Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2002
Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism (ARRIRIAB) at Soka University for the Academic Year 2002
Vol. VI

目次 CONTENTS

● 研究報告 RESEARCH ARTICLES

Akira YUZUYAMA
The Bihitsu-Prakaraṇa of the Mahāyāna-Mahāyāna-Lokakṣetravidyā: Quoted by Santideva in his Bodhicharyavatara

Nanayuki RUOJO
The Mahakāmarāja-hömei and the Karmarāja-hömei (5): Translations of the Original Manuscripts Preserved in the National Archives of Nepal

Senshi KARASHIMA

Senshi KARASHIMA
Sanskrit Fragments of the Sutra of Golden Light, the Lotus Sutra, the Ayavritamahādeviyakṣara and the cittamadābhāvabhīṣadāhāraṃ in the Osaka Collection

Duan Qing and Peng Shuang
A Newly Found Sanskrit Fragment from Dambang

Joe NAYRIO
The Ten Epistles of the Buddha in the Translations of Zhu Qian 祝漁

Srinivas ZACCHETTI
The Rediscovery of Three Early Buddhist Scriptures on Meditation: A Preliminary Analysis of the Saṃgha, saṃgha, mañjī, the Saṃgha jā saṃgha mañjī Translated by An Shih-hui and Their Commentary Preserved in the Newly Found Kong-fu Manuscript

Haoshi KANNO
Chinese Buddhist Sutra Commentaries of the Early Period

Akira YUZUYAMA
Groundwork Layers for Buddhist Sūtra Philology in America

Akira YUZUYAMA
Introducing Three Recent Japanese Publications on the Dharmapāla Literature

Akira YUZUYAMA

a) “Some Philological Remarks on and around Kukai’s Kryōdōgashō (patibrāhmi),” ARRIRIAB, V. Year 2001 (March 2002), pages 27-41.


March (Akira YUZUYAMA)
Metsubōnō Bibliographica Buddhica (I)

March (Akira YUZUYAMA)
近刊書誌紹介(3) [Introducing New Publications in Several Lines (3)]
Brief Communication:
Seishi KAKASHIMA:
Two peculiar omanwendoṣu in the Central Asia MSS

Noriyuki KATO:
One More Extra Folio Included in the Bundle of Mṣ[A] of the Mahākāranarājaṃbhoga
Preserved in the National Archives of Nepal, Kathmandu

ARIRIAB BULLETIN:

Editorial
Contributors to this issue
Editorial Backscript
New Publications/Back Issues [ARIRIAB, BPPE]
The Bhiksu-Prakirnaka of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins
Quoted by Sāntideva in his Sīkṣāsamuccaya

Akira YUYAMA

Prefatory - This humble article was written in celebration of my old friend, Professor Dr. Josef Kuhnert, President, Oriental Institute at the Czech Academy of Sciences in the capital city of Prague, on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. Josef, five days senior to me, is world-renowned for his remarkable achievements in the field of Sanskrit texts. Those who are engaged in Indian and Buddhist studies owe much to him, particularly to his work on Tibetan Buddhist literature. The original idea to present this paper had come from my colleagues, Professor Libuša Chuchvoldová, Editor-in-Chief of the Arctis Orientalis and her guest editors, Professor Legközi Chalambodi and Martin Slobodník, who so kindly invited me to his commemorating volume. I have been decided to publish it here separately somewhat in revised and enlarged form, for, I felt, it is far out of the place from his specialty and furthermore the troublesome work for the printer to keep my complicated text revolved for the press. Hereewith I express my sincere gratitude to the editors and ask them every success in this existing enterprise.

0.0.0. In this paper I would like to make some philological remarks on a fragmentary citation in the Sīkṣāsamuccaya by Sāntideva (around 700 CE).1 It is a matter of great significance for the history of ideas in Indian Buddhism, for the celebrated Mahāyāna master has cited it.2 It is also of great importance from the viewpoints of Buddhist Sanskrit textual transmission. This is not just for the recovery of the missing literature but for linguistic peculiarities of the extant texts belonging to the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins (cf. infra §1.0.0-1.0.2).

0.0.1. There are certain complicated questions with regard to the authorship of Sāntideva and thus the relation of the Sīkṣāsamuccaya to the Buddhistārāma-śāstra. In this connection one cannot overlook a series of serious work brought out by Akira Saitō (齋藤明) in recent years.3 In order to discuss the above-mentioned questions (cf. supra)

---


2 For a condensed but comprehensive survey of writings by the Mahāyāna masters on among others an indispensable work by David Seyfort Ruegg, The Literature of the Mahāyāna School of Philosophy in India (= A History of Indian Literature, VII. 1) (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1981), esp. p. 82-86, 128 & 131 (Sāntideva).

§0.0.0), however, it is most important to ascertain if the cited passage in its present form has been correctly transmitted to date. It is fortunate, therefore, that Cecil Bendall has presented the Indic text edited carefully on the basis of a single manuscript of good quality kept in the University Library of Cambridge (Add. 1478). This edition princeps inaugurated the ambitious series under the editorship of his friend Ser- gei Ofenbourg in St. Petersburg. On its appearance Utrai WOGHEJRA published a short review article, full of interesting suggestions, with a focus on the relation of the Chinese version to the Indic. P. L. Vaidya followed Bendall in his edition.1

1.0. Bendall has carefully listed the works cited in this text. Strangely enough, however, on the list he has not mentioned this text in question. He knew that there was no corresponding text either in the Chinese Tripitaka or Tibetan Kanjur with reference to the catalogues by Bunyia Nanjio (Oxford 1883) and Alexander Csoma-Léon Feer (ibidem). K. F. by Bendall in his footnotes: Calcutta 1832-1836 / Paris 1881 respectively. The text cited by Santiadeva in its Sktutedasvamya reads as follows in Chapter VII: Bhoga-punya-rakab saapatam pratisedhap (ed. Bendall, p. 154-17153; ed. Vaidya, p. 86-5-11):

yathoktam bhikhu-prakrutvah (1) / bhogasatan aha / ma bhaya2 bhiksu ma bhaya bhiksu / aham te bhikshudasthisam (Vaidya: bhiksu-aparthik) / aha sa bhiksu caturana yatac et dhexati (1) (Vaidya: dhexati) / cema abhi aparyam anando bhugramast iti iti avocat / ma bhugaram etiya glanasya-sarva-sarviki samah samah / abh no glansat dhexati (Vaidya: "am") / bhogasatan aha / tana by ananda cema etiya bhiksuva caturana dhera / tathaga vadeka aham (Bendall: 155)xerijati / aha kho bhant aparyam anando yatra glansat bhiksuva caturana dhera / bhugaram vadeka ati katac // pr (Vaidya: pâtyam) // aha kho bhant aparyam anando yatra glansat bhiksuva sikhoh ca siddho ca siddho

4 Cecil Bendall has described it with utmost care, but with a caption "Sktutedasvamya by Jay- dihva". Catalogue of the Buddha.
cānuparigṛhya bahiddhāḥ 1) karṣitaś māṃсут 2) bhogasaṁ udadhānām āśirtatitāḥ 3)

Bendall’s footnote on p. 154:
2) Nor in Nāgāra or K.F.; Tib.-de-sk-ṣ-phy-ba-ba-rgyas-pa (V6.5.3).
3) Prakrit and Pali forms.

Bendall’s footnote on p. 155:
1) Śūdraś u karṣitaś MS. With karṣitaś for harṣita compare the Pali.

0.1.1. Bendall and Rouse translate this portion as follows (p. 153f.):

“As it is said in the Bhikṣu-prakārīnaka. ‘The Blessed One (p. 114) said: ‘Fear not, Brother, fear not, Brother; I will serve you, Brother. Give me your robes while I wash them.’ When he had thus spoken, the Elder Āṇanda said to the Blessed One, ‘Let not the Blessed One wash the dirt-stained robes of this sick man; I will wash them, Blessed One.’ The Blessed One said, ‘Well, Āṇanda, you wash the robes of this Brother; the Tattākāya will pour the water. Then [115] indeed Elder Āṇanda washed the robes of that sick man, and the Blessed One poured the water. . . . Then indeed Elder Āṇanda would take the sick Brother outside with all care, and wash him, and the Blessed One poured the water.’

Notes on the translation by Bendall and Rouse:
1) Omit the vocative biṣṇu, ‘Brother.’
2) In the edition made teṣaṁ gāmaṇyaḥ kṣīrṣapaṇa, ‘of other sick Brother’.

1.0.0. In search of more Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit literature Franklin Edgerton excelledly paid his increasing and special attention to this quotation (Edgerton, BHSGr, p. 5: §1.37, n. 14):

“No other fully preserved work is comparable with Me in presenting its prose parts, as well as the verses, in a largely Middle Indic guise. We know, however, that there must have been others. In Shiśa (154.17), which is a prose passage cited from a lost work called Bhikṣu-prakārīnaka, and this prose is precisely like that of Me, and radically different from the prose of any other work preserved to us . . .”.

1.0.1. Soon after it Franklin Edgerton delivered a series of lectures at Banaras Hindu University as Holkar Visiting Professor of Indology (1953-1954). It was published in book form. In it he furthered his astute observation on Śantideva in more detail.4

... The Śikṣāsamuccaya, ‘Summation of Instruction’, by Śantideva, is a work unique in

4 In the Appendix “Svāroddhārasūrya” (p. 167-200) Vaidya offers a very useful list of citations in the Śikṣāsamuccaya. What Vaidya cites under the Bhikṣu-prakārīnaka (p. 202), however, is unknown to me: “Bhikṣu-prakārīnaka (Being cited by K. P. Jayaswal, Pune) (1) 865 bhogasaṁ gāmaṇyaḥ kṣīrṣapaṭṭhānam; (2) 861 (svarddhārasūrya mahādhyāna)”.

5 Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Language and Literature. Ten Public Lectures by Franklin Edgerton (Banaras Hindu University, 1954), p. 56 cum fn. *.


Character, … and Śāntideva’s readings are often very helpful in correcting errors in our manuscripts and editions. Even more important are the numerous quotations from lost works, not known to exist in Indic languages (some are found in northern translations). Of special linguistic interest is one short quotation from a ‘Bhākṣṇaprakāśa’, which until recently was believed lost. …

1.0.2. Immediately after the publication of Edgerton’s monumental work on Bud-

hiṣṭi Hybrid Sanskrit (New Haven 1953) a number of scholars have directed their immediate attention to this peculiar language.10 Louis Marie Joseph Renou showed his keen interest in this particular text from the linguistic point of view.11 To my sur-

prise, as usual, this has never escaped Étienne Lamotte’s close and unremitting at-

tention.12

1.1.0. About this time Franklin Edgerton visited Pāṇa, where Rāhula Śāṅkṛtyāyana was occupied in deciphering the manuscripts brought back from Tibet (mostly in photocopy). In his hitherto unpublished article Śāṅkṛtyāyana declares that he has identified a manuscript of the Bhākṣṇaprakāśa.13 The editor of this book gives no detail about this article of his. But from Rāhula’s description it must have been around 1954. In it he introduces an interesting story:

“We have recently deciphered in Pāṇa four new Sanskrit books on the subject preserved among the Tibetan manuscripts; they are Upamsapadavam, the Bhākṣṇarpakāśa and Samantaśravana. The last three are very important and reveal to us many aspects of the monastic life, which are otherwise unknown to us.

“The Bhākṣṇarpakāśa and the Bhākṣṇapanapakāśa which are companion works, belong to the Lokottaravāda school of the Aṣṭamahassikas. They are important from the lin-

10 In my paper to discuss the background history of Franklin Edgerton’s research into Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit I have listed most of the works published in connection with his book (New Ha-

ven 1953).

11 Louis Renou, *Histoire de la langue sanskrite* (Ouvrage publié avec le concours du Centre Nation-


— This book contains R. P. Jayaward, “In Lieu of An Introduction: Lost Sanskrit Works Recov-
ered from Tibet”, p. 214-228, published originally in Calcutta in 1937 in *Modern Reven, LXI, and reprinted women in Mahr-Bahu, XLIV, 3).
gueristic point also, because they are almost entirely in prose and written in what has been recently described as Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. Most of the Buddhist works written in this dialect are in metre. Professor Edgerton could lay his hands on two complete prose works, the Mahayanasu [sic] and a short Jataka. He had come across only a short citation from the Bhikshuparakrama. When during his recent visit to Patna, I showed him the entire manuscript deciphered into Devanagari, his surprise knew no bounds, in a public lecture delivered there he said that he was inclined to make a Simhanada where he saw the entire work. ... (op. cit., p. 222).

1.1. Long ago Gautam Rohit paid his careful attention to the so-called Patna corpus of Mahasanghika-Lokottaravada literature. He has thus proposed to call the language “Prakrit-cum-quasi-Sanderie” in his stimulating works. This may not be the place to discuss the language question. In fact, there have appeared a number of enlightening works until today. S. Bhattacharjii has recently drawn attention of his companions to the language and literature modestly but strongly.

1.2.0. Thanks to the painstaking efforts of Gautam Rohit toward identifying this important corpus, he has clarified all these questions.10 The text Bhikshu-prakrama is presented in summarized form or just with the sub-di-visional titles (saṃyga - addāna). Rohit has appended it to his critical edition of the Bhikkhu-Vinaya.11 Unfortunately, however, this summarized text of the Bhikshu-prakrama offers nothing helpful for us to examine our text in question. It may well be possible that the texts edited by Rohit is different from the one mentioned by Subhuk. I wonder if Edgerton saw a full text of the Bhikshu-prakrama in manuscript form. Incidentally, Rohit also cited the

10 Cf. e.g. G. Roth Bhikkhuni-pravattyam and Bhikshu-Prakrama and Notes on the Language, Journal of the Bihar Research Society, LII, 1-4 (Patna 1966), p. 29-31, esp. p. 38. This enlightening article is regrettably excluded in his collected papers: Indian Studies: Selected Papers by Gautam Rohit. Edited by Heinz Beckert and Petra Kirscher-Fitz. Published at the occasion of his seventieth birthday (= Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica, XXXII) (Orbis: Sri Sarup Publications, 1986) All the other related articles are fortunately found therein.

11 To my regret, however, she has very little touched this genre of literature in her book: Buddhist Sanskrit Literature (Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1992), xxv, 178 p.


7
Bhikṣuṇi-prakīrṇaka critically.18

1.2.1. Further in this connection Roth seems to argue that the term prakīrṇaka- is characteristic for the Mahāsāṃghika-Vinaya, equivalent to the Pāli khandhaka- and vartu- for the Sarvāstivādins and Māla-sarvāstivādins.19 It seems to me, however, that prakīrṇaka- simply means "miscellany" in usual Indic meaning, as is also attested in Chinese (see infra §2.0.2 & 2.1.1). Roth himself translates it "Miscellaneous about Monks" (Roth, op.cit., p. 36). One may also be able to compare with a text bearing the title Prakīrṇaka-caitya-lakṣaṇa.20 To my knowledge, the term prakīrṇaka- for divisions has not yet been seen in Indic literature. Needless to say, prakarana- is often attested for denoting chapter and section divisions in Sanskrit literature.21 It derives from the same root prak- ।. Attention may be drawn herewith to the fact that the term vartu- is used for textual divisions in the Mahābhārata-Aśādāna of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins.22

1.2.2. It is to be added here that Yumi Ousaka and Morichi Yamazaki have just offered a detailed index to Roth’s edition of the Bhikṣuṇi-Vinaya, including this “Prakīrṇakadāna” portion, with reference to its pages and lines in their most skilled way as usual.23 Only recently they have published an extremely ambitious work for the future of Buddhist philology together with Masahiro Mivao.24

1.3.0. To my great regret, Edith Nolot has omitted this portion in her otherwise ex-

20 For further details see A. Yayama, “Some Remarks on Two Terms Related to the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins”, Indological Journal (Turin, in press), §2.0.
tremendously enlightening work of translation. In the preface she explains the reason why: "Si par contre laissé de côté le Bihka-Prakritaka, donné en annexe, dans le manuscrit du Bihka-Vinaya, sous forme de sommaire, et dont le texte ancien détaillé n'a pas encore été retrouvé; cette section devra faire l'objet d'un travail dis- tant, dont on devra, d'ailleurs, en tenir un registre sur les parallèles Mahāsaṁghika en chinois réunis par Frawartallner 198-207 (et 68-129)." (Nolos, op. cit., p. XX à la fin.) This is also found in the summary very useful English summary of her work: "On the other hand, the summary of the Bihka-Prakritaka has been neither translated nor studied here; its full Sanskrit text has not been traced until now, and any research work about it would have to take into account the Chinese Mahāsaṁghika parallel." (Nolos, op. cit., p. 327.) André Batteau admires her work in his review: "Mlle Nolos a su traduire admirablement leurs pittoresque et leur charme pour le plus grand plaisir des lecteurs."

