamānā (ē ubhyamānā); H/M/a3. frutena (ē frutena); H/M/17. āśīnanyā (ē āśīnanyā) etc.

§ 4.8. b/bb
46a1. abhisambhotire (ē abhisambhotire); 78b2. bhīdeṇa (ē bhīdeṇa)\footnote{46a1. abhisambhotire (ē abhisambhotire); 78b2. bhīdeṇa (ē bhīdeṇa).}

§ 4.9. rg/rgh
18a4. ārgāmi (ē ārgāmi)

§ 4.10. st/stb
H/M/a6. bṛṣṭi- (ē bṛṣṭi-)

§ 5. Vowels
§ 5.1. e/i (cf. BHSG § 3.59)
77a2. kīḍṛti dharmanau (ē kīḍṛti dharmanau)\footnote{77a2. kīḍṛti dharmanau (ē kīḍṛti dharmanau).} [nom. sg. fem.]

§ 5.2. ai by Hypersanskritism for e\footnote{77a2. kīḍṛti dharmanau (ē kīḍṛti dharmanau).} (cf. BHSG § 3.69)

\footnote{46a1. abhisambhotire (ē abhisambhotire); 78b2. bhīdeṇa (ē bhīdeṇa).}

\footnote{19b5. sarvajñāhākāraśāmya (ē sarvajñāhākāraśāmya) \cite{aririab_v:2002}; H/M/a1. trē (ē te); H/M/a2. ciksititi (ē ciksititi); H/M/a3. fruttaṃ bhavati[i] (ē fruttaṃ bhavati[i]); H/M/b1. +manasvāgato (ē samanvāgato); H/M/b4. dhūtagunān (ē dhūtagunān).}

\footnote{77a2. kīḍṛti dharmanau (ē kīḍṛti dharmanau).}

\footnote{19b5. sarvajñāhākāraśāmya (ē sarvajñāhākāraśāmya) \cite{aririab_v:2002}; H/M/a1. trē (ē te); H/M/a2. ciksititi (ē ciksititi); H/M/a3. fruttaṃ bhavati[i] (ē fruttaṃ bhavati[i]); H/M/b1. +manasvāgato (ē samanvāgato); H/M/b4. dhūtagunān (ē dhūtagunān).}
§ 8. Case

§ 8.1. Nominative for locative? (BHSG-)
44a1. yunī hīmavatīh parvataś ca bhājajayēti vīraktam (prose)
44b3. hīmavatī sa parvataś cā bhījakā rajahati (vs)
It may be also possible to take the latter case as instances where stems in -a are used for locative.39 Then, hīmavatīh parvataś cā in the prose is merely the result of an automatic backformation.

§ 8.2. Predicative instrumental (cf. BHSG § 7.38)40 and predicative ablative -tas (cf. BHSG § 7.47)41
62b1-3. dharmata "ce tathāgatam na samamopyatayā. kah punar vāca rūpābhivyena?
virāgata "ce dharmam nābhīnakacitā, kah punar vāca rūpābhivyena?
Samayetam api āchāryaṃ bhakṣyam na vikalpayaḥ, kah punar vāca ganaścānīpitātah?
(prose)
63b1-4. virāgata dharmam arvake saṣād at (vs)

§ 8.3. Dative -aya with ablative meaning? (BHSG-)
32b3-4. akṣaḥ punah Kṣīrapa rūpābhivaścināśya toryat (prose)42
However, referring to BHSG § 8.82, Welle (101, fn. 2) takes it as instrumental form with feminine ending.

§ 8.4. The subjective genitive with a gerundive (BHSG-)?
77a2. tatra Samaṃtāloka kīde tvā dharmam a bhavanta samudānīyata (taryat)43

IV. Morphology

§ 9. a-stems

§ 9.1. Stems in -a as locative (cf. BHSG § 8.11)

39 Cf. § 9.1, BHSG § 8.11.
40 Cf. also Speyer § 717; Speyer § 117, 2, Renon Cr. § 219c; von Hinstiber 1908: §143, fn. 4.
42 "He does not regard the Tathāgata as Dharmma; how much less as material body. He does not insist that the Dharmma is the absence of desire, how much less as words, discourses or utterances. He does not regard the Sanghe of saints as 'encumbered'; how much less as an assembly (of monks)."
43 "He always regards the Dharma as the absence of desire."
44 "We find an instance of the same usage of a dative in the so-called Kashgar manuscript of the SP-SPYO. 79b25: yādy ati bhūk bhūmikāḥ pravāhikāḥ ārambhikāḥ dūrakāḥ seyaḥ pravāhikāḥ (pāñca). ... yaḥ pravāhikāḥ pravāhikāḥ. The word pravāhikā here means "because of not obstructing (them)", just the same as akṣaḥ. Cf. Depakārikā 1996: 159.
45 "Again, Kṣīrapa, emptiness is not the result of the destruction of the existence of individuality."
47 Presumably a scribal error for kṣīrapa.
48 Cf. Turtin MS b.2. dharmam a bhavanta samudānīyata.
Kāyaya dvau pravṛttiṣṭaya aṁkita ṣātyay (prose)
60a\-1. dvau: imaṁ Kāyaya pravṛttiṣṭaya ṣātya, ... ime Kāyaya dvau pravṛttiṣṭaya ṣātya (prose)
71a\+1. tav dvau bhikṣu nirmātm (prose)

§ 9.6. Nominative-accusative dual masculine -ā (= Middle Indic and BHS plural masculine) (cf. BHS § 8.76. -ā)
59b\-2. dharmāva imaṁ dvau puruarjanyaśa (vs)

§ 9.7. Nominative dual masculine -ē (= BHS-) (prose)
57b\+4. akṣābādita (read: "goḍtē?"") imē dvē ("pratijātita / tav bhūtisvānena viṇāvajjitaṇīyo // (vs)) 37

§ 9.8. Nominative-accusative dual neuter -a (BHS-)
57b\+5. dīcēva imē Kāyaya pravṛttiṣṭaya gāḍhahandānaṁ (prose)

§ 9.9. Nominative-accusative dual neuter -ām? (BHS-)
58a\+1. ime Kāyaya dvau pravṛttiṣṭaya gāḍhahandānaṁ (prose)

§ 9.10. Nominative plural -ah\+28 (cf. BHS § 8.83; RgGr § 8.60)
60a\-4. caruia ime kāyaya tāmmanāṁ (prose)

§ 9.11. Nominative plural -ām?\+29 (cf. BHS § 8.79 [mainly m.c.])
70b\+2. te tatāvat cvasa samāna (prose)

§ 9.12. Nominative plural masculine -āya\+30
16a\+4. aravatīvate kuśaḥ/āvatasvānī / saṭveṣṇa ca (read: ca m.c.) samyagahā yasaktē (vs)

§ 9.13. Accusative plural masculine -āri\+31 (BHS-)
10a\+4. dāṁstājāyavāpyataḥ (read: "pāśaṃroṭ") ca bodhisvarum dṛṣṭvā (prose)
58b\+2-3. kriṣita (read kriṣita-men-ṛ) ca yo pravṛttiśa ("dithiṣayita" / (vs)

79b\+2. tam sarvākāhātāhāh sāyaśatāramajarpīrānṃ kṛṣṇā (prose)

37 "These two kinds of sky-like attachment(?; aṁkita-bhikṣa) are groundless. A bodhissatva should cast them away." The word aṁkita-bhikṣa (read: "goḍtē?") is difficult to understand; cf. BHSD, s.vv. aṁkita, bhikṣa. For pāśaṃroṭa / pāśaṃroṭa see BHSD, s.vv.; Lin 1949: 169, fn. 6; Bloch 1950: 104, fn. 13; Lüders 1954: 16\+37; Chang 1937: 109-110; Weller 127-128, fn. 19.
38 This form might also be a scribal error for -ā.
39 This ending is quite common in verses in BHS texts, as Edgerton states. We find also one example in a verse in the KD: 56a\+1. mājāpaya dārbhanām ca imē // (vs).
40 This form might also be a scribal error for -a.
41 -āya < (m.c.) -āya (BHS § 8.82), Pkt. -āya (Pischel §167), cf. BHS. nom. acc. fem. -āya (BHS § 9.88).
42 This form might also be a corruption of -āya; cf. § 2.1.
44 Geiger/Naumann §78, 3.a.
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§ 9.15. Accusative plural neeter -e (CEF BHSG § 8.103)
11a. *sāsārīhtā jātra na kāyam [Praktiké játra sa bhūtātra // (wan)]

As the expression bīna- yāna is found in a plural form elsewhere in this text, I assume the form yāna as an accusative plural neeter rather than the much doubted accusative singular one.58

§ 9.16. Instrumental plural -ai, -er, -eh, -e
§ 9.16.1. -ai (-aī) (CEF BHSG § 8.107)59
56a. ātisī ca deva mānasīca sa keśit (wan)
73a. dohī(?) cīka niyamanto dharmānīnariṣya nācyut (prasas)
§ 9.16.2. -er, -eh, -e (-ai)60
6a. tāvamātraḥ saṁghṛtaṁ (prasas)61
6a. do dohaśābhāgyatā samāta (prasas)
6a. saṃsūtraḥ saṁghṛtaṁ (prasas)
70a. na tākṣam avanāyaśācakālamāśīlā pāmapitāparipārīhīte anuddhikubhābale tattvāna adhikācāreṇa niyamena viṇa paśyāntena sa avatārintaṁ vā paryantā (prasas)
50a. 1.1. saṃsūtraḥ 2.1. tattvāna samāta (prasas)
4a. gurudakīśa (prasas)62
171a. ehti mūra-ya hishāya yā vai kāhyam // te bhūtāvaswada saciśācāryya \// (prasas)

56a-58b. kāhyam yāna rata na kāhyam (wan).


The instrumental plural in -ai is also found in fragments of the SP from Kholbol: SPWJ541, Fragment 16, verso 5. 1. lokātya paritattāyāmā; da. 81, Fragment 85, recto 5. nakatvā rukhātā yāpātyākā; da. verso 1. nekaḥ hātātmanā; da. 81, Fragment 61, recto 3. \//bhūtātā sarī //

These instrumental forms are used in an abative function; cf. BHSG § 7.39.

The Prasenapadi (88.7) cites this passage and then states stands dharmānīnariṣya (wan).

For the instrumental plural in -e, cf. Geiger Sīkār 5.6; Norman 1969: 146 (ad Th 102), ad. 1995: 253 (ad Sā 547), 262 (ad Sā 609), 272 (ad Sā 609); 1997: 76 (ad Dīp 61); v. Hilmert 2000: §116. This ending is also found in the SP; e.g. SPX67. 166. 166a. ahaṃ parivasīmaḥ (prasas) (vo; cf. SPKRN 61.12. 167. 167a. ahaṃ parivasīmaḥ (prasas) (SPX10084. 167. ahaṃ ca bhūte na hātae samāta (vo; cf. SPKRN 97.1. 166. ahaṃ ca bhūte (sīkār 5.6) na hātae samāta (SPW.1) Fragment 20, verso 5. bhūte (sipattā //) sarī //) SPKRN). 166h-3. ahaṃ sarvasām apyā suhātāsu nhātānām ahaṃ ca bhūte samāta (SPKRN). 166h-3. ahaṃ sarvasām ahaṃ ca bhūte samāta (SPKRN). 166h-3. ahaṃ sarvasām ahaṃ ca bhūte samāta (SPKRN). 166h-3. ahaṃ sarvasām ahaṃ ca bhūte samāta (SPKRN).
24a2–3. bodhiṣṭavō yātā lokābharme na ṭīpyate (prose)36
62a2. yathā kāyam bhūṣan anarthaḥ[ay] bhavati kāyena ca jīvitenāpi. kaḥ putar vṛddo
lakṣahsāṃkārale bhūṣan (prose)
76a5. sarvacatā tājajātārāḥ samāshū yēya ubhayāṃaṃ (prose)

§ 9.17. Genitive plural -ānā (BHSG.)
24a–5. dhrīmārthāh[ā] kānā ca kāraṇāti viṣṇuḥ śaṃkārī // (vs)
195. pravijvpāpāpratirhitiṃsām satavāṃ (prose)
27a2–3. yathāpi decinaṃ samā prajagā / mātrākṣaṃ samābhāsāt abhijjā // (vs)
47b1–2. tatyānā práppiṇā parābhera (t%) pratyākṣepa cikitiṣa (prose)
55a3. nāmā lokākṣaṃatrādhiṣāṇā samavāka upapattir bhavati
59b3. mahāyānassattānāṃ cessu ca satavāṃ viśeṣanāṃ
70a2. bhūṣhānā bhūṣhāmesaṃ (prose)

§ 9.18. Genitive plural -ām (CF. BHSG § 8.124)
56a1. a-dānām niḥpravaṇaḥ[ā]ḥ 30 kām ca 31 (vs)

§ 10. ā-stems

§ 10.1. Noninative singular feminine -ā (CF. BHSG § 9.8)
77b4. dhrāmānāvā [nom. sg. fem. ... ] mātrākṣaṃpravāyaḥ balavagasaṃmodatā antavasaṃ (t%ti) ... arthānāpāptādaḥ (prose)

§ 10.2. Accusative singular feminine -ānant (CF. BHSG § 9.16 only in verses)
42a5. devaḥ śaṃbhū prajāpanāṃ (prose)

§ 10.3. Nominative plural feminine -āya (m.c.)39
25b2. tathā bhudācāryaṃ satvapāyaṃgṛivaḥ / bhudācārya prajāpana karaṇa uṣaya // (vs39)

§ 11. ā-stems

§ 11.1. Accusative singular feminine -āṇā (BHSG § 10.60)

36 Cf. 24a4 s. lokābharme kādē śīpyate.
37 This form might also be a corruption of -āṃsā, cf. § 2.1.
38 Scribal error for “tām. Hṛṣya, the sign for k kēva very similar to mūrti. I assume that the scribe noted his mistake just after he marked writing is, nosalating in the ambiguous sign we find here.
39 “evam (gen. pl.).
40 This form might be a scribal error loc. -ānā.
41 Cf. BHSG § 9.86. -āp, śabāp
42 Probably a scribal error loc. “gṛiva.
43 Cf. 25a5–25b1. evam eva kāyam mātrākṣaṃpravāyaḥ bhudācāryaṃ prajāpa satvapāyaṃgṛivaṃ karaṇa.
56a3. *ayuḥkhamiḥ manapatamati keśi (vi)
§ 11.2. Genitive singular masculine -7th (BHSG -)
KP. 75b1. ayuḥamatiś *śubhibhi pariprathataḥ (prose)
§ 11.3. Locative singular feminine -a (< -ma) (BHSG -) 66
50b5. *atūnaḥ 66 taciṃśātikṣa (prose)
§ 12. in-stems
§ 12.1. Genitive singular -ina of -in stem (BHSG -) 66
18b4. *cākākṣātikṣeśa na tuṣaḥ
§ 13. u-stems
§ 13.1. Instrumental singular -ūna (< [m.c.-]ūna) (BHSG -)
55b4. ācāna uṣṭāḥ leśiṃ labhiyante (vi)
§ 13.2. Locative singular masculine -unmi (< Pā) (BHSG -)
21b1. pari ca barumub ca tuṣāṁātasa (vi) 67
§ 13.3. Nominative-accusative dual masculine -u (Skt. -ū) (BHSG -)
71a3-4. bhagavānam ... dvau bṛkṣen nirmimite u ma ... tāu dvau bṛkṣenāt nirmimite 68
(prose)
§ 13.4. Accusative plural masculine -uṇāḥ (BHSG § 12.48)
79b2. tām sarvasaharkitātāvah uṇāḥ[arantavaparipūrṇam kṛtā] (prose)
80a2. gamgānaivalikāsamām lokahātāvah paramānanrūjeyie (ā)ittākā bhīṣy 69
(prose)
§ 13.5. Accusative plural masculine -ubhaḥ (BHSG -)
80a3. tām sarvasah lokabharah uparārasuparipūrṇam kṛtā(vi) (prose)
§ 13.6. Genitive plural -umām (CE BHSG § 12.71)
61a5. bhrīhunām amikte (prose)
§ 14. an-stems

66. This form might also be a corruption of -a (BHSG § 10.72).
69. Ska.234.10 cites this word in the KP as atuvan.
70. Cf. Rāgsa § 10.23. menām (gen. sg. of meni-; m.c.).
71. Cf. Weller 87, fn. 3.
72. In a quotation of this passage, found in the Prasannacādā (47.3, 3), the classical form of bhrīṣṭi stand in place of bhrīṣu.
73. In this sentence, both tām and paripūrṇam are acc. sg., while *ākṣātikṣa is acc. pl.; cf. § 7.
74. Cf. § 7.
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§ 14.1. Ablative singular -nā (BHSG) - Cf. §14.3
79a5. tām rakṣākāvā samātvaparyāśā d-eṣṭiṣṭovā panya upa spadita*(prose)
80b2. tiṣṇakramānīti samātvaparyāśā samvatsīkhāhadbhājñālīd (prose)

§ 14.2. Ablative singular neuter -nam ("-na") (BHSG) - Cf. §9.4
46b2. sādhatvaramānī parākramamānī tathā / abhi ṣādī (prose) trāvacakṣumaṇī tathā=* ca // (vs)

§ 14.3. Genitive singular -ān (BHSG) - Cf. §14.1
4ib3. prati ca kākṣavacanānārī prakasvaharam bhāva* (prose)

§ 14.4. Locative singular -e/a (BHSG)
44b3. bhavastumā yuṣṭuṣṭurāja bhavastu nibhānti // (vs)

§ 14.5. Nominative plural masculine -ānā (BHSG §17.60 [n.c.])
47b3. anāmānā sarvādikānaṃ sv (prose)

§ 14.6. Genitive plural -anam (e [m.n.]- anām) (BHSG)
14b2-3. adhyātma dharmān adhikāmāna (s)ya sada / vijaya pariṣṭu pariṣṭamānaanā ca // (vs)

§ 15. -nā-stems

§ 15.1. Genitive singular -taḥ (BHSG)
70a5. tathāgatavāprabhaḥ saṃyakamabhidyaya (prose)

§ 15.2. Genitive singular -nāḥ (Cf. BHSG § 18.69)
72b1. ājñamānāḥ Sāktāt pariṣṭhataḥ (prose; genitive absolute)

§ 15.3. Locative singular -nā (BHSG)
44b3. bhavastumā yuṣṭuṣṭurāja bhavastu nibhānti // (vs)

§ 15.4. Genitive plural -māṇop (Cf. BHSG § 18.74. -nam < -nām)
73b5. ko nāmāyaḥparāmānā naś ca tānta (prose)

71 Cf. Pā. rūpā (Abl. sg. masc.1).
72 For the interchange between a and am, see footnote (33).
73 Cf. Pā. kramānta (Abl. sg. neut.).
74 However, Edgerton takes this form as a nominative singular neuter of the word "parākramanā" which is in this instance elsewhere according to my knowledge (BHSG, p. 120).
75 Real: "trāvakāmanā (m.c.?)
76 "Similarly, through the "polishing" of the Buddha's sons, brothers also emerge in numbers."
77 See § 8.1.
78 Cf. 14b4-5. (trāvakāmaṁ bhāvaṁ bājanaṁ in
79 It can be merely an omission ofārtha which is very common in manuscripts.
80 The same form is found in Caṇeva 1962: 105.18 tathāgatavā-prabhaḥ saṃyakamabhidyaya.
81 Cf. Pāramasaṇḍa 49.15. ājñamānta Subhārath pariṣṭhitāḥ.
82 See § 8.1.
83 Cf. Pāramasaṇḍa 49.3. ājñamānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānānāṇ
§ 16. Generic Pronouns

§ 16.1. Locative singular feminine taryā(<' taryām < Skt. taryām)\(^ {35} \)

75b2. taryā pariṇā (prose)
H/M.h.b. taryā vādi-\(-/-\) (prose)

§ 16.2. Instrumental plural masculine te (< Skt. tāt)\(^ {36} \) Cf. § 9.16.2

Aṣa1-2. ye mama tvuddadāhantī tv bhalaṃṣatantarāṃ bhuddhiṣṭāṃ namakartāryaṃ-saṃ (prose)
70a5. ekālottaya tātēvakartyamānīkatā upārāṃbhābhāyāya śāk dharmadeśānāṃ oṣṭātām ṣārayātām (prose) rca citrapraṇālā śabāhā (prose)

§ 16.3. Genitive plural masculine teṣā (< Skt. teṣām)\(^ {37} \)

17a3. teṣām āparāṇaṃ maṃ saṃkṣātāt (m.) (vs)
54b3. teṣāt tātā (m) ekākām aviṣkāyānām kṣāyaparākeśākāhānām (prose)

§ 16.4. Accusative plural masculine etā (< cātām < Skt. cātām) of etad\(^ {38} \)

13b2. etā nirocatta śivā yāryānta (vs)

§ 16.5. Instrumental singular feminine (āśrayām (<' imāyā [ = Pa\(^ {39} \)]) of idam

(BHSG : -)

70b5. kṣetram punar eva āśrayām dharmadeśānāṃ parivartana\(^ {40} \) (prose)


§ 16.7. Nominative-accusative dual masculine āme (< plural masculine or dual neuter ending) Cf. § 9.7

58a4. āme Kātupya dvāu pravrajyaṃyantarāyukaraṇa dharmas (prose)
58b2. āme Kātupya dvāu pravrajyaṃyadā (prose) etc.\(^ {50} \)

\(^ {35} \)This form is found also in: SP(W). 163.12. taryā vādiṣām (- 236.16).

\(^ {36} \)This term might also be a corruption of taryām; cf. § 2.1.

\(^ {37} \)Cf. 68a3. tātēvakāryānta.

\(^ {38} \)This form is also found in the SP: SP(O). 38b6. māgānā jñātām na tv tātēvakāryāntaṃtv (vs; cf. SP[H]). 273.11. Kha. 001-bh. 7. māgānā jñātām na tv tātēvakāryāntaṃ; SP[KN]. 31.10. māgānā jñātām na tv (RC: on tātēvakāryāntaṃ); SP(O). 55b5. na tv tātēvakāryāntaṃ tv (vs; cf. SP[KN]). 48.8. tv tātēvakāryāntaṃ tv (RC: on tātēvakāryāntaṃ); SP[F]. 11b2-3. saṃsärem tv (vs; cf. SP[KN]). 273.11. saṃsärem tv (vs; cf. SP[KN]). 267b1. saṃsäre� tv (vs; cf. SP[KN]).

\(^ {39} \)The form mātā might also be a corruption of mātā, cf. § 2.1.

\(^ {40} \)Cf. 68a3. tātēvakāryānta.

\(^ {50} \)Other instances are: 58b6. āme Kātupya dvāu pravrajyaṃyantarāyukaraṇa dharmas (prose); 59a6. āme Kātupya dvāu pravrajyaṃyantarāyukaraṇa dharmas (prose).

\(^ {51} \)Cf. Geiger/Norman §108.