1.3.1.b. The colophon of this summary reads as follows:  

samāyās bhiṣka-prakṛitaka-vināyaka aṣṭā-saṁghīyaśaṅkaraṇa lokottara-sidnām // (ed. Roth, p. 331; §296.6; this is followed by the well-known Pratīyāya-samastā-pārtha.)

1.3.1.b. Following the colophon one finds the Tibetan equivalent in Bhūm-med script at the end of the manuscript:  

'phugs-pa dge-dam-bzhin-'dun-po'i 'gyig-'rgan-las 'deu-pa mna-pa de'u-sku-gi 'da-'bha til-bu rabs-so // (ed. Roth, p. 334; §296.7 comm n. 22.)

2.0.0. It is fortunate that Sāntideva’s famed work Sīkṣāṃsāramūla has been translated into Tibetan and Chinese. Herewith I simply note the Tibetan version Bīhā-pa


24 Cf, e.g. Ryōji Yamada (山田隆昌), Bongu Bāten-mu Shōbōwa (講論仏典の始末華) (Kyoto: Horakūji Shoten, 1995), esp. p. 138f. (Sīkṣāṃsāramūla).

This book is now univoxically and meticulously continued by his pupils under the leadership of Keishō Tuckamoto (篠本昌時) at Toho University of Sendai. The middle period of the Mahāsaṁghika School is treated by Kanehiro Takano (高野兼雄) and the later period by Masanao Kobayashi (小林正男) (Kobayashi, 1986). Some Bongu Bāten-mu Shōbōwa (講論仏典の始末華) (Kyoto: Keishō Tuckamoto, 2006), written by Hirofumi Soda, Ei Rom-kou (講義) (Kyoto: Horakūji Shoten, 1995), p. 250-254: §3.1.1: Sāntideva’s Sīkṣāṃsāramūla. Reference to the original manuscript is also given briefly but as a prerequisite for further studies.

For some bibliographical information from the viewpoint of the disciplinary literature see Yuzama, Vinaya-Tantra (Wiesbaden 1979), p. 41f. 4:67.5.3 (such p. 39: §4.55-17.C.1).
"de-shaad ces (P 2) bha'azal-pa dahei hovom-ladan-de the-dan-ladan-pe hum-dga'-bas 'de-shaad ces gnil-ti /

hovom-ladan-de kyi dge-sno nad-pa 'di'i gos mi gtean-bas 'barg-pa-rnam (D 4) mi khrus-ba gnil-lo (P 0 cm. k)

(b 3) hovom-ladan-de (P cen. de) byag-gi (P 0 gi) khrus-bar 'ebhal-lo !/!

"hovom-dga'-dan-khyis bha'azal-pa /

kun-dga'-'bo di'i phyir khyad-khi dge-sno 'di'i gos-rnam khrus-sig / de-btum-rgyug-pa-ni chu bhag-so !/

(P 0 byag-wiwtoc yusa) "de-nas the-0 Ailatu-ladan-pa kun-dga'-bas-ni (D 0 cm. ni) dge-sno (D 5) nad-pa de 'le gos khrus-ro / hovom-ladan-de khyis-ni chu bhag-so !/!

-- de-btum-du shuar-te !--

"de-nas the-de-ladan-pa kun-dga'-bas dge-sno nad-pa de de-0 tu legs-pa klani (P 5) te phyi-sig du phyim-nas khrus-so / hovom-ladan-de khyis-ni chu bhag-so !/

-- sin gnas-pa btaim-te !--

17'Not repeated in Tibetan. Cf. Indic ma bhsya bhikhu ma ma bhsya bhikhu !

2.0.1a. This can be literally translated as follows:

As (it is said) in the Bhkram-Prakrtiksa (Dge-sno-gi Bya-ba Rig-pa-pa):

"The Bhagavat spoke: 'Bhikhu, do not fear! Bhiksu, I honour you. Bhiksu, give your garments over hitherward (and) I wash (them)." Being thus told, Ajumnat Ananda said this to the Bhagavat. The Bhagavat is requested not to wash this sick Bhiksu's garments solely with libation. Bhagavat, I would wash them."

"The Bhagavat spoke: 'Ananda, therefore, you wash this Bhiksu's garments. The Tathagata yours water.' Then, Ajumnat Ananda washed this sick Bhiksu's garments. The Bhagavat poured water... . (P 9 and so.) Then, Ajumnat Ananda took the sick Bhiksu very comfortably, took (him) outside and washed (him). The Bhagavat poured the water." -- Thus it is said."

2.0.1b. This can be literally translated into Indic a la maniere de la langue hybride sanskritisee as follows (cf. supra §0.1.0):

yatboggam bhiksu-prakrtiksa / bhagavan aha / bhiksu ma bhiksu bhiksu / abham te bhukpitkhyam (se opusculum) / abha bhiksu ciraithiyar yutte de bhuvapi (se doxum) / evam utte ayumam ananda bhagavantam etad atocat / ma bhagavan etaya ghanapitkhu-ni-akasthini ciraithiyar doxaci / abham bhagavan doxaiyam (se 'am) / bhagavan aha / trna by ananda evam etaya bhiksu ciraithiyar doxaci / satthidam udukkam sithitayati / abha khalu ayumam ananda tayya ghanapit bhiksuny ciraithiyar doxaci / bhagavan udukkam sithikayat / pe (se polusum) / abha khalu ayumam ananda tayya ghanam bhikakam tahun ca nagha causuvyaghyah bahirthah harica bhajeyat / bhagavan udukkam sithihitati !/
2.0.2. The Chinese version reads as follows (Taisho XXXII p. 165c17-26: Chapter VII-2, Fascicle X): 損受用語補第二二二。

如 3 比丘鍾律律。 (18) 佛子，佛子。故尊重者是病比丘。我於比丘中， (19) 尊尚為末事。持此病比丘衣。乃至浣濯，如是 (20) 言已。時具壽阿難陀問佛言。世间，如來若應 (21) 覆此患比丘衣不善故，我當為汝。佛告阿難 (22) 難。故應浣此患比丘衣。如來
當以親手覆水。(23) 緩時具壽阿難陀於病者比丘前浣此衣。如 (24) 如來以親手覆水，
乃至簡略。時具壽阿難 (25) 陀知彼病比丘衣名。審我故當覆此。我今 (26) 侍汝於外。
出。於此。如來亦復親手覆水。

Footnote 3 on p. 105 in the Taisho edition: Bhikkupratima

2.0.2a. One may consult a version translated in Kana-nai Japanese from the Taisho edition with reference to the Indic by Gisho Nakano and Yukio Sakamoto, and revised by Shunko Katsumata and Yuki Hiwat. This kind of translation does not fully satisfy us. I would however cite it here, for this series of translations may not always be available everywhere outside Japan:

比丘鍾律律有元が如し。「悖の言はく，佛子，汝坐病比丘を嫌棄すること勿れ，我比丘中の尊尚に於て尚末事を為す，北の病比丘の衣を持させる。乃至，浣濯せん。是の如く書じたまへり。爾に具壽阿難陀由自を言勒く，世尊，如来は於て比丘の
病比丘の衣を浣せしめ。因淨に覆はれるが故に，我等に親手を以て (p. 105/121) 覆水すべし。爾の時具壽阿難陀見有病者の比丘に於て浣に彼の衣を浣し，如来は於て
親手を以て覆水す。乃至，簡略。爾に具壽阿難陀是彼の病比丘の所に知り賜りする故，
熟に浣濯に着くと結びて，我今汝於侍拝外にてはなれ。外にて住しる。如来
亦復親手もて覆水す。

2.0.2b. The Chinese version can literally be translated as follows:

As 3 is said in the Bhikṣu-Pratima.

“The Buddha spoke: Son of the Buddha, you do not desert this sick Bhikṣu! I honour
(you), Bhikṣu, in dealing with the matters. Take this sick Bhikṣu’s garment and wash it. When (the Buddha) spoke thus, then Åyūmat Ånanda said to the Buddha: ‘The Bhagavata is requested not to wash this sick Bhikṣu’s garment, for it is filthy (not: a-dho). I would wash (it).’

“The Buddha spoke to Ånanda: You wash this sick Bhikṣu’s garments! The Tathāgata will pour water with my hands.’ Then, Åyūmat Ånanda washed this sick Bhikṣu’s garment. The Tathāgata poured water with his hands... to and so... Then, Åyūmat Ånanda said to the sick Bhikṣu: ‘Very well, you would raise, and I will take you out and put (you) outside.’ The Tathāgata poured the water again with his hands.”

2.1.2. In vain, I have on probation tried to translate the Chinese version into Indic in the same manner as in the cited passage (cf. supra §0.1.0). I have therefore given up to offer my translation by guesswork.

2.2.0. The editor Hermann Oldenberg of the Pali Vinaya Pitaka deemed it desirable to publish the Mahāvagga in the first place among the Vinaya Pitaka (1879-1883). The corresponding Pāli text in the Mahāvagga, VlII.6.2 reads as follows:

atha kho bhaga sa etamman nidāne etammin jākarahe bhikkhu-sanghām samrijjatātāmpana bhikkhū patijācchati: atthi bhikkhāve amukuśamino viharā bhikkhū gilāno ti, atthi bhage ti, kim tassa bhikkhuve bhikkhāmo ādāno ti, tassa bhante āyamāte kusikāvāratthāhā he ti, atthi pana bhikkhāve tassa bhikkhām upatthāto ti, n’atthi bhage ti, kice tam bhikkhū na upatthānati, vo bhante bhikkhu bhikkhūhāno akārahe, tena tam bhikkhūja na upatthānenti, n’atthi te bhikkhā ve matā n’atthi pitā ye ti upatthāheyum. tenkhe te bhikkhāve athā-maññahe na upatthāhitahe attha ko carahi upatthāhitahe, yo bhikkhāhe mam upatthāheyu ga gilānām upatthāhaya. 3 // (ed. Oldenberg, I. p. 302.8-20).

2.2.1. Herewith I would refer to the translation done by I. B. Horner, who has placed it in the first volume of the Pali Vinaya: The Book of the Discipline (first published 1951). She had her way of translation in contrast to Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (cf. ibid., esp. p. v—vi). Let us see her careful annotated translation (p. 411f.):

Then the Lord, on that occasion, in that connection, having has the Order of monks convened, asked the monks:  

"Is there, monks, in such and such a dwelling-place a monk who is ill?"  

"There is, Lord."  

"What, monks, is that monk's disease?"  

"Lord, the venerable one has dysentery."  

"But, monks, is there anyone who is sending that monk?"  

"There is not, Lord."  

"Why do not the monks send him?"  

"Lord, this monk is of no use to the monks, therefore the monks do not send that monk."  

"Monks, you have not a mother, you have not a father who might tend you. If you, monks, do not send one another, then who is there who will tend the sick?"  

2.2.2. Needless to say, sickness has always been one of the greatest problems not only among the people in general but also among the constituents of the order after re-nouncing the world. In fact, it should be noted that the question of the sick and the
one who tends him continues to the following sections in the Pali Vinaya. This is one of the naive and beautiful stories of this weak by the tenderhearted Buddha:
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those by celebrated Madhyamaka masters like Candrakirti, Kamalaśīla, Prajñākaramati, in addition to Śāntideva. It is also worth noting that a fragmentary text is found in the Pelliot collection.38 The Chinese and Tibetan texts are also to be consulted: e.g. Taisho No. 529 and Tibet No. 760-16. Furthermore, this literature contains a most interesting story of King Nimi.39 Needless to say, it needs another paper to discuss such a complicated topic. It is of great interest both philologically and in the history of ideas.

7.1.0. As mentioned above, Śāntideva cannot be forgotten among the Madhyamaka masters for a treasure house of his quotations from canonical literature. His celebrated name may have risen a reputation beyond the boundaries of the Indian Subcontinent. His works have spread all over Buddhist Asia.40 Through A. Saito’s energetic research the Tibetan materials from Tenhung have revealed how much Śāntideva and his successors were considered to be important figures in Central Asian Buddhist communities. A series of his projected work during the past decade has appeared regrettably in more or less private circulation due to the fact that it has been carried out under the patronage of the Ministry of Education of the Government of Japan.41

3.1.1. It is becoming clearer that the Mahāyāna-Śāntarākṣita played a great role in the development of Indian Buddhism. Materials recovered recently in Afghanistan, particularly in Bamiyān, may become very important.42 The Buddhism flourished in this area has long been known to us through the Travels of Hiuen-tsang (玄奘; <664 C.E.) and Hai-ch'ao (慧超; 703-?) respectively.43


39 In a series of enlightening articles Junko Iryama has beautifully demonstrated such questions e.g. 入山浄子, "Naka Jun'ya ナカ・ジンヤ - ヴィーディ・ジャイ - と生前の火刑の実際 -", 東洋文化研究所紀要, No.110 (March 1991), p. 75-104 (English summary on p.9), etc.


43 Cf. Roth, Bhikkhu-Vinaya, p. XIII-XIV, §7. For further details about Hiuen-tsang’s description see Yuyama, "Some Remark on Two Terms —", IF (in press), §§6.5-8, num. n. 45-65.
3.2.0. Incidentally, it may be worth noting here that there lived Kuladatta by name in the second half of the eleventh century C.E. He is thought to have been versed in the literature of the Mahāśāṃghika-Lokottaravādins. Gustav Roth has since long unconv- ered the importance of Kuladatta’s Śūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivekaṇa, which includes the Praśnaka-caitya-lakṣaṇa. Kuladatta offers endless interests from various viewpoints.83

Appendix

Brief Grammatical Notes on the Indic Text

To my great regret, I have been unable to use the manuscript used by Bendall for his edition. I believe, however, that his readings are careful enough for me to discuss gram- matical peculiarities. The following two verbs found in this prose text (supra §0.1.0), though small in number, are not only typical of Middle Indic syntax but also characteristic of those attested in the literature belonging to the Mahāśāṃghika-Lokottaravādins, as noted by Edgerton in the first place (cf. supra §1.0.0.1-2, further §1.0.1-2.2).


dhōra/– dhōra: dhōra-ti, pros., “washes, rinses,” etc., etc., Mīndic, recorded by Edgerton BHSGr §43 p. 217b-218a, q.v. pros. dhōra, Śīkṣa 155.1, dhōra, Śīkṣa 154.18 (Edgerton: “text dhōra,” perhaps to be kept, see Dict.): impv. dhōra, Śīkṣa 154.20, dhōra, Śīkṣa 154.19; fut. dhōraṃ, Śīkṣa 154.19-20. Cf. Edgerton BHS, p. 266b-267a, dhōra-, etc.; also Geiger §34 (end) & §130.2 (end) for Pāli dhōra.84

Edgerton notes a reading dhōra-ti, which occurs also in Pāli manuscripts (BHS p. 266b, dhōpa-ti, s.v.; also p. 287a, dhōra-ti, s.v.): Śīkṣa 154.18 (cum p. 154 n. 3): dhūpay, 1 sg. (Vaidya reads dhōra” without note). It is necessary to collect more examples to judge if this is correct.

83 For further details see A. Yuwana, “Some Phyleological Remarks on and around Kuladatta’s Kṛṣṇamukha-paṭṭaṭkā,” ARIRIAB, VI, 2001, p. 27-41.

The Mahākarmavibbāna and the Karmavibhangasūtra (5):
Transliterations of the Original Manuscripts
Preserved in the National Archives of Nepal

Noriyuki KUDO

Symbols used:
+ lost akṣara
( ) recored akṣara
| damaged akṣara
< > omitted akṣara
|| superfluous akṣara
[[ ]] erased akṣara
< < >> interlinear insertion
.. illegible akṣara
• single element missing
∞-∞-∞
○ punch hole
⊙ double circle with i rosette used to indicate the end of a chapter
(m unclear mark, appears as combination of anusvāra and virāma
evaṃghra
; reverse-like sign to fulfill a blank, mostly at the end of line or before a
punch hole

Abbreviations follow the system established by H. Bodeker, Abkürzungerverzeichnis zur buddhistischen Literatur in Indien und Südostasien, Göttingen, 1989 (Bodner-Werobechel der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Band 1).

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

In the footnotes, all the references, whatever related closely or not, concerning to the prakritic 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 Ex-Director of the National Archives of Nepal, Prof. Dr. U. R. Desai, for his kind support in providing him with the microfilms of the MSS and other forms of assistance, and to Mr. Haiso Chūrihakata (蔵部資) who kindly allows to use his "Tisāho Tripiṭaka CD-ROM" (printed on the basis of the first edition of the Tisāho Tripiṭaka, vols. 1-55 + 85, Big5, CJK).
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32. tera kahatone kacara desanatrapaksam' 11 ucyate 1

yan' karma tasmin eva samandate desamangatasya vipacyate 11 'skhasa 1 va' 11
tan' karman desanatrapaksam' 1 1

a) yathā (gajā)ḥagāvānśa kaharynti 11 (15v.2)

tān' [yugam bhaktasubhājan dīnānandānam apavimānam āyur bhavyati 11

yathā] 1 nyantarasyāmin, 1 śrījñanabāneśe. Mahākāśī 11 nāmā nāgraṃ Mātrīyagīho nāma

sthitavahāpattrato bahūvahā 11 sa patha(15v.1) 1 +... 1 bhūpatraśaḥ udhyānam girah 1 tan' ca

saṁhārād utkraññ 1

śaṁśīnāgāre 1 varaya 11 rava pitara 11 pūrvangamam kṛtvā mahāsamudram avatīrya

Suvarnānābhirājapahlavāriṇī desamārānī gatvā dvija(15v.8) 1 +... 1 paśyanti 1
dsvaropāyāsamāḥ ca kṣevanti 1 vayaṃ api evam pūrvangamam kṛtvā 1 samudram avatīrya

1 For 'vipakṣam.
2 For yat [confusion of abhava: n - t].
3 For abhava, add abhāvam.
4 or eva?
5 For yat [confusion of abhava: n - t].
6 For 'vipakṣam.
7 Read 'bhāva/pārvarām.
8 Commission by hapaxology: yathā (pravo Mahābhāṣyā-1 etāb).
9 MS[A] does not refer to a place here but latter in his dialog to a person in the bud Maitrayaḥa tells that he
became from 'Trivenīja [12r.1] (in MS[B], this portion is not available due to a missing of two folios).
10 Read patha(iva)stvā.
11 For varya [pl. Num.]
12 For pīrava.
13 Real dhāmaśāradāvate. 1
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1. For kariyam (yà b).  
2. For kariyam (yà b).  
3. A scribal error for màtār [ma > ra].  
4. A scribal error for arthati.  
5. For màtār.  
6. For sathm.  
7. A scribal error for cattartham [ma > ra].  
8. Thā phrase that Mātṛakṣaṇā asked his mother to go abound fourth time is omitted from Liśīvā's text without any note.  
9. For trayaśatraya (trādyāma).  
10. A scribal error for màtār [ma > ra].  
11. For bhāndāma.  
13. A scribal error for màtār.  
14. For 'Rūṣek.  


1. For kariyam (yà b).  
2. For kariyam (yà b).  
3. A scribal error for màtār [ma > ra].  
4. A scribal error for arthati.  
5. For màtār.  
6. For sathm.  
7. A scribal error for cattartham [ma > ra].  
8. Thā phrase that Mātṛakṣaṇā asked his mother to go abound fourth time is omitted from Liśīvā's text without any note.  
9. For trayaśatraya (trādyāma).  
10. A scribal error for màtār [ma > ra].  
11. For bhāndāma.  
13. A scribal error for màtār.  
14. For 'Rūṣek.  


1. For kariyam (yà b).  
2. For kariyam (yà b).  
3. A scribal error for màtār [ma > ra].  
4. A scribal error for arthati.  
5. For màtār.  
6. For sathm.  
7. A scribal error for cattartham [ma > ra].  
8. Thā phrase that Mātṛakṣaṇā asked his mother to go abound fourth time is omitted from Liśīvā's text without any note.  
9. For trayaśatraya (trādyāma).  
10. A scribal error for màtār [ma > ra].  
11. For bhāndāma.  
13. A scribal error for màtār.  
14. For 'Rūṣek.
<dra-yyopājanam karṣīyāṁḥa dhīṣāṇi ca, ḍrakṣīyāṁḥa

tatē sa 'evan' iti pratidrītaṃ <1>

sa rātraḥ gauṇa (15v.5) +++++ +, ti' 11

"amba Suvartanāḥbōmān gāmṣīyāṃḥa l"'

tyaśa mūrī zhā 11

"ācāparimāṇaṃ patra dravyam ghe tiṣṭhati l na gantavyaṃ" iti

sa mātṛ varacanāvṛttaḥ 1

sa hūtya udvyānāṃ gacḥ sahāyair u (15v.5) s1

"+++++ [g]yātman"

tena "cāh啊" ti' 11 pesāritram 1

sa hūtyo māvāraṇa gāvā pṛyaccaha l

bhāya ca mātṛ śāpyāpanām nipaśayāḥ 1 evam tṛtyaṃ api <1>

sa hūtya naudyānāṃ gacḥ sahāyair uktah 1

[Two folios are missing]

1) Read "[m]ātarmā ṣaṛchayā".

2) W. t. tor uya-ṣaṛca nīṭeṣah.

3) Read udvēṭha.

4) Read [la-ṛtām] ṣaṛchayāyaḥnā.

5) Āgī rāhaḥ [51, fn. 5] d mātṛ ... nīṭetit.

6) Followings two folios are missing.
1 A scribal error for pehai.
2 As skrta: ma - at the beginning of this line is sticking out from the line.
3 For "rampannam.
4 For "rampannam.
5 For "rampannam.
6 For "rama.
7 For "rama.
8 For "rama.
9 For "rama.
10 For "rama.
11 For "rama.
12 For "rama.
13 For "rama.
14 For "rama.
15 For "rama.
16 For "rama.
17 For "rama.
18 For "rama.
19 For "rama.
20 For "rama.
21 For "rama.
22 For "rama.
23 For "rama.
24 For "rama.
25 For "rama.
26 For "rama.
27 For "rama.
28 For "rama.
29 For "rama.
30 For "rama.
31 For "rama.
32 For "rama.
33 For "rama.
34 For "rama.
35 For "rama.
36 For "rama.
37 For "rama.
38 For "rama.
39 For "rama.
40 For "rama.
41 For "rama.
42 For "rama.
43 For "rama.
44 For "rama.
45 For "rama.
46 For "rama.
47 For "rama.
48 For "rama.
49 For "rama.
50 For "rama.
51 For "rama.
52 For "rama.
53 For "rama.
54 For "rama.
55 For "rama.
56 For "rama.
57 For "rama.
58 For "rama.
59 For "rama.
60 For "rama.
61 For "rama.
62 For "rama.
63 For "rama.
64 For "rama.
65 For "rama.
66 For "rama.
67 For "rama.
68 For "rama.
69 For "rama.
70 For "rama.
71 For "rama.
72 For "rama.
73 For "rama.
74 For "rama.
75 For "rama.
76 For "rama.
77 For "rama.
78 For "rama.
79 For "rama.
80 For "rama.
81 For "rama.
82 For "rama.
83 For "rama.
84 For "rama.
85 For "rama.
86 For "rama.
87 For "rama.
88 For "rama.
89 For "rama.
90 For "rama.
91 For "rama.
92 For "rama.
93 For "rama.
94 For "rama.
95 For "rama.
96 For "rama.
97 For "rama.
98 For "rama.
99 For "rama.
100 For "rama.
101 For "rama.
102 For "rama.
103 For "rama.
104 For "rama.
105 For "rama.
106 For "rama.
107 For "rama.
108 For "rama.
109 For "rama.
110 For "rama.
111 For "rama.
112 For "rama.
113 For "rama.
114 For "rama.
115 For "rama.
116 For "rama.
117 For "rama.
118 For "rama.
119 For "rama.
120 For "rama.
121 For "rama.
122 For "rama.
123 For "rama.
124 For "rama.
125 For "rama.
126 For "rama.
127 For "rama.
128 For "rama.
129 For "rama.
130 For "rama.
131 For "rama.
132 For "rama.
133 For "rama.
134 For "rama.
135 For "rama.
136 For "rama.
137 For "rama.
138 For "rama.
139 For "rama.
140 For "rama.
141 For "rama.
142 For "rama.
143 For "rama.
144 For "rama.
145 For "rama.
146 For "rama.
147 For "rama.
148 For "rama.
149 For "rama.
150 For "rama.
151 For "rama.
152 For "rama.
153 For "rama.
154 For "rama.
155 For "rama.
so tâshîm pramîrtâd ratîhîmmî notifications a 17 utrâshîhîmkhernî gaz(29c:3)chhan' kaştîkattrî prapnahî 1 aha kroshyâse 1 na prâkîrâng nagharam paśyâti 1 sa tatra prâvîstâh 1 prâvîstamkâmryaya ca nagrahâvâranî prithâ(29c:4)thâ 1 [nîrûdhvam pāś-cy-âti 1 prâkârî vardhîthâ 1 bhâravâni ca jk 1 sahâlam śrîm 1 tattânhî ciyâyâti 1 'kim etad' iti 1 sa tatra gâthâ 1 aha paśyâti paś29c:5)prâvasyâkâhârâmânak śrîmân śûrya'sechhâna 1 ciyâyâti 1 sa [bhîtâ] bhîthâ prêchhâ 1 'kim etad bhû pûrtus iti' nîrâjyakapuruśam prîthâ 1 'esa prâytrîkannâvâka 1 1 Mat(05r.2)lîrîyâjâhâ 1 'ami tvâyâ pîpaśkam karma kram' iti 1 sa kathârayâ 1 'nim[s] Jâhithîpî'î.[Mhâkîosalî]â 1 naîma nágala[t]ram 1 tattâhan mahâśrîkâhâvâhâpûtâ 1 (05r.2)abhir 1 sa paścâbhihi sahâyavatâh sahâdyâ[naîma gâthâ 1 te kathâraya' iti'1 1 tava pîthâ yârhâvâhâ 1 asâmâkâm prâvâpurusâstâm11 prâvângaâ 12 k'k(05r.3)viyâ delâintârini gâtvâ dhravâyopârâjanâmi kurva'1[naîma 1 Suvârînâbhîminî Sinhâlalâpîpatî 13 ca prabhûtini 'ca'14 bhîgâlânârâni prâyânta15 1 vayam api tvây(05r.4)âyâ prâvânganâma delârântâm prâyânta' iti 1 'vāc'ây iyam api gacchhâma' iti prâtîrâtanâ 1 so 'î[naîma 1 ghamâ gâtvâ mátaram âpâyâvanâ' 1 'ahâm evah (05r.5)delârântaram gamsîyâmâni 1' iti mîra ra aha 1 'pūṭîlā tava pîth samudram avârînâ18 delântâra19 gata eva kâlâgatah 1 tvam

1 For setosa1 [tv'c].
2 For kaṭṭkatâṭiśtva.
3 For pîtîlam [6 > 10]. On pîtîlam itiâvârâma?
4 For prâkârî, cf. RIsG § 8.25.
5 For lâvâg a sâhavâvâhâram [53.12 (13v.3), 54.10 (15v.5)].
6 For aśvâlêl errors for śrîrârama [ns. up. Acc. P.], cf. RIsG § 66.6-7.
7 For bhûy.
8 Deśikā pâtra: 'apātâku. Lâvâ osa' [55, fn. 1]: Mātrîpâtu 'kam'.
9 For śrînâdhâra.svam śrînâdhârâya.
10 For Mākkâlà.dal [1 > 1].
11 Read 'parâhâra'.
12 Read 'parâhâra râha'. Lâvâ 'parâh ahî'.
13 Upper margin where letter(s) is to be inserted is/c're written is broken. Read 'gaman'
14 For 'bhîmâna'.
15 Long vowel sign 3 'a' isâ lâm is crossed out by the scribe.
16 Added by later hand.
17 A scriptural error for prâyânta.
18 For avârînâma, cf. RIsG § 8.24.
19 For 'nârâyaṇa.'
Fols. Nos. 16-17 are lost.
Folds Nos. 16-17 are lost.
Fols 16-17 are het.
cakrats śivār chintaḥ 1
Maitreyāvāca cintāyatati 'sa ...(32r.1)yāpy 5 eva karmma kṛtam 1 upaśhito nāmāpi karmavāpaśka' iti 1
tāvayākapuruśah [1] prāha 1
"kṛtaye tvam 1"
Maitreyāvāca karhayati 1
"amhi Jambudvīpe Ta[m]ād[ll]i[p]nai(m) n.(32r.2)ma' mahānagarat tato 'ḥaṃ 1 mayāpi ceta" 5 sarvam anumōḥ 1
nairayākapuruṣah prāha 1
"amhi mayādhyāntarīcī" ghoṣob [1] ārunah 1 'kainas tava karmaviṣā(32,3)kab 1 Maitreyāvāca nāma śāchavākaputrabh adhyātoyāmāyati 1 etad eva karmā kṛve'ti 1"
"Maitreyāvāca bhāva 1
"kṛtayā 5 prānānāma 1"
sa pā prā 1 1
vastuvat trasā(32r.4)yahatānī 1"
Maitreyāvāca āhā 1
"kalā 5 bhogānāthi" sa āhā 1 1
"svy asya mārṣte kādhyamantarākṣetā 5 papātraṇīta 14 āvavati iti 1 evam uktvā sa purasah kālagu(32r.5)kah sapatita 15 1 Maitreyāvācā bhūti śaḥ śaṁvénah 1 sarve nābāvānā mārṣitroḥ pranipātām kṛtvā 1

---
1 W. e. for chinna[3 n r 5].
2 Read mātṛjyā.
3 For evad, cf. Bṛhaspāya 3.49.
4 For atra.
5 Read mātṛjyā.
6 For antat, or eva evad.
7 Lēti notes 54, fn. 4; 1. nāyātāya.
8 Cf. Bṛhaspāya, u. u. amarkaṇa.
9 Lēti, although in its reason is unīthāv, omits the following sentences concerning the life-span in the hell. In the parallel text, the life-span is as follows: 66,000 years. Divy p. 607: "nirvāyaśaṅkarāni sattvāvapta cātā = ṭī p. 204, Divy-Kaṭāpī) 36, 164, 66,000 years. Fohhner-Böckh "Tathāgatavijñāna" 3, 886,28) "तस्य निर्वाणम् अवत्त्वम्" thousands years. Jiṣṭaka No. 419 (IV, 6) "nirvāyaśaṅkarāni.
10 A scrithal error for kīna(r)itā rī dyāt-dyātā dyātāḥ-dyātāḥ?
11 A scrithal error for sa āhā or sa prāhe.
12 For kīna(r).
13 This abhaya [r] is rewritten on the original abhaya me; since this rewrite is unōrāv, a letter is again inserted from upper margin.
14 Originally written as hū-. and then a vowel sign is added to its left side, resulting in īū-. However, read pāyārītāmān.
15 Read pātāya.
Folio Nos. 15-17 are lost.
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Folio Nos. 16-17 are lost.
yadu asta mara kicicet punyapuhalom (1) pradipnete na silena va brahmacaryena va patravatavana va tena punyaiva dama (33r.3) putrasya yatra tatra shishaya va kicicet pāpar bhošvate (1) tena ca tasya śīvam iti.

b) yadu Śukṣmājāte (1) saśiṇe saśāna saraṇa (1) vidhyāhāya Śukṣmākumāryasa (33r.3) sattāpiro niśraścianena śālaya ca (1) niṣranta va śāh ca nastāṁ mṛta ca saunjīvitaṁ(ḥ) 1 tadtra tasyaṁ śīv ṛṣi ātmā (11)

yadu vajrāyughe Dhanas (33r.3) āśvāsūtere (1) āśvaśārāvatāputreṇātmā 1 "tena esa (1) bhošvate mātāpiścārte namaśmi samāvam samyakā pūjitaś ca kalyāṇena

1 MS[B] 18 recto starts here.

2 The story of Maitreyagṛha continues to c). This subsection b) seems to be added here.

3 On Śukṣmākumārya, see: Ratnakīrti (T 174, vol. 3, 306-316), Pujñā (T 174, vol. 3, 406-418b); Pujñā (T 175, vol. 3, 410b-440b); [This translation has another two versions (same title) by the same translator with some alternations: T 174, vol. 3, 440b-441b; T 175, vol. 3, 442b-444a]. In the Zākārāntaka (childhood) of Śukṣmākumārya, he is 14th chapter of the Zākārāntaka attributed to Haritaśāstra, see Michael Hahn 1976. Due to a limit of space here, as details of above parallel versions, I will deal with in another occasion. "Bibliographical Notes on the Quotations in the Mahābhārata (3): Avadānas ad Jāṭakas" (in preparation).

4 A scribal error for sarana (a. tera). Lêvi does not correct this word. MS[1] is not broken here.

5 From here on end of this subsection, MS[D] does not have corresponding sentences.

6 Originally written as yajja and a long vowel sign is erased.

7 Lêvi says [55, fn. 10]: "Jignesu āntiṣṭham of quel texte il s'agit ici. Ni B ni T ne permettent de contrôler le texte, tout au moins sinquerré, de A avec la mention éminément Vajra Rājagre placée devant le nom du sûtra." And he suggests that Dhanasāya might be a son of Menlakṣa and a father of Viśakha, well-known lay woman. However, in Chinese translation, the Mahāyāna Agama and its corresponding Pali text, we can find one uttara where the same moral is narrated: Zākārāntaka (T 174, vol. 3, 306-316), Pujñā (T 174, vol. 3, 406-418b), MD V: Dhanasāyavaṃśa (II), 188-196. The portion which corresponds in turn texts is as follows: Zākārāntaka (T 174, vol. 3, 306-316), Pujñā (T 174, vol. 3, 406-418b), MD V: Dhanasāyavaṃśa (II), 188-196. The portion which corresponds in turn texts is as follows: Zākārāntaka (T 174, vol. 3, 306-316), Pujñā (T 174, vol. 3, 406-418b).