\(^ {52} \)"Then, through this exposition of the Dharma, they made preparations."
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16.8. Accusative plural masculine imā (≤ imān < Skt. imān) of idam (BHSG:)
   cf. BHSG §21.33. Cf. § 2,1
36. cauśa(?) imā dharmaṁ bhajanaṃ paṇḍitāḥ / (vs)
   796. imā tu dharmān ca tu vidinā / (vs)
16.9. Instrumental plural masculine eḥi (≤ Skt. ebhiḥ) of idam (BHSG:)
   696. tam eḥi dharmeḥ samavāsītaḥ / (vs)
16.10. Genitive plural masculine eṣa (≤ Skt. eṣaṁ) of idam
566a1–2. ābhujatāṁ mānāṁ pārvitarāḥ / (vs) / eṣa / ājñāmanāṁ pana grāvām ābhirattā
   // (vs)
706a. kramāḥ āsya eṣa (≤)manera dharmadānaścāya pārvitām (prose)
16.11. Nominative singular masculine yaḥ (≤ CF. BHSG §21.7) Cf. § 9,2
   174a. ye kṣetrajñye yathā gangāmāśāraḥ ratnuḥ pārvitum āsya (prose)
16.12. Nominative-acusative dual masculine katamo (≤ Skt. katamau)
   See § 9.5

17. Optative
17.1. Non-thematic middle ending in aya stem: -itu (opt. 3rd sg.) (CF. BHSG §29.6)
666. * * khyita imā jīne prakāṣa (vs)
17.2. Athematic optative in yu (CF. BHSG §29.42)
80a2–3. utakā caiva gandhānudvahaktaṁ lokahātavāḥ paramārthavajñena
   pārthitakaḥ bhāgya (prose)

18. Imperative
18.1. Imperative 3 sg. middle -ātiḥ (CF. § 2,1)
60a. imā kāryasya duva pravrajitaḥ akṣita glāyo (prose), 60a. imā kāryasya duva pravrajitaḥ tātāya
   (prose)
   5 Acc. pl. masc. (m.c); cf. BHSG § 8.94.
   6 Acc. pl. masc.; cf. BHSG § 8.99.
   7 ≤ Skt. tad.
   8 The form ātiḥ might also be a corruption of ātita; cf. § 2.1.
   9 Gen. pl.; see § 9.10.
   10 "Then, through this exposition of the Dharma, they made preparations." This sentence constitutes a
   nominative absolute.
   11 Gen. pl.
   13 Skt. prakrēta.
   14 Cf. 796a, bhavataḥ (MS. brāhnyā).
   15 The form -āti might also be a corruption of the imperative 3s. sg. middle -ātāḥ; cf. Rām. 210.6.
§ 19. Passive

§ 19.1. Non-Sanskrit passive

48b. *te sarve pariṣṭhēṃ<sup>106</sup> (prose)

§ 20. Past passive participles

§ 20.1. Past passive participle with active meaning from transitive verb (Cf. BHS:\n:\n75a. <i>cīndu</i> yaṣṭam saṃśāt<sup>105</sup> (prose)<sup>105</sup>

§ 20.2. Past passive participial suffix -<i>etā</i><sup>106</sup> (BHS -

45b. 3. na kena (read; "vā ce "<i>candā</i> vārṇa-jaśī<sup>106</sup> // na jatu śekopṛatāṃ cāvam / mamāmājanam tuṣā(<=<i>m.c.</i> tuṣā) namitā (<=<i>m.c.</i> namitā) śrīvāca//<sup>106</sup>

§ 21. Gerunds

§ 21.1. Gerund -<i>ay</i> (BHS § 35.18)<sup>115</sup>

8b. 9a. <i>dvayāravaheta</i> na ca jī(ḥ)(ūrāḥb) / meyāḥ samātanme vidad-ch-ṣiṣya<sup>112</sup>

§ 21.2. Gerund -<i>ay</i> (BHS -)<sup>215</sup>

armamānāyāṃ saṃhātam saṃbhāt<sup>105</sup> saṃbhāt<sup>105</sup> saṃbhāt<sup>105</sup> saṃbhāt<sup>105</sup> saṃbhāt<sup>105</sup> saṃbhāt<sup>105</sup> saṃbhāt<sup>105</sup> saṃbhāt<sup>105</sup> saṃbhāt<sup>105</sup>

107 Cf. Prasenadhi 49.14. pāla<sup>108</sup> (ṣuṣṭa: (Cf. p. 339, ft. 1) yaṃkālīḥ<sup>108</sup> saṃbhāt<sup>108</sup>.
109 Cf. Infinitives in -<i>en</i>, -<i>era</i> (BHS § 36.8, Rg. § 43.3).
110 "Having set aside the moon, nobody ever pays homage to stars, similarly, having set aside my sons who are following (any) discipline, no one pays homage to a beast." 215 Gerunds in -<i>ay</i> are also found in the Allahabadkāra-Dharma of the Mahābhārata-Lokamāravida: 24B4-5. kartaḥ (three times), 34A3. pārya, 36A2. pāpyāya. All of these occurrences are found in the prose part.
112 Gerund formed from the present stem of Skt. -<i>ātā</i>. 113 "Neither for the sake of wealth and the kingdom nor for the sake of their lives, they tell lies intentionally b't; having fixed awareness"). Both Weller (p. 70, fn. 8) and Pāṇīkā (1977-1979, I, p. 38, fn. 4) fail to understand this form correctly.
114 On a similar error for -<i>ay</i>; cf. § 2.2.
115 For the extension of a pravast by -<i>ay</i> in Pāli, see Norman 1969: 294 (ad Th 1242, paliṣṭhajāno), etc.
§ 22. Infinitive

§ 22.1. Infinitive -nu (BHSG § 36.3)

KP.22b1. na lakyam abakhabarit pariyostrana να (prose)
H/Ma.2. lakyam abakhabarit (prose)

V. Some Noteworthy Words

anu-patisi < (m.c.) > anu-patisi < anu-apatosi "attains"

3b5. prajñām anu-patisi samapalatā // (vs)

arāghati "is qualified for, is entitled to (+ dative)"

18a3-4. [a] prajñāya kāmāya kāmāya kāmāya (prose)118

1963. savāraṇāya kāmāya kāmāya uṣyāya uṣyāya uṣyāya // (vs)119

ukumbhāti ("insects")120 < ut-kumbhāti < ut-kumbhāti < ut > āṁ sūra ("to shake, tremble, be disturbed")

56b2. atva ikalati ukumbhāti vā khabākekkadāyā (vs)

cāyam121 < presumable as a scribal error for cāyaṃ>

70b2. "atvādyam yataca madhuvaprapyakābhi khalu cāyaṃ Kātyapā na kābhi satkāgāra ("there summer's lumbuddha") iti (prose)

---

118 Cf. CDPD, s.v. agghati; DDKp.392; tathāgasam, apayagasaṃ, paccayaṃ.

119 s.a. hāyāsa; cf. BHSG § 4.29.

117 This form might also be a corruption of -nu, cf. § 2.1. Cf. also Upādhiṃ 1994: 11f.

116 Cf. CDPD. s.v. agghati (2) "to be worthy, proper, becoming"; cf. also Skt. jñā "to deserve, he entitled to be able."

115 (Considering) "Am I qualified for making (others) penetrate the wisdom of the Buddha?" (b) "If He (consider) (or They consider) 'Am I qualified for making (others) penetrate the wisdom of the Buddha? or not?'"

120 Cf. BHSG, s.v. ukumbhāti "breach"; DCDH. 1751. "aumbhāba "cut up."

121 For the dissimulation of apsaras, cf. Geiger/Neuman § 62, fn. 6 (Ps. iboneva < *iboneva < Skt. dhanuvā); Neuman 1995: 113 (ad Sin 52; e.g. Ps. kānḍa < *kāndha < Skt. kāndha); cf. also Obertos 1996: 90 (Ps. pujāya < Ps. pūjāya < s.k. pūja < Skt. pujā < Skt. meh).
otaranas-(<m.e.>atrauna- <sa PA> <avatāra>) "the causing to penetrate (intellectually), bringing to comprehension"

19b. sarvajñākātarāntātāyanā kēm nu / argyāmnā sārgāhyānā abale / jikānamānā // (vs)"102

ketarasa-(<sa PA>) "deceit" 4a. māyāsā āyavāna kārvata / patti śa sūvāśeśā ca nādayama // (vs) cārayati ("utters [abuses]")103

8a.2. akārya avānam ādyam ca cārayati103 // (vs) jñāna- / jñāna- 105

11b. buddhatānām samādāpanāta sarvavatēntām (prose)

This prose was versified as follows:

11b. samādāpanād-hū sha buddhatānā (vs)
pārjñākāma: "having comprehended and given up?", cf. Pā. patakāma "knowing and renouncing", AMg. pāramita "abandoning after careful consideration"111

6b3. na cādatānāma ca na pāve samātił samātił pārjñākāma viñuddhatah 112 (vs) pāve: "Magadhism for Pā. pāve, Pā. pāve (<skt. pāyana) or a scribal error for pāve or pāve?"

56a2. pāve pi rūpe hi viyuhanāma (vs) pāve: a corruption of pāramā114 (skt. pāri "before")116

102 Cf. BSID, s.v. avatāra.
103 Cf. 18a-4: bājātraṇaḥ kāpatātanāḥ kēm abhām arghāṇāhi (prose).
104 Cf. A Dictionary of Pāli, by Margaret Cone Osumi 2001 (PIT), s.v. kārta "gambling; cheating; fraud, deception.
105 This usage is found also in other Buddhist texts: BDP. 47.8. avaram samātił; SP K(N).282.1f. na cvāravān bhāvāna na cvāravān nādayama (cl. cārayati) na na avaram bhāvāna na avaram cārayati.
106 An ascent form with optative meaning; cf. BSID § 32.11f. In his essay, Edgerton fails to notice this form in the following sentence in the SP as such and wrongly takes it as an adjective, see BSID, s.v. cārayati, SP K(N).273.3. nādayama avaram samāhitā tirīhyatādām ca cārayati (cl. tirīhyatādām ca cārayati; tirīhyatādām ca cārayati; tirīhyatādām ca cārayati; tirīhyatādām ca cārayati; tirīhyatādām ca cārayati; Tirākāra 2001a: 145, fn. 20).
107 For the interchange between jñāna and jñāna, see Karashima 2001b: 211f., von Hinüber 2003: § 251.
109 He has no notion neither about himself nor about others. In his essay, Edgerton and renounced traditions, he possesses pure concerns. Cf. 7b.3a-4: prajñākāma samāśāntaṃ nāyāt asa pārnikāyaṃ sā cā samāśāntaṃ samāśāntaḥ (tirākāra: prajñākāma, prajñākāma samāśāntaṃ samāśāntaḥ: tīrīhyatādām ca cārayati; tirīhyatādām ca cārayati; tirīhyatādām ca cārayati; tirīhyatādām ca cārayati; tirīhyatādām ca cārayati; tirīhyatādām ca cārayati).
110 Cf. BSID, s.v. pari.
111 Cf. MBa 113.4: abhāyanti abāhāṃ sat ca avānam pārjñākāma (cl. pārjñākāma) // as. Cf. also BSID, s.v. pāramā.
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vigrabdika- ("disputative, quarrelsome, challenging [speech]") Cf. Pā. viggabhika- ("quarrelsome")

1282-3. lokāyaṃ ye ca paṭhāṃ bhīka / vigrabdīka yaśa kathopadeśa //[16] (vy)

viḍūṣyaṃ read viḍūṣṭyaṃ see § 21.1

sa-hbhakaka-bhāvanā / (m.c.) na < na-: a family who gives almost constant to

him//18

58b1. mātāṃṃ tābhakakaka-bhāvanā ca roṭati // (vy)

smītanukhāvanam: presumably a hyperbolic form of mātānām 18 (m.c.) mānusunukhāvanam

1945. smītanukhāvanam mātā(ṛ) ca roṭati a tāti // (vy)

VI. Obscure Words

tajjekkarpī10

54b4. rajajīṣyā tajjekkarpī rūpadakṣaṇakaraṇasattābhāvabhistam āgyāchāṃsi (gerone)

dāyarnavat

1955-20a2. upātubhāre + + dāyarnavat (10) karunaparicchena tathā) ca sa cīva // (vy)

śīlattaDev112

56a1-b1. adhyātama cittam pratijñātstal ca / gaccheśu śīlattati mūrtiṃ / (vy)

ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGNS

Abbreiatiions of the titles of Pali texts are those adopted by CPD. Editions are those of the PTS.

Other abbreviations:

10 This tajjekkarpī is used always to deseribe the word kāmi ("a talk"). Cf. PTSD, s.v. vigrabdika; cf. also Sn 930. kāmiyo vītābhikinn ni layābhāya, Vin V 158 b. ni kāmi sabha abhāsi, kāmiyo vītābhikinn anabhāvābhāsi.

11 Also the foolish who study the lokāya-philosophy, in which disputatious are taught.

12 Neither Wellers (p. 74, fn. 17) nor Paśiika (II. p. 33) understands the meaning of this verse correctly.

18 Cf. BhDS, s.v. bhaṅgakāra; Wellers 129, fn. 6; cf. also kV II.254.17-18. mama bhaṅgakākālā, Dīy. 281.2. amalāṃ... bhaṅgakālānā.

19 Cf. kV. 28-12. samunabha-bha... samunabha-bha-bha... Skt. mānusunabha.


21 The Tibetan translation reads shun pi mān (= Skt. amālana, amāna, a-dainya-) here.

22 A corruption? See Wellers: 126, fn. 10.
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Some Remarks on the "Pētaka Passages" in the
Da zhidu luo and their Relation to the Pali Pētakopadesa'

Stefano Zucchetti

1. Introduction

Recently, the identification of an early partial Chinese translation of the Pali treatise named Pētakopadesa' led me into a reconsideration of the three well known passages of the Da zhidu luo 大智度論 T 1500 (hereafter DZL) which deal with a text — *Pētaka by name (see below n. 6-7) — ascribed to the Buddhist’s disciple Mahâkâtyâyana. The possibility that this scripture may, at least in part, correspond to the Pali Pētakopadesa, transmitted under the name of the same author (Mahâkakutipana), has been suggested several times by modern scholars. However, to my knowledge, a detailed demonstration of the correspondence between the *Pētaka described by the DZL, and its Pali counterparts was never provided, in spite of the fact that the Chinese source contains, as I will show, a number of significant parallels and even literal quotations which can be traced to the Pētakopadesa.

In the following parts I will analyse the three "Pētaka passages", listed according to their relevance. I hope to show that they constitute a significant

* I am grateful to my senior colleagues Prof. Hiroshi Kanmu and Prof. Seishi Karashima for a number of important suggestions on some points discussed in this article.

† I have identified the You ching yue 劉秉彝 (605-655), translated into Chinese by An Shigao 安世高 around the half of the 2nd century AD, as a version of what is nowadays chapter 6 of the Pētakopadesa' i.e. the Suttanta samayavakadhamma on this finding see Zucchetti, forthcoming.

‡ This is the fundamental commentary on the Pāthaprajñāpatinīhāra Prājñāpanāmaṇḍita translated into Chinese by Kumārajīva at the beginning of the 5th century and traditionally ascribed to Nāgārjuna.

§ Notably by Weigbhar (1911, rep. p. 210), possibly for the first time, and subsequently by Mizuno in his fundamental article on the Pētakopadesa' (1997; for the DZL passages see pp. 124, 129, probably the most detailed treatment of this question), Lanotte (1994 n. 2 p. 109), Saigusa 1969 n. 42 p. 151 and Yamamoto 1980 p. 45 (but with some important differences: see below no. 85). Venkata Ramana (1966 p. 141 ff. and n. 29 pp. 357 b. 358 a) has followed a completely different track: while taking note of Lanotte’s explanation of the term *Pī sū (on the whole the correct one), for some reasons he interpreted it as equivalent to Vīmaṇa.
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source for the study of an important tradition whose history remains, on the whole, regretfully obscure.³

On the other hand, they may also contribute to enrich the widely shared image of the DZDL, as a merely "Satavisetudin turned Mahayanaika" work: this most important commentary is certainly a more complex text.⁴

2. File and Petakapadesa

2.1

In Chapter XX of the DZDL (which in the Taino edition is included in the 18th paars ka), at a point of a long section devoted to various forms of smṛti, a threefold classification of the Teachings on the Dharma (कुि त) is introduced as Teachings of the *Pali* (परा०), Dharmas, of the Abhidharma (रा०), and of Emptiness (मृकृत). The first one, the Teaching of the *Petaka* (रा०), is ascribed to Mahākāśyapa. It is said to consist of 384,000 "words," yet

³ Apart from the DZDL, to my knowledge in the Chinese Canon there are only two other scriptures containing quotations relevant to the Petakapadesa: Vasumaran’s Sri dīn hi mātipāt (T 1647) (see Duvernay, Sources Chinoises, in Duvernay 1975 p. 459; Nakamura 1980 p. 123 and n. 102), and the *Ratnākara samādhi* T 1688 (Vinicius Zimmermann (ed. Vneesamill) see Duvernay loc. cit., Minno 1990, p. 17). For a detailed analysis of these quotations see Minno 1997, pp. 129-140.

⁴ This is also one of the main points in Yim’s study on the DZDL (1990).

⁵ In his translation of the DZDL, Lamotte (1944 p. 113, corresponding to DZDL, p. 70a 21, and 71b 1) offers a version following Pajñābha 1926 p. 73 – referred to this “Teaching” as 71b 1, without further comment. However, it must be clear that this is a conjecture (probably he read [8,8], while a very easy one: as a matter of fact all the available witnesses of the DZDL I could access read 8b 18, and 71b 1 in all the relevant passages. On this issue see the Appendix 4 below.

⁶ Lamotte 1949 pp. 1074-86, and Lamotte 1944 p. 114 give Pātaka as an equivalent for “Petaka”, while Lamotte 1944 p. 113 (and 1958 p. 208) has Petaka. I prefer the latter term, which is corroborated by a number of quotations in Pāli exegetical literature (see Nyanasāmi 1964 pp. 399-401). See also Safin 1969 n. 42 p. 151.

⁷ Incidentally, this portion of the DZDL, especially the passage quoted below in n. 73 (T 1509 p. 194a 28 – b 1), excited some influence on those schools of the Chinese Buddhism more or less directly connected with the Mahayana tradition introduced by Kuo-tung: e.g. see Juang 1956, Suan shou te sheng xiao jiu 71b 15 (Lamotte 1944 p. 113, and 1958 p. 208) has Petaka. I am grateful to Y. Takeuchi for some references on this topic. On the whole, all these texts seem to have drawn their information on the *Petaka* only from Chinese sources. I.e. mainly the DZDL and a few glosses on Mahākāśyapa by Kuan, Takeuchi, and Suenobu. What preserved in the Zhe Wenwu cong lue Wenwu cong lue T 1775 (e.g. p. 558b 3, etc.), as a possible exception, I must mention a passage of Juang’s Baoche zhai xun zhi (F 1827 p. 205a 9-20), which requires further investigation (it might be based on Paramīthāna’s commentary to Vasumaran’s treatise on the Buddhist texts: Duvernay 1982-1932 pp. 49-50, cf. Yim 1980 p. 47).


⁹ Yan T., i.e. xiezi syllables; see Duvernay 1956 p. 348 n. 1; see also Rouxler 2000 pp. 227. This figure would give a total of 12000 dhūna (as the *Petaka*, cf. Juang’s Wenwu cong lue T 1781 p. 943a 17, where a similar computation is made, though on the basis of the figure provided in the DZDL at p. 706 10 (cf. below n. 59 and 64). Perhaps this record should not be dismissed
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supposedly being the summary of a much larger original text (3,200,003 "words") composed during the Buddha's life; this was later abridged and written down by some "enlightened persons" because, after the Buddha's parinirvāna, the life-span and strength of memory of the human beings decreased, so that they were not able to recite this scripture in full 11.

The *Phetsa, which is portrayed in a slightly unsympathetic light 12, consists of several methods (種類教門), two of which are expounded as examples: the "Method based on the characteristics" (法種門), and the "Method by antidote" (對治門). This is by far the most interesting portion of the whole passage, as these two methods can be in part traced to the Pāli Petakopadesa 13 or to the Neżipuṇakaranā (hereafter Neži) 5.

2.1.1 Chapter five of the Petakopadesa 14 is devoted to the exposition of sixteen categories (hāra, "Modes of Conveying a communication"); as Nāgamoli renders it 15, for the utmost importance to its system. As a matter of fact, the fifth category, "Characteristic" (lukhopa hāra, hereafter lukkhaṇa-hāra), is nothing but the first method mentioned in the DZIL, "based on the characteristics." 16

---

11 DZIL T. 1509 p. 1928-4-6: "佛滅後後，人不辨識，性識力少，亦能識聞，於彼法入開示自十八夏坐等。In this context, where it is contrasted to the preceding 智, "to rectify, to provoke" (on this term, see the remarks by Lévi 1915, pp. 426-428), the verb 識 (Lamotte 1949 p. 1074: "comprehend") must, more specifically, mean "to write" (see HYDOCD vol. 6 p. 895a, 5). The fact that not only abridgments, but writing itself is referred to is quite interesting. This phrase seems to echo a common motif: cf. the account of the writing down of the Pāli Canon analysed by Borry 1932 p. 51, and especially the passage quoted in n. 21 (from the Mahāvagga 7, 12), which can seem extremely close to the DZIL's description. Although in translating Lamotte simply as "memory" (cf. Lamotte, loc. cit.: "la force des intelligences") I have followed HYDOCD vol. 7 p. 760a, I cannot help observing that 触力 奇 might reflect an original reading similar to that quoted by Borry: neutralisé/pensée/éminence ... On the other hand, elsewhere the DZIL itself makes use of the same cliché to describe the abridgment of the Pratītipalatamil literature: see Hikata 1958 p. LVIII.

12 DZIL T. 1509 p. 1928-6: "闇入等、流唾門、流唾門等。i.e. 言one enters into the teaching of the *Phetsa, gets entangled in endless discussions.

13 Prof. Minou (1997 p. 129) has suggested, but only in general terms, that the 異門 may refer to the eastern hāra.

14 This is another Pali treatise attributed to Mahakāśyapa (see von Hahn 1906 pp. 77-80, §§ 158-166; Normann 1983 pp. 109-110, Bond 1990a); it shares many of the features and topics found in the Petakopadesa. On the problematic relationship between the two, see the Conclusions (5) below.


16 On this pivotal technical term occurring is both the Petakopadesa and Neži, see Nāgamoli 1902 pp. xxx - xxxvi.

17 Petakopadesa p. 90, 15 - 01, tr. Nāgamoli 1906 pp. 120-121.

18 My translation of 流唾門 is tentative, and mainly based on its correspondence with the Pali. Lamotte (1949 p. 1073) has interpreted it as "enmènement par implication anuvartanā."
2.1.2

The correspondence between the two sources is remarkably precise, even in the form of the explanation. According to the Petakopadana, the main content of the category is that "... When one idea is mentioned, all / Ideas of like characteristic / Are by that mentioned ..." (Bh. Nânapoli 1964 n. 120). This principle is then made clear by means of some examples, the second of which is of particular interest: in the stanza "... Purifying one's mind: this is the teaching of the Buddhists" also the mental factors concomitant with citta are implied[16].

The very same example and a similar explanation also occur in the DZDL's exposition of the "Method based on the characteristics" of the Buddha (I have underlined the literal correspondences between the two texts)[17].