For more information
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b) yathā Śyāmājātaka savimna śāreṇa viḍdhasyaś Śyāmakumārasya māttīptirov āśravacanena śālanaḥ ca nirgata (18v.2) + + + + + + + + + jīvāṇa tadvat tasyāpi śīvam śūnāṁ śūnyatāṁ.
d) yatāḥ Ājñātāḥ eva paripūrṇaḥ 1 eva nairāyikā-m-āyuṣyamāreṇa[na] tataḥ 2 cyutah 1 avandhyavet karmayām kaikāda ativa śirojanā bhavati 1

c) (18r.3) + + + + (m)dhānasyaḥ Maitraśyaḥ/ḥṣya mātṛpiṭāmārgaḥ vaktavyaḥ 1

yatāḥ Śyāmasūrīke
yatāḥ andhau mātṛpiṭaraḥ hastibhrataḥ paripālatuḥ <1>

---

1 A scribal error for api{ibhi}; MS[A] reads api{ibhi}.
2 For tataḥḥi
3 On the basis of MS[A], read (aṇa-ātmatuḥ) api{ibhir}ātmyaḥ.
arya ca Jitokastum punah 11

5 atha Bhagavān (18.4) + + [łam]1 bhākṣṭāṃ śantrāyatate <1>

"svāy evam bhikṣavo yuṣmākam anyah sa ○ tena kālena tena sannyāsena Maitreyājīno nāma sārthavīhyaptebhābhebi naivāṁ dṛṣṭavyam 1 aham sa tena kālena tena (18.5) + + + śa Maitreyājīno nāma sārthavāhyapte aneś11 tamāṁ tarihi bhikṣe, [śa]ṃ̄ono vacanām śraddhadhāmāḥ1 bhuddhaḥ sagurvīvair bhavītavyam 1 dharmāṁ samgke sagurvivair bhavītavyam 1 mātipitro cācāryopā(18.6) + + + śa gaurdive bhavītavyam 11 evam vo bhikṣavāḥ śāstavyam 1 aya evam dēśāntaragataḥ sukha duḥkhaḥ pratyantabhavati 11"11

idem karma dēśantaravipakṣam10 11 + 1;

gi cetā11 dāsrayati bhagavān1 <1>

"yathā mayi mātipitr(18.1)++ + yopaśāhyayestyī2 vaumakārinīṃ [śa]ṃ vacanām [śa]ṃ bhāke2 parāde ca 11 aha bhāde ca samaporna karmaśvāpikā bhavati 11

yathā Śrīvatvāya dāśdipurussaḥ Bhagavāntaḥ śrīvācasamsaṃgāmāḥ (18.2) + + mani11
dhāvy ācittam prasādāvātaḥ1 tena mahāpunyamabhāma udākītu10 <1> rājaśāmvevartanīyācha karma kramā <1> tad eva ca naśalobham <1> tac ite viśe Bhagavāta
gatha bhājata 11

1 Read (pratyakshā)lam.
2 Read (samayām).
3 Wrong word. for “parām.
4 For taddalāshām.
5 For bādha.
6 For maṅguras [an ++].
7 Read “piśāchāya si”.
8 For naṁkam-dākāhām.
9 After this, M(B) does not have a concluding remark on the story of Maitrīyāṇa. Is this omission due to an eye-skip by the scribe? (Omitted portion also has the same sentence ending in “pratyamabhimān”)
10 For “vāpaḥam.
11 W. r. for etad.
12 Read “pīṭha dākāya”.
13 A scholiastic error for tīrthabōṣṭaḥ or ihārām.
14 For samsaraṃ.
15 Read bhādajīnaṃ.
ye tatrāḥbhyuṣṇaḥ (18v. 3) a + e 1 vaśajñayakaranā ca ye
esāna daksīṇā teṣām te āpi puṣṭyaḥ 2 bhūgaṇeḥ 3 etad eva gūḍhāyā 1 samarthānām 1

manapūrvarmanam 1 dharmāḥ manārājyaḥ nāmaḥ vā prasthāne(18v. 4) a+ e 2 vā karoti vā 1
tatas tān suḥsām saveti chaḥ vā anugānāṁ 1

rataḥ cyutaḥ ca devesopamnāḥ 1

---

1 Read 'ānuyuddhātrā'.
2 MS[A] does not have this latter half.
3 The form is found in MS[2].
4 For nāmaḥ 1.
5 Real -pā iñciuātā.
6 Originally written as vā and a long vowel sign is reused.
Among many pratyakhyaśaddhan "Tagarālikhīn" is the one who appears frequently in Pāli and Chinese commentarial texts, see, for example, Klosterhaus 1974 (though her study is based on the Pāli canonical and commentarial literature alone). For further discussion on the word ‘pratyakṣabhādha/प्रत्यक्षभाड़ा’ and a bibliography on ‘pratyakṣabhāda’, see K.R. Norman 1983.

However, as nowhere mentioned in the MBT that he was given a kind of peace-sword by a poor person and this poor person because seeing the same at the same time as a result of his donation is not attested to any extent even both in Pāli and Chinese. Similar story is found as several avadanas of Ariyabhūta who gave a sword to a pratyakṣabhāda Vājanas.

1 A mere transcription for yeṣṭha “peace-sword” [confusion of two abahus : i.e.].
2 A scribal error for itikakha.
3 Originally written as {v}el and rewritten: {v}el.
4 For ‘vahādha.
5 A scribal error for nāma.
6 For ‘drūghah.
7 For citram prakāsham(१) or citram prakāshito(२).
8 For ‘vagalaḥ.
9 On discussion of MS[B], read (kathoṃ mānagāyaṃ).
10 For akartāraḥ(१).
11 Ekaṃ saroṭhīnaṃ we rewritten and an inverted abahu ma- is very illegible.
12 For caturāraṃ.
13 A scribal error for tat tā.
14 Basing on MS[B], read (mālakāyāṃḥ २ or mālakāyāṃḥ ३) (१).
15 Read mālakāyaṃḥ. Originally written as -tāyaḥ- vowel signs, १ of aś- is rewritten as vowel signs १ of p- and then p- is erased.
16 Continued, see 35r.3 and MS[B]9r.1, 3.
17 Read Dhammaḥīnaṃ Bhagavati citraṃ prakāshitoḥ (२) (१).
tathā ca Taṅgaśikānāṁ nāmaḥ śravaṇe pratyekabuddhaḥ 

(18v.5) + + + + + + 1 sa ca tadābhar eva tasmin nāgare rājā abhisāktaḥ <1> tatraḥ kāśyapena
pratyekabuddhaṃ samvytte ṣve 1 ya esa sūtrāntare patipathitaḥ pratyekabuddhaḥ Taṅgaśikānāṁ
nāmaḥ <1>
evam bhavati(18v.6) + + + + + + + [ś c]jñanapādasya phalaviṣpākah 11

h) katham mātāpiṣṭuḥ <1>

yatā Matṛāpiṣṭuḥ sārthavahāpattre acārthvyām pratiṣṭhitryaḥḥ mātāpiṣṭuḥ catuṣro maḥānāgareṇaḥ pratyekavargam 19v.1) + + + + + + + [kas]bijam 1

nevam mātāpiṣṭuḥ apiṃ sāṃśritakāḥ phalaviṣpākāḥ iti 1

i) katham Bhagavatō mātāpiṣṭuḥ cittapradāsteṣa marakagamanam bhavati <1> ucyate 1

Devadattaḥ Bhagavatī cittam (1) pra(19v.2) + + + + + + taḥ 1 Avicau maḥānākāre patitaḥ

11

1 Read (pratijāra).  
2 For ucatah.  
3 For ‘buddhaḥ’.  
4 Read bhavatiṃ sāṃśritakaḥ; as is found in MS[A].  
5 Lāvi reads ‘mātāpiṣṭuḥ avatāraḥ’ – tar to sāṃrājya mokṣah pātaṃ which is partly based on MS[A]; but in this MS[B] there is narrower space for these akārām.  
6 Read Bhagavatī.  
7 Lāvi suggests to read [58, fn. 6]: sāṃpradāyaḥ. However this reading is too short for the space in this position. Read pratijāraḥ X X taḥ.  
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tatha Sindhuvisa avye Rastiwan nama nagaram <1> tatra Sikhati’1 ras[(j)j]jauitra’ pitaro bhagavytv naare patish 1
<vaya> Bhagavati m(9r.3)* s+ s+ cittapad-aḍāṣṇena narakagamanaṃ bhavati 1

<1> tena kāraṇena kim na’ cinti nānakaranaṃ ucyatai 11

mahiṣaśaṃ <1> Bhagavān

nānakaranaṃ <1>

anekalpaḥ-pataḥ-anahaparājyuktakalamaḥ(9r.4)+ (stalajambhara) 11 anuppannavā
mṛgayopāyaḥ bodhāya mārgaṃ deśa(9r.5)avyatai 1 tasmim kṛtaṃ 1 pravṛddha

sprameyaphalavijokataḥ <1> ante ca nirvāṇaṃ <1> mātajitṣeḥ mokṣenaṇāṃ avi(9r.5)+ s+ 1

api ca na sarvam maṭāpirrār vacanam khyata 1 asti’ 11 kecit

mithyāda’ śrīnābapatiṣṭitam para’ braviati 1 ’chi maṁ abhāṣanaṁ nayaḥ-tad vo’ bhavasyati

hināya sākkhyati 1 mama ca pū(9r.6)+ ā śa[tnyā]1 agnie vā prāasadeti’ 1 tan naiva
taravām kāraṇaṃ <1> mātajittraparājya sāvyataṃ narakagamanaṃ <1>

atu eva Bhagavati pratidāhna na maṭāpirrārācchā prājñayitavāya m(9r.1)+ s+ (slyā1) pravṛtiya nāpy upasampannāti11 phalāprvaṣṭh 11 evanvadham varjāvitaḥ anyañā

---

1 Originally written as ḍha- and its long vowel sign is erased.
2 Read māṭa[ppayya].
3 Read “māṭa[ppayya]/yata”.
4 W. r. for karmab.
5 W. r. for “mārga” [g. Nāsas: o-a-o-a-a].
6 Read tva[ṭhätāh].
7 W. r. for sani.
8 Fee parān [cf. BHSG § 8.92].
9 W. r. for vratanie [or > n > it].
10 Eachen 1. 2 pl. tab.
11 > Livs suggests no read [9r. fn. 1] pravṛtib māṁ pāśyā, 
12 s cvctah etne for “tapaḥ.
13 Read māṭa tathājaya.
14 A scribal error for “pati ṛṭiti.”
kotham sasasamamāći na bhagavatā utkṛta
"matirupatibhū pritasthitah āyānāh asthājyamā cicāśīya tīrthaḥ (16.1:4) ata eva mātunāpi (tīrtha) bhūyo manātājanāyā māri pravṛtvaḥ 1"

1 Read (sasasamamāci mātunāpi) (evan).
samusamāḥ mātāpitaraḥ a-taryopadhyāyāh

karham ca samusamāḥ <1> namu bhagavān uktenā

"mātāpitroḥ putrasravah yāva(19v.2)> + [m]ajānāṁ kāritya tiṣṭhāte <1> ata eva

mātāpitṛḥbhūyāṁ ananuḥātāsya nāsti praṇavṛṣṭaḥ 1"

1 Originally written as -a- and its long vowel sign is erased.
2 Read yāvad aḥ or [m]ajānām.
yathā yāraśṬrapāla śoṇa prabhūtyaḥ Bhagavata mātipitarāv anumāṇāyasya na pravrājītāḥ।।1।।

adyēc(19v.3)+...[na]pravrājītāḥ na pravrājyante।।

¹ Read adhyāti iūn a[j]yē[ā]vān.
yathā ca Bhaṣya-vatī prakṛti'rājābhī Šāhādhanasya patriṣlokaṇa'ca cālankiṣi 'antarhite ।

api ca ।

"mitāpitarah ([] pāc[56,5])ca śaśāniṃ śravasyadānāmah putram iṣchānti sārḥu'vyarūdhito no vādiḥhitahāhinī" paripālasyayati । kriyāya ca [kal] [kal] kariṣāya (dūṣyati ca [56,4])hāvayati । kālaganānā ca pitṛpiṇāhād ca dhī'jatu ca kālovanīśa ca cārādaḥthāko bhāvayati । śravāniṃ prāyāsāsānām[56,5]yāḥ mitāpitarah putram iṣchānti ।"
yathā Bhagavati pravrajite rājāhā Śrīdāmohana-cīya potravokera caksunā antarhite 1

uyate 11

"mātāpitāraḥ pāthaś thāhāśi pratyāsāṃsamanāhāḥ putram ichanti (19r.4) + + + śv

vṛddhiḥśūtānā pálayāyati <1> kāryāh ca kariyāti <1> dravyavāhāni ca th bhāvayaḥ ,

kālagnātaḥ ca pitṛpadam dasyati 1 kahanvātaka ca ciraśhākopa bhāvayaḥ 11 imānāh

pāthaḥ(19r.5)++ + + śv [ma]manāhāḥ mātāpitāraḥ putrān ichanti 1" 2

1 Read (cāṃsamanāhāḥ)

2 Read (śv [ma]manāhāḥ).
na evan kṣāryopādhyāyaḥ <1> kevalam eva kārṇyayā puraskṛtya katham
asyānāmākāśavṛttaya sansārasya paryaptam kuryād iti !

yaskan (19c.6) + + + + + < 1 kram b <

"upādhyāyaṣya śīye pārhatāṃ bhave, śīyasyāpya upādhyāye pārhasamāḥ bhavasyāti
 evam anytimeśirāḥ sukāno bhavasya !"

evam kṣāryopādhyāyaḥ sasasamā mà(29c.) < + + a < 1 >

1 Liter value: Bhagavatī Vīrāja (= MS(A)).
2 Viṣṇu used as a punctuation.
3 W. - bhavitāmi 
4 Read mājāphirāhōtā.
yathā Cakravartinātūre śukā Bhagavata

"ākṣyā kamāṇo" vīpūkato rājā caikt (36v.3) vartti hastiratāny aśvaratāmi ca pratiḻabarthe. 1) 1) dighārātām rājā caikavarti [1] nītāmārām viṭṭṣaraṇām vā vaṭṭhā vā va-havayā vā āsavaśavatāhā [36v.9] kīhā vāhāyāya ācāryopadhyāyaḥ 2) [1] sūyan vahātyā 3) va sahaṇām vā 1 taṃ çaṇṇaṃ 3) vīpūkaṇā rājā caikavarti āsavaśavatāmi pratiḻabarthe. 4) (36v.5)

āntapi kāraṇa samassūtām omākāpītāmārām ācāryopadhyāya ca 1

api tv aṣṭi śrā naṅkarānam i gṛhohānaṁ mātipītāpravesātī ṣṭhaṇāb 1 pravrajitāna(37r.4); 6) [ācāryopadhyāya eva pūjanaṇāḥ 1

1 For Cakrasvarūṭiarent. On Cakrasvarūṭi. In the MSN, quotations from the Cakrasvarūṭi and Cuhānga appear twenty-four times (numbers are given in order as Lēvi’s section, page, line, MSN[A], MSN[B], To kāho on its pleasing title I shall quote all readings of above materials).

§ 12, 19, 21–65, 5: Cakrasvarūṭi (see also his fn. 12); MSN[A] 16v.2–4: Cakrasvarūṭi; MSN[B] 20n.1–2: Cuhānga; (Lēvi notes 102, fn.1) A. Abhaiśavatāraya; MSN[B] 2n.1–3: Cakrasvarūṭi viṭṭṣaraṇā 4: Cuhānga 5: Cuhānga 6: Cuhānga 7: Cuhānga 8: Cuhānga

§ 76, 103, 6–12: Abhaiśavatāraya; MSN[A] 9v.3–66.1: Abhaiśavatāraya Cuhānga; MSN[B] 35r.2–Cuhānga viṭṭṣaraṇā 3: Cuhānga

As to a detailed study on this sitra, see Namukawa 1949b and 1981a. In those articles, Namukawa suggests that going from their contents all four quotations reflect each stages of development of this sitra: (A) → (A) → (B) in order. However, as we see in §§ 75–76, MSN[A] reads “Abhaiśavatāraya Cuhānga” while MSN[B] reads “Cakrasvarūṭi viṭṭṣaraṇā,” impairs of these readings Abhaiśavatāraya in title in § 75 as “Abhaiśavatāraya Cuhānga viṭṭṣaraṇā” and in § 76 as “Abhaiśavatāraya Cakrasvarūṭi.” Therefore, as far as its classification is at least based on the differences of the title edited in Lēvi’s version, we need to reconsider this problem.

2 For nātanā.

3 A erratic error for ṛajaranā.

4 For kāraṇa.

5 For pravesātī. Lēvi notes (60, fn.6) A mātipītāraḥ

6 Read "na."
| 1 | कायां करणेष्व विषपेक्षा रजस काक्रवति हसितरत्नयो आवरत्तयो यथा प्रतिलाख्याति ।
| 2 | दिनगहर्तस्य विषा काक्रवति मर्तरं मितारमः वा स्वयं व शक्तेऽक्ति (20r.2) + + + + *
| 3 | रंगसिद्धिविश्ववानोऽस्मि 1 अति काक्रवति हसितस्वयं व वहां (2) । वहार्यपति व स (1)
| 4 | तस्य करणेष्व विषपेक्षा रजस काक्रवति हसितस्वयं व वहां (2) । वहार्यपति व स (1)
| 5 | अन्यन्तरि कितिप्रति । + + + + सामि मतापितानि (अध्यात्माज्ञात्यात्मात्रा) ।

प्रवर्त्तन अध्यात्माज्ञात्यात्मात्रा वाक्योऽन्यन्तरि ।
yathā (20r.6r.)[b].śivasā āgatāṁ āraṇyakaṁ dhārayanti 1
"yathāha Bhagavān vāt" <>< na bhūtavrājā cāyapādāṁ bhavānī māṃ sātvahānaptra āśeṣa<>< iti 11
etad evaivaṁ karttara<>< evam eva samaretāṁ cāyapādāṁ(20r.6r.3) ca śetasā<>< ca<><

1 As to dhā akṣara (ḥ), there seems to be no vowel sign on its right side; to read as h is impossible; cf BBD(s.v.)
2 For arthavatēreśa.
3 Read -aṇa.
4 Read ṛṣayakata.
5 For karttara, however "vāraṇam" is adequate here as is found in MS(A).
6 Read ṛṣiyēṣa.
yathā coktam Bhagavatāṁ (ḥḥ) 11
'yyo bhikṣavo mātāpiṭārāṁ skandhena grhya Jambūśrīpaṁ paryateta
sarvayogadvahanaṁ ca kuryate' 1 catasraṁ (Jambūḥ)bāpeṣu hiranyājīvaṁ sauvargasya ca
dharmyāṁ (20v.1) 2 'va mātāpiṭāroḥ pratyupakāro na lṛto bhavati 11 yath ca punah bhatēhe
ahvikartayaṁ dharmane saṁghaṁ 3 <c> (pa)śca isu śaśepadeśa (1) āryakānteṇa śileṣu
pratishṭhapyet 1 evam mātāpiṭāmart punrajāḥ pratyupakāṛ (20v.2) 1 lṛto bhavati 1 tāc ca
saṁvī yaśāyopadhyāyaṁ 4 kuryate 11"
yathā cāha bhāgavān 1

1. A scribal error for Dukkhetā?

vratā padaṃ bhoṣitaṃ padgalaṃ āgamyā budhīham ṣaṭeṣaṁ gacchante 1

1. A scribal error for gachari [⇒ ṣe > se].

yaḥ boḥāra āraṇḍa paraśa padgalaṃ āgamyā budhīham ṣaṭeṣaṁ gacchante 1

1. Read vaṭaṭeṣaṁ/ṣe.

1 2 3

1 2 3

evān api pratiṣṭhātātāḥ [1] kicchopādhyayāṁ mātṝprabhāyan 11
yathā ca Mahākāryena Amśuṣṭhānottayāḥ puṣcimajjasapadāḥ bhūjprākāritaḥ | 1

athaścāryaśa Mahāyudhinena uttarapathaḥ 1 Kaśñ(77v.ś)[ś] [śrīvaśyā]ṃ patra nāgastunī viṃlīṣa dāso bhūjprākārita 1 āśravastasaṃsaraḥ ca kṣamṭaram api yājustaṃ ātyaṃ Kṣīṃrāyanaṃ | 2

yathā cārya Śaṅkaraṃ [śrīvaśyā]ṃ śivaṃ śiwołāvahyaya tākṣasāḥ samām(38r.2)ye śūḍhīṣṭāḥ 1 deśc(38r.1)gālā cāṭhījaśāhīṣṭaḥ 1

1 yathā cārya Śaṅkaraṃ śivaṃ śiwołāvahyaya tākṣasāḥ samām(38r.2)ye śūḍhīṣṭāḥ 1 deśc(38r.1)gālā cāṭhījaśāhīṣṭaḥ 1

yathā cārya Śaṅkaraṃ śivaṃ śiwołāvahyaya tākṣasāḥ samām(38r.2)ye śūḍhīṣṭāḥ 1 deśc(38r.1)gālā cāṭhījaśāhīṣṭaḥ 1

2 yathā cārya Śaṅkaraṃ śivaṃ śiwołāvahyaya tākṣasāḥ samām(38r.2)ye śūḍhīṣṭāḥ 1 deśc(38r.1)gālā cāṭhījaśāhīṣṭaḥ 1

yathā cārya Śaṅkaraṃ śivaṃ śiwołāvahyaya tākṣasāḥ samām(38r.2)ye śūḍhīṣṭāḥ 1 deśc(38r.1)gālā cāṭhījaśāhīṣṭaḥ 1

api ca [1] kim. 38r.4)kasya bhūkośa 1 nāmag(38r.4)śrīnaśeśa k. tenaśeśa 1 yathā pāñcaśi Śivaṃ śiwołāvahyaya tākṣasāḥ samām(38r.2)ye śūḍhīṣṭāḥ 1 deśc(38r.1)gālā cāṭhījaśāhīṣṭaḥ 1

1 For ‘prākāritaḥ.
2 Read ‘janapadodhībhījaśāhīṣṭaḥ’ [don’t[38r.1]śrīvaśyā].
3 See uṣṭhāpate.
4 Read ‘Kṣīṃrāyanaṃ śivaṃ śiwołāvahyaya tākṣasāḥ samām(38r.2)ye śūḍhīṣṭaḥ’ [don’t[38r.1]śrīvaśyā].
5 From here to the end of this line, sentences are transcribed but what were originally written are impossible to decipher.
6 For Kṣīṃrāyanaṃ.
7 For ‘bhūkośa’ (as utilized as a medicine’). After this sentence, MS[38r.3] has more: ‘śivaṃ śiwołāvahyaya tākṣasāḥ samām(38r.2)ye śūḍhīṣṭaḥ’ [don’t[38r.1]śrīvaśyā].
8 For Śivaṃ śiwołāvahyaya tākṣasāḥ samām(38r.2)ye śūḍhīṣṭaḥ.
9 A scribal error for ‘prākāritaḥ’.
10 This viṃlīṣagena is used as donḍa. After this, MS[38r.3] refers to one more papuś, Āṇaśa Bhāsaśāvaśa.
11 Originally written as donḍa, but a wrong sign -ra added.
12 From here and onwards, another single folio of the MS[38r.3] is detached from the bundle of MS[38r.3] attached to the folio of MS[38r.3] corresponding to following passage, see my paper, Kudo 2001.
13 See Lēti (8)-4, fn. 2.
14 Read ‘prākāritaḥ’ [śrīvaśyā]ṃ śivaṃ śiwołāvahyaya tākṣasāḥ samām(38r.2)ye śūḍhīṣṭaḥ.
15 For bhūkośa.
16 Read nāmag(38r.4)śrīnaśeśa k. tenaśeśa 1 yathā pāñcaśi Śivaṃ śiwołāvahyaya tākṣasāḥ samām(38r.2)ye śūḍhīṣṭaḥ.
17 MS[38r.3] has another passage which describes the relation of donḍaśāhīṣṭaḥ to mankā, mano and both male and female hypostases. This connection in MS[38r.3] seems to be caused by an eye-trick of the scribe, jumping up to near “Śivaṃ śiwołāvahyaya tākṣasāḥ samām(38r.2)ye śūḍhīṣṭaḥ” [don’t[38r.1]śrīvaśyā]. However, judging from its context, this omitted passage is not always necessary; is it an additional phrase? See Kudo 2001: 48-49.
"मातृपितरां गाँधी शासनी प्रत्याश्यसमानं न प्रत्ययसि। न्याय ज्ञानौ नन्द यथानुशास्त्रं न्यायार्थं विनौ।

"मामा या धार्मिक बहुःप्रत्यासी न्याय भिक्षुः हर्षार्थं सहिताः स्वरूपं न्यायार्थं।"

13. कः सत्योऽनं तत्र हर्षोऽनं।

1. रूढः (आक्रांक्तः)।
2. रूढः (कार्यः)।
3. रूढः (सुभाषेन ज्ञानः)।
4. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
5. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
6. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
7. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
8. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
9. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
10. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
11. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
12. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
13. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
14. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
15. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
16. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
17. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
18. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
19. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
20. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
21. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
22. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
23. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
24. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
25. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
26. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
27. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
28. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
29. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
30. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
31. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
32. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
33. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
34. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
35. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
36. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
37. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
38. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
39. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
40. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
41. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
42. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
43. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
44. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
45. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
46. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
47. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
48. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
49. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
50. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
51. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
52. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
53. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
54. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
55. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
56. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
57. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
58. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
59. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
60. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
61. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
62. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
63. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
64. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
65. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
66. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
67. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
68. रूढः (सुभाषेन निर्देशः)।
eta(21r.4) + + t. Bhagavan

"mānītiṣṭhāna" pade ca ekaṁ hiṇāmī prātirāmsamānāṁ putram 1 cchasti 1 icčrayoṣāhīśyāna

a kāryoṣā 1 sārvavānam ṗāraṁ ca desoyeri 1 atmanā ca kāryaṁ māyāpātrāhī 1

aśīka ca cchasti 1 ete. 1

vr 1 navam iha Bhagavān 1 c <

"mano bhikkhavacanā sāradādhiśajñānām buddhe Bhagavati" paraśā prāsādāh kāryaṁ dharme samge māyāpātrā icčrayoṣā(21r.6) + + + + t. prāsādāh kāryaṁ <1> tad vo bhavisyaya (1) dirgharātratam hitaya sahāyati 1 10 11

idam karma desāntavapiśaṣṭam 11 11

33. tato katamam karma yena samanvīteṣaḥ pudgalāḥ pūrvam sukiito bhūtvā pātecī(21v.1) + tō bhavati 1 ucyate 11

ibhikṣaya danam yūtīna samanah pūrvam prakṛtyāḥ prajāpe te pramūttho dādīt i
dva khalu vipratastrīḥ bhavati 1 sa (1.2 la) ādī maṇesyaṣṭapādayate 1 śīhyesa mahākāmanesu

ra(21v.2) + g. 1 (1.2) kuleṣṭapādayate 1 pāscit tasya te bhūtaḥ parikṣayam pūryāda(1) naśā
gacchati 1 sa pāscit dādīro bhavati 1

1 Read ca(g) ādīna(ya)(1), cf. § 32 g).
2 For "puṃ (c. pl. pānā)(1) [a+h = °u+h].
3 W. t. for koheya(1) [a = °u 1].
4 Read kāmye(ya).
5 W. t. for desoyeri(1) [e < e 1].
6 Read akṣītya(1)aṣṭaḥīśyān.
7 MS[A], singling from in broken space, does not have "bhagavati."
8 For parād, see next line.
9 Read akṣītya(1)aṣṭaḥīśyān patrāḥ.
10 For tājākām. MS[A] does not have this concluding phrase here although it last same phrase at the end of the subsection 1 (34r. = MS[B](1x.3)).
11 Dādī pātecī dādīhīṣyān.
12 Read vaścāha(1)aṣṭaḥīśyān.
13 This word is found only in MS[B]. Lādi does not note in his footnote; thus this occurrence is not recorded in BHS[D]. As to the usage of this word, see BHS[D], i.e. (p. 335).
14 W. t. for gacchāte(1) [e < e 1].
yathā āryaGopaṇaḥ <1> tena Krakaṇandeḥ sanyaksaṃbudḍhe bhūkṣsamanghasya gokeṣvara(21v.3) + "[su] paścāt parair grāhito "mūḍhaṅkṛtvā ṅat topa" 1 tena sitim praddhātā <1> 2 se yatra tretopapadyate 3 [1] tatra tatra mahābhisaḥ bhavaḥ 1 paścāt tena āttarpadaśeṇa darśito bhavaḥ 1 

paścime bhave (21v.4) + + heḥ nagare anyatarasmin gheṣa prvaṣyātaḥ <1> tasya jñāyamānasya 2 ( ) mitā kilagataḥ[1] 1 "anena mitā mārit[l]ajñā jñāyamāna mūlasaṅkaletre" 3 [a] (jñā[ṃ] mā mitāṃ kroṣaṃ eva kūkāṃ karṇya(21v.5) + + + [m] ) 4 5 niḥ mūḥaiva saha

---

1 A scribal error for Krakaṇadeḥ [dhe > s (cf. BHSG § 2.19) + m (orthographical corruption)]: Levi notes [65, fn. 6]: B Kohanimadā. Raising on Levi's footnote, Ederovet refers to this reading as "<s>"; see BHSG, s.v. (p. 196).
2 Read pārvaṃyaḥ dattā 1.
3 For pradhistam.
4 W: e; for ācāra?
5 Read Rājagṛhe.
6 A scribal error for *kṣatra*.
7 Read kṛiṣṇaḥ i amanigo [sā].

71
1. A saizai error for saziyi.
2. For kikira.
3. yi - Originally written as ji - and is vowel sign is rewritten.
4. For bhikisa.
5. For go$e$ma$eb.
6. W.r.s. for p$e$sea$ma$etana$e$.
7. The - Originally written as th as in vowel sign is rewritten.
8. Source unknown.
9. For Le$sar.
10. For b$e$sa$ya$bona [be $i$ be].
11. For b$e$se$ya$bona [e. Dac.]
12. For se$ma$.
13. Or d$e$. On a vowel sign - i there seems to be a cancellation mark but it is obscure. Read as [MS][B]: de$ma$se$ya$bona.
14. For megasa.
15. Read as MS][B]: p$e$sea$ma$eranya$e$.
16. This portion from ibudikyere is confused, [MS][B]: read as um$e$ka$ka$ma$ (saneba) $p$e$se$ya$bona.
17. For b$e$se$ma$.
18. A scumbled error: p$e$se$ma$sa$ $p$e$se$ma$sa [p. as a consonant cluster: prp: might be wrongly read as a vowel sign of p, resulting in prp:]
19. A scumbled error: $p$e$sa$ $p$e$sa$ [p. as a consonant cluster ppe: might be read as a vowel sign of pp, resulting in pp:]
20. A scumbled error for mbuluma$e$.
समाजातून उपलब्ध <i>ि</i> तरीके येणे ती त्या किंतु कस्तीला किसान चेकायला <i>ि</i> तरीके पुन्यादुहोऱ्या वाचणे <i>ि</i>।

वर्णवदन के बहुवर्णीय बांधकाम याचे प्रतिकूल आहे त्याचे करोजन ठपावणे ते त्याची निर्माण किंमत आहे

‘त्यात आपल्या ठराव्यांना’ जात्याचा प्रस्ताव द्यावा पालक विचारप्रत्येकांनी

हस्ताने प्रयोगाचे वाचणीय विश्लेषण करू लागावे तर कस्तीला त्याचे विविधता त्याच्या वाचणीच्या विचारांचा संबंध असले हाय

<كرور>


dāna samājikā<sup>11</sup> (22r.2) + + + + + [m]<sup>12</sup> bālā na bhāsā sāhīk bhavati l l

1. C.R.H.D.I., s.v.
2. MS[A] reads "agraya.
3. Read "mrΓ" (म्रग)" in Bhasma.
4. For pārase.
5. C. Agas' Dictionary: kātaka "c. milk cow", go-dhena "c. milch-cow with calf" (≈ MS[A]).
6. C.R.H.D.I., s.v. This word is, according to Edgerton, used as rarely as. Since Levi does not mention this reading of MS[B] in his footnote, this example is not referred by Edgerton.
7. For taryayana, cf. B.I.B.S. <sup>3</sup>.69 [r = al]
8. Read "Hīma.
9. Read "pradhān maṇīla/maṇīrāj".
10. For haṁsa.
11. For sāraṁ.
12. MS[A] reads as instead of. sāraṁ as.

Levi reads: yena sammaṇaṭṭhānā pāryaḥ pārom nabhitaḥ; but this reading is too much long for the space.