DZDL: T 1509p, 192b-9-10: Petakopadana p. 91, 5-4:

16. Both sources provide several examples, by first quoting a stanza (although in the Petakopadana’s lakkhana-s, all the quotations are shortened), and then commenting on it. For a more detailed analysis of these features, see part 3.1 below.

17. The Petakopadana further links these to other categories, ultimately referring this passage to the scheme of the four Noble Truths. This is a typical hermeneutical pattern in the Petakopadana.

18. As observed by Lamotte (1949 n 1 p. 1975), the stanza quoted by the DZDL corresponds to Dhūmanapada v. 185; this is quoted in full in the letter of passage of the Petakopadana, where it occurs in a different context, as well as in four passages of the Nettipātī (see the list in Nânapoli 1962 p. 285, under the heading "Dh verse 185"). Significantly, only this occurrence within the lakkhana-s of the Petakopadana, the interpretation of this stanza matches, at least in part, that of the DZDL.

19. Cf. the exposition of the lakkhana-śūtra in the Nettipātī, where an identical formula occurs quite often, e.g. p. 51, 5-6: "kama kīrāṇam? Ekākākāraṇam ... etc. (passive). As to the, I have
As a second example, the DZDL (T 1509 p. 129b 12-17) mentions the four foundations of mindfulness (四念處). This comes close, to a certain extent, to the first example given by the *Pajokapadesa* in the section on the *lakkhana*-s (also on the *satiapiṭṭhānas*, though we find some discrepancies). The *Pajokapadesa* (p. 90, 18-25) states that when one mentions the *kāya*, all other *satiapiṭṭhānas* are hereby implied, while in the *DHEL* (T 1509 p. 129b 12-17) the *satiapiṭṭhānas* are said to imply other categories belonging to the *buddhipakkiyā* group:

«For instance, when the Buddha [only] refers to the four foundations of mindfulness, in the latter [also] the four right endeavours, the four bases of supernatural power, the five faculties and the five powers are included.»

Interestingly enough, in this case the closest parallel to the DZDL’s exposition is to be found not in the *Pajokapadesa*, but in the corresponding portion of the *Netī* (*lakkhana*-krama).16

«When the four foundations of mindfulness are kept in being, in the four Right Endeavours come to fulfillment through keeping in being. When the four Right Endeavours are kept in being, the four Bases for Success ... come to fulfillment through keeping in being. When the Four Bases for Success are kept in being, the five Faculties ... come to fulfillment through keeping in being. When the five Faculties are kept in being, the five Powers come to fulfillment through keeping in being.»  
  
16 The DZDL is more explicit in stating that the foundations of mindfulness *itseve* (及等) the four right endeavours etc., the participial form used in the *Netī* parallel (*cattāri ... buddhipakkiyāni*) seems to imply substantially the same meaning: i.e. that these attainments are not conceived as a sequence of stages reached one after the other.

The DZDL goes on explaining:

```
followed Lamotte’s interpretation (1909 p. 1075: śāleśvaram, cf. also DHEL T 1509 p. 290c 12-14 (tr. Lamotte 1880 p. 2174). 16 If we understand correctly Nāgāmoli 1964 p. 120 a 322/3, the 20th-century commentary *Pajokapadesa-Abhāsakathā* (it has in the lemma) *sabbha-buddhipakkiyādhamma* (svatta bhavati) instead of the reading *sabbhadhamma* etc. of *Pajokapadesa* p. 91, 1. As Nāgāmoli seems to imply, this is merely due to the influence of the parallel in the *Netī* (see below, n. 20), and not a genuine variant reading (see also Nāgāmoli 1964 pp. xiii-xiv). I am not in the position to express an opinion on this point, as, unfortunately, I could not get a copy of this Commentary. However, the issue is worth reconsidering, given that this reading occurring in *Nyā* would agree well with the passage from the *Sutta* I am dealing with here (see the text quoted in the next note; d. also below n. 57, marggs).

T 1509 p. 195 12-14: 6. 17 On this topic, see Balgl 1966, esp. p. 207 on this example concerning the *buddhipakkiyās*.

18 I have quoted Nāgāmoli’s translation (1962 p. 54 § 175). In the *Netī* all the *buddhipakkiyā* are linked together in this way. However, cf. the occurrence of the same exegesis at *Netī* 85, 8-12 where, by a certain coincidence (cf.), only those *buddhipakkiyā* referred to by the DHEL are mentioned. Nevertheless, all the categories are meant here (88, 12: evaṃ sabbāḥ), I suspect that the same holds true for the DZDL’s parallel.

19 Netī p. 53, 10-16: 10. 20 Cattāri satipatthānaṁ bhāvavahāratsaṃ cetana sammappadādā bhāvanāsattārāpitarāpī justī. Catānā sammappadādābhāvavahāratā cetāna sīdhipatī bhāvanāsattārāpitarāpī justī. Catānā sīdhipatībhāvavahāratsaṃ Caitānā sīdhipatī bhāvanāsattārāpitarāpī justī. Catānā sīdhipatībhāvavahāratsaṃ etc. ... 71
```
"Why? Because the four foundations of mindfulness are the four kinds of energy (心力, *sattā)* constitute the four right endeavours; the four kinds of concentration (心, *samādhi*) constitute the four bases of supernatural power; the five kinds of positive dharmas constitute the five faculties and the five senses. Although the *sattā* has merely referred to the four foundations of mindfulness, without mentioning other categories, one has to know that these are hereby implied."

A parallel to this explanation can be found, again, in the Netti. Few lines before the passage quoted above, we find an interesting exegesis on the canonical *kayaipaṭtābhāna* formula (i.e., *bhikkhu kāye kāyāntassu viharati atāti sampajāyato satīmā vinayā poke abhiñāhā-domanassāya*):

> *"sattā* means the faculty of energy; *awake* means the faculty of wisdom; *mindful* means the faculty of mindfulness; *overcoming both desire for and discontent with the world* means the faculty of concentration".

So, as we can see, also according to the Netti the *kayaipaṭtābhāna* formula involves, among other faculties, *vīRAMiṃdra* (corresponding to *sati*), *sati*, *samādhi*, and *paññā*. Although there are some discrepancies, the argument is largely similar in the DZDL and in the Netti for both scriptures some faculties are implied by the *satipaṭṭhāna* formula, and this fact makes it possible to establish a connection between the four foundations of mindfulness and the other categories of bodhipakkhiyā.

The "five kinds of positive dharmas" (五種善法) further referred to by the DZDL must quite obviously be the positive qualities which constitute the content of the two fivefold groups of bodhipakkhiyā, i.e., faculties and forces: *saddha, viśīna, satī, samādhi, and paññā*.

Although there are some discrepancies, the argument is largely similar in the DZDL and in the Netti: for both scriptures some faculties are implied by the *satipaṭṭhāna* formula, and this fact makes it possible to establish a connection between the four foundations of mindfulness and the other categories of bodhipakkhiyā.

---

36 DZDL T 1599 p. 192h 14-17: तदलोप! यो अभियोग सत्ताकर्मी त्रिसत्ताकर्मी त्रिदस्तिकर्मी त्रिदस्तिकर्मी. त्रिनादिकर्मी कर्मी विशेषतः त्रिसत्ताकर्मी।
37 Gethin (1992 p. 29) translates: *... a bhikkhu ... with regard to the body dwells watching body, he is ardent, he comprehends clearly, he is possessed of mindfulness and overcomes both desire for and discontent with the world.*
38 Netti p. 51, 3-5: अत्यः सतिरिम्निधरणः समग्रिनिधरणः सिद्धिनिधरणः सतिरिम्निधरणः. विनयपुस्तिका शब्दांमार्गानुसार सतिरिम्निधरणः. See Gethin 1992 pp. 48-49 for important remarks on another occurrence of this passage (i.e. Netti p. 83, 1-3).
39 Note that the *Vibhanga* does not gloss the phrase *Vinayapāda* etc. in terms of *samādhi*. Significantly, only the *Netti* does so.
40 I could not find a clear parallel to this category of *sati* in the *Vibhanga*.
41 This connection is certainly more explicit in the DZDL, than in the Pali treatise. Actually, in the *Netti* (31, 6-9) at first the *kayaipaṭṭābhāna* is linked to the other foundations of mindfulness (cf. *Paṭinippada* 90, 18-25 mentioned above); then the *satipaṭṭhāna* is a whole are in turn linked to other bodhipakkhiyā in the DZDL. But it is indeed remarkable that even in the *Netti*, as in the DZDL, it is by means of the faculties (*āriya*) that such connections are established (see p. 72).
2.1.4

The last example concerning the *lakshana* provided by the DZDL (T 1509 p. 192b 17-22) deals with the Four Truths. This passage too has a parallel in the *Petropadesa*, although not in the chapter on *harta* but in that devoted to the *Noble Truths* (ch. 1):

**DZDL: T 1509 p. 192b 17-22:**

**Petropadesa** p. 10, 22 - 11, 2:

Tattva katanam eva yasya aryayasanam?  
Ye dharmam hetupabhavam teesan hetup  
Tatagatah kha, itteno yo na paresa  
evamodarati mahesanato  
hetupabhavabhi dharmam dañcaññañça,  
hetu samudaya  
yayam Bhagavato varamap aryan  
"maggā"...  
on ninadā...  

如彼分别谛中，成就一谛，是成二谛，如  
如星罗在合合而旋转等，  
如彼分别谛中，成就一谛，是成二谛，如  
如十方在合合而旋转等。  

如彼分别谛中，是成下谛在合合而旋转等，  
如彼分别谛中，是成下谛在合合而旋转等。

 consulta a un autor, un gobierno.

**DZDL:**

"For instance, the Buddha sometimes (only) mentions one of the Four Truths, at other times two  
or three. Similarly, when the bhikkhu Ānāthā156 entered this *gāthā* for the benefit of Śāriputra:

"All the dharmas arise from causes and conditions;  
The causes and the cessation of these dharmas,  
My Master, the Great Sânta Kâning  
thus has taught the Truth  
(Although this *gāthā* only mentions three Truths, one must know that one of the Truths of the Path is (implicitly) included in it, because [here the Truth] are not separated. So, for instance, when somebody commits a crime his whole family bears the responsibility for it"."

31, 8. *Tantra Prathapana* Ekadikālalakshana samyapita ādiyāyana, and so the text quoted above, n. 30, although in the *Netī* this explanation is only referred to the *saritapālahāra* (the connection of all the bodhipatipatha is explained in different terms; see *Netī* p. 31, 22-23).

156 However, a reference to the Truths within the *lakshana*-āhāra is also made by the *Petropadesa* (31, 4-7, tr. Nāṇagārī p. 121): after the example quoted above on the *rattākāla*, cīya is further connected with *rūpa*, both these terms, taken together as *netarputa*, are then considered as equivalent to the Truth of suffering etc.

32 See Nāṇagārī 1964 p. 14 n. 42/2: the *çarit-mang-agga* for *dharmas* occurs in the modern commentary (Cy; see above n. 25).

156 Nāṇagārī 1964 p. 14 translates this short explication as follows: (Now here) the "ideas that drew their being from a cause" are [A] Sûtranga, the cause is [B] Oṅgur, the Blessed One's statement [D] the Path, [and] that statement is also [C] Carbon. However, so ninadā is more likely to be a taxonomical reference to "neeap or ye ninadā" in the *rattākāla*. On the other hand, ye Bhagavato varamap, which is said to represent the Truth of the Path, may refer to "Tatagatah kha".

31. 8. See Lamotte 1949 n. 3 p. 650. Elsewhere in the DZDL (e.g. 156th 23) this name is rendered by means of phonetic transcription as Shravan Mārka. In mentioning Ānāthā and Śāriputra, the DZDL is very likely referring to a previous passage which has nothing to do with the  
*Peteu* see T 1509 p. 10c. tr. Lamotte 1949 p. 651.

156 This last phrase (T 1509 p. 192b 22: 許如一一人 dies to 面先受受) is perhaps an explanation added by Kumāraśravaṇ and not quoted from the *Petropadesa*. The principle it describes seems foreign.
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Not only is the same stanza quoted (possibly with some variants) in both sources, but it is also interpreted in a similar way, even if in the *Pettakopadesu* this expression occurs in a different section.

Although here the DZDL comments only very briefly on the stanza, its implication is consistent with that of the Pāli treatise; indeed, also the latter’s interpretation implies that all the Truths are, explicitly or implicitly, referred to by this well-known stanza. Actually, the *Pettakopadesu* is more specific than the DZDL, as it points out at a definite feature of the stanza as representing *maggal*, while in the Chinese source the reason for the “immanence”, so to speak, of the Path is simply stated in rather general terms.

2.1.5

The second method mentioned by the DZDL (T 1509 p. 1926a 3 – c 7; tr. Lamotte 1949, pp. 1075-1076) is that “by antidote” *páraparíyána*. This means that the mention of a certain negative category involves an implicit reference to the opposite remedy. For instance, when the Buddha only speaks of the *viparáyána*, also the corresponding antidote, i.e. the category of *yantrayánapatha*, is hereby referred to: when he meditates, also the relevant type of disease can be inferred, and vice versa.

---

to Indian juridical tradition: cf. Kane 1903 chapter XV, esp. pp. 588 ff. At p. 496, Kane quotes a text which tries to reject death penalty resorting to various arguments. Significantly, capital punishment is also refused on the ground that, besides the culprit, it might also affect his innocent relatives, leaving them without support. On the other hand, collective responsibility, even in the form of the extermination of the whole family for one single member’s crime (as it was), was a basic tenet in traditional Chinese criminal law. According to Yang 1908 p. 223 (the only historical study of Chinese law I have been able to consult), the punishment of a, dating back to the pre-imperial dynasties, was amended by the Han emperor Wen D.X (180-157 BC), however cf. Jin Shú 喬書 (ed. Zhonghua shuju, Beijing 1974, vol. 3 p. 934), but resumed shortly after.

---

Of course, this being one of the most famous passages of the entire Buddhist literature, its interpretation does not, as such, imply any affiliation between the two sources.

---

We must, however, consider that this particular example is defined by the *Pettakopadesa* itself (p. 10, 18-17) as *yatráparipávada adhyáta* ("shared tetrad-demonstration", as Nāgapālal 1964 § 61 renders it; see also n. 612 ad loc.), exactly in the sense that it deals with all the four Truths, and not just one (cf. §§ 39-41, i.e. *adhyáta-praṣna*, two §§ 40-45 or three §§ 52-54). Perhaps we should see in the explanation provided by the DZDL – *boadhyáta*, which I have tentatively rendered as "because [here the Truths] are not separated" – a reference, by titles, to the notion of *adhyáta-paripávata* (an important term in the *Pettakopadesa* used in Nāgapālal’s translation) underlying this passage (Nāgapālal 1964 §43). In fact, this expression *paripávata* used by Kumārājiva is not too clear. Lamotte (1949 p. 1076) translates: ‘...car cela [i.e. le méthme] n’est pas en contradiction *paraparíyána* avec les précédents’. However, the obvious fact that the Truths do not contradict each other does not yet account for their implication in this stanza. Moreover, *paripávata* has normally the sense I have indicated; see HYSeq CD vol. 7 p. 116), but also other occurrences in the DZDL (T 1509 p. 1924b 24, 1926a 27, 1928a 15). In the light of the possible Pāli parallel, we might perhaps interpret *paripávata* as: *because (in the particular context of this stanza) the four Truths are expounded as not separated*. 

---


---

DZDL T 1509 p. 192a 23-25: 載作所案, 如練識所聽則, 受觀則, 悟觀則, 感觀則, 此識則, 是申明不說四念處, 當知已有四念處義, 當知說巳知其見, 諦識則知其見。
I was not able to detect Pāli parallels to this portion of the Dīgha, as clear and detailed as in the case of the "Method based on the characteristics" (dhamma). However, if we take a closer look at this "Method", as described in the Chinese text, it will appear clear that it has mostly to do, exactly as the preceding one (i.e. the lakkhaṇa-dāna), with a "Mode of Conveying (a communication)" (see above n. 16). In other words, it is, again, in the sections on bhūtas of Petakopadesa and Nettī that we shall seek for parallels.

It is the seventh bhūta, "Conversion" (avatāra-hāra, here after avatāra-hāra-śīha), the one which seems to match relatively better the "Method by antidote" (kathā). Notwithstanding considerable differences, the two share a number of significant common features, which can be summarised as follows:

a) Both use the relationship between vipallāsa and satipatthāna as a key example (beetles several others)46.

b) What is more significant, the structure and function of the two principles, avatāra-hāra, on the one hand and "Method by antidote" on the other, are strikingly similar. Both involve, at a first stage, association between different factors belonging to the same "idee" (i.e. negative or positive) and, as a subsequent, distinct passage "conversion" to the opposite side. As the DīghaL puts it:

"The four perversions are characterized by misconception: if the four perversions are mentioned, then all fetters are [also] hereby referred to. Why? If the root is mentioned, also all the branches and twigs are implied ... In this way all fetters are included in the triple poison. By which [remedy one can eliminate it? The Eightfold Path consisting of three classes (ākānā). If this is mentioned, then one must know that all the thirty-seven categories [i.e. the khandhā] are also referred to."

On the other hand, the avatāra-hāra, as Bond describes it, -- shows how "footing" and "characteristics" can be used first to identify unprofitable root terms or other basic ideas of defilement and then to convert the unprofitable roots to the

---


47 One should perhaps also take into account the ninth category, Pāvijitānā-tāna, "Revenue" (Petakopadesa p. 95, 22 - 96, 3, tr. Nītīnī 1964 p. 129 § 550). Unfortunately, its exposition, in both the Petakopadesa and Nettī, has remained obscure to me.

48 It is also difficult to determine whether Ācāra can be considered a rendering of avātāra (but cf. Minzono 1997 p. 120, n. 75).

49 Cf. the passage quoted in n. 44 above, n. 49 below and Petakopadesa p. 95, 14-16.

50 The, T. 1509 pp. 60 rb 27 - 6 (tr. Lamotte 1949 pp. 607-6077): [i.e. the three bhānas of the Eightfold Path, i.e. the pācchīkākhandha, samādhi and pācchīkākhandha, and pācchīkākhandha] are introduced as an antidote to the threefold poison. On this characteristic doctrine, expounded also by the Petakopadesa, see Minzono 1997: 6: n. 4 p. 129 and p. 153 (quotations n. 9). To the references provided by Prof. Minzono (Petakopadesa p. 67), I can add Petakopadesa p. 115, 9 - 116, 5 (see also Zasckett, forthcoming). For a partial parallel in the avatāra-hāra, see Jletti p. 41, 1-24 (tr. Nītīnī 1962, pp. 68-69, § 245-246).
profitable ones. The four foundations of mindfulness oppose the four perversions—c18.

c) As Bond's descriptions have made clear, this sort of preliminary "associative function", pivotal in the avatta-bh., is mainly carried out through the "root terms"—c19. This point is particularly noteworthy, as we find a similar use of the same terms also in the "Method by antidote"—c20. To sum up, it seems a reasonable working hypothesis that the "Method by antidote"—粷治門 is indeed the same ūkṣa as the avatta-bh., although it is quite clear that in the DZDL's *Petaka it was expounded in different terms.

Unlike the preceding section on the "Method based on the characteristics"—(見宗門), nc stanza is quoted here. If we consider that such quotations are typical of the hāra-section of both Pali treatises, this inconsistency is unlikely to reflect the original of the *Petaka quoted by the DZDL.

Perhaps the exposition of this "Method by antidote"—粷治門, unlike the "Method based on the characteristics", was not based directly on the original source, although such a discrepancy between the two descriptions is rather difficult to understand. Abreidgment by part of the author of the DZDL could be the easiest expiation, if the section dealing with the 粹治門 was not almost as long as that on the 終極門.

2.2

The DZDL contains two other very short passages dealing with the *Petaka. They occur in the same chapter of the DZDL (in the second javan ṣ), and are actually separated only by few lines. On the whole, they add little information on the Petakapada, and are perhaps more relevant to the textual history of the DZDL than to that of the Pali treatise.

Unlike the passage we analysed in the previous part (2.1 above), here the *Petaka is — significantly — mentioned within an exposition of the different

---

18 Bond, 1990a p. 99; see also Momin, 1997 p. 120. On the avatta-bh. in the Nettis, see Bond, 1990b p. 408. The pattern of "reversion", or "conversion" based on common characteristics can be seen at work also in the lakkhanā-bh. of the Netis (see p. 31, 25-fl. (again on vipallās and sātaipattinis).

19 On this fundamental category occurring in the two Pali treatises see Bond, 1990a p. 394 and 1990b p. 405; Warder, 1999 pp. 303-304.

20 Among the terms employed by the DZDL to illustrate this "Method", we find, besides the four vipallās (見識門), the threefold āsūkha, i.e., greed, hatred and delusion, "fifteen kinds of ignorance" (十種無明) and "fifteen kinds of craving" (十種愛). These categories constitute, in both the Petakopīdāna and the Neti, the group of the negative "root-terms" (muṭṭhānadī). Moreover, quite significantly, the idea of "root" is also mentioned in this connection in the DZDL (T 1509 p. 219, 27-28: 粹治門, etc., see above, n. 49), c.f. Bond, 1980 p. 21, on the term ināla in the Neti's avatta-bh. These facts seem to have led Prof. Momin (1997 p. 129) to the hypothesis that the 粹治門 may refer just to the eighteen root-terms. However, in the DZDL (T 1509 p. 102h. 27 - c 5; tr. Lamotte 1949 pp. 1076-1077) all these terms are not explicitly described as making up a group, and, exactly as in the avatta-bh., they are mentioned alongside other negative factors. So, for instance, besides those of ignorance and craving, the DZDL also mentions "fifteen kinds of anger" (十種瞋), which do not belong to the root-terms. Moreover, I have not been able to find in the two Pali treatises any parallel to this classification of ignorance and craving into "fifteen kinds".
typologies of Abhidharma texts (mainly devoted to the Sarvastivadin Abhidharma).
The first passage reads:

-When the Buddha was alive, Mahākāśyapa, explaining the Buddha’s Word, composed the *Petraka* (Pāla in the language of C5) in ‘box, container’; up to the present it circulates in South India.

There is little to say on this passage. The portion I have quoted in brackets, which is printed in smaller size in the Chinese text, is clearly a gloss inserted into the DZDL, during its translation.

The following statement ("up to the present ... South India", printed in full size), which is very significant for the history of the *Petraka*, seems to belong to the original edition of the DZDL, if we are to trust the ancient editions of the Canon; however, in my opinion this is open to doubt. Actually, as in his *Hsiu* (1958 pp. 207-268) Lamotte ascribes this whole passage to Kumārajīva.

The next passage is more problematic and more interesting at the same time. It comes at the end of an enumeration of three* types of Abhidharma, as given by the Korean edition and (subsequently in the *Taishō*, it reads:

- The third is the *Petraka* in its abridged form it consists of 520,000 words. The *Petraka* compares is detail all topics, so that they accord with each other by category; it is not Abhidharma*.