Probably read 'pāryaḥ pāroma nabhita.'

"dāna samājikā" MC, "one who is called to donate."

11 Read (समाजीक पुरुष समाजीक)
kulo(39;3;)yutpadyate 1 tsuy paṣci1 te bhogā ahīṣveddhiṃ garuḍaṃ 2 niśv2

stratrāni udādārāhārāśādāhārā cakramāyanaḥ 1 tena kāla Rājāgrihā sāmātaṇḍalабālaṃ 4
Upārī(39;3;)-dhyāṣyaḥ 5 pratyakṣabuddhaḥ paśyataḥ dattraḥ 1 tadāc-caturm 4 eṣa 1 rajā
stages 5 1 mahārajām dāttam 1 tāc ca paścaṁām dāradīnuḥ 1 yathā taseva 1 viśrātaṃ 5
Pārzyāpa(39;3;)-yāśyāmā yātadvīte 6

1 For paśca. 2 For daṇḍa. 3 For samātāla. 4 For Upārīṃ. 5 For āśā. 6 For āśā. 

1 For Upairinya. Lāvi notes [67-7, fn. 14]. A apayk. t-rec. And he emends this word as "Upairinya." However, as Edgerton accurately points out, Lāviś ṛn reading has no ms. support; since we have another example of this word "upairiya" as it is collected in Bṛhadṛṣṭrīya, i.e., the name of pratyakṣabuddhāḥ here should be "Upairinya." In Chinese parallels, the name of this pratyakṣabuddhāḥ who appears in the past story of Aniruddha is as follows: Zhōnggānyánghǔ "Aniruddha" Kārttikeya (Shāntipuṣṭa (T 266a), vol. 1, 108b-260). [A one-sentence translation is in the notes: Lāvī śāstraḥ: Pāṇiniś Viṣṇukīrtiviṣṇuśāstraḥ (T4, vol. 1, 826-29), (as above, as already stated above): Pāṇiniś Viṣṇukīrtiviṣṇuśāstraḥ (Lāvī śāstraḥ)]. (T 186, vol. 1, 829b-20).] For pratyakṣabuddhāḥ (Lāvī śāstraḥ): Pāṇiniś Viṣṇukīrtiviṣṇuśāstraḥ (Lāvī śāstraḥ). (T 190, vol. 1, 829b-21).] For pratyakṣabuddhāḥ (Lāvī śāstraḥ): Pāṇiniś Viṣṇukīrtiviṣṇuśāstraḥ (Lāvī śāstraḥ) (T 199, vol. 4, 1983). [Encyclopedia of the Buddhist Canon, vol. II (2004), p. 170, fn. 6: Deśatārāśādāhārā Yānīyāḥ pātā ṛṣṭ iti dānāḥ (Shāntipuṣṭa (T 266a), vol. 1, 108b-260).] For pratyakṣabuddhāḥ (Lāvī śāstraḥ): Pāṇiniś Viṣṇukīrtiviṣṇuśāstraḥ (T 190, vol. 1, 829b-21).] For pratyakṣabuddhāḥ (Lāvī śāstraḥ): Pāṇiniś Viṣṇukīrtiviṣṇuśāstraḥ (Lāvī śāstraḥ) (T 199, vol. 4, 1983). [Encyclopedia of the Buddhist Canon, vol. II (2004), p. 170, fn. 6: Deśatārāśādāhārā Yānīyāḥ pātā ṛṣṭ iti dānāḥ (Shāntipuṣṭa (T 266a), vol. 1, 108b-260).] For pratyakṣabuddhāḥ (Lāvī śāstraḥ): Pāṇiniś Viṣṇukīrtiviṣṇuśāstraḥ (T 190, vol. 1, 829b-21).] For pratyakṣabuddhāḥ (Lāvī śāstraḥ): Pāṇiniś Viṣṇukīrtiviṣṇuśāstraḥ (T 190, vol. 1, 829b-21).] For pratyakṣabuddhāḥ (Lāvī śāstraḥ): Pāṇiniś Viṣṇukīrtiviṣṇuśāstraḥ (T 190, vol. 1, 829b-21).] For pratyakṣabuddhāḥ (Lāvī śāstraḥ): Pāṇiniś Viṣṇukīrtiviṣṇuśāstraḥ (T 190, vol. 1, 829b-21).]

However, according to the Sphātikāra of Visvamitra, commentary on the Abhādhamasakasūtra, the pratyakṣabuddhāḥ to whom Aniruddha gave a meal was "Tapasrikākānā (kaṭanamāla, v. 95a); tena jñāntattvena kṣatriyakākānā pratyakṣabuddhāḥ paśyantai dattraḥ.

1 For āśā. 2 For āśā: [pravocandamlalā chart: āśā > āśā].

3 For āśā. 4 For āśā. 5 For āśā. 6 For āśā. 7 For āśā. 8 For āśā. 9 For āśā.
kulešṭapapadyante tasya pasāt te bhogā ahīvīrdhibhi gucehuti

(22r.5) in [sub]āhirudhaśāyavadānā vaçtrāyam ī tene kilā Rājagehe nagare śyāmaśīstakulubhākram ī Upaśrājasū pratyekabuddhānā pīladapyā dattā ī tadāvaṃ eva rajāta tustena sitra mahādehe(22r.5) ī dattā ī ta ca paścimāki dārīdriyān ī yatā tasyaiva karaṇāṃ ī ī Parvāpāntaśākāś ī ī
yathā ca Śrāvastīya dārśinākṣaraṇaḥ svāmakaḥpāhārīni yācito keśam niśāni
kṣaraṃkṣaṅgeḥ <i>tāṇya pāṇīyā pari(22v.6)> h. 1 bhūjanam śāhāya viśhreṇ śāhīni bhaktam
śrīdharan 11
adha Bhāgavata Śrīputra Mahāvīryaṇa Mahākāśyapaḥ 11 Subhūtiprabhūtah Mहेण <i>ete
ukṣāḥ <i>1</i>
"aṇakasya gṛha-pateṣe gṛhe prathamam bhāṣāṃm gṛhitvāyām iti" 11
(22v.1) + 1 surve yathānupāravena tatra gṛha surveḥ ca tasmād bhāṣāṃ labhāh 11
adha-pacitd Bhāgavato gṛhaḥ <i>1</i> sur[...].[...].[...].[...].]yā māyā jñatpaśadāyā paripāṭṭiṃ bhaktam
11 survam Bhāgavato dūraṃ <i>c</i> pranīchatanā ca karoṣi
"aṇena Bhāgavan kuṣ(22v.2) ... mūlaṇa mā bhūyāh 11 kācid dārśīm syed" iti :\'1
"yathāḥ" iti Bhāgavatā śrīc ātūrā tattvāv cha tānāhīat eva tāṇya mahānīchācāraṃ prāṣūbhītμ<1>
MS(A) No. 4-20

tata šreṣṭi ṛja "Pṛo-senajit tasmān" grīhe gataḥ 1 tenoktaṃ "samākṣaṃ pṛyāyāḥ āhāri['te]tāte" dīnārā śhāpātām 1
tatas tasya grīha pātā 40.v.5 tato grīhyāṃ bhūpāri pītāḥ dataḥ 1 anūraṇaḥ samātāh 1 rājāḥ bhūtyo grīha pātā 40.v.5 dataḥ 1 suraṃrāṇaḥ samvāṭ 1
ahin rājā Praṣmaṇāja vistārayāōā tvat BVg 56-57 1 "viśvavirajīte gataḥ Bhāgavato niśvadaya iti" 40.v.1.3 "pṛyāyāḥ āhāri[te] pṛyāyaṃ taḥ 1 sarvāḥ nāhānātāvāvam sūtātām iti 1

evam esa yadi dīrā bhavati duṣṭa-khena yacitāḥ samānāḥ pāṭijātīte 1 duḥkhāna

dalitā 1 datvā 40.v.2 ca cītām prakāśaṃ 1 tetaḥ hetuḥ pūrvāḥ dhīrīśu dhīriśevas pāṭicīte mahādhanā bhavati 1

idām karma yena samāvāgataḥ pūrvaḥ 16 duḥkhātī bhūtvā nā(40.v.3)īcāt suktāḥ bhavati 11 11

35. kṣatmat karma yecīna samāvāgatah 16 pūrvaḥ pīrva ca pācīte suktāḥ bhavati 1

ibhātyo 12 dinām yacitāḥ s. pra(40.v.4)braṃ prāṣṭāṃ pratiṣāke pīrva 12 1 datvā 1 datvā ca priṃ cīrām bhavati 1 sa yadi mahāseṣṭa-pāpādyate 40.v.1.6 1 śāhīṃ 1 kuśāstarpāpādyate 1 mahādhāmāne 1 mahā(40.v.5.5)bhūge 1

adra 11 Bhaddīye 13 nagare Mipchos phabrībhūtitān ca catuṣṭāṇā dānapattam vijātā diktaṃ vaktavyaḥ 1 tuḥ tīla Tājgilagurasikhipy āryekeñukābbhādhaṃ piṇḍapaṭena pra(41.v.1)ipādātaḥ 1

1 For tatūḥ or tatāḥ; MS(B) reads taḥ dvāramānā. 2 For pārśvabhadhaṃ.
3 -asi- is uncertain; read sār. etc. 4 For dīnātah. 5 For sāhī. 6 For sāhī.
7 Read grīhapātaṃ.
8 A scriptural error for Praṣmaṇāja.
9 Read grīhapātaṃ.
10 A scriptural error for āhāraṇā.".
11 For pārvaṃ.
12 A scriptural error for gataḥ.
13 Yer bhāyaṃ or ihi[te]kāro.
14 A scriptural error for pṛyāyaṃ.
15 A scriptural error for muṃāyaṃ.
16 A scriptural error for atra.
17 For Bhadrīte (b > dā) it > yā).
18 For "prāṇāyām. The story of Mipchos, a merchant in Bhadra, is preserved in the Mahābārata (Prāśāntaṇī 2.451-455.10) and the Divyām 9 Mahābhāṣyaphāṭapariccheda and No. 10 Mahābhāṣyāṭa (Cowell and Neil, pp. 123-135); see J. E. Cow. 1968 58-58. According to H. H. H. R. K. s. partial and slightly different parallels are found in Chinese translations of several Vīnaya texts; see H. H. B. 2002 50-51.
tac chutuv Prasenaji taisha sagat h 1 tenokram
"semikam puvvarialbh ko di(22v.3) + [b] thapata ina"
gphasatna ta iyo toto gathapaladho datata l a tugva samunyak h 1 rajh bhiyo gehapater
datt sauvargad samunyak 1 11
artha rajh Prasenajitah vismayagatah gath Bha(22v.9) + + [v],dayati 1 11
Bhagavan liha 11
"punyaniyajita gehapater iti na gra hyam " 1
sartho ca tadasuppta hena karthuna 1

evam esa yakh datt bhavati [1] dukhthena yacetah samanah pratijanata <1> du(22v.5)+
+ + + + + tvam cinam prasidayati 1 tena hetum puvram datiro bhuvati ◊ pacat ca mahadhano
bhavati 1 1

idam sevam yena padgala dharm dakhito bhutvam pacat sukhitobhavati 1 11

35. (22v.6) + + + + + + + + + samayagatah puvralach puvram pacat sukhitobhavati 1
sayate 1 11

bhavakayo dinam yacato sa phrayatah pratijanite <1> phrayato ditha dum 1 datupui ca
pratiti m bhavati 1 sa ya(23r.1)= + + + + + + te(1) 1 adhyavesu kuleshipapadyate 1
mahadhanatca mahadhugena <1>.

atra Bhadrkere nagore Mindahkaphalhitihin caturnanam danapatinam vipakvo 11
valkavyoh 11 te(1) kila Tagnikakhi pratyayyak(23v.2)= + + + + + [v],ma(10) pratipadatrah <1>.
atra Vaisnavadānam vaktavyam 11

i-dam (2) karma yena samamvagataḥ padgalah pūrvam paścott ukhito bhavati 1 11

36. atra katanvam karma yena samamvagataḥ padgalah pūrvam paścott ukhito bhavati 1 acyate 11

i-thakatyaḥ kalāyānvirahūtāḥ (1a) bhavati 1 sa dinam na ca-dātāḥ 1 na ca yena kalāyānvirahūtāṁ karma kṣetram bhavati 1 sa yathā manuḥyastopapalyate 1 (11) daritvā (2r.6) + [h]yopapalyate 1 ajaśāyinīvānapojanācyāt 1<1>

yathā Śrāvastyāṁ daridrāḥ (2r.3) rākṣasānāṁ vyanavartante 1 Śrāvastyāṁ kīla Bhagavāṁ pindapātāṁ parparpātā 1 tada Śrāvastyāṁ ikṣudvāsāṁ nāma (2r.5) + [y]atītāḥ 1 Bhagavatā śaṅkhrūkṣātvarṇāḥ lakṣāhānāḥ 1<1> anyutaranāṁ hi ghasalvārca daridrākāṁ tīrthasāt <1> sa Bhāgavantam āśātām yacati 1 Bhagavatā ēkaṁ dattam <1> sa bhītyo yacati 11 Bhagavān āha 1

"vatsa ucyatāṁ (2r.6) miti<1> 11 bhītya dāsamātī 1" sa phalā 1

"na mayā Bhagvan necchāmīti uktam-pūrvam 11" Bhagavān āha 1

"vatsa ucyatāṁ necchāmī 1 Bhagavatā<1> sarvāqiśa dāsyāmātī 1"
tena ısukalobra harsuresa\(^1\) (41v.2) "nchêmû ti' ucte\(^2\) Bhagavata sarvani dattáni i āry\(^3\) nandid prechati i. "Bhagavân" kım idam i. Bhagavân hiha i.\(^4\)

\textit{tu kalcídä esàm}\(^5\) Ánanda nípparagandhá(41v.3)sparśásânàni tyáptásvará\(^6\) i bhavālavyāna vāh i i nechêmí\(^7\) ‘ti vā na kalcíd vaktām pāveta\(^8\) i tad erasya vacanām tana nechêmáti hetubhítam bhavisyati i.\(^9\)

\textit{a(41v.4)ha ca i. nechêmítya esa vyavakāro na kalcíd udhirita door ki toto rūpāni sat-śīśa ca gandhaśaṣṭikaraván\(^10\) iti i. kh i iy evam prithhayānās\(^11\) esa niyam bhramati (41v.3) baffá\(^12\) i nechêmáti prakr̥ṣāyena yeśām\(^13\) vākra\(^14\) samuñātita i hetur alpgechātya yeha si eva bhavisyati i. i idam karamma samarvāgahāt pudgalaḥ pāveta(42v.1)bh ca paścāc ca duhkhiḥ bhavati 11 11 11

---

\(^1\) Read \textit{vyavahāraḥ}. Lévi omits this word.

\(^2\) For \textit{nchêmí}.

\(^3\) A scribal error for \textit{Bhagavon}.

\(^4\) W. e for vāt.

\(^5\) A scribal error for \textit{rāvah}.

\(^6\) A scribal error for \textit{prāvah}.

\(^7\) Lévi notes [69, fn. 2]: \textit{tyáptasvaram} Bhavan taniyamanaṃ nechêmátai ud na kalcíd vaktāyam. pāveta tad erasya vacanām. Ye ca\(1\) a\(1\) u gau and adds amsa\(2\) without MS\(3\)'s support.

\(^8\) For \textit{pāveta}.

\(^9\) Read \textit{vyahāre} instead of \textit{vyavahāre}.

\(^10\) Read \textit{al} (pl. \textit{Nam}),

\(^11\) This danda is originally written as \textit{b} and corrected.

\(^12\) Originally written as \textit{b} and than its long vowel sign is erased.

\(^13\) For \textit{kālītab}.

\(^14\) A scribal error for \textit{prakr̥ṣayena}.

\(^15\) For \textit{vākra} or \textit{vāk} is.

\(^16\) Read \textit{vāhā}.