58 中国: i.e. in Chinese. The Later Qin tseung (584-417 AD) was ruling over North China during Kumārajīva’s activity at Chang-an.
59 1509 p. 70a 22: 謂所說絕在-佛在時-佛所說作”佛說法” (即說法) ’乃此行於南天
(see Lamotte 1945 p. 113, Priyabhas 1929 p. 73).
60 On these glosses in the DZDL, see Hikata 1953 pp. LIV-ff.
61 According to Lamotte’s analysis (1970 p. D-ff.), the DZDL was probably composed at the beginning of the 3rd century AD (bes de Jong 1971-72, rep. p. 109). Not long before this date, An Shigao translated into Chinese a scripture corresponding to chapter 6 of the *Petraśāstra* (see Zucchetti, forthcoming), a fact which suggests that at least a portion of this treatise was probably still circulating in the northern part of the Buddhist world by the half of the 2nd century AD. This would make the statement 謂所說絕在-佛在時-佛所說 (see footnotes) sound a little out of place in the original text of the DZDL. On the other hand, the earliest evidence of the presence of these treatises in the Theravāda area is provided by Bodhidharma 5th century AD, who does quote from the *Nīlantan* and apparently from the *Yajñavalkyapada* (Nakamura 1962 p. xiii., see also a. 38 ibid.; cf. Nakamura 1964 pp. 400-401) and was almost a contemporary of Kumārajīva (see von Hintz 1966 p. 103 § 207: ‘the brackets for Bodhidharma’s dates are about AD 570 to 450). For these reasons, it seems to me that the reference to South India in this passage of the DZDL must better fit in with the chronology suggested by Bodhidharma’s quotations, and should therefore be ascribed to Kumārajīva (see also Vagharia 1973, rep. p. 211; for a possible similar interpretation, cf. above, n. 49). This is not without relevance: if these are Kumārajīva’s words, the date of this precious piece of historical evidence cannot be much earlier than the beginning of the 5th century AD. It is also to be observed that in the preceding line (T 1509 p. 70a 20) there occurs a somewhat similar statement of the *Sariputraśāstra* ("up to the present is named *Sariputraśāstra*.
The first two are, according to Lamotte’s translation (Lamotte 1944 p. 116), “le Corps et le Sens de l’Abhāṣṭhān” (several different glosses) and “‘Abhāṣṭhān’ en six parties” (see section 5); the latter is interpreted as *sāparbhāṣṭhāna* (Lamotte 1944 n. 1. p. 111) i.e. the *Sāparbhāṣṭhāna* and its six treatises. The fact that the *Petraka* is mentioned in this context poses a number of additional issues as to the history of this text, cf. part 5.2 below.
62 Reproduced in the *Zhengshan Dangang*, vol. 25. p. 133b 2-4.
However, all other editions have a completely different reading:

"... The third is the *Pētaka in its abridged form is consists of 320,000 words. This is the Abhidharma*.

If we consider the overall context in which this passage occurs, three facts will appear quite clear:

- The original reading (i.e. that occurring in the text on which Kumārajīva based his translation) must be the second, that attested in all the editions apart from the Korean*.
- Apart from stemmatological considerations, only this reading is consistent with the preceding phrase (T 1599 p. 70b: 7-8), where the Abhidharma is clearly introduced as the topic of the following text, including the passage on the *Pētaka*.
- Therefore, the author of this passage, which describes the *Pētaka as a form of Abhidharma, cannot be the same person who wrote the section on the three Teachings on the Dharmak in juan § 18 (see part 2.1 above)*; in fact, in that passage the *Pētaka is clearly opposed to the Abhidharma as a distinct genre*.

- Then how would one explain the phrase "The *Pētaka compares in detail all topics etc." occurring in the Korean edition? Lamotte (1947 p. 114), though last in his Traité on the Taisaka, did not translate this passage, nor did he even mention it in a footnote, merely leaving ellipses.

But this is not just a scribal mistake: although this phrase is a sort of stereotype formula*, it gives a sketchy but non incorrect description of a text otherwise

---

* See T 1599 p. 70b 12 and Shunsho Danshū, vol 25 p. 16a 2-6, instead of "... the first two passages etc. (see the preceding note) as in the Korean Edition, all the other editions simply have: *... [§: 47] .

Unfortunately, the portion of the juan § 18 containing this passage is not available.

Both Minoo (1967 p. 128) and Yamada (1990 p. 42) refer to this passage as given in the Taisaka, while Przybysz (1926 p. 5n 7) followed the other reading.

Note that if we choose this reading, the phrase "This is the Abhidharma" is probably to be referred to all the three types of text mentioned (see above n. 57), not just to the *Pētaka*.

Lamotte (1970 n. 2 p. LIV) observed: "On pourrait se demander si l'Upadesha (i.e. the DZDL, comme la Mahāvīlasūkha, qu'il combat, n'est pas une ouvrage collectif. C'est une question à laquelle je ne suis pas en mesure de répondre. This is not the place to discuss such an abstract issue as the authenticity of the DZDL (on this topic see also Yamada 1990); one cannot help sharing the great Belgian scholar's cautious approach. But his suggestion is well worth reconsidering in his fundamental analysis of the DZDL, Hikata (1958 pp. LII-LIV) detected three distinct layers in this text: passages more or less clearly by Kumārajīva, passages unquestionably by Nagārjuna (whom he considered the author of main nucleus of the DZDL) and passages better be regarded as Nagārjuna's, as has been traditionally held. In other words, only two persons, Kumārajīva and Nagārjuna, were ultimately taken into account by Hikata (although a passage at p. LXXXIII seems to leave room for other possibilities) I cannot discuss here the overall soundness of Hikata's argument; but it seems to me that his hypothesis could hardly account for an incoherence such as the one I have pointed out here.

We can note another inconsistency, probably less significant: the two passages give a slightly different number of abhīsara for the abridged *Pētaka (cf above n. 10). It is also noteworthy that one notices what in juan 18 occurs elsewhere in the DZDL, with a rather different reading: cf T 1599 p. 70b 7-8 and p. 155c 4-5.

Similar expressions occur in many Chinese Buddhist texts: see for instance Jitsug's Zusha yu shu shi fubingai T 1721 p. 55a 28, 55c 4; and I am grateful to Tsvd. Kanno for these references, 78
almost unknown to Chinese Buddhists (cf. above n. 4). As we have seen, the origin of the DZDL ("this is the Abhidharma") contradicts the description of the *Pettesaka occurring in par. 18. Thus we could interpret the gloss "The *Pettesaka compares ... It is not Abhidharma" as an attempt to account for an inconsistency in the text of the DZDL.

Therefore, the author of this gloss must have been an early commentator of the DZDL, or, perhaps, Kumārajīva himself, who used to comment upon the texts during the translation work68, although it is difficult to explain why this gloss has been preserved only in the Korean Canon. Perhaps, in a future critical edition of the DZDL, it should not be disregarded, but printed in smaller size after the phrase: "this is the Abhidharma".

3 Conclusions

3.1

In part 2.1 above I have tried to demonstrate that the *Pettesaka dealt with by the DZDL is indeed related to the Pali Petnakapadassā.

Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that the two texts were different69. Inconsistency between the description given by the DZDL and the Petnakapadassā does not, alone, suffice to demonstrate this statement: inaccuracy and abbreviation on the part of the author of this portion of the DZDL in quoting from the *Pettesaka might have overshadowed the affinity between the two sources. But the correspondence between this *Pettesaka and the Nettī (see above part 2.1.3) positively corroborates my assumption.

Also the form of the quotations used to exemplify the "Method based on the characteristics" or 门, or kā tankha-b., is noteworthy: in two out of three examples (see above 2.1.2 and 2.1.4), a stanza is at first quoted in full, and then commented on. This comes close to the hātra-section of the Nettī where, unlike the corresponding portion of the Petnakapadassā, complete stanzas (and even longer passages) are generally quoted67. But, on the other hand, from the viewpoint of content, those two examples (i.e. 2.1.2 and 2.1.4) have parallels in the Petnakapadassā and not in the Nettī.

In short: the testimony provided by the main "Pettesaka passage", short and fragmentary as it is, suggests that this *Pettesaka had a hātra-section which was – as far as the kā tankha-b. is concerned (the "Method by antokete") – a 海门, as we

68 After all, establishing connections between different doctrinal topics, and accounting for (apparent) doctrinal inconsistencies is indeed a typical feature of the method exposed by the Petnakapadassā and the Nettī. It is one of the main concerns of this tradition to show how various Canonicical passages, no matter how different in their wording, agree as to the basic doctrinal tenets: in other words, to 海门. On this passage of the DZDL, see the remarks by Yoshinou 1990 p. 42.

67 See Lamotte 1970 p. XLIX. For other possible instances of Kumārajīva's glosses transmitted in the main text (and not in smaller size), see above n. 40 and 50.

69 As we have seen (in 10 above), we cannot exclude that this *Pettesaka was larger than both the Petnakapadassā and the Nettī.

66 Actually, this formal discrepancy is not limited to the exposition of hātra. As Nikāmiki (1904 p. 12) observes in general terms, "in [i.e. of the Petnakapadassā] way of presenting quotations is often diagnologically abbreviated, and lacking the Nettī's precision".
have seen in part 2.1.5, too problematic to allow us to draw conclusions – similar in part to the Petakopadesa and in part (especially, but not only, in the form of quotations) to the Nettis. In his recent book on Pali literature, Prof. von Himmel (1996 p. 82 § 171) has also drawn attention to the “Petaka passages” in the DDL. A text ascribed to Mahākāśyapa called Paṭe in Chinese, corresponding to Petaka, is mentioned by Kumārājīva (the 5th century) as being used in South India in his translation of Nāgarjuna’s Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra. This could refer to Petakopadesa, if there were not quotations from a Petaka in Pali literature, which cannot be traced to Petakopadesa. Thus it is not impossible that there was even a third text similar to Petakopadesa and Nettis (pāpakāra). Indeed, the argument I have discussed above is not completely wrong, in the DDL we find other trace of such a “third text”. Whether this Petaka is in turn the one quoted by Pali sources, is of course, a mere speculation. But if we ascribe the phrase “up to the present it circulates in South India” to Kumārājīva (see above n. 56), even this identification becomes more plausible, though, of course, still entirely hypothetical.

We can also look at the argument discussed above from another perspective: in the discussion of the lakkhana h. the Nettis makes use of an example which is not in the Petakopadesa but is in part paralleled by the Petaka quoted in the DDL. This fact, in turn, corroborates the hypothesis that the Nettis is not to be considered a mere direct revision of the Petakopadesa (as Nāṇamoli thought). The history of these treatises must have been a bit more complex.

In this respect, the passage on the Four Truths (part 2.1.4 above) is rather telling: the same stanza and a similar excerpt belong, in the Petaka and in the Petakopadesa, to two different sections. This is a pattern of correspondence also met with in comparing Petakopadesa and Nettis (see Nāṇamoli 1969 pp. vii ff.; cf. also above n. 23). This fact suggests that all these treatises independently adopted some material (quotations, exegetical methods, glosses etc.) from a (possibly fairly old) common tradition in which it was not yet systematically organized (see also n. 71).

Incidentally, it is also remarkable that, unlike the Petakopadesa, the DDL is very explicit in ascribing the authorship of the Petaka in its present shape only indirectly to Mahākāśyapa (see n. 11 above; cf. von Himmel 1996 p. 82 § 170).

3.2
In the most important passage analysed above (part 2.1), the Petaka was clearly considered to be not simply a text belonging to a certain school, but rather a genre, a particular method and a textual tradition comparable to the Abhidhamma as a whole: i.e., arguably, a scriptural typology not confined to a

---

71 On the discrepancies between the chapters on Jātaka of the two Pali books see Nāṇamoli 1962 p. xvi.

72 See again von Himmel 1996 p. 81 § 168 and 169: “. . . Perhaps Nett and Pet are not directly dependent on each other, but simply dealing with the same material derived from a common source used for the same purpose.”

73 Cf. also the treatment of the first quotation analysed above (2.1.2) in the various sources, which presents a partially similar situation: see n. 21 and 23.
single sectarian tradition. A genre, we may add, in the light of the preceding analysis, probably represented by a number of scriptures.

Whether and to what extent the DZDL's description reflects the actual history of the Pejaka is, of course, questionable. But in connection to this issue, it may prove fruitful to carry out a systematic comparison between the relevant Pāli sources and Vasubandhu's Vīyakhāyuktikā ("Principles of Exegesis"), recently dealt with by Peter Skilling in a very rich and stimulating article (2000).24

As Skilling describes it, the Vīyakhāyuktikā, which is preserved only in Tibetan, seems to be concerned in the same methodological issue which ultimately produced the two Pāli treatises attributed to Mahākācārika. The role it played in Indian and Tibetan traditions also parallels the influence of Petaikpadesa and Netti in Theravādin exegetical literature.

Skilling observes that "as a manual of exegesis, the Vīyakhāyuktikā may be compared with the Pāli Nettipakama of the pre-Buddhaghosa Theravādin tradition", concluding provisionally that, apart from few details, he has "not noticed any striking correspondence between the two texts (but a thorough study remains to be made)".

Indeed, if we consider that very likely in an early period the circulation of the Petaikpadesa was not confined to the Theravāda, it would be also important to extend to it the comparison with Vasubandhu's Vīyakhāyuktikā.

So a "Pejaka tradition" exist in the sense apparently suggested by the DZDL? Only a careful comparison of the methods, operations from canonical sources and technical terms employed by all these treatises will be enable us to draw some conclusions on this important problem.

24 Cf. also Minmat 1997:194; Yonshen 1990 p. 42; Hirsch 1990, pp. 135-135. The genre which concludes the whole section on the three types of Teaching - itself a very peculiar book within the book, an interesting short monograph on Pejaka - is particularly intriguing (T. 1509 p. 194a 20 - 21). The person who does not study the Mahākācārika, entering into the Teaching of Abhidharma will fall into the wrong view of existence; entering into the Teaching of Epiphenomenes will fall into the wrong view of non-existence; entering into the Teaching of Pejaka will fall into the wrong view of existence and non-existence.


26 As the Vīyakhāyuktikā inscii states (Skilling 2000 p. 317), this treatise has been composed for the benefit of "those who wish to explain the sutras". Indeed, one might borrow here very same words to describe the Petaikpadesa.


28 Some features of the Petaikpadesa and the Netti suggest a northern origin: see Norman 1983: 110; Randles 1991 p. 46; cf. above n. 70.

29 As well as by some modern scholars: Hirsch 1990: 150; Wardes 1990: 215; 1st ed. 1980 p. 229) mentions a source concerning a Pejaka belonging to the Mahāthikā School. Unfortunately, I was not able to check this very interesting information. See also, id. 1999: 316: "... the Prajñāpāramitā and possibly the Mahāsamghika group in general included it [viz. the "Petaikpadesa"] in their Abhidharma. If correct, this would be a piece of information of the greatest relevance to our topic, but, regrettably, no evidence is provided at this point by Wardes."
4. Appendix: *Kanle* / *Pile*

As I have briefly noted above (n. 6), the traditional text of the DZDL’s *Petaka* passages is remarkably consistent in giving the title of the treatise as *Kuanle* in both the "true" and "false" versions. Apparently, of the three passages only that in juan 18 has been preserved in the Jin *Mim Eulogy* (12th century); see *Zhanghui Baolun* *Yutai Fapu* (Beijing 1989-1988) vol. 25 p. 423 a-c. Here the Jin text has *kanle* which, as a phonetic transcription, appears equivalent to *kanle*.

The reading *kanle* occurs also in an manuscript from Dunhuang (A 7251, see *Dunhuang Baolun* *Yutai Fapu* vol. 105, p. 239)79, to my knowledge the only surviving fragment relevant to our topic.

That nevertheless we should still read *Pile*, i.e., arguably, *petaka*, was demonstrated in detail and very convincingly, in my opinion—by Wogihara Ururai long time ago (1911, repr. pp. 296-299), although, to be sure, the right conjecture had already been suggested by the Later Jin *Yue Lü* lexicographer Kehong 可弘 in his remarkable glossary90.

This of *kanle* is a well-known problem, at least to East Asian scholars, yet there remain a few obscure points. The fact that not only all the direct witnesses of the DZDL, as expounded above, but even the commentaries quoting from the DZDL are generally consistent in having the error *kanle* (see above n. 8) is particularly striking.

However, we may formulate an hypothesis. As Wogihara did not fail to observe (1911, repr. p. 296), the wrong reading *kanle* is recorded, by means of a *fanxie* 及 its gloss, in Huolin’s manuscript early 9th century glossary *Yujing yinshi* 一切經音義.71 We know that Huolin based this section of his glossary on the 6th century homonymous glossary by Xuanying 真彥 (not printed independently in the *Tainbō*). The question whether the gloss under issue occurred already in the latter text is difficult to answer, because Xuanying’s glossary has in fact been transmitted

---

79 At the beginning of the relevant passage, where the three "Teachings" are introduced (cf. part 2.1 above), the manuscript reads 一一真益門庭（"The first is the *Kanle* box"); quite clearly, this is not a variant: the scribe simply took up the gloss inserted in the previous mention of the *Petaka*, that occurring in the second *juan* (see part 2.2 above). We must also observe that at the very beginning of the *Petaka* passage, the manuscript lacks eighteen characters corresponding to the phrase which introduce the two Methods (i.e. T 1509 p. 192b 6-7: 其中有二 通相門庭; see above part 2.1). As in this manuscript each line has seventeen characters, we can conclude that here the scribe has merely skipped one line.

80 On the very intricate manuscript tradition of the DZDL, now see Hiro Miki’s 伊藤敏男 深入考察 detailed study: *Tenkō bon Daishidaikon no seiri* "transition to 大智度論 の 訂正", in *Kagawa* 1996, pp. 355-465, the synopsis table provided at pp. 395-465 is most useful. The manuscript containing the main "Petaka passage" cannot be dated with certainty; however, the group to which it belongs, according to Hiro’s classification of the DZDL manuscripts, is made up by rather ancient copies (see Hiro’s study, in *Kagawa* 1996, pp. 351-352).

71 *Yujing yinshi* nai ku in *Korean Sutra Catalogue* (completed in 940 AD; see Ch'en 1992, pp. 1023-1027); see the Korean edition of the Canon, *Yuljin* *Yutai Fapu* vol. 34 p. 963a, also quoted by Wogihara 1931, repr. p. 207.

82 *T* 2128 p. 610b 18: 古德及 此為古德藏法. Note that the *Tainbō* wrongly has 場 instead of 場, but cf. the *Korean* edition vol. 42 p. 964a, which gives the correct reading.
See the remarks in the *Zhonghua Dazangying*'s apparatus, vol. 56 p. 827b, and by Zhou Fangao 周方藻 in the preface (pp. 1-2) to his *Xiangying zaiyi* 這個一切約言義. *Zhongguo yuanyuan liuyiyan yanyan* 中國研究論叢論文 (Taibei 1982).

The editors of the *Zhonghua Dazangying* have wisely decided to print the two recensions of Xiangying's glossary separately (vols. 56-57). As to this second recension (vol. 57), they have reproduced the Yongle Nanzi a book (15th century) as main text, collated with the Qibha 秽華 (15-16th century), *Puzuo 諸寶* (end of the 15th century) and Jingshan 敬山 (16-17th century) editions. Unfortunately the *Beiji 敬記* (12th century edition) is not represented in this collation; it might have been the prototype of this recension (cf. Wogihara 1911, repr. p. 206: he quotes the Song 敬 dimension as having the kusa glosses). These witnesses belong to the same branch of the tradition: therefore their agreement is of some little importance.

Huilin was a "bon saumîriste" according to Déméville (Source Chinois, p. 457 § 2156, repr. in Déméville 1975; cf. Chen 1992 p. 1012; see also his short biography in the *Song gao song shuan 敬高僧傳*) 1001, especially p. 708a 24-25.

To my knowledge, Ven. Yimshun (1990 p. 42) is the only modern scholar who took into account, besides the above mentioned encodification, also the possibility of following the etymological view, he proposed, as a possible origin of kusa, *karaizhu*. However, apart from other considerations, the presence of a final *-i* in the medival pronunciation of the character 影 {EMG bu etc.}; see Pulleyblank 1981 p. 186; cf. Colini 1994 p. 415, sv. *0981* makes this reconstruction rather questionable. I must thank Prof. Karashima for a very fruitful discussion of this issue. Yimshun 1989 (which I could access only through internet: h：／／keikaku／yonshin／（／yonshin／0：00.html）discusses the issue in greater details, and decidedly takes side for kusa as the correct reading; see pp. 16-18. Here Yimshun challenges Wogihara's hypothesis mainly on the ground that in Kumārajīva's transcriptions on initial श, we would stay for vi and not for pi (1989 p. 18); but cf. Colini 1994 p. 217, entry 0952 (especially sv. कु, i.e. Kumārajīva). In this study Yimshun concludes (1989 p. 18), seemingly only on the basis of the very brief reference to Mahākāśyapa's activity in compiling the *Abhidharmas* contained in the *Zhuanzi nanzi yu nanzi shuan 敬高三藏玄奘傳 T 2002* (p. 8-12; cf. Lamotte 1958 p. 207 and 146), that the text described by the *DZDL* is a fundamental treatise of the Mahāyānta tradition (cf. n. 78 above) unrelated to the *Petakapadika*. 83

in two rather different recensions: one preserved by the Korean and Jap editions, and the other by a group of closely connected editions carved during the Song, Yuan and Ming dynasties. Now, the gloss on *kusa* occurs only in the second recension (see *Zhonghua Dazangying* vol. 57 p. 2203c 10 and cf. vol. 56 p. 951b), and thus we cannot exclude that its occurrence is due to conflation with Huilin's glossary.

Both Xiangying and Huilin had took part in the translation teams of their period, and at least the latter is credited by biographical sources with a good command of Sanskrit: thus it is hard to imagine which Indic word, if any, he had in mind when he used the DZDL's gloss (i.e. 'box, container') to explain the wrong reading *kusa*.

At all events, the unequivocal acceptance of the wrong reading in these glossaries – particularly authoritative as to difficult or rare terms – is likely to have been the main reason for its widespread preservation in the Canon.
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The Mahākarmavibhanga and the Karmavibhangaśūtra (4)'
Transliterations of the Original Manuscripts
Preserved in the National Archives of Nepal

Noriyuki Kudo

Symbols used:
+ lost akṣara
( ) restored akṣara
! damaged akṣara
< > omitted akṣara
[ ] superfluous akṣara
[ ][ ] erased akṣara
<< >> interlinear insertion
. . illegible akṣara
* single element missing
vīrtta
○ punch hole
◎ double circle with a rosette used to indicate the end of a chapter
m unclear mark, appears as combination of anusūtra and vīrtta
\ anagrāha
; niṣṭha-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, 1969 (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Bechert 3).

In addition, quotation marks — straight or not — have been added to the text for convenience of reading, especially in case of the curation 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 consideration at the next stage of a critical revision.

The present writer must express his thanks to the former Director of the National Archives of Nepal, Professor B.D. Dhalal, for his kind support in providing him with the microfilms of the MSS and other forms of assistance.

© 2002 IKPAB, Soka University, JAPAN.
6. kātanaṭaḥ karma prāsādikṣamvartanīyaḥ ucyate 1

akrodhaḥ 2 anapāṇīhabhiḥ 3 āmrakṣaḥ 4 vāstraśraddhānām 1 stūpacetyagṛhiṣu 5 ca (16c.7)
suddhihānām 1 śuvarnaspṛṣṭradhānām 1 gandhalepāḥ 6 pradānām 1 alamkārapraddhānām 1
mātāstro'varṇaśvādītā 1 āryaśaḥ 7 sīlāvattām (16c.8) varṇaśvādītā(m) 1 śūpānganaśvādīnāca 8
sa(m) 9 mārjjanam 1 1 satataṃ grhaśaṃmārjjanam 1 viśeṇātm satvānām anāvahanaṃ 1
tathā (16c.4) aneraḥ balavṛddhānām 1 1 tathā cauksaṃsadācāraḥ 1 11

1 For *samvartanīyaḥ*.
2 Read *anapāṇīhaḥ*. A mere transcriptional error.
3 After this word, add *aprakṣaḥ* according to T1: ni chīg pa.
4 For *sāṭya*.
5 Read *prāva*.
6 For *pitrā*.
7 For *āryaṁ*.
8 For *śūlapataḥ*.
9 For *śūlapatā*.
10 Read *āryaḥ*.

88
(Folios 8-10 are lost)
9. kata" mat" karmma nicaku la samvarttanāyanī l ucaye l

starthātā l abhimānātī ca l ann(17v.3)apātīṣhūṭā l āvānanyatā l abhāma[1]cīnyatā l kulajjēṣhpācīṣhūṭā l mātāpiḍhātā aprat.[up.]dā[śi]r[na]mī l āryatā(17v.4) śilavatām apratīṣhūṭāhāmī l aṃśātī ca O gurudhānīyānām ārcyāpīdhāyāṣṭāḥnām apratīṣhūṭāhāmī l nicaku laṇāmī sarvāt(17v.5)mā parabhava l

ida karmma trīṣhācakas la samvarttanāyanī l 11 11

10. katanāt karmma trīṣhācakas samvarttanāyanī l ucaye l

astartha l tānābhi(18t.1)manitā mātāpiḍhūṭā ca l somanatā l brahmānandatā l kulajjēṣhpācīṣhūṭā dā[śi]r[na]mī l mātāpiḍhātā apratīṣhūṭāhāmī l āryatā l śilavatām apratīṣhūṭāhāmī l aṃśātī ca gurudhānīyānām aci ēcyāpīdhāyāṣṭānmī pratīṣhūṭāhāmī l nicakoliminī satvānām aparabhava[1] l

1. W. r. for mabhātā.
2. Read abhulaśṭūṭa, cf. BHIS §2.18. pU > pU.
3. Read apratīṣhūṭa deriṣṭānām.
4. For ēryatām.
5. For anuṣṭātī.
6. For satvānām.
7. For ēdām.
8. W. r. for sahvinda or sahinda.
9. W. r. for mabhātā.
10. For "jātātā.
11. For thānanyatā.
12. For "pāṣa, cf. BHIS §2.18. pU > pU.
13. For ēryatām.
14. For śīlā.
15. For anuṣṭātī.
16. For gurā.
17. Originally written u-; i in vowel sign i is erased and then sūghī is added.
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11. *katanam* karma ○ alpbhogaśaṃvatṛtiṇyiḥ 1 ucyate 1

adāśēdānām1 1 adattādānasamādāpanānī 1 〈1〉 cau(ṣv.3)tyavārasyāvādiśā 1 tadābhāvyamudanānī 1 mātiśa-pitro 1 1 vṛtyupacchedadh 1 tadānāśiśām1 1 vādāśāvalāvrdhīda(erp)11 [pañātī]12 vṛtyupaccheda(ṣv.4)śyā 1 paraśyāsyā lābhānātūṣṭābh 1 〈1〉 parālābhāntarē[gaṇeṣi]11 1 durbhāsābhinnamaṇāḥ ca 11

idaśā kramaḥ alpbhogaśaṃjvalāśātānīyaḥ 11 11 11

12. (18v.5) *katanam* karma mahābhogaśaṃvatāśātānīyaḥ10 1 ucyatiḥ 1

adāt-svādānānāṁ nivṛt-tvābh 1 parekhāh11 cādattādānāṁ12 śivāśānyām 1 parekhāh13 cādattādā(9r.1) samānāni niśanāmudanānī 1 mātiśa-pitro11 1 vṛttisvā[n]peśādāmānī11 1 4-laśāyāmānī śilāvātāmāśā 1 vṛttisvā[p]eśādāmānī 1 tathā 'naśām13 1 vṛttisvādālaśāvrdhīdākkhatāpaśā[9r.2]śānāśā 1 vṛttisvā[p]eśādāmānī 1 paraśābhāṇāstūṣṭābh 1 paraśāṣāvalāśāstūṣṭābh 1 paraśābhāṇāsvaśānaḥ 11 1

---

1 A mere typographical error for adāitā: (see next section. The scribe added -t-)

2 W. r. for adāitā;

3 For *pitr*.

4 For *svarīgāla*.

5 The vouched sign ē of m. is intentionally rewritten as -ā.

6 Read *kṛṣṇa*.[svarīgāla]...

7 For *svarīgāla*.

8 Originally written as parā- and in vouched sign -ā is omitted. For *nāvāu*.

9 For śūrām.

9 For *karmā*.

10 For *adjatiśātānīyaḥ*.

11 For *paryāṭa*.

12 Rewritten as - mān-.

13 For *paryāṭa*.

14 For *pitr*.

15 Read vṛtyupadānām. The vouched sign ē of m. is intentionally rewritten as -ānd rewritten.

16 For *śāmciṣām* or *śāmciṣāyām*; cf. *Bṛh. Gā* 18.27

17 For *svarīgāla*.

18 W. r. for *tyādā*.

19 W. r. for *vṛdiffā*.

20 This insertion is given by a later hand.
(11.1) + + + + + + + + .. प्रयोजन वर्त्तुपचेताः क्लो तथाह्येष्मां व्यधितालस्यद्धकपानिं वृत्तु-पचेताः क्लो परस्य लभ्यन्तरस्तीध परस्यां लख्यांतरक्षार्यार्याः क्लो दुर्भीषणिन्द्रानं क्लो

िदम कर्म अनुभो(11.2) + + + + + [व्या](मक्त) 11 11

12. तत्र करतम् कर्मां कार्यां भद्धगस्सव्यार्थीस्य क्लो उच्यते के

ाद्वितीयान्वितत्त्र क्लो प्रच्छादः अद्वितीयान्वितत्त्र्यात्मां प्रेमिकां अद्वितीयान्वितत्त्र्यात्मां सामानुमोदनां केमात(11.3) + + [रूपांश्वला] 1 अर्थात् का [न्या]लवताम्यात्म व्यधितालस्यद्धकपानिं वृत्तुप्रदेशां क्लो तथाह्येष्मां व्यधितालस्यद्धकपानिं वृत्तुप्रदेशां क्लो परालभेन्त्रस्तीध परस्यालभ्यन्तरस्तीध क्लो परालभ्यासामुलिन्द्रानं क्लो (11.4) + [बहु],क्षेत्रिन्द्रानं क्लो

1 Read (सदलेयसंयोगिनांम | मिति)-
2 Read (सुसंस्कृतियो)(मक्त).
3 For (सदलेयसंयोगिनांम).
4 Read (प्रच्छादः).
5 For "प्रच्छादः-
6 Read (व्या)|[बहु][क्षेत्रि]".
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1. See above footnote in § 10(a) paragraph of the AV, pustakabikash, no. 199.

2. This insertion is given by a later hand.

3. W. e. for -vatn.

4. For ‘samwurtantyanam.

5. For karna.

6. For ‘samwurtantyanam.

7. For ‘sallohrantyanam.

8. Akrama pandita = rewritten on originally; original letters are not illegible.

9. This insertion is given by a later hand.

10. For dharmam.

11. Rewritten as bra > br.

12. W. e. for vigrahati.

13. For ‘subhakamb.

14. The word pustaka was originally written as pustakā and a vulgar sign ‘ of -ā is crossed. For ‘jāthakabāha.

15. The phrase ‘kaś ceranaṁ kum dharmas aśyāsaya yātā naita samasya yātā iti’ is added here and is not in the original text.

16. ‘Kṣevanam śvāma’ is also added here and not in the original text.
13. tatha katanam karma dasaprjnaasamavartaniyam 1 ucyate / t

Although the passage which is expected to quote in § 10 (fourth paragraph of the A.V) though MSIR does not have corresponding folios. See my discussion of § 10 of the MSIR.

1. For tal.
2. Read (prati) [tenam].
3. Here, MSIR has a passage which is expected to quote in § 10 (fourth paragraph of the A.V) though MSIR does not have corresponding folios. See my discussion of § 10 of the MSIR.
4. For tat.
5. Read pratipaadam.
6. Read pratipa[tenam][bhrasat].
7. For pandita. (Acc. pl.), cf. BHSG §8.90. -men instead of -men. This writing is found elsewhere in this MS, herein, the type of orthography will not be mentioned.
8. Read [bhrasat].
9. Contemntually these abovewords should be read as (dharmam) the second one seems to have a vowel sign -e on the left side of sharma.
10. Read (k)j[pratipa].
12. For sattvamay.
14. For sattvabhukham.
a) stūtra cokākajātāt

unmattakasamvartatīyam ca kārñamuccāparājaya karo'ī ti sam(iḥ)āṃdībhāthā ca kālām karoti i dhyāṇaprajāta ca bhava'C Ātī ti

yathoktami ca ā[1] Nandikarāte ācārvināmarādā āptanā satyārāmadyapramādā(āv.)jitne yojayatiyāhi 1 i Buddha ca gauravo bhavati dharmam' sanghe cāgauravo bhavati i

1 Lēvi could not read this portion due to a worn-out hole but some parts of alabas are restored.

2 The sentence beginning from √samatāsthyām to karotim rewritten.

For the translation, see Gouesnon, "Dākṣiṇāyikā's "Dvaita" and the Pāṇini School's "Vaiśeṣika"", p. 49-51.

a) sūtre colkanā

usmattakaśamvartaniyam ca (11v.3) 5 m. pārjyayenaḥ 6 1 sattamābhakā ca kīlām ākroti 1>

yasaktam 6 2 Nandikastre 1> pāc cattrimśaśa śālīnavah surāmāyaṃyasaḥ apine

yosajitvāyāḥ 1> Buddhe cāgatraṇo bhavati 1 dharmaṃ (11v.4) 6 3

5 Read / deva/ pārjyayati
6 Read sattamābhakā ca 1>
atra Śākyā-vāśiṣṭha's vottam' yogajīvayati l
yathā ca Bhagavān Kapila-vāsūtur-20r.11ty' [āgataḥ] l sa madhyātmasvam na kadaccid
Bhagavān tasmu paśaṃśruntaḥ l catuṣṭha'śvair dharmaiva Bhagavata prátiṣṭhā/gavā vinirnā
kālakṣatā ca l
sākhyāj prāchami(20r.23)1 l
"Bhagavān nyaya kā gatī" iti l
Bhagad(1)3ya vā iti l
"inte 'opi ca mā Śākyā śūkhitasyārydhham' śūnneya" 
ātira trimayam(20r.3) l
tathā's Vrātām11 Pambhako11 nāma bhūkṣaṇa1 tiṣṇaya Rājājāyate prativrataṃśa
Bhagavata gītybhodita l it ca varṣitāśrīna1 ni śikṣaśtrīvā gra(20r.4)hitum11 l bhūksa
vismayā prātāh prācham l
"Bhagavān(a)1 kasya(1) esa11 karmāśīvāpakena dhūptaśīh" l

1 Added ny a later hand.
2 Although the word inserted master, it does not make sense. As for the title "Śākyasūna," we have no corresponding text in Saṃśkrit. The motif that someone who always drank did not come to see the lūdhdā is well known in Pali and Chinese examples Līlā 1932: 43, fn. 1.
3 Read "vanam.
4 For caturthaḥ.
5 For pratiṣṭhā.
6 For bhūkṣaṇa.
7 For jānyey, cf. BHS G 29.23f.
8 Vowel sign is added.
9 W. s. for Cūddā.
10 Abhava eva is rewritten.
11 Abhava kṣru is rewritten.
12 For varṣitāśrīna? Cf. the Fāyākuming 『梵語梵名』 (ed. by 竹谷 聖, T 2335, vol. 54, 1233cv) "夏
五六月 錫飛香鴨, 鋼鴨銅鴨, " ,
13 Vowel sign is added.
14 For gatītanum.
15 For vānapurnam.
16 For bhūkṣaṇa.
17 For karmāśīvā.
.. ta' Śākyāntiśya yojayatyayam 1

yudd ca Bhagavān 1 Keśūvastum ājato 0 māyāpānadesāṃ na kaścid Bhagavatāh 1
ultraparasmakṣeṇatāh caturthih śīvāvih Bhagavatā presitai rātrau gaur eva vin(11v.5)+++ ..

... tāh ca śākyāya prachāntī <1>

"Bhagavamānasi kācāt" tī hi 11

"ime ∞ [ ] ji ca gathā bhūtrasyāyānham ajānīyur" 

in stōram yojayatayam 11

yathā Cāda Panthako nīma bhāksam tasyā Rāja(11v.6)+++... Bhagavato 6
ghoṭhodāśīkā 1 si ca varṣāṣṭiṃ na śākṣote 10 gṛhitum 11 <1> bhākṣavo viseṣyā 12 prāpaḥ
prachāntī 1 "Bhagavam kasyaṁ karmāno vīpākena duṣṭaṛaṭāh 11"
Bhagavān āha 11

"Kāyān (12.1): + + + + [dh]. [pa]mirvṛte ess āraṇyaḥ bhūkaḥ tripāṭhab 'cakālam isē' <1> bhūkaṁkātha ca buddhe pājām eva kuryavānān bhūṣhavanānam antaḥram <1> te bhūkvas tasya samīpam gataḥ 'āsamikam buddhavaca (12.2): + + + + [t] (m) [t] āsamikam aśu upadesam kuryavāya sūvita maṁśyadṛśdām upadeṣo na krtaḥ 1 evam tacchānānam antaḥram 1 tasyaśa karmāv vipakṣenās āsaṃprajñāb 11" 1


---

1 Read Kāyān (12.1): samśikṣāmākātha.
2 Read tripāṭhab.
3 Forśaśurāvānam.
4 Read buddhavaca (12.2): āsamikam āsamikam aśu upadesam kuryavāya sūvita maṁśyadṛśdām upadeṣo na krtaḥ.
5 For’āśu upadesam kuryavāya sūvita maṁśyadṛśdām upadeṣo na krtaḥ?
6 We expect here to have a double circle indicating an end of the section.
14. *katamat* (28v.3) *karma* *mahāprajñāsāntvāt* ita tecṣe i

īh(’) ekṣayab, *pariprachakajñeyo bhūvati* ita pāṇdītin* śrāṇoṇī* *brahmaṇān* (28v.4) sanitve i *duḥsūprajñā* *brahmaṇān* *parivṛtiyajñātī* ita *saddharmma* dipāyati ita *saddharmma* *vīgarhati* *dharmavibhūkṣānān* vaisaradyam vārdhāyajñātī tī (28v.5) *sabdhikṣādītān* *sādhakāyam dasati* *vīgarhati* *sāsambhāvitaṁ* 1 *sādhakāyam dasati* *sāsambhāvitaṁ* vāpāyati ita *vāsāpyajñātī* *māyāyajñātī* *vīgarhati* ita *masipūta(1r.1)kalīčekhōpaipradānān* *dādātī* ita *ca* maṇḍyam pibat 11

yathoktenā ca *Nandikāśūtā* 12 ita vāvṛīṇdād adīnavās 13 maṇḍyadāsāh ita akalīarpakaṇa yojaṇā(1r.2)sa-vvās 11

idam karmma.mahāprajñāsāntvāt vājñāyam (1[1]) 11 11 11
14. tatra katamaṃ karma mahāprajātāsanvarttaniyam 1 ucyaete 11

īhaikātāḥ paścārijujñahājyo bhavati 1 paṇḍitāti cchramaṇabrahmaṇapānāṃ sevati, dasprajātāṃ patiṇahyati 1 sadharaṇam dipayati 1 (12r.9) + [sa]jādharman'vigahayati 1 dharmahājanakīnāṃ vaśāryadā vartenayati 1 sahitahbhāśīnāṃ sadhukāram dadāti 1 ahātraḥṣahityāṃ pariharati 1 sanyakṣiṣṭām varṇayati 1 mithyādityāṃ vigahati 1 (12r.5) + [l]. khanipraalānām dadāti l na ca madyam pibati l yathākram ca Nandikṣetre 11, 11 1 patacaṁsit madayapānadastā akulalapathe 1 yojayitavyah 11

idam karma mahāprajātāsanvarttaniyam 11

1 Read (s)ajādharman.
2 Or ‘Nārāyaṇ’ (Acc. pl.)?
3 Read maniprastha(ksa)litādhanu.
4 W. v. for ‘paterna? (T.: phṛty). Or does it imply ‘ahātra(ḥ)-karma’-patha,” although ‘ahātra’ is not included in ‘dāta karma-pātha’?
15. katamati* kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

trīvā śrutiśiṣṭvā [Śruti śrutiśiṣṭvā] cāyaśvānapadaśiṣṭvā || ucyate ||

iśīvadādīṣṭvā [Iśīvadādīṣṭvā] cāvaśvānaśiṣṭvā || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

madhyamaśa ṣa-nāmaśaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

15. katama] (kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||

16. kṣarama] narakopapattisaṁvaṁnaññiyaṁ || ucyate ||
15. tatra (12r.6) +.. mani1 karma narakapaptasamvarttanayam <1> ucyaete 11
tvam1 pradurcapitasya kayavagnanadhicaritan <1> ucchudasistsib <1> sāvativadesthib <1> nāstikobyāthī1 akriyādyāthinī1 asatkiyāvadād <1> mahaśa1(2v.1)[y]ādah <1> akṣṭa[ḥīyā]tib <1> ānantarāyam āvyānaṃ nīlavattām abhilābhyākhyānādānāṃ <1>
idad karma narakapaptasamvarttanayam 11

16. tatra katamānān karma tiryagyonyupapattis[is]|[a],[é],[r],[i],[t],[i],[y],[a],[i],[a],[t],[i],[a],[y],[e],[t]<1>ucyaete 1

madhyamā(12v.2) + [y]āvatsāna-ducarañinām1 karma <1> vicitra1 rāgasaṃvichāritān1 karma <1> vicitrānāṃ dvesasaṃvāthitaṃ kāraṇā <1> vicitraṃ mohasaṃvichāritān1 kāraṇā <1> mātāproh pravṛṭitaṃ ca kalpakapradā[ñ][a]nām <1> tiryagyonyupatisā[ñ][a]nam <1> tiryagyonyupatisānam sa(12v.1) + namī10 avahasaṃ 1 tathā prajñāhānakarma yathā govardhakaśākṣatvarati, īkaprābhaśā[ñ] prajñāhānaṃ "[ñ][i][t]oprapadyeyam" iti1

1 Read (ka)śman.
2 Keśariśa: tvam = śiśram.
3 Read (y)ām(y)āṣṭra(y)ā(m)|yā(y)ā(m).
4 For mohasyam.
5 Read (a)diṣṭaḥ.
6 For visvayam.
7 For "samsthitam.
8 For "samsthitam.
9 For saṁsthitam.
10 Read saṁsthitam.
a) vasthā ta bodhisattvasya Sādhgajatake avalāśaṇa vaktāvyaṃ 11

vastha (12v.4) + + rṣajākāraśaṃ brahmaṇaśaṃ mukṣatopapattīśaṃ 11
tadyathā Varsākāreśu (12) brahmaṇaṃ sthitaraṃ Mahākāyopahāre Bhikṣhukā Kārgaṇaḥ puraṃśaṃ

Vṛddhāraṅkāreśu parvatiḥ Gṛmhaśparvatuḥ vātāḥ (12v.5) + + + nā nāśaḥ <1> śāsya tenni

prādyutacivittata Devajārā[1]−tattājārāśaṃsthitasaṃgītā vāgūpaścitraṃ kṛṇaṃ. <1>

"esa śrāmano vāhāvāno parvatiḥ parvataṃ gaccham" [1] tadyathā maṅka vṛtsam eva gacchā (12v.6) +

++ + [1][kajjhatam 'Varsākāreṇa brahmaṇena krodhaśākere vāgūpaścitarāṃ kṛtām]

"tāsya ko vāpikāḥ 11"

Rāghavaśānaḥ aha 11

"asya vāgūpaścitarāsaṃ vāpikāḥ Varsākāreyo brahmaṇaḥ pāṭika jārmatā (13r.1) + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

[1] brahmayā. 11"

1 Read (as Var)cjākāraṃ.
2 Original: sūta (Rewritten).
3 Gṛmhaśaṃ.
4 Read sahājyam gacchāṃ.
5 āraṃ.
6 Cfr. RMDS, s.v. vādṛṣṭaṃ.
7 Read parāchāraṃ.
8 Read (Bhagavata) ṣaṃ.
9 W.s. for Vārsākāraṃ.
10 Read jāmāthāraṇaṃ (written).
11 Compared to MS A, there is a long omission after this sentence: saṃ tad vāsūkāreṇa utamaṃ Bhagavatā

nirūṣṭam — tāna kā pāṭika jāmāthāraṇaṃ markapā ṣvapyaḥ (this is a reconstructed sentence based on

MS A).
tatas tena Vasakārī(22r.3ya)era ēratat (1) Bhagavata nirādīṣṭa1 <1> tvaṃ kīla śo paśca jana[2] aśeṣatāsatāṁ markkte bhavakteśu1 11 * sa sanvijñacitam prasidita(22r.4ya)1 tena Bhagavan pariṣheṇānukā śo 1 pṛṣṭaḥ 1

"tasya kārmaṇaḥ kada pariṣayya" iti ।
Bhagavān ēha āha ।
"tany aśi(22r.5ya) paśca jañānīṣṭājaśātānāṁ 2 kin1 tu Pijārgbe upanyase 1 yathā jañānā Jambudvīpa jāyām3 । yatra ajñāṇāśiṣṭā aśiṣṭā phalāni 1 yathā jañāna(22r.1) kundramadha evam avāsottāḥ tatraṇāstiḥ bhavaiṣyeyā । tato vyutthitasya te sugaṁ bhavākeṣu1 । yathā cittaṇaṇusa saṁhṛṣṭa[2]pañapannānāḥ 11 ।

(22v.2) tadārthaḥ ca Bhagavatā gītā uktā ।
dirghā sūcīchātra11 rāttī dirghānaṁ śrātaṇaṁ yojanaṁ 1
dirghā bālaṣya samsāraṇāḥ (1) saṁdhamanu svayā(22v.3)nāthaḥ 11 ।
idān krama11 śirṣaṇyavapapati śrīsaṁvartanaṇaya11 । 11