\(^17\) Lévi notes [69, fn. 7]: \textit{A se mukha (sveha)} this reading is of MS\(1\)h.
teneksonloobhun 'necchmity' akram l Bhagavati sa(23v.1)+ ni' datraja i
athary-Anandah prauchya i
"Bhagavati kim idha 11"
Bhagovin idha 11
"na kaalciid eso Ananda rtpagandhikaraasparcshinim tepatpovah bhavatu <1>
necchmity" [11] na kaalciid ukatpovun 1 tad eva tasya" necchmil(23v.2)+ hetupovum1 bhaviyati 1
idha ca
necchmity esya vytharo na kal(cii)kaliicic ic ahd udirat1
kato rupanij sahadi ca gaundha" 'esopartii ca vai 'kutah1
ity evam prarhaya" esya nayam bhramati kalice1
(23v.3)+ esopartii 'praharrati1 yajna vai samuddait1
hetur alpeccchara yaaca sa () eva"1 bhaviyati 11
idam karma yena perva ca pasca[...]> ca dubbhito bhavati i 11

Kho bahram lito
A Trilingual Edition of the Lotus Sutra
— New editions of the Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese versions

Seishi KARASHIMA

Editions of the Sanskrit Version

E. Burnouf’s French translation of the Saddharma-pundarika (Skt. SP) appeared in 1852, followed by H. Kern’s English translation (1884). It was in 1912 that H. Kern and B. Nanjio published their edition of this Sanskrit text, and since then, this has maintained its primary as the edas princps for the last ninety years. Following Kern-Nanjio, N. Dutt (1953), U. Wogihara and C. Tsuchida (1958), and P. L. Vaidya (1960) also published their own editions of the text. However, these cannot be called critical editions. Kern-Nanjio’s edition is based mainly on the collation of the ten Nepalese manuscripts, to which Kern inserted readings of the so-called “Kashgar” manuscripts in a very arbitrary way. By consulting Tibetan and Chinese translations as well as palm-leaf Sanskrit MSS. (K), Wogihara and Tsuhida attempted to improve the edas princps, but their emendations are often without foundation.

Since the appearance of Kern-Nanjio’s edition in 1912, a number of manuscripts and fragments of this text have been discovered, and especially within the past few decades, most of extant MSS. have become available in the form of photographic reproductions, while many important ones have been romanised, making it possible to...
compare various recensions of the SP. to a considerable extent and with more sufficient exactitude. Moreover, our knowledge of Buddhist (Hybrid) Sanskrit and Middle Indic has considerably grown since the time of H. Kern and B. Nanjio. Therefore, owing to this favourable circumstance, I have decided to edit new editions of the recensions of the SP., collating them with each other, while referring to the Tibetan and Chinese translations at the same time. For the purpose of compiling reliable editions, I have been transcribing relevant MSS. and fragments anew from photos or photomechanical reprints, while consulting previous works. The new editions of the Sanskrit recensions consist of the following two groups:

(1) One part of the new edition will be mainly based on the Gilgit MSS. (D1, D2, D3 etc.), which though not complete still cover eighty percent of the whole text, referring to variant readings, found in the older palmleaf MSS. from Nepal and Tibet, namely, B1, K, CJ, C4, N1, and possibly a MS. as well, which was copied in the middle of the eleventh century and recently discovered in Lhasa; C5, C6, T2, T6, B, T7, N2, N3. Apparent scribal errors in the Gilgit MSS. are to be corrected on the basis of readings found in these older Nepalese MSS. The part, where the Gilgit MSS. are not extant, is to be supplemented by B1 or K. Variant readings found in paper manuscripts, which are relatively new, are referred to, only when those readings seem significant.

(2) The second group consists of the Central Asian MSS. and fragments, namely: (1) the so-called Kashgar MS. (abbr. O); (2) Farhad-Big MS. (abbr. F); (3) fragments from various collections, such as Petrowsky (abbr. SIP), Otani (abbr. Lü), Stein, Turfanmumulunen etc.

Additionally, I shall include also a transliteratation of 44 fragments of the text from the Schayen Collection, of which photographs and a transliteration, prepared by Prof. H. Toda, have been recently published.

1 I should like to thank the Institute of Oriental Philosophy and Mr. Noriyoshi Mizufune for providing me with copies of the microfilms of the Gilgit MSS. of the Lotus Sutra, which had been presented by Dr. Lokesh Chandras, Director of the International Academy of Indian Culture, as a gift to Dr. Daisuke Ikeda, President of the Soka Gakkai International, and now kept by the Soka Gakkai.

2 For the abbreviations of the manuscripts, see under ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOI، خ. خ.

3 This manuscript had already been studied and transliterated by the late Prof. Zhengmin Jiang, though his work has not been published yet.

4 As to the classification of the palmleaf MSS. from Nepal, I completely owe this to the results of Prof. Toda's long painstaking research on them. Also, he has published diplomatic transcriptions of most of these MSS. as well as many of the Central Asian MSS. of the Lotus Sutra, which are of immense help to my present project.

5 I should like to thank the Institute of Oriental Philosophy and Mr. Noriyoshi Mizufune for providing me with their colour photographs of the St. Petersburg manuscript.
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(II) Editions of the Tibetan translation:

1. An edition of the Tibetan translation in the Kanjur, *Dann pa'i chos padma dkar po zhes bya ba thog pa chen so'i mdo* by name, translated by Surendrabodhi and Ye shes sde. This new edition of the Tibetan version will be based mainly on the MSS. in the Tibetan Kanjur from the Kawaguchi Collection (abbr. T), which seems to contain fewer scribal errors and wrong readings than the MSS. in other Kanjurs which I have been consulting, namely *Jang sa thers* (or Lithang) (abbr. T2), Stog Palace (abbr. S), Phug brag (abbr. P), Berlin (abbr. B), Peking (abbr. Q), Naxang (abbr. N), Derge (abbr. D), Cone (abbr. C), Lhasa (abbr. L). Variant readings found in these Kanjurs will be referred to in notes; (2) An edition of the Ratnaguru Kanjur MS.10 of the Tibetan translation (abbr. Bth); (3) An edition of an old MS. of a Tibetan translation from Khotan (abbr. Tlh. Kho), in fragmentary form, which was obtained in 1933 by Fr. Dr Niki Ambodi, a member of the Sven Hedin Expedition, and is now in Stockholms; (4) Translations of fragments from Tabo (abbr. A)11; (5) Translations of fragments from Dunhuang (abbr. Dtn).

(III) Editions of the Chinese Translations:

Three Chinese translations, namely Dharmaraksha's *Zhengfanghuaqing (Taihê, No. 263)* (abbr. Dr) and Kunstrajiva's *Mianfaliambhajing (Taihê, No. 262)* (abbr. Kj), and the *Sazafumudajing (Taihê, No.265)* (abbr. STF), which is though the oldest of the three but only partial, are to be edited anew on the basis of the Koyô Edition, referring to the variant readings, found especially in the Jin Edition and Fangshan Shijing, both of which were unknown to the editors of the Taishô Tripiṭaka. The texts will be punctuated.

---

1 My thanks are due to Prof. Yôichi Fukuda and other members of the Toyô Bunko, for providing me with photocopies of the Tibetan translation of the Lotus Sutra in various Kanjurs.

2 I should like to thank Dr. Hermann Pfeiffer of the Szentbibliothek zu Berlin, for providing me with microfilms of the Tibetan translation of the Lotus Sutra in both the Berlin and Lithang Kanjurs.

3 I should like to thank Prof. Jonathan Silk, Mr. Shin'ichi Miyake and Ms. Naomi San for giving me helpful advice concerning the Kanjur editions. Apart from these Kanjur editions, I am trying to obtain also photographs of the text in the Yongle and Ulan Bator Kanjurs.

4 My thanks go to Dr. Valerius Reitzen, Curator of the Asian Collections of the Newark Museum, for providing me with a microfilm of the the Ratnaguru Kanjur MS.

5 I should like to thank Drs. Hakon Waldquist and Suzana Türemsman of the National Museum of Ethnography, Stockolm, for providing me with coloured slides of the MS. I am also grateful to Prof. Akira Yuyama, Helmut Eimer, Paul Harrison and Cristina A. Scherrer-Schaub for their helpful advice concerning this manuscript.

6 My thanks go to Dr. Helmut Tauscher of Institut für Tibetologie und Buddhismuswissenschaft, Universität Wien, Austria, for providing me with photographs of the fragments.
afresh and provided with various kinds of marks such as exclamation marks, question marks, quotation marks and so on. English translations of the Chinese translations will also be provided.

(IV) "Scribal error" (s.e.), "learned correction" (l.c.) and "wrong reading" (w.r.)

In these editions, I shall try to present how different readings in older manuscripts occurred, by relating them to one another. For this purpose, three terms, namely, "scribal error" (s.e.), "learned correction" (l.c.) and "wrong reading" (w.r.) are used. The first one means a certain variant which arose purely from a scribe's error, such as careless omissions, additions, haplography, diacography, homoioteleuton or an error, caused by the similarity of letters — such a reading was, on occasion, then copied by later scribes, but its origin is apparently a scribal error. The second term, on the other hand, relates to a certain reading, which was changed by a transmitter of the text or by a scribe himself, with the intention of making a form of a word more comprehensible (or "acceptable"), which he had found puzzling, obscure, unfamiliar or old-fashioned. When reading is apparently incorrect but its cause is difficult to judge, then I label it simply as "wrong reading" (w.r.). I think that, when all these procedures, described above, are completed it will be unnecessary to list all the variant readings in relatively later manuscripts.

(V) A trilingual edition of the Lotus Sutra

I am preparing this trilingual edition of the Lotus Sutra, in which several versions in three languages and recensions in each language are to be collated with each other, in the hope that it will provide a basis for further philological as well as historical investigations on this Sutra.

As the very first part of this edition, I have chosen the XIIIth Chapter of the text, namely Sukhāvibhāra-parivarta.

17This term was kindly suggested by Prof. Oskar von Hinüber at the XIIIth Conference of the IABS in Bangkok, 2002.
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Bh (Barthang Kanjur) 115a6-

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Chin. Dr. 107b-17--12} \\
\text{《安行品》第十三} \\
\text{所以懸賞大士} ① 佛曰：「善，大聖！此諸菩薩恭敬世尊，所當勸悦，難及難及。} \\
\text{何時應當寫一切眾說曼経典？} \end{align*}\]

Chin. Kj. 17a6-10

《安樂行品》第十四

爾時，文殊師利法王子菩薩、摩訶薩② 佛言：「世尊！是諸菩薩甚難得，敬順佛教，愛大歡願，於於後世，護持、護、說是《法華經》。世尊！菩薩、摩訶薩後於後世，云何能說是經？」

XIII § 2 (KN.275.3-5)

gilgit/Nepalese version, based upon D2. 75a3-

evam ukte bhagavā Mānjuśrīyaṃ kumārmyāntam' etad avocat ① "caturṣu Mānjuśrī' dharmeyu pratiṣṭhitena bodhisattvena maheṣvaraṇaṃ dharmaparyayāṃ paścime kāle paścime sama D2.75a3 ① samprakāśayītavyāṃ. ② katameṣu caturṣa ②
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O (ক্ষাব্য) MS. = "Khashgar" MS.) 263a-

few ukte bhagavāṁ Manjuśrīyaṁ (263a) kumārakṣhitam erad avocac' caṇṭeru

Manjusrī śrī bharmesu pratīṣṭhitena bhojitaṁ dhīṣṭvaraṁ mahāsātvanāyaṁ

Pārśamāparyāya - '1 paścime kāle sampṛkṣāṣayā (263a) tavyah' katamēṣu caṇṭeru

SIP (Petersky Collection: SIP/10, fol. 120 = BB. 33, p. 213, fol. No. 16) 120a-
evum ukte bhagavāṁ Manjuśrīyaṁ kumārakṣhitam erad(263a) āvavac' caṇṭeru

Manjusrī śrī dharmesu pratīṣṭhitena bodhiśātvana mahāsātvanāyaṁ

dhāmamāparyāyaḥ paścime kāle sampṛkṣāṣayā (263a) kāśyapavyah katamēṣu caṇṭeru

Khi (frag. from Khādala) 1cf. Wille 2000: 84) 62al-

[evam uktē bhagavāṁ Maryuśrī] (1) ... (ku ... [r]a ... 62a[b] [tam erad a] ... + + + + +

+m+r+r+r+r+ ... [t]ō[nn] b}[dh]jīṣayena mahāsātvanāyaṁ dhā}[ṛ]māparyāyah

paścime kāle sa[m]prakasayita ... 62a[b], ka[ṭ]a[me]ś[ṇ] (1) ...

F (Farāhād-Bēg) 14b7-
evam uktō bhagavāṁ Manyuśrīyaṁ kumārakṣhitam13 erad avocac' caṇṭeru[r]

Manyuśrī śrī dharmesu pratīṣṭhitena (1) (62a) bodhiśātvana mahāsātvanāyaṁ

dhāmamāparyāyaḥ paścime kāle sampṛkṣāṣayātavyah13 katamēṣu caṇṭeru

Tib. Kasjur version, based upon T. 311b3-
des kāde ces gos pol daṅg / boc ṛmn 'dus khyis' 'jam dpal gcñhor' nur gur pa la
di skad ces' bka' ssa[a] to / "'jam dpal' реша zhi la gcñ [5,311b,9] te / 10 byang

chub sensive dpa' sensive dpa' chen sos / 10 chos kyi rnam' grangs' di[5] phyi ma'i thse

25 phyī ma'i dsa na yang dag par rab cu [22] bstan par bya' o / bho'i 25 gzing zhe

na'or /

Bh (Bathang Kanjur) 115a8-

des kāde ces gos pol daṅg / boc ṛmn 'dus khyis 'jam dpal [5,40] gos pol nur gur pa la
di skad ces bka' ssa[a] to / 'jam dpal chos zhi la gcñ [5,311b,9] te byang chub sensive
dpa' sensive dpa' chen po ces chos kyi rnam' grangs' 'di phyī ma'i thse na [5,40]
yang dag par rab cu bstan par bya' o' / bho'i 25 gzing zhe na /
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Chin. Dr. 107b-12—11

佛說：‘法華藏土是法，乃應講經’。

Chin. Kj. 37a11—12

佛說：‘法華藏土是法，乃應講經’。

XIII § 3 (KN.275.5-7)

Gilgit/Nepalese version, based upon D.2. 75a4–

是 Manjüśrī bodhisattva mahāsattvenācāratocaraprajñātihitenaśāyam

Sūtrāparāśāryaḥ sampārkakṣāyitavyāḥ kathām ca 

Manjūśrī bodhisattva mahāsattva

ācāratocaraprajñātihito bhavati?

O (Khādaliq MS. = "Kashgar" MS.) 263a7–

acāratocaraprajñātihitena Manjūśrī bodhisattva mahāsattvenāṃ
dharmahūśaṃ[V]śāryaḥ sampārkasāyitavyāḥ kathām ca Manjūśrī bodhisattva

SIP (Petrovsky Collection: SIP/10, fol. 320 b BB. 33, p. 213, fol. No. 167) 320b2–

acāratocaraprajñātihitena Manjūśrī bodhisattva mahāsattvenāṃ
dharmahūśaṃ[V]śāryaḥ sampārkasāyitavyāḥ kathām ca Manjūśrī bodhisattva

Khā (frag. from Khādaliq) (cf. Wille 2008: 84–85) 62a3–

.. + ... [c][o][c] [parārattisthī] [t]e ... [Many] (o) u bo ... tue [Sup] mahāśa[V]śa[m]āyaṃ
dharmaparāśāraḥ sampārakāṣāyitavyaḥ kathāṃ [ca ma ] ... ... ... + ... (C) +

hāsāyaṃ [c][i][i] [C] + ... + [t]u kathāṃ [g][o][c] [br] [pr][i] [j] [k] [a] [t]i kathāṃ [a] [c] [a] [r] [a] [t]i +

+ ... + [t]u kathāṃ [g][o][c] [p]arārattisthī[te] − [varṣī[te]]
XIII § 4 (KN.275.7-(1))
Gilgit/Nepalese version, based upon D2. 75a-

9a ya'da Marjutora' bodhisatva mahāsattva dharmanā yadā ca Marjutora' bodhisatva mahāsattva ca dharmam svalakṣaṇam vanyakāyaṃ 9b ya' 대통령 esu dharmasya avicārayaṃ avikāpyantā āyaṃ ucyate Marjutora' bodhisattvavyaṃ mahāsattvavikārayā.