1 For nirādīṣṭa.
2 ap. < ty. Read bhājyaṇi; cf. Lōvī 1932: 45, fn.11.
3 For 'kāla'.
4 For 'sūcī'.
5 This aśiṇa is rewritten, so illegible.
6 Originally written as aśi and then is rewritten as ap.
7 For jāyām.
8 Lövī: 45, fn. 16. cf. BIJS, s.v. aśiṇa.
9 Read truśaṇaṇadaḥ; as for this phrase, see Lövī 1932: 45-6, fn. 18 and BIJS, s.v. anuloka and kuṇḍvra.
10 For bhavaiṣyeyā.
11 Several terms which have this verse read jāyārayo, see next footnote.
12 This verse is found in the followings: the Upaniṣadja (Bhāratarād ed.) 19: dirghā jāyāraya saṁrā ayāyam saṁsāraṁ saṁbādhaṁ atiṣṭhāyā ।
13 For 'Jambudvīpa' (Jaṃbuḍvīpa) (Yajur Veda) (br. by Vaiṣṇava Vaiṣṇava, T 210, vol. 4, jēlīb 20-21) ।
14 For 'Jambudvīpa' (Jaṃbuḍvīpa) (br. by Vaiṣṇava Vaiṣṇava, T 210, vol. 4, jēlīb 20-21) ।
15 For 'Jambudvīpa' (Jaṃbuḍvīpa) (br. by Vaiṣṇava Vaiṣṇava, T 210, vol. 4, jēlīb 20-21) ।
16 For 'Jambudvīpa' (Jaṃbuḍvīpa) (br. by Vaiṣṇava Vaiṣṇava, T 210, vol. 4, jēlīb 20-21) ।
17 For 'Jambudvīpa' (Jaṃbuḍvīpa) (br. by Vaiṣṇava Vaiṣṇava, T 210, vol. 4, jēlīb 20-21) ।
18 For 'Jambudvīpa' (Jaṃbuḍvīpa) (br. by Vaiṣṇava Vaiṣṇava, T 210, vol. 4, jēlīb 20-21) ।
19 For 'Jambudvīpa' (Jaṃbuḍvīpa) (br. by Vaiṣṇava Vaiṣṇava, T 210, vol. 4, jēlīb 20-21) ।
20 For jāyāmaya·
सा सम्बिन्त हितमसमस्याकोपेय पस्ताउँ ।
"तस्य कर्मही विपाकह कदापरिसया" यो उँचि ।
भगवान अहा ।
"तत्त्व १ रूपुर्वक जन्मसंततिः (१३.२) सा + + + ग्रहहत उपायवयात् । याया जाभ्व जम्बुद्वीप जीवस्वरूपः । तत्त्वातिक त्वरित ज्ञानात् । तत्त्वात्यावथ श्रीविषयः । त्रिशेषितस्य सुखमी (१३.३) + + + यथा । यथा चित्तान्तिकरणां समपरिस्परणम् अविनाशः। च।
तदर्थो च भगवानां गृहि भौषिण ।

dirghān jāgarato rātrīm dirghān śrāntasya yojyaṁ ।
dirgho bālasya sāṃśārah sādhaṁ haranam avijñanatāḥ । ।
(१३.४) + दामः कर्मा तिर्यग्योनि उपापापसामवर्त्तनायः। ।

1. W: for "स्तानि।
2. Read घनम् रात्रि।
3. Read उपायवयात्।
4. For जीवात्
5. See Levi 1952: 45-6, fn. 18 and also Sādhārya s.v. अनेकाः and कलाखरे।
6. Own it।
7. Read नागदृश्बीविषयी।
8. Read (श्रीमत।
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17. tatra katamam karma precā lokopappattisamvartaniyam | ucyate 11

tatra katamam karma yasalokopappattisamvartaniyam | ucyate 11

krudibhaya (13r,5) + .. haracittaya1 kāyavātmanudaracittam | lōhohi visamalobho
mihyāţ̄e ā†hugāhanitaśāya2 krudibhaya kālakriyā <1> vastuvar abhisakrakcittaya
krudibhaya kālakriyā <1>

a) yathā coktām (13r,6) + .. vata3 Šatavarge Āgama Kačrarnaivbhāṅgavātrey <1>
“tasya khalu punah śāntadeva pulgalasya arisūtikṛtam v kārama pratyupastitam
bhavati l maranālāte v mithyādeṣaḥ 11”

īdām karma yamalokopappattisaṃvatīyāṃ(l1v,4) + .. niyāya11 11 11

18. tatra katamam karma asuralokopappattisamvartaniyam | ucyate 1

sarvaṃśa kāyavātmanudaracittam l mānāya <1> aparaviṇāya <1> adhīmāṇāya <1>
accaṃmaṇāya <1> mihyāmaṇaḥ <1> sijaṛāṭa(l1sr,śa)kṛta(l1śa).kāl(13v,2) + .. m1 11

asuralokopappattirānāṃcitam <1> samudrakṛtam rājasanattarācāṇa durjñāhyam
prajñāmkhena

īdām karma asuralokopappattisamvartaniyam 11 11

1 Simon (570: 163, fn. 4) “The heading ye-dgya sky-ba rnu-nu, pratālokapattī (see Lévi, p. 46, no. 6). Note the alternative heading yamalokopattī preferred by T seti: gtim-phir sky-ba sky-ba.”

2 Read śraytaya.

3 Vowel sign of a seems to be corrected but is illegible.

4 Read bhajaptamātā.

5 Read sanavattāniyāyam.

6 Read līkaḥprakāśatājñāmaḥ. The word dukkha should be omitted on the basis of the FST-šālinkapattisamvartaniyāḥ/dukkhakṛtug hyāntasāṃkhyā ṣāntaveṣa-sāṃkhyā (T 80, l, 893a27-8). (109, 119)
19. katamatt karma manuyopapattisanvatpaniyanahi 1 ucyate
subhavita mandabhavita ca dasa kusale_karmapathah 1 kac(23v.1)tasama dasa li tri-cvi-dhama
kayakarma caturvidham vakkartha trividham manah(11)karmanha 11

idam karma manuyapapattisanvatpaniyanahi 1 11 11

20. katamatt karma kac(23v.2)mavacaadevopapattisanvatpaniyanahi 1 ucyate 1

su<sa>maitapaDasas ko<sa>hidh karmapathah 1

idam karma kimavacaadevopapattisanat(23v.3)varttaniiyaahi 1 11 11

21. katamatt karma rti<pa>vacara(puta)devopapattisanvatpaniyanahi m+s{(hi)} 1 ucyate 1

sasanapathah sasanah/23v.4)tasato visistatara paraipurnaDasas ko<s> karseah karmapathah 11

idam karma dpavacara(puta)devopapattisamvatpaniyanahi (23v.5) 11 11 11

22. katamatt karma maitrep<ya>vacara(puta)devopapattisamvatpaniyanahi 1 ucyate 1
cateca <ravyasamapatetcayah i ikisasantayatanah i (24v.1)
aivasa(n)jitarasamajyaatanah 1 etah samapatecayah bhavita bahulikritah ca bhavanthi

idam kac(24v.2)maitrep<ya>avacaadevopapattisamvatpaniyanahi 1 11 11

1 Originally written as _-pi- and then rewritten as _-pi-. Read manuyopapattisam.
2 This verse is written on original redes sign.
3 W. c. for manuyopapattisam.
4 Athara as- is added by a later hand.
5 Rewritten as Hi> hi.
6 MIS(A) mentions only two among four apatanas.
19. tatra katamā karma mamu(13v.3) a lokopatissathavarttaniyām1 1 ucyate 11
abhīvāt2 mandubhāvītā ca dasa ○ kuśāla karmapathāh3 1 kāsme dasāh4 trividham
cyakarma, catvāridham vākākarma, trividham manaskarma 11 11
idam karma ma(13v.4) + syo(papattisanvarttaniyām)11 11 11

20. tatra katamā karma kāmāvacaradevopapsaṭisamvarttaniyām 1 ucyate 1
susamāptā dasa kuśālāḥ karmapathāḥ 11
idam karma kāmāvacaradevopapatti(13v.5) + + + iyaśāh11 11 11 11

21. tatra katamā karma rūpāvacaradevopapattisaṭisamvarttaniyām 11 11 11 ucyate 11
susamāptāḥ susamahitāḥ tato viśeṣātārāḥ paripūrṇāḥ dasa kuśālāḥ karmapathāḥ 11
(13v.6) + + + + + .10 [va]cara沛vapattisanvarttaniyām 11 11 11

22. tatra katamā karma ṛṣiprāvacaradevopapattisanvarttaniyām 11 11 11 ucyate 11
niṣṭhaṃ viṣeṣātābhvaṃ vapi 1 etāḥ samapattahanāḥ bahuḥ bhaktiś ca bhavanti 11
idam karma ṛṣiprāvacaradevopapattisanvarttaniyām 11 11 11 11
1 Read mamu(13v.3).
2 W. z. for nabhibhāt.
3 For kuśālāḥ karmapathāḥ.
4 This viśeṣātāraḥ seems to be a punctuation.
5 Read ma(13v.4).
6 Read ' (asaṃvarttaniyām).
7 Read 'idam karma riṣaḥ'-.11
8 For caatah (<ct-p.Nom.). Is a neumer form aṣṭhuṣnuṣṭātārāḥ as feminine form?
9 For ṛṣiprāvačaradevopapattisanvarttaniyām.<h3>10</h3>
10 Read 'viṣeṣātārāḥ (asaṃvarttaniyām). In enumerating four stages, the fifth stage, i.e., aṣṭhuṣnuṣṭātārāḥ, is omitted.
23. katmat  karma kṛtayam nopaścitaṁ 1 ucayate 11

yat kṛtva laśrūmaṁ ārtyayati 2 1 (24.r.3) jihreti 1 vijeyopasti 1 desayati ācaśaṁ 1 vyaktikaroti 1 āryayāṁ samvaram āpadyate 1 na punah karoṁ 1

idāṁ kai24.r.9rūma kṛtayam nopaścitaṁ 11  11

24. katmat  leśrūma nopaścitaṁ na kṛtayam 1 ucayate 1

yat[ā] karma [na] cāyena pariṣṭabhītavyam 1 āśrama pra24.r.5.iṣṭaṇācitaṁ 1 vacāṁ bhūṣate 1 'evaṁ te kariṣyāṁ āsā 1

idāṁ kramaṇa-saṅgacitaṁ 4 na-kṛtayam 11  11

1 Added by a later hand.
2 On several textual problems concerning to this word ārtyayati and a set phrase "yat kṛtva karma ...", see our introduction in first part of this study (pp. 99-103).
3 For "deśnśreṇo").
4 For kramaṇa-saṅgacitaṁ.
23. tatra katanam karma kṛṣṇa nopaicit(14r.2) + + (y) śevā 1

[yat] kṛtvā ka(j)ma] ... īva jī 1] [jē]hīyati 1 vādhasati, vijñapaite 1 ○ dekanyā acate vyabhikavā 1 āyatiṃ simśam āpadyate 11 na punah karo iti 11

idān karma kṛṣṇa nopaicitum (14r.3) + 11

24. tatra katanam karma upacāryaḥ sa kṛṣṇa c<1> ucyate 11

yat karma kāyastena [pari] [purayi] [rayam] ... tatra pradusṣajīto vacām hhasati 11 'idā' te kaṇśayanati 11

idān karma upacāryaḥ sa kṛṣṇa 11 11

---

1 Read nopaicitum i ushyājita 11.
2 Read āmpaśa 11.
3 Read jīhvaya 11.
4 Jēvā vyabhikavyā 11.
5 Probably this is a double danda, i.e., a double i or a double upa.
6 For idam.
25. tatra kata(14r.6) i. [ka]rnam kṛtaṁ comparitaṁ ca 1 ucyate 11
yat karma sāṁcetanakām 1

a) yathaṁ kṛtaṁ Bhagaṇaṁ vataṁ,

manahpūrvavagamā dharmaṁ manahāreśvā manojava
manasā ca pratistena bhāṣate 1 karoti va 3
tataṁ tam ucyate kham a(14r.5) + i. ukraṇaṁ va, vahatamīre 11
manahpaubavagamā dharmaṁ manesā-sūryāḥ manojava 2
manasā cet prasannena bhāṣate va karoti va
tataṁ sukham anvete cchāyā vā anuyāyini 11
idam krama kṛtaṁ ca(14r.6) + + [ta]jya 4 ca 11 11

---

1 Read manahāranam.
2 After this word, add va.
3 Read aṁ karoti.
4 Read ta-jyā.  
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26. katarat* karma (24v.4) naiva krttvat nopac"tau> 1 ucyste 1
yat* karma (a) smnetan"yanm svap(i)nntara'ktyam krttvat v4 1

idam karma naiva krttvat nopac"tau 11 (24v.5) 11 ⊗11

27. katarat* karma yena (7)mama "a i patagalo naak"etopapannah [1]
parip"ntu(a) nainiyam 'ty"nahap jy"vivayavat 1 ucyste 1<1>

ihakal(25r.1)ty"saun nairiyam karma krttvat huvaty upac"lam <1> sa tat* karmma
kva nairiyati 1 na vuyiyati 1 na vijayayati 1 na de"ayati 1 nica"te 1 na
jya(25v.2)kijakari 1 nainyatun samvaram jpyalyate 1 o bh"tasya nairiyav hra"katati 1
pritim atryal"yati 1 yath\DevadattaKoka\(25r.3)tyah 1

idam karma yena samamvagata patgalo o naak"etopapannah pari\"ntu(a)
na"i"yam 'ty"nahap jy"vivayavat 11 1 ⊗11

1 For smnetan"yanm; cf. RLSSD, s.v!: (two appearances in the MDV are sole reference of this entry).
2 For ma"nta.
3 Aksha mi a rewritten.
4 For pudalo.
5 This word p"ra"ya is rewritten. For \"p"ra"ya.
6 For b"yati; cf. RLSSG §16.46: b"yati as acc.sg.nt.
7 For ihakalyata: > at.
8 Originally written as it<, then its vowel sign i is erased and sign y is added.
9 For b"yati or b"nu"yati (see next section).
10 For \"p"ra"ya.
11 A- ending for F-ending.
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26. tatra katamam <ka>rima karma naiva kṛtam naivopacitam <ci> ucyate 11
yat karma stūntanikam na kṛtam na kārītam vā <ci>

idam karma naiva kṛtam naivopacitam 11 11

27. tatra katamam karma yena samasvāga(14v.1) 4 es posgalah narakeshapapannah
patipṛtṛṇam nairayikam āyuh kspayitvā cavyā[nti] i ucyate 11

ihākaityena nārākyaṁ karma kṛtam bhavaty upacitam sa tam kṛtvā nārttiyati 1 na
[jhēryi]e am na, ja<c>op.xte 1 na de[14v.2] 4 es te 1 nācante, na vyanitkaroti 1 nāyatyām
samvāram āpadyate 1 bhūyayaśu mā[braya]hṛṣyati 1 <ci> prītim utpādayati 1 yathā
Devadatta-Kośālika-prabhṛtye 11

idam karma yena samasvāgataḥ posgalah (14v.3) 4 riṣṭīrṇaṁ 4 nairayikam āyuh
kspayitvā cavyā[nti] i i 11 11

1 This sentence does not match to that of MS[A] but to that of the Fritsh/rajanbhāshagāyini/rahavatākāshān
「佛師善達長者憶業報經」(785, 1, 805c20-21): 「若有微塵。在干燥處。亦不放散。無覆障等。」

4 Read samasvāga(ṇaḥ).
3 For tatt (ctvarg. Acc.), cf. BHSV§21.11.
4 Read jhēryi/jhēyēti.
4 Read mā[braya]hṛṣyati.
4 Read mā[braya]hṛṣyati.
4 For hṛṣyati 1; see next section.
4 Read āpadyate.

iha ikaryena nai (25v.3) arikāyam karma kṛītaḥ bhāgalvayv upacitaṁ <1> sa tatātāṁ kṛīva nārttiyati i na viśhīrtī i na viśuṣṭayati i na desaṭati i nācaśe i na vyakārcarī (25v.1)-ṭi i nāryācayaṁ samvarāṁ āpadayat i api tu na bhūtyayaṁ nārttī bravayat i na prītīm utpādyayati i (na narakeśu-papannah 1 ardhana-nirayikaṁ ārya kṣapa (25v.2) yitrīva cyavati i)

idam karma yena sannava-gacah putāgalo 1 narakeśu-papannah 1 ardhana-nirayikaṁ ārya kṣapaṁtīva cyavati (25v.3)-i 11 1 11

29. katana (11) karma yena sannava-gatah (11) pudgalo narakeśu-papannah i maṭira eva cyavati i ucyate 11

iha ikaryena nārākāyam (25v.4) karma kṛītaḥ bhavaṁ upacitaṁ ca <1> kṛīva āṛti-cyayati i jāhīryate i viśuṣṭayati i ācaśe i desaṭati i vyakārcarī i ājī (25v.5) i yāntīyaṁ aśaṁvaram āpādyaṁ śṛtate i na pītnoṁ kṛānti i sa <1> narakešu-papādyate i upapāntamāttrā <evo> cyavati 1

a) yathā saśa rajā Ajātasaṅkarah i ma Deva (25v.1) dataśāhīyena śāntaṁ cyaykarma kṛītaḥ pīṛ-varāḥ samghūnabhedo Dhanapalamoksanam i śīlayamoksanam i Devadattasāyīvigamanaṁ śuṇāca tema (26v.2) saṁvīghītāygena Bhāgavati cittaṁ prájātāt 1 1
28. Ata krta karma ○ yena samavagatah pubdalo narakeshupapannah arddhansirayikan ahyo ksa papayita cyavajñiti i ucate 11

ihav(14v.4) + ty[e]n1 narakiyam karma krtam bhavay upacitas i sa tam2 krvi nartiyati 1 ○ na jehriyati i na viharati i na vijeyupute, na deasayati i nacaste na vamtkaroti 1 nayatyam samvaram apadyat(14v.3) + + + .1 na bhavyayi mitrayi hnya[n]jiti 1 na pritim upadayan 11

dam kar○ma yena samavagatah pubdalo narakeshupapannah arddhansirayikam ahyo ksa papayita cyavajñiti 11 11

29. tu(14v.6) + + + + + + ..ma samavagatah pubdalo narakeshupapannamatra eva cyavajñiti 11

ihakatyena narakiyam karma krtam bhavay upacitaṁ <1> sa tam krtvā ārthiyati 1 jehriyati 1 viharati 1 vijeyat(15r.1) + + + + + + + + + + .. yatī 1 vyavik[c]-[k]-roti 1 āyatiyam samvaram apadaye 1 na punaḥ kurate1 sa cet narakeshupapadyate 1 upapannamatra eva cyati 1

(a) yatha rajā Ajitaśatruḥ <1> tena Devadattasaḥṣayena inhā(15r.2) + + + + .tyā <1> pṛtvadhā1 1 sunghabhodho Dhanapalamokṣanam 1 tīlayantra; mokṣanam Devadattayaḍeṇa <1> tasmād avicinarakaṃ anāṃ śrutvā tena saṃvignena Bhagavati cittaṃ prasiddhi(15r.3) śū<1>

1 Read ihaśākyena.
2 For tat (cau.4), cf. BHISG §21.11.
3 Read āpadyate 1 ap nus.
4 Read tajra karamam karma ye/na.
5 Read vijeyupute 1 icate dekhyati.
6 W. c. for kurate.
7 Read vaścakarma kṣetraḥ, sa.
8 For pṛtvadhā.
9 Rewritten: te sovi.
10 Read praśiddhi(15r.1).
Srāminyaphalaśātreśā 'tyavadesārā 'pratishandhādā kusā-la-mālānī lī tene maras(26r:3)śkē citrā prasādītī 'asthibhir iti Bhāgavatān śrāpanam gacchāmi | sa upapadyamārā eva cyavātī

Idām karmā yena (26r:4) samanvāga-taṅga pudgale narakcēśaṇamānārātra cyavātī | 11    11

30. kharatār karmā niyapopattisārāṃ/vartanīyāt 1 ucayāt

ya[t]a līr(26r:5)ēva kvaś ucyaptattā pariśnāmaryāt 1 "samutrapadāyeyā" iti '1 sa tatropapadāyate 1

---

1 Srāminyaphalaśātra. The quotation in the MKP is discussed by Namkava (1984a: 60-62). According to him, this does not match any version of Akṣaraśahna's story found in Pali, Pāli texts and Chinese translations. Pāli: Sāṃyakāyadāsaśātra (DN.1, 4); Sāṃyakāyadāsaśātra (in Dīghakośa: Sūtānādakālaśātra; V.1, 102-210); Chi. (the Chāngāpiān) (former Chāngāpiān) (V.1, 807a-c). (In Jātakaśāna: V.1, 310-320).

† Kharatār is a term used in Jātakaśāna: V.1, 310-320. This term is not found in any other version of the Akṣaraśātra's story. The term "Kharatār" refers to a type of work that is used by a teacher to instruct his students. It is a type of commentary that is used to interpret the teachings of the Buddha.

2 "samutrapadāyeyā" is a term used in Jātakaśāna: V.1, 310-320. This term is not found in any other version of the Akṣaraśātra's story. The term "samutrapadāyeyā" refers to a type of work that is used by a teacher to instruct his students. It is a type of commentary that is used to interpret the teachings of the Buddha.
+ .. [ṣṭhānāḥsa]ttre 1 atyayadeśanam kṛtam 2 pratisamāddhāyā 1 kusalam 3 dhān 4

30. tatra katamam karma naiyātopaśaptriṣamvartanāyaḥ 1 ucyate 1

yat īrtvā upapattatvo pariśāno 1 "(15r.5) + .. papadya[relyāni] 5 iti 1 sa tatropapadyate 1

1 Read ṣṭhānāḥsa[ṣṭhānāḥtsa]ttre.
2 Rewritten: pr > pr
3 Read uṣṇapīṣa[ṇapīṣa]yaḥ.
yathā Bhāgavatam tā tīrtha tenu 'Śyamakajśātaka prabhṛtyaḥ (26v.1) tiva 'prajñāhṛtaḥ saśād upapatti' varṇyate: 1

idam karma niyātopyapattiśvāvarttaṇiyyaṁ 11 © 11

31. katamast karma niyātopyapattiśvāvarttaṇiyyaṁ 1 (26v.2) ucyate 1

yat(a) kṛtvā na kasṣād upapattai paśūtī: 1 mayasi i 'amutropapadyamyam' iti 1 ye savaḥ karmavāśād upapadyante 11

idam karma (26v.3) aniyātopyapattiti saśāvarttaṇiyyaṁ 11 © 11 ©

\[1\] Corrupted: Bhāgavata 'śāyam'. L-1 reads on the basis of MS[B]: Bhāgavata 'śāke' (p. 58).

\[2\] For 'śāke' : Śāmacchāsāke. M. Jahn published a critical text of the Tibetan Śāmacchāsāke fourteenth story of the Īḍākumāli of Haribhīra: 'Dīṛṛhā ṇākumāli (II) Des Śāmacchāsāke,' in: Wissen Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südostasiens, XX, 1976, pp. 37-74. In the A-Kopy (1), one śākun (1) titled 'Śāmacchāsāke (No. 101) is included and its story is parallel to Phī, Śāmacchāsāke No. 980, VI, 72-87. However, there is no description that one's fire is decided according to his pṛaśākāna.

\[3\] For upapattiyā:

\[4\] For kasā:
yathā Bhagavatā jātaka Śyāmācakṣa-jātakaprahoṁtri pranidhānavaśīd upapattu varṇoyate

idaṁ karma niyutopapattisanvaṁvatūtaniyāṇaṁ

31. (15v.6) + tamaṁ karma aniyutopapattisanvaṁvartūtaniyāṇaṁ ucyate

yat kṛtvā na kvacid upapattau pariṁśmayat "anumāna-padacyayam" iti yathā sarva karmavaśīd upapadyante

idaṁ karma aniyutopapāpa(15v.1) + [n]y[ṛ][at][t]aniyāṇaṁ

(to be continued)
Prabodh Chandra Bagchi (1898-1956)
A Model in the Beginnings of Indo-Sinic Buddhist Philology

Akira YUVAMA

Prefatory Note

Early in 1997 I was invited to contribute a paper to a volume in celebration of an eminent Bengali-born Swami Prabodh Chandra Bagchi (1896-1956) on the occasion of the centenary year of his birth. To my regret, however, my extremely busy schedule at that time prevented me from writing anything. A year after that I was instead asked to send a few lines of appreciative word on his works. I hurriedly wrote a short tribute in praise of the great Swami. I always felt much indebted to such pioneers in the field of modern Indian and Buddhist studies.

In that short notice I placed special emphasis on the background discussing how Bagchi’s work on Buddhist culture in India had developed even beyond the boundaries of his country, particularly to Central Asia and China. His wide range of interests lay in cultural aspects of Buddhism all over Asia. Without his teacher Sylvain Lévi, he might have not decided to pursue this line of research work.1 Bagchi was thus part of the lineage of French scholarship which began with Eugène Burnouf.2 After all the goal is the study of humanities across the globe.

However, my paper may have given a wrong impression. I have since heard no direct information from the organ in question as to whether or not it was published. No reply to my query in this connection has ever reached me from them, and to my knowledge this memorial volume never appeared. I have therefore decided to bring it out here in a totally revised form.

---

1 See Louis Renou, "Sylvain Lévi et son œuvre scientifique", Mémorial Sylvain Lévi (Paris: Paul Hammann, 1937); n. XXXVI. This article was originally published in the Journal de l”Historique Asiatique, CCXXXVIII (1936), p. 1-59. — cf. infra n. 41.

2 One may now consult Gokaranga Gopal Sengupta, Buddhism and its Earliest Western Sources (Calcutta: Calcutta University, 1993), esp. p. 213-215.

---

It seems the appearance of my book on Burnouf I have been feeling rather assimilated at having accomplished too many types in addition to my career’s mission of a number of works in the “Reference” section. I am only hoping to bring it out in fixed time and had led me to time to revise the composition. Although this seems like crying over spilt milk, I am momentarily hoping to write a short revision paper within a few years, if at all possible. In the meantime, more information of a relevant type may be available as request, if any.
Bagchi in his Motherland

It is a matter of pleasure for me to write a brief remark in appreciation of Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, a scholar of international reputation in the field of Buddhist studies. I believe that he is to be remembered as a scholar who developed a fresh approach to the relevant fields of study. However, it is impossible to describe him and his work within the limited space. I will therefore confine myself to taking a brief glimpse at his scientific activities, which he carried out on an international scale. This grand savant has left a vast range of academic achievements for the world of knowledge during his regrettably short lifetime. If he had lived a few more decades he must have benefited us even more.

In his motherland he was not just an extraordinarily distinguished scholar but also thoroughly amiable to anyone who had direct or indirect contact with him. Those fortunate students, friends and colleagues were innumerable, though many more have now lost their chance to meet him or work with him in person.

Through his writings, however, Prabodh Chandra Bagchi still benefits immensely those who are engaged in related fields of study. I am no exception. He has fostered a great many brilliant scholars both at home and abroad. Indeed, there were scholars senior to him, who have derived great advantage from him and who regard him with real adoration, for example, Suniti Kumar Chatterji (1890-1977).1 Bagchi’s shorter writings have fortunately been brought out in a book together with an index.4 One can witness the wide range of his interest. A number of his articles are written with full reference to Chinese source materials.

Bagchi’s Scope beyond the Subcontinent

V. Raghavan (1908-1979) remarked in a small booklet published on the occasion of the XXVI International Congress of Orientalists held in New Delhi in 1964. “One of the drawbacks of Indian Indology in the past has also been lack of exploitative original work in regions outside the country, i.e. in Greater….”

4 Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, Indological Studies: A Collection of Essays (Santu...
Indian regions. I would say that Prabodh Chandra Bagchi was a notable exception. In order to seek for the wonder that was India he tried to search for it not only within India but also beyond her boundaries.

On his second trip to the East, Sylvain Lévi (28.III.1863-10.X.1935) arrived at Santiniketan in the month of November 1921 at the invitation of Rabindranath Tagore (1861-1941) upon the foundation of the International University on 22 December. Lévi then deeply and richly influenced Bagchi. This well-known but beautiful story begins here. Following Lévi’s earnest advice Prabodh Chandra Bagchi travelled extensively, and was consequently able to bring out much fruitful research. Prabodh’s personal affection for his teacher was solidly planted when he accompanied Lévi to Nepal in 1922. It is enviable to see Madame Lévi describe him in her journal.5

Sylvain Lévi sent Prabodh Chandra Bagchi to so-called Iranianized South-East Asia. Hanoi was a world-renowned centre for such studies under the eminent directorship of Louis Finot (1869-1915), followed by George Cœdès (1886-1969),3 and the competent scientific patronage of Sylvain Lévi.4 Prabodh Chandra Bagchi doubtless got acquainted with a number of leading scholars there and became a pioneer in this field in India.

6 D. Sylvain-Lévi, *Dans l’éclat de Ceylan au début* (Paris: F. Rieder et C°, 1926), esp. p. 114 et suiv. Later in her diary she refers to him familiarly as Prabodh and mentions that he was going to follow his master to study for two years in Europe after one year in Hanoi (ibid., p. 168).

Both M. et Mme Sylvain Lévi must have enjoyed their trip to the East. A rare photo of the couple in Indian costume taken in 1922 at Santiniketan is found in a booklet: *Université de Paris – Institut de Civilisation Indienne 1921-1923*, p. 22.
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He further visited Japan in order to observe her Buddhist studies and seek for research materials. His master taught him the importance of the materials preserved in Japan and of the studies as well as the living religion observed there. On his first visit to Japan in 1897 Sylvain Lévi discovered much source material of great interest to him. In Tokyo later on Lévi established an intimate contact with his Japanese colleagues. In the meantime the Maison Franco-Japonaise was founded with the generous patronage of the then French Ambassador, as well as the dramatist and poet, Paul Louis Charles Claudel (1868-1955) and his Japanese counterpart the business tycoon Eiichi Shibusawa (渋沢栄一 ; 1840-1934). In September 1926 Sylvain Lévi arrived in Tokyo to take up an appointment as the founding director of the Maison (1926-1928). Strictly speaking, its establishment was legally approved in March 1924, and it was inaugurated in December 1924. Immediately after his arrival in Japan, Sylvain Lévi began to collect materials for the study of Buddhism in Japan. This must have become an indispensable guidebook for later students of Buddhism.

Incidentally, around that time a number of distinguished French scholars spent their youth in the East. Among many others it may be noted here that early in 1926 Alfred C. A. Foucher (1865-1952) came to Tokyo. Paul Demiéville (1894-1979) resided in Hanoi (1919-1924), Amoy (1924-1926) and Tokyo (1926-1931). Their base of academic activities was the Maison,11 from which the first fascicle of an indispensable work Hôkyôgen appeared in 1929 under the direction of Sylvain Lévi and Junjiro Takeda (高橋俊郎 ; 1866-1945) and the editorship in chief of Paul Demiéville.12 For any serious scholar


11 Sylvain Lévi, "Matériaux japonais pour l’étude du bouddhisme", Bulletin de la Maison Franco-Japonaise, Série française, No. 1 (Tokyo 1927), p. 1-63 (whole number); a portion of this article "Inventaire des sectes bouddhiques japonaises" (p. 25-34) is to be found in: Mémoire Sylvain Lévi, p. 319-340.


in the field of Buddhist studies must no doubt be indebted to its annexed volume. It is not just a table of contents of the *Taishō Teishitsu* (大正新編大藏経) but is full of useful information of Indo-Sinic as well as Sino-Japanese Buddhist literature.  

Needless to say, Sylvain Lévi must have constantly stimulated Prabodh Chandra Bagchi through his elaborate and elegant writings. Lévi had made a distinguished contribution not only in academic works but also for the benefit of the general public and students. And it was exactly around this period that Lévi brought out a collection of six essayists' but serious articles on India and its outer world in book form. This book includes an address delivered in English at the University of Deaca on 4 February 1922. I wonder if Bagchi had a chance to hear it.

**Bagchi and China**

Soon after his return home from Paris he brought out an ambitious book on the relation between India and China. At the very beginning of the "Foreword" to this book, he quotes his teacher's word seriously. Since I believe that it is the starting point of his studies, I would like to quote it here in full:

"In concluding one of his thought-provoking essays of *L'Inde et le Monde*, Professor Sylvain Lévi says, 'In the great movement of exchange, which constitutes our time immemorial, the organic life of the whole of mankind, India has largely given as it has largely received. We may, being carried away by our prejudice, exalt or depreciate her role; but her role she has played like the rest of the world with the rest of the world. If nature and laws have taught us their best to isolate her, thereby her part has only become a specially important one; each group, race or nation in its acts as in its thoughts, in its conscience as if its instinct, is related to the whole of humanity.'

"But we Indians, ignore too much that India has played her role like the rest of the world until the rest of the world. The isolation in which India is living to-day, shut up from the rest of Asia and her general movements, is a forced isolation of her evil days. She has got to break once more the colonial barriers around her and to come in close touch with the outside world on a basis of equality. . . ." (Bagchi, op. cit., p. 1).

---

Bagchi absorbed a great deal of French scholarship. He was always an ardent and beloved teacher at home. As I have demonstrated in my recent book on Eugene Burnouf, humanism is the keyword to understand the French scholarship in Buddhist studies, or Asian studies as a whole. Throughout his book Sylvain Lévi carries out his idea with humanism. Bagchi cited Lévi’s words in his translation. The original runs at the end of Chapter I “L’Inde et le Monde” of his renowned book:

"... Dans cet immense mouvement d’échanges qui constitue de temps immémorial la vie organique de l’espèce humaine, l’Inde a largement donné comme elle a largement reçu. On peut, au gré des passions, exalter ou dépréciar son rôle; mais son rôle, elle l’a joué comme le reste du monde, avec le reste du monde. Si la nature et les lois ensemble ont tout fait pour l’indiquer, son cas n’en prend qu’une valeur plus decisive: chaque groupe, race ou nation est dans ses actes comme dans sa pensée, dans sa conscience comme dans ses instincts, solidaire de toute l’espèce humaine.” (Lévi, op. cit., p. 21).

Later on Bagchi seems to have elaborately revised and enlarged his book in question in 1945 and 1950/1951. Bagchi loved things Chinese. He dedicated this book “To Friends in China — To show that we are not forgetful. The road is long, so do not mind the smallness of the present. We wish you may accept it.” 『示不空心／路遠未兇其少／願銘』 (op. cit., p. iii).

Incidentally, it is of great interest that a Chinese grand savant Chi Hiselin (李華林 06.VII.1911 - ) mastered many classical languages and achieved western methodology during his stay at Göttingen from September 1935 to October 1945. He returned to his home country in the spring of 1946 via Switzerland, France, Vietnam and Hong Kong and in autumn of the same year he was appointed to the chair of Oriental languages at the University of Peking. Since then he has contributed a great deal in the field of Indo-European, Indological and Buddhist studies. He is a scholar who has developed a fresh approach to the related fields of study in China. Chi Hiselin has absorbed much on German methodology and digested it onto his soil He has then promoted the digestion of his many students.

At the same time he has always shown his keen interest in the cultural relations between China and India. He has brought out a number of important works on the relevant topics. It is impossible to describe him and his achieve-

Un fortunately, I have not yet been able to see his India and China (Calcutta: China Press Ltd., 1945), 240 p. — cf. Nalinskha Dutt, Indian Historical Quarterly, XXI (1945), p. 151f.

Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, India and China. A Thousand Years of Cultural Relations. 2nd ed., revised and enlarged (Bombay: Hind Kitabs, 1950 / New York: Philosophical Society, 1951), viii, 234 p., 1 folded map (frontisp.)
ments in brief. He treats every topic meticulously in linguistic and historical perspective. It is fortunate that all of his important papers have appeared in a series of various collections. In 1982 Chi brought out a collection of his philological works, which contains his hitherto unpublished dissertation on the conjugation of the finite verb in the Mahābhārata-Avātimā submitted to the University of Göttingen in 1941. During this period he spelt his name as Dschi Hsian-lin. It is followed by a number of his collected papers, many of them being in duplicate.

It may not be an accidental coincidence that Prabodh Chandra Bagchi was guest professor at the University of Peking in 1947–1948 (as will be mentioned below). Chi loves things Indian. He has often visited India and made careful but affectionate observations. Being a well-known writer in prose and poetry, Chi has written hundreds of essays.

Sylvain Lévi had always tried to make the humanistic approach in the nucleus of his writing. I believe that this has been the essential tradition of

29 A detailed biographical sketch and a list of his publications can be found in: 東京大学教授


34 S 東京大学教授


36 See e.g. ^a nice pocketbook: 東京大学教授, 內天心 (天津: 中國社會科學出版社, 1980), (ii), 2, 126 p.

37 His interesting essays are to be found in: 東京大学教授

38 Although I cannot find any work of his in Chinese, there have been several books of his collected papers, many of them being in duplicate.

39 I am grateful to the East-West Center, Honolulu, for their kind hospitality and to the University of Hawaii for their generous support.
French scholarship in Indian and Buddhist studies since the foundation of Buddhist philology and of research into the cultural history of Buddhism by Eugène Burnouf (12.VIII.1801-26.V.1872).

Bagchi and French Scholarship

Bagchi can not have ignored Lévi’s wide knowledge of Indo-Asian linguistics. As mentioned above, during his first tour to Japan in 1897-1898 Lévi uncovered a number of important works. Among them were two Indo-Sinic dictionaries compiled in China and now lost there, but preserved only in Japan in blockprint. Prabodh Chandra Bagchi edited them with utmost care. However, printing wood blocks have often been sold and bought by dealers. And characters can sometimes be infixed in the printing wood. A blockprint may be slightly different from others. It is not exactly clear to me which printing Bagchi had really used. It is now eagerly hoped that a new critical edition will be prepared with more materials available now.

In any case, he then dedicated the volumes to the memory of his teacher at Calcutta, Sir Asutosh Mookherjee (1864-1924), as the first Indian organizer of scientific works: “A la mémoire / de / SIR ASUTOSH MOOKHERJEE / le / premier organisateur / des travaux / scientifiques dans l’Inde” (Bagchi, op. cit., II, p. (v)). Indeed, it was Sir Asutosh, who had sent him to Visva-Bharati, where he met his beloved lifelong master Sylvain Lévi. All those who have teachers or who are teachers of others cherish Sylvain Lévi’s name. In fact, Bagchi called him “mon cher Guru Monsieur Sylvain Lévi”.

27 Cf. e.g. Jules Bloch, Sylvain Lévi et la linguistique indienne, Leçon inaugurale lue au Collège de France le 11 avril 1917 (Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1927), 10 p. — Bloch read his inaugural lecture at the time when he succeeded to the chair of Sanskrit language and literature held by Lévi until his death (1894-1935).
31 On Sir Asutosh see e.g. A. P. Das Gupta, Anant Mookerjee (~ National Biography Series) (New Delhi: National Book Trust, 1973), (iii), 179 p.
Prabodh Chandra Bagchi's wide range of research work was brushed up under the efficient guidance of Sylvain Lévi in Paris for the period between 1923 and 1926. It was also in Paris, where Prabodh was fortunate enough to learn a great deal from various eminent scholars such as Antoine Meillet (1866-1936), Paul Pelliot (1878-1945), Jules Bloch (1880-1953), Henri Maspero (1883-1945) among many others. In connection with his work beyond the Indian boundaries Bagchi must have been influenced by Henri Cordier (1849-1925) as well as René Grousset (1885-1952). It was there, I believe, that he firmly attained the western methodology. In carrying out his research work he carefully consulted the first and second source materials written in both eastern and western languages either classical or modern. This is evident from reading his publications.

No one would deny Henri Cordier's remarkable contribution to Asian geography and history as well as his bibliographical works. It may therefore be interesting to know of his whole private library collection, which is now kept in the famed library named Shido Bunko at Keio University in Tokyo (since 1975). It was formerly in the possession of Lord Moritatsu HOSOKAWA (細川護熙/細川護熙, 1883-1970) of Kumamoto, who bought it at an auction during his stay in Europe. A scholar's library collection tells many stories of scientific research by itself. It is a library of about 5,000 books.

After the death of René Grousset a grand exhibition was organized in his honour in collaboration with a great number of scholars, collectors and museums throughout the world. Japanese specialists also lent their helping hands. Its wide range of coverage in Eurasia itself shows a vivid account of his scholarship and familiarity among the people.

In Paris Bagchi had fostered friendships with others who were there, even from the farthest east. Immediately after his return to India Bagchi began to

32 Cfr. e.g. Bibliographie des Œuvres de Henri Cordier, Membre de l'Institut, publiée à l'occasion du 75e anniversaire de sa naissance (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1924), VIII, 151 p., 1 portrait- frontisp.
bring out his detailed work on the Chinese Buddhist canon. He inaugurated the new series in Calcutta.14 Incidentally, I cannot but help feeling I am living in a completely different age, when I think of those days in which Stanislas Julien (1799-1873) was producing a number of important works out of the canonical literature in Chinese without having a complete set of the Tripiṭaka!

His rich international background often explains the quality of his research work. The book of outstanding value published immediately before his death is another example. The core of this work is a series of lectures he delivered in Calcutta as Hom Chandras Basu Mallick Professor of Indian History from 1949 to 1951. It is a work based upon a wide range of his well-documented knowledge. He turns his keen eyes and his profound and fresh insight, as always, to the relation of these studies to India, as the title gives eloquent proof.15 It is a pity, therefore, that Prabhodh Chandra Bagchi has given no detailed reference to his arguments. Once again Sylvain Lévi must have been his initiator in this respect. The Guru had shown him the path to the goal.16

Among many others Sylvain Lévi knew about the importance of Jain studies from Chinese source materials. It may well be worthwhile to mention here that Lévi seems to have encouraged Bagchi to take up Jain studies from this angle. Lévi writes about it in one of his many letters addressed to a famed Jain scholar.17

Sino-Indian Scholarly Friendship

He was not just a scholar who worked on ancient India and China, but also a bridge between the ancient world and the modern. In connection with his studies on Sino-Indian relations from historical perspectives, mention must

15 Prabhodh Chandra Bagchi, India and Central Asia (Calcutta: National Council of Education, Bengal / Printed at Santiniketan, 1955), (vii), 185 p., 1 folded map.
16 See e.g. Sylvain Lévi, "Central Asian Studies", Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, October 1914, Article No. XXVII, p. 953-963 (abstract of his paper read 16 June 1914). Bagchi may have missed this in his otherwise useful comprehensive "Bibliographie", op. cit., p. 162-163.
17 Letter to Vijnendra Swari. Published with an introduction by Raghu Vira (Bombay: Yashodharma Mandir - London: Arthur Prothstain, 1960), p. 131: "... Jainism requires a well trained Chinese Scholar. I hope that my new student P. C. Bagchi who is sailing back to India next June and who is good in Chinese and Tibetan will be of help on that side...".
be made of his appointment as the first visiting professor of Indian history and culture at the University of Peking. The Government of India accredited this position from 1947 to the next year. There he was intimately acquainted with the then President of Peking University, Dr. Hu Shih, in 1919-1962, one of the most prominent scholars at the time. It was in that university that a number of young and promising scholars of Indology were seriously working immediately after the World War II. In this connection it is indeed fortunate to see Jan Yün-hua at McMaster University in Hamilton, who has brought out a stimulating article (in Chinese). 40

If one carefully compares the works both of Sylvain Lévi and Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, it is clear that the influence may not just be one-way. But it is really beautiful and admirable to see how much Prabodh Chandra looked up to Lévi as his great role. Though briefly, he expresses his sentiment in his obituary. 41

After joining Visva-Bharati in 1945 he fostered a number of disciplines and disciples. He was elected Vice-Chancellor in 1974, when everyone had expected him to facilitate the work of students pursuing Chinese and Japanese studies in particular. His untimely death is still lamented by all serious scholars throughout the world.

If Bagchi had lived longer, he might have corrected the direction of what is called a "restoration" of Indic texts from their corresponding Chinese and/or Tibetan versions. I am very opposed to such projects. 42

Afterword in Short

In short, I have tried to place special emphasis upon the importance of international scientific intercourse and mutual understandings among academics.

40 Jan Yün-hua (袁厚華), "胡適與印度文化友人劉師月/Dr. Hu Shih and His Indian Friend - Dr. P. C. Bagchi", Chung-Hua Buddhist Journal (中華佛教學報), No. 6 (Taipei, July 1993), p. 263-278 (English summary on p. 278). Jan has added a useful list: 'A Bibliography of Dr. P. C. Bagchi's Works' on p. 272-277. Jan seems to have taken it from Sarkar (cf. infra n. 44). The works written by Bagchi in Bengali have regrettably been omitted.


Bagchi was undoubtedly an illustrious example in this regard. Therefore, I deeply lament for his premature death. It is the duty of the following generations to further promote his profound achievements in striving towards the goal of greater human knowledge. It is after all the globalization of the real humanities, not the cultural monopolization under the multiplicity of civilizations.

Finally, Professor Kalyan Kumar Sarkar at Windsor in Canada, one of the most distinguished among Prabodh Chandra Bagchi's students, was the author of a nice booklet offering a warm, if rather brief description of his teacher.44 He afterwards also wrote a tribute to his teacher containing a condensed description of works by Bagchi.45 In this connection it may be worth quoting some short obitaries of Prabodh Chandra Bagchi.46

---


45 Kalyan Kumar Sarkar, "Hommage au Professeur Prabodh Chandra Bagchi". Probus-Aistria: Revue mensuelle de culture et de synthése franco-asiatique, 13e Année: n° 144 / Tome XV (Saigon 1958), p. 207-209. - Incidentally, it may interest some colleagues to see a sabtitile "Pour le 2100e anniversaire du Pârśivavas du Bouddha" in the list of contents of this issue.

Miscellaneous notes on Middle Indic words

Seishi KARASHIMA

(1) BHS. bhikṣuṇe (४ पिक्षुणे): "monks!" (vocative plural)

In my recent article, "Some Features of the Language of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīkaśāstra," in Ino-Iranian Journal 44 (2001), I have pointed out (pp. 207-208) that the vocative plural, bhikṣuṇe — a back-formation of the "Mīgālāhīma" bhikkhura — occurs in the Lālāṃ fragments of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīkaśāstra (SP).

After I had sent the final revision of the above-mentioned article to the publisher, I noticed that there were more occurrences of this noteworthy Middle Indic form in other texts.

One of them is in a fragment of the SP from Khādaqū in the Stein Collection: H 57 Kha. 0011, 3. duṟtākham prādārīhīmaṃ bhikṣuṇe (तुष्‌ताक्षताऩिण)म (४ दृ. H 57 Kha. 0011, 3).


(2) BHS. pratīcarati : with anyenāṃyam "goes off upon another issue, leaves the talk aside, gets off the subject, pravacacaro"


This phrase may mean "He goes off upon another issue" which is the same as Paś, athīres' athīkam patīcarati 2. A similar form is also found in the Kāvyaparinirvāna śā (8b1).

---


2 Cf. PTD, s.v. patīcarati, The Book of the Discipline (Vinaya Piṭaka), II 164, ४. ४: Dialogue of the Buddha,

ARIRAB Vol. 1, 147-152, 2002. © 2002 IEJAB, Nara University, JAPAN.
(3) Gândhări ăghavaṭha (č Skr. ṣravaṇa): “householder”

Konow noted a long time ago that ăghavaṭha, found in a Kharoṣṭhī inscription, dated A.D. 134 (C.E. 77?), is a Gândhări form of Skr. ṣravaṇa (“householder”). Therefore, this is not a new finding at all. However, what makes me mention this word here is the fact that I have recently found that the puzzling Chinese transliteration ăkār (MC. kja[k]a?) in the meaning of “householder” is most probably based on this form (şravaṇa - ăghavaṭha). This word is contained also in the title of the Chinese translation of the Uyghurarparipṛcchā, 裏罽藏文翻譯問難行 (T.12, No. 523, 231); “Uyghuru-şravaṇa - paripṛcchā,” which has been normally incorrectly back-formed by modern scholars as “Uyghur-kāśaṇa - paripṛcchā or “Uyghur-kālaṇṭha - paripṛcchā.”

(4) Pi = BHS. ścāraṭha: “maintains, holds, claims, accepts, admits, approves of (a theory)”

BHS. deśāchānta: “one who maintains (a theory), or a theorist, pedant”?

In the Vīnītabhimagna (ed. C. A. F. Rhys Davids, PTS) the verb ścāraṭha occurs several times in the meaning “maintains, claims, thinks of (a theory)” or “approves of, admits” as follows:

I I I, 6, 2; “The Disposal of Deletion (Samāccavasādā), II, 273.


2 The word is found in order to transcribe the Indic velar consonants k, g.

3 This word is found in the following: T.2, No. 144, 868b20-869b2; No. 156, 875c20-875d6; T.4, No. 204, 500b6; No. 205, 507c7; No. 206, 510b6; T.7, No. 221, 328, 43, 710, 906, 1406, 1404b9; T.12, No. 337, 84a17, No. 342, 303b3; T.13, No. 418, 903a11; No. 419, 920b-7; T.14, No. 458, 440b15; No. 527, 801c-1, 807a2; No. 513, 899a4, 901b1; No. 514, 905b2; No. 535, 905c19; No. 556, 907c-7; No. 563, 913c6; T.15, No. 597, 113c1; No. 624, 135a4; No. 626, 392c3, 403a2; T.17, No. 805, 750b-6, 750a11f; T.21, No. 1331, 132a22f; T.24, No. 1471, 927b.

4 Please read this in light of the preceding discussion on the origin of the Khăi-ṭha (v. 2).

5 I wish to thank my colleague, Nōtāyak Kudo, for bringing my attention to this transliteration and its problem.

6 This meaning of ścāraṭha is not recorded in dictionaries including CPD and the newly-published A Dictionary of Pāli, by Margaret Cone Oxford 2001 (PTS). The latter dictionary (v. ścāraṭha [2]) gives “approves, allows, prescribes” to this verb, but only as a grammatical technical term, quoting the Paramatthaparihāra I and the Saddhāni. Similarly, Monier-Williams; A Sanskrit-English Dictionary (v. Ś) gives “to acknowledge, maintain, regard, think” also as a grammatical term. Cf. Points of Controversy v Subjects of Discussion, Being a Translation of the Kāțha-tantra, by Shaws Zoé Ang and Mrs. Rhys Davids.
310.20f. akkharacintaka pada astham avicintita "nāmam atmam etam" ti icchāmi, ye ti astham vićinteti, ti satāmyuṣayavi(c.1. satta) "satā" ti icchāmi.11
338.10f. āsvamamakākkramaṇa ca sastrau ti bhūcaveti imāni aṣṭī gītāvāsānām eṣā ti icchāmi subhāvāne 12
775.20f. aṣṭī gītāvāsānāma vācāśamānaḥ pariṣṭhitā eva astham apāyogatā addhā tam bhūvaśākṣakān na bhūt.12
692.27f. ye pada nāmaśūlamanam icchāmi asam uttam Abhidharmo Kāṭhāṭhāni susam eva.13
A similar usage of this verb is also seen in the Kathāvāsānāmapakṣaṇa-āṣṭikākatha, ed. N. A. Jayewicrama, London 1979 (PTS), as follows:
37.2f. Sammitīya Vajjiputtakā Suzakactātādido etace ca Mahāyānabhih araham p(i-.) paryābhāṁya icchāmi 14
41.5f. satthayya paramīvasa-vasavatāvirodhe upādāya tad upari deva muggahāvāmanam pī na icchāmi sāvattabhāṁya Sammitīya 15
85.15f. satthayya susamāmiprītaicchā naśānam icchāmi, sāvattabhāṁya Anbhikā 16 etc. etc.
The word icchāmi, with the same meaning as in the above-cited Pāli texts, is also found throughout the Abhidharmakosa and in its commentary. For instance:
āsūlamanicchāyāpya kanyāya śrutipakṣapravarthā bhyaśattaya-icchāmi 17

---

11 "Patiṣṭhāṇavāñgaga-āṣṭikākatha I 57.20f.
12 "However, in the (buddh) etymology who do not consider meaning have it that it is a mere name, while those who do consider meaning have it that it a 'being' (satta) is so called with reference to the 'bright principle' (satta). The Path of Purification: Vimalakīrtavigga, translated from the Pali by Bhikkhu Śāntamati, 1956 Colombo A. Serage; 1991 Sandy: Buddhist Publication Society, pp. 302-303.
13 "While redempted by surrounding of the object they are four, the wise do not admit surrounding of factors that one cannot recognize." (ib. 331).
14 "Some words also have 'definition of factors and object', but since that is not given in the commentator it is certainly not being handled in the development." (ib. 371).
15 "But those who would have it that [the different truth] are presented to separately, more is said in the Abhidharmas in the Kathavatīthā." (ib. 719).
16 "The Sammitīyas, the Vajjiputtakas, the Vāsakacchāya, and some of the Mahāyānakas maintain that an yahana can fall away." Cf. The Dhāranī Commentary, trans. by S. C. Law, Oxford 1989 (PTS), p. 4, wherein icchāmi translated as 'induced to the belief'.
17 "But some, for instance the Sammitīyas, do not believe in any Way-culture among the higher devisa." (ib. 48).
18 "But some, for instance the Anbhikas consider that insight into any part of the future is possible." (ib. 106).
20 "Some admits that even one who is skilled in the art and one who is well practiced and has a good department (acquire supernatural powers)."
This was commented upon by Yasomitra as follows: 19.
ichantika Vaihāyakābā 20.
In the same Abhidharma-kosavākyāyā, we find also the following set phrase:
40.27, 141.4, 362.21 etc. tad evam nīcchānti Vaihāyakābā 21.

From these examples, it can be clearly seen that the word ichchati, both in Pāli and Buddhī Sanskrit, is used in contexts where theories or doctrines of a certain school are concerned.

I, further, assume that the word ichchantika (—常, as MC,  הבית: diei), whose etymology remains obscure 22, may be somehow 23 derived from the verb ichchati in the above-stated meaning.

Numerous characteristics of ichchantikas, as antagonistic towards Mahāyānists, are described fully in the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, T.12, No. 374, 418ff. From the descriptions found in this Sūtra and elsewhere, 24 we know that they were by no means outsiders of the Buddhist community, but rather they were, in general, monks, some of whom even looked like arhats or bodhisattvas. Also, they are not depicted as greedy, desirous persons in the scriptures, though modern scholars have defined them as such due to their name being associated with the verb ichchati "desire". The common characteristic of these ichchantikas is that they, as monks, rejected Mahāyāna scriptures and denounced Mahāyānists.

I suppose that those who argued by "maintaining, claiming, or approving of" theories, but at the same time, disapproved of Mahāyāna scriptures, were labelled as ichchantikas, namely "those who maintain" or "pedants", by Mahāyānists. In conclusion, ichchantikas were presumably none other than orthodox monks who discredited Mahāyāna doctrines.

If we accept the above, then, we may understand the play on words, used in the following passage.

sattvah, bhavantāhum pramāṇā Mahāyānām anichchantikā lokaḥ kena pravartate? —

bhavantāhum pravartati ko yāyāyānāṁ sa nāṭītānāṁ-cintāya-rodhānāñātā iti

23. Cf. BHSID § 22.29.
burewate sartukdalemisitaragatan na nirayanti 24"How, Mahāmāti, is it that those who maintain (sahāntaka) do not have a desire (sahānti) for emancipation? ... One, who rejects and denounces the bodhisattva collection (of scriptures), saying that it is not in conformity with the Sūtras, disciplines, and emancipation, will not enter into Nirvāṇa, because he has forsaken all roots of merit (by such deeds)." 25

(5) BHS. mano (c. "pāṇo < Skt. pāmaṇa) "again"

In K. Fujita's edition of the Sākhāvatīparāsha, we find the following verse:

\[ \text{te pūpasātā saṃkhāraṇi} \]
\[ \text{udāgastā avāda prītye} \]
\[ \text{vīcam prabhāṣāni pūna tu nāyake} \]
\[ \text{amāgya kṣetram iṣya evaśrīgam} \]

As the first and third lines are problematic, I cite the readings of manuscripts here. First, an older palm-leaf manuscript (abbr. E), dating back to the middle of the 12th century; 27, now at Ritsukoku University, Kyoto, reads the lines in question as follows:

\[ \text{te pūpasātā mano kīranti ...} \]
\[ \text{vīcam prabhāṣāni pūna tu nāyake ...} \]

Another older palm-leaf manuscript, dating back to 1152/1153 C.E. (abbr. NI), now at the National Archives, Kathmandu, reads as follows:

\[ \text{te <pūpa-pāṭhō mano kīranti ...} \]
\[ \text{hānu\* prabhāṣāni pūna tu nāyake ...} \]

It is clear, therefore, that the reading of Fujita's edition differs from these two older manuscripts. The other extant manuscripts, which are all written on paper and probably not dating back earlier than the 17th century, read the lines in question as follows:

\[ \text{te pūpasātā (c. J. "pāshā, pākērē) pūna (c. J. pūna) kīranti ...} \]
\[ \text{bāhu\* prabhāṣāni pūna tu nāyake ...} \]

Thus, we realise that the reading of Fujita's edition differs also from these relatively new manuscripts. How did the discrepancies among manuscripts occur and what was the

24 Sākhāvatīparāsha, ed. B. Nāmiṣa, Kyoto 1923, p. 65, l. 17.

26. avāda prabhāṣāni pūna tu nāyake ... // (A. Ashikaga, Sākhāvatīparāsha, Kyoto 1965, p. 44, II. 21-24). Gōmez translates this verse, based on the same edition, as follows: "Elated, incomparably elated, they shower handfuls of flowers over him, and again they declare this vow before the Leader. 'May we also have a field like this one!'" (The Land of Bliss: The Paradise of the Buddha of Measureless Light, Luis O. Gómez, Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press 1996, p. 90).
27 For descriptions of these manuscripts, see Fujita, op. cit., I. p. vv.
28 Probably a corruption of saṭān.
more original reading?

Concerning the third line, I assume that the readings, pana ru and pana to, were corrupted forms of parasita, parašita (m.c.) "parasitaṁ"<sup>25</sup> (Skt. parasitaḥ), due to the similarity between the Indian characters ru and to.

Now, looking at the first line, the readings papaśitaḥ-bhūṣaṇa are probably corruptions of papaśitaḥ-bhūṣyaḥ. However, more problematic is the reading mānu in the palm-leaf manuscripts. As the paper manuscripts read pana<sup>22</sup> "again" (c Skt. pana), we may assume the word mānu was used in this meaning, too.

Also, as the bodhisatvas are described, in the verses immediately preceding the verse in question, to have scattered flowers once, the expression "(scatters) again", therefore, agrees with the context.

I assume the word mānu in these older palm-leaf manuscripts is a Gāndhāra form, derived from Skt. pana: mānu<sup>13</sup> <i>c. pana</i> <sup>14</sup> <i>c. pana</i> which the Nepalese scribes seem to have recognised correctly as such and rendered into the regular Buddhist Sanskrit form pana, while modern editors of the text misinterpreted it and wrongly back-form it as same-(trumas) (prob. <i>c. Skt. same-stuṣṭa</i>-) which is not found anywhere else.

We may translate the verse as follows:

"Delighted, they scatter again wondrous flowers over (śrīmālābha) with incomparable joy, and they utter the (following) words (nāc) in front of the Guide: 'May our field be like this one!'"<sup>465</sup>


26 Cf. Ps. parasitaṃ. For the ablative is -am, cf. v. Hinüber, op. cit. § 304.

27 The verb kārṇa ("scatter") is often combined with the ablative form of noun; cf. PW., ex. Kar.

28 The reading pana in some manuscripts is a corruption of pana, due to the similarity between the characters ru and to.


30 Cf. Ps. pana, pana.

31 Cf. "wish" (c. kāmā).


Brief Communication

On the Authenticity of the Kongoji Manuscript of An Shigao’s *Anbo Shouyi jing* 舊版守夷經

Recently two closely related manuscripts (甲本 / A, 乙本 / B) containing, among other texts, a scripture named *Anbo shouyi jing* 舊版守夷經 (hereafter ABJS) have come into light among documents kept at the Kongoji 金剛寺, near Osaka. This ABJS, which is preceded by Kang Senghu’s 嚴勝慧 well-known preface (cf. Zhou sanzang ji ji 釈三藏記集 T.2145 p.45 a-c; T.602 p.163 a-c), has been promptly identified as a version of An Shigao’s 安世高 homonymous translation (ABSV) T.692. However, the fact that the Kongoji ABJS is completely different from the text transmitted in the canon (T.692), though itself far from being unacceptable, raises unavoidably the issue of its authenticity. Luckily enough, some evidence is provided by the indirect tradition.

The Chinese Canon has preserved two commentaries which are commonly believed to be the earliest surviving Buddhist scriptures composed in China. They are the *Yin chi ru jing zhu* 聖持入教註 T.1694 (hereafter YCRJZ), attributed to Chen Pui 陳愔, and the anonymous interlinear commentary to the first chapter of the *Dai mingdu jing* 大明度經 T.225, i.e. Zhi Qian’s 至善 translation of the *Aṣṭacandraśīla Pañcāśīla-pratīyāga* (hereafter DMJ). These two commentaries show some significant similarities, from the viewpoint of both doctrinal content and style, and were very likely composed in the same area (the kingdom of Wu 處) and period (8th century AD). The YCRJZ and the DMJ commit a number of early translations, one of which, referred to as *Anbo-shō-ji*, is most likely - given the early date of these commentaries - the ABJS translated by An Shigao.

---

1 See a recent article by the author of this most important finding: Kajima Susumu 青柳進, "Kongoji zukeho to shihbunsho An Shigao yaku kyoten" 金剛寺足取と聖傳本能安世高撰, in *Buddhismu seminar* 佛教數學セミナー n.75, May 2001, pp. 25-44. I wish to express my gratitude to Prof. Oehyai Toshiba, who kindly allowed me to take part in his research group on the Kongoji manuscript.

2 That the ABJS as transmitted in the Canon is a badly corrupt text, full of interpolated glosses, has been widely recognized since early times: see for instance the colophon of T.602 p.173a 23-26, which in fact is most likely by Sugi 史賀, the main editor of the 19th century Korean edition of the Canon: see his *Koryo-guk cho-jo tao-jang kyo-jang jyokguk* 高麗國朝教萬經刊, Seoul 1402, Korean Canon, Koryo, vol. XXVIII p.647a; cf. Kajima, op. cit. p.57. However, the difference between the manuscript ABJS and T.602 is such that we cannot explain it only by these interpolations (but, on the other hand, cf. n. 6 below).

Two quotations from this "Amoban" 安般 found in the YCRJ/Z have parallels in the Kongjô manuscript of the ABSYJ (hereafter "manuscript"; reference is made to the manuscript A):

1) YCRJ/Z T 1694 p. 12c 8-9 (commenting on the 法分別觀意識 dhammanyavaya sambojhaṭṭhasaṃ) see You chi yu jing 雲持入經 T 608 p. 174b 5:
   安般曰， 慧法觀意識。  
   Cf. manuscript line 201:  
   ... 是名慧法觀意識。

   安般曰，應念觀意識。  
   Cf. manuscript line 200 (same term).

The YCRJ/Z contains one more reference to the 安般, which I have been unable to find in the manuscript, as well as some quotations from a commentary on this text, referred to as "Amoban ja 安般解. The untraceable quotation (YCRJ/Z T 1694 p. 11c 21-22) reads (the punctuation is tentative):

安般曰，念因有分念意無相，所空、不願、無想定，向泥洹門也。

At present I am inclined to consider this as a quotation from the commentary 安般解, wrongly referred to as 安般. The three sambojhaṭṭha mentioned in this passage (stānāyata, apraniñhitā, anāvittam) are indeed dealt with extensively in the manuscript (see especially II. 127-157), but, significantly, not in T 602.

The DMDJ/comm contains only one quotation from the 安般, but it is by far the most significant: DMDJ/comm T 225 p. 478c 7:

3) 安般曰，逝為何等？逝五陰知見滅處。

This corresponds almost perfectly to line 109 of the manuscript (the latter has 減處 instead of 滅處).

It is noteworthy that none of these three quotations can be traced to T 602.

All these facts, I believe, suggest that the text preserved in the Kongjô manuscript is the one translated by An Shigao. Needless to say, there are still many obscure points in the history of the ABSYJ which need to be explained, especially the very intricate relationship between the Kongjô text and T 502, and the problem of the two versions of the ABSYJ (大 / 小) attributed by some catalogues to An Shigao.

Stefano Zavohetti

---

1 That this quotation has 識意 instead of 識識意 as in the manuscript is perhaps simply due the influence of the passage of T 605 commented upon; in the latter, sambojhaṭṭha / sambojhaṭṭhayas is indeed translated as 識意.

2 However, it is interesting to observe that T 602 p. 167a 29-29 and if, seems a gloss upon the passage on 遺 quoted by the DMDJ/comm (see number 5 above), although the passage itself is not found in T 602, except in the form of two abridged lemmat: 遺五陰者等... 何等為便知滅處... Note that this second lemma (滅處) would confirm the manuscript reading.
活動報告

平安：3年3月以降の研究所のあゆみ

「仏教仏教学高等研究所運営委員会」を年に2回、3回の割合で開催。
「仏教仏教学高等研究所運営委員会」を2回の割合（春期、秋期休暇外を除く）で開催。
以下、月日を経て研究所および別の活動に回転を記す。

平成13年
3月1日(火)～14日(木) 櫻山隆一所長・平野静志教授・工藤覚之講師
教東洋哲学研究所 第17回学術大会に出席

3月25日(日) 平成12年度外国語研究員
ロシア科学アカデミー東洋学研究室研究員
マルゴリータ・ヴォロピョーヴァ＝デシャトフスカヤ博士、共同研究を替え講師

3月31日(土) 櫻山所長 退任

4月1日(日) 増野博史（本学人文学科教授） 所長として着任（兼任）
桜山前所長 研究所顧問に就任

4月5日(木) ボリス・オゴビーニュ（Prof. Dr. Boris Oguibénine）
ストラスブール大学教授 来所

4月17日(金) シルヴィオ・ヴィタ（Prof. Dr. Sibio Vita）
イタリア国立東方学研究所所長／ナポリ大学教授 来所

4月19日(月) 年報・研究叢書発送
・「創価大学・仏教仏教学高等研究所年報」 平成12年度(第4号) [3月31日付]
・Seishi Kamijima, A Glotary of Kamijima's Translation of the Lotus Sutra
妙法華経英典, 2001, xxxix + 528 pages.

4月27日(金) 工藤講師
仏教大学総合研究所「仏教と自然」研究班研究会に出席
（於: 仏教大学総合研究所）

5月1日(火) ステファノ・ザケッティ（Dr. Stefano Zacchetti）助教授として着任

5月25日(金) 工藤講師
仏教大学総合研究所「仏教と自然」研究班研究会に出席
（於: 仏教大学総合研究所）
6月30日(土)～7月1日(日) 宮野所長・工藤講師
日本印度学仏教学会第32回学術大会に参加（於：東京大学）
30日の理事会にて創価大学の総務会の会が正式に承認される
理事会にて宮野所長出席
（理事・評議員に宮野所長・評議員に篠山明教授）

7月27日(金) 工藤講師
佛教大学総合研究所「仏教と自然」研究会研究会に出席
（於：佛教大学総合研究所）

8月21日(金)9月7日(金) 宮野所長中国出張
8月24日(金) 中国人民大学・仏教与宗教理論研究所にて「中国共産法華経思想的解釈」と題して研究発表
8月28日(金) 中国社会科学院世界宗教研究所において「仏教と豊穣の法華経観の比較」と題して研究発表
9月5日(金) 東洋哲学研究所・世界宗教研究所共催「第二回日中共同シンポジウム」において「仏華経中常不動音諭の実践及び其在中国和日本の実体化状況」と題して研究発表

12月12日(水) 第15回仏教学懇話会
東洋学園大学チャールズ・ミュラー（Dr. Charles Muller）教授を招聘
テーマ「起信論、元曉、圓覺経において変換された唯識の二論」

12月21日(金) 辛隆教授・工藤講師
佛教大学総合研究所「仏教と自然」研究会研究会に出席
辛隆教授「初期大乗仏教派論の成立と対立」と題して発表（於：佛教大学総合研究所）

平成16年
1月17日(木) 第16回仏教学懇話会
オスロ大学イェンス・プロールヴィック（Prof. Dr. Jens Braarvig）教授を招聘
テーマ“The Thesaurus Litteraturae Buddhicae - a new attempt on Buddhist lexicography”

1月23日(水) 第17回仏教学懇話会
Eörvő Lőrincz大学助教授イムレ・ハマル（Dr. Imre Hamar）博士を招聘
テーマ「ハンガリーにおける仏教研究」

1月25日(金) 工藤講師
佛教大学総合研究所「仏教と自然」研究会研究会に出席
工藤講師「仏教と自然と世界の成長・衰退——如何にしてカルマは世界を変えるか」と題して発表（於：佛教大学総合研究所）
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『真理の宝と物語 仏法総論経 現代仏教』 上, 各村, 2001-1, 平行出版 (Annotated Translation of the Fa Pu jing, Part One, April, 2001-4, Tokyo: Daishi Shuppan).

『真理の宝と物語 仏法総論経 現代仏教』 下, 各村, 2001-12, 平行出版 (Annotated Translation of the Fa Pu jing, Part Two, December, 2001-12, Tokyo: Daishi Shuppan).
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