Chin. Kj. 37a-15-13

- 7 láyé tianzheng shí jīnshí shí qíngshí, gēn wéi zhōngsheng shíjiē jīnzhī, wénzhī jīnzhī jǐ yì mínshí, mìng yì huáxiáng, mìng yì fēixíng zhì? 20

Chin. Dr. 107b-11-10

- 7 yí cíhuí; ér cítōng. wéi zěn mei yì wéi jīnzhī zhī? 20

F (Farhād-Bēg) 15a-1

ācāragosāpratisthītaM manyasaṃ bodhisatva na mahāsattvaṃ dukkhasāryāyaḥ saṁpratīṣṭhāyeyāḥ katham ca Manyasaṃ bodhisatva mahāsaṃ katham ca ācāragosāpratisthīto bhavati. 12

Tib. Kanjur version, based upon T. 131b4

'Jam dpal ba 'byang chub sems dpa' 'sems dpa' chen po dag cho ga darg phyod yul la gnas te / cho kyi rnam grangs di yang dag par rab tu bstan par bya'o / 'Jam dpal dga' 'byang chub sems dpa' 'sems dpa' chen po dag cho ga darg phyod yul la gnas pa yin zhe na? 14

Bth (Batkang Kanjur) 115b1

'Jam dpal ciitar na 'byang chub sems dpa' 'sems dpa' chen po dag cho gar dang phyod yul la gnas te / cho kyi rnam grangs di yang dag par rab tu bstan par bya'o / 'Jam dpal ciitar na 'byang chub sems dpa' 'sems dpa' chen po dag cho ga darg phyod yul la gnas pa yin zhe na? 14

Chin. Dr. 107b-11-10

- 7 yí cíhuí; ér cítōng. wéi zěn mei yì wéi jīnzhī zhī? 20

Chin. Kj. 37a-15-13

- 7 láyé tianzheng shí jīnshí shí qíngshí, gēn wéi zhōngsheng shíjiē jīnzhī, wénzhī jīnzhī jǐ yì mínshí, mìng yì huáxiáng, mìng yì fēixíng zhì? 20

XIII § 4 (KN.275.7-(1))
Gilgit/Nepalese version, based upon D2. 75a-

9a ya'da Marjutora' bodhisatva mahāsattva dharmanā yadā ca Marjutora' bodhisatva mahāsattva ca dharmam svalakṣaṇam vanyakāyaṃ 9b ya' 대통령 esu dharmasya avicārayaṃ avikāpyantā āyaṃ ucyate Marjutora' bodhisattvavyaṃ mahāsattvavikārayā.
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svaḥvaśvalakṣaṇam vyavalośayau āyam eṣu dharmasya ācāraṇāt(m): iṣṭāt yā avikalpanat(m): sparikalpanat, syam ucyate bodhisatvasyācārāḥ


Tib. Kanjur version, based upon T. 13116-

'Jam dpalṅgang gi thseṅ byang chub sems (T.1316) dpa’ sems dpa’ chen po’i bzhod pa dang / its dal ba dang / iṅs dal ba’i sa thob cing / yid mi sdi dang la / phrag ‘dog med par ’gnyur te / 'Jam dpalṅgang gi thseṅ byang chub sems (T.1316) dpa’ sems dpa’ chen po dag / iṅschos tang la yang / mi spyod cing / phros nasṅkyi rang gi mthun nyid la yang dag pa jī ita ba’ bzhin duṅs ita steṅ / tang chos rnam la rnam par (T.1316) mi spyod / māi rnam par mi rtogroup pa de ng / 'Jam dpalṅbyang chub sems dpa’ sems dpa’ chen po’i cto ga zhes bya’o/

Bth (Rathang Kanjur) 115b2-

'Jam dpalṅgang gi thseṅ byang chub sems dpa’ sems (T.1316) dpa’ chen po’i bzhod pa dang / dūl ba dang / dūl ba’i sa thob cing / yid mi sdi dang la phrag ‘dog med par ’gnyur te / 'Jam dpalṅgang gi thseṅ byang chub sems dpa’ sems dpa’ chen po dag / iṅschos tang la yang / mi spyod cing / phros nasṅkyi rang gi mthun nyid la yang dag pa jī ita ba’ bzhin duṅs ita steṅ / tang chos rnam la rnam par (T.1316) mi spyod / māi rnam par mi rtogroup pa de ng / 'Jam dpalṅbyang chub sems dpa’ sems dpa’ chen po’i cto ga zhes bya’o/

Chin. Dr. 107b-10--7

假使持心，忍辱调柔，护持其戒，畏不自立，其志如地；不見有人；不見有人而行法者；觀自然相，語法本無。此諸法者乘行之式也，亦無思量。是謂破壊。 30

Chin. Kj. 37a-13--10

若菩薩、摩诃薩住忍辱地，柔和順順，而不自棄，心亦不驚，又復於法無所行，而觀諸法如實相，亦不行，分別、是名菩薩、摩诃薩行處也。
10 Tib. Kanjur version, based upon T. 132a1.200

'Jam dpa'i101 byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' (T.132a1, chen po'i spyan yul gang zhe na? / 100) Jam dpa'i102 gang gi tehe jio/103 byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rgyal po la mi sten/104 rgyal bu dang/105 rgyal po'i blon po chen po dang/106 rgyal po'i zhab 'bring ba/107 (T.132a1, la mi sten/108 p/109 mi/110 bnyen/111 p/112 bnyen)
12 raams dang ma yin/162 gyad raams dang ma yin/163 gzhun dag gi/164 dga' ba dang/165 (T.132a6, tsh/166 ba' gnas raams su/167 mi 'gro/168 de dag dang lhan cig/169 'ders pa/170 yang?/171 mi byed de/172 drung du lhags pa la dus su/173 cho bshad pa ni ma gtsogs te/174 te yang/175 mi gnas par 'chad/176 pa'o/177 nyan thos/178 (T.132a7, kyi tshag pa can gnyi 'chra slos dang g/179 dge slong ma dang p/180 dge bnyen dang/181 bnyen na la mi sten/182 'ders pa/183 bnyen byed/184 de dag dang/185 'ders pa/186 mi byed de/187 'chag sa 'am/188 rgya knang ngya/189 (T.132a8, gsug lag khang na yang/190 de dag dang 'grogs pa'i spyan yul ba/191 ma yin no/192 / drung du lhags pa la dus su chos/193 'chad/194 pa'i ni/195 ma gtsogs te/196 de yang/197 mi gnas par 'chad/198 pa'o/199 'Jam dpa'i200 (T.132a9, de r/201 byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po'i spyan yul lo/202

Bth (Basthan Kanjur) 133h5-
'Jam dpal byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po'i spyod yul gang ahe na / 'Jam dpal gang gi tsha: byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po yul lo ma li brtan'52 rgyal bu dang: rgyal po'i blo sbyin lo po chen po dang: rgyal po'i zhus 'bring ba la mi brtan / mi bshad: bshad bum khris mi byed / nye bar mi 'gro / shad. na mi stod53 can gyi, spyod bya dang: kun tu rgyu ba bo dang: 'tso bo ba gser bu pa rnam dang / sbyan neg54 (11)4 gi bstan bcos la zhsags pa'i sems van rnaams la mi brtan mi bshad: bshad bum khris mi byed / 'jig rten rgyang .........
legs kyi sili khrod55 byed pa rnaams na mi yin / gyud rnam dang ma yin / byed dag gi dpa' ba dang (r) tser bari dga' nas rnaams (11)4 su mi 'gro: de dag dang lhan cig 'dris par yang mi byed de: drung du brag56 la du sams su cho shad pa ni ma rtags te de: de yang mi gnas par 'chad de: nyon thos kyi etha pa can gsvis gi ege slong (11)4 dang: ege slong ma dang: dge bshad dang (r) mi mi brtan / mi bshad: bshad bum khris mi byed / de dag dang 'dris par mi byed: de dag, cuds rip sa 'am gnas khros ngam / / (gtsug lags khang ngam i) gtsug (11)4 (dus /) khros na sgyag de dag (r) brag56 pa'i spyod yul na yin no / / drung du brag56 pa'i la (r) cho shad sa ni ma rtags te de: de yang mi gnas par 'chad pa'o: 'Jam dpal de dag, ni (11)4 byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po'i spyod yul lo:

---

Chin. Dr. 167b-7-e2

何謂禮節？謂令菩薩不與王者、太子、大臣、吏民從事；不與外道、異學交會；不尚世欲、著於言、書籍、吉凶，不與；不與羯磨、魚鹽、戈射、鶏、犢、原阿司等事；不與歌舞、遊宴聚會同處；不與賢能，比丘、比丘尼、清信士、清信女從事，亦不與親近、可親、可接，不共共住；不與同志經行、行香等。故華、著華，然燃，除其往諸講經會時，唯與講師而共從事；雖有所說，亦無所著，是為禮節。201

---

Chin. Kj. 37a-10-b2

云何名菩薩，摩訶薩？從近處？謂令，摩訶薩不與親近王、王子、大臣、官長；不與親近外道，梵行、尼犍子等及道俗僧衆，演說教義及諸善事，與善知識等相交，亦無善友，亦不與親近羯磨等善友；亦不與親近，與兩、同志等善友說，亦不與親近羯磨等善友；亦不與親近羯磨等善友；亦不與親近羯磨等善友；亦不與親近羯磨等善友。是如是等所來者，則稱為善友，無所說，亦不與親近賢能比丘、比丘尼、優婆塞、優婆夷，亦不與親近，於房中，若經行處，(179)若在講堂中，不共住住；或時來者，隨宜說，無所說。210
Bth (Bathang Kanjur) 116a2- 

'Jam dpal ge]han yang byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po' bud med la rgyan chags par 'gang yang rang ba a}tshang mar bsodIAS (116a1), nas rtng tu chos 'chad pa mi, ma yin po, i bud med la rtng tu lta bar 'dod pa ma yin po, / khyim bshad 'gSung ste bud med dam; bu mo 'am; khyim bshad 'gSung la rtng tu chos, 'chad par sems pa ma yin yang (116a1), dag par mgu bar byed pa ma yin, ma ning la chos mi ston: de dag dang lhan cing 'drin par mi byed / yang dag par mgu bar byed pa ma yin / slong ba'i phyir cir bu khyim du mi 'jug ste / de bshin gshegs (116a6), po rgyan dran pa bsgom pa ni ma grogs so: gal te bud med la chos ston na, / de la na chos la'chos kyi, 'dod chags pas kyang chos mi ston na / dje bud med la 'dod chags dang ka la lta ci smos; de chos (116a6) ston pa na: g so'i phel bjal 116a yang mi ston ra: [la i] bshin phag 'gyur ba ci cher po lta ci smos; de dag, <dges> tshul dang: dge tshul ma dang: dge slong dang: dge slong ma dang: gzhon nu ma ii la, mi bya' / de dang dag giasto, yang yang la'chos <dges> yang bu med la chos stod na yang / de chung mgu na chos lat 'dod chags pas yang chos myi stod na' / de bud med la'chos <dges> pha (116a4) [i-ii] lta ci smos / de chos ston pa na / chung
Chin. Dr. 107v-2-11

又話首云：「吾謂，大士不顧。家居，宗室，親屬，不欲想見思內人。女媳，親
說話，亦不欲親語群從。幼童、男、女及婦人所，而說語語，所不欲講不適定
意；是謂不欲，不與己立，亦非同環。不與己比，如人等語，話意來
清進為行，親為女不能親語，不於中染浮浮語，不令受取，而聞語
谀，不與沙纏。因為，子、女，共在，一處，常好言坐，織織，謬謬。

是為禮節。」[[17]

Chin. Kj. 37b-2-11

文殊說利，又説，摩利無不憚於女人身。取能生欲想相，而為說法。亦不樂
見；若入他家，不與小女、處女、處女等其語，亦不近不親。不與女
為，不与女為，若有因緣，梁緣人時，則心悲痛；若為女人說法，不樂說笑，
不與相接，乃至為法語不親，況況語事；不樂聞少弟子、沙纏、小児，亦不
樂與同師，常好言坐，織織，謬謬，在於處，修攝其心。文殊說利，是名初穀處。119

XIII § 7 (KN.277.11-278.5)

G/N (Gilgit/Nepalese version), based upon D2. 75b7-

punar aparata Manjuśri bodhisatvo mahāsāvakvo sarvadharmān (D2.75b6, 6.9.1v1, 6.9.1v1)\n
akṣampyān avivartyaṇā aparivartyaṇā sadā satyabhūtasthitān akṣamāyavartyaṇā\n
akṣampyān avivartyaṇā aparivartyaṇā sthitān satyabhūtasthitān akṣamāyavartyaṇā\n
nirvāṇavairocana viśvābhāṣitān asamābhistān asamātān asamāsāsthitān\n
asamāyavartyaṇā asamātān asamābhāṣitān (\n
śrīvajrapālāyāparāśākṣāṣṭhātाव

104
O (Khidlalq MS. = "Kashgar" MS.) 266b–
punar aparām (266a) Manjusrī \ bhoḍiḥसत्तत्वa mahāसत्तवa sarvadharmāh
echāyam vyavakṣayatī yathā(266b)pratāpittham 10 \cibhāpitthāyino
5 yathābhūtasthitham 10 acalān abāmālpākān (266b)āvīrātī aparvāratam sadā yathābhūtasthitham 10 ukāśasvabhāvān sarvadharmān
ānūkāśasvabhāvān(266b)āvīrātīvarjītan 10 \ a bhūtān samabhūtan 10 samāskṛtān
20 asamkhṛṣṭaṁ \ nā na sato nāsāṁ-satāṁ a-satā\mā \pālābāhārpratāpitthān 10 \ aṣṭaṁ \ asamgasthāṁṣṭhithān 10 abhyāvān sarvabhūtān(266b)āvīrātīm
25 samājīśvāpunyāsādprabhūtan ete sarvadharmā 10 evam hi Manjusrī bodhīsatvā nāsāṁsātām hāsātva 10 sarvadharmān
abhijnānam vyavakṣayamāna etena vihāraya 10 \ahākṣamaṁ vihārāmāno gocare sthito bhavati (ayaṃ Manjusrīr bodhīsatvā mahāsattva gocare sthito) bhavati -) ayam Manjusrīr bodhīsatvāya mahāsattva gocare triyō gocara 19

F (Farhād-Bēg) 16b7–
(167) punar aparām Manuṣyār bhū(đh)ṣatvā maḥāsattvā sarvadharmā(ṃ)
šūnyāt(m) vyavakṣayati yathāvapratīṣṭhitam 10 na (vipā)rtattāshāyino : yathā(167)bhiṣasthitā na ca na kampikā : na navartā na parivārat sadā yathābhūtasthītā ukāśasvabhāvā : sarvadharmā : nirukti(167) vyavāhāravarjītanā : na jātān na bhūtān : cina samabhūtan 10 na nā asamkṛtān \ na

(4-42) // yajñī yathāvapratīṣṭhitā avipāṣṭ[i]ṣṭāḥ śāyino yathābhūtasthi . . . (4-42) /// // \ mūryāḥ samabhūtan \ (4-42) \ \ \ /// // \ abhasanām\"vyopa[lok]yamānā(ṃ)\" \cetena vihāre[ṣa] a(bh)ākṣamā \ /// //

Tib. Kanjur version, based upon T. 132b8–9
(Ext. dpa)\"g[he]n[za]n he (b)hāng chub\" sens dpa 'sems dpa' chen po\" chos thams cad li stong par lta' \\mā (132b)\mā li tae gnas pa bzhin sāng \// \ma log par\"
Chin. Dr. 107c11-18

又譯道：‘菩薩大士觀一切法皆為空無，如所住立，不見顛倒，所立正報，常住法。’

Chin. Kj. 37b12-17

復次，菩薩、摩醯首羅一切法空，如實住，不顛倒，不動，不退，不轉，如虛空，
無所有性；一切諸法行，不生，不出，不起，無名，無相，實無所有，無邊際，
無際，無際，但以因緣有，從顛倒生，於此常樂。嚴如是法相，名菩薩、摩醯首羅
第二親近處。

XIII § 9 (KN.278.6-279.8: vss. 1-6)

G/N (Gilgit/Nepalese version), based upon D2. 76a1–

atha khalu bhagavān etad evārtham bhūyasyā mātrayā sāndarśayāmānas tasyaṃ
velāyamś imā gotā bhābāsaḥ //

yo bodhisattva iti cheyā paścātkale subhairavē //
idaññā 72.76a6 sahaṃ prakāśetā saṅgī pākṣūvanā viśisṭadarśaḥ // (1)
acāragocarasaṃ rūpeda saṃsārata ca scūt bhaveta // (2)
varjiyā matī samstṛvāṃ nāmaṃ rājaputraṃ rājāḥ // (2)
ye cāpi rājaputraḥ kutiyā tehi na samstṛvām //
ca nādiśamāsurikasā ca 72.76b3 priyā kāśikā cāpi sarvaḥ // (3)
adhimā niṣa nevata vinaya cādame athis of //
arhatasammatanām bhikṣuṃ duḥkīlādā cā cāvirañāya // (4)
bhikṣuṇī amāvatāṃ bhikṣuṇīḥ bhāvāmālapocārabhi // (5)
upāśakāmā ca varjeyaḥ paścā 72.76b6 katāna svasthitān // (5)
"ya" niṁsatāṃ gāveṣantām dṛṣte dharmā upāśakāya //
varjieyaḥ samstṛvām tābhi ca cātāṃ saṃ yām ucyate // (6)

O (Khādaliq MS. = “Kashgar” MS.) 266b3–

atha kha[238]lu bhagavān idam evārtham bhūyaso mātrayā sāndarśayairuktāmas

107
Tib. Kanjur version, based upon T. 133a5–19

dae nas bcom ldan 'das kyi, don 'di nyid rgyas pa ston cing de'i tshes tshigs su bmad pd 'di dag bka' stsal to / /

phyi dus shin tu'i 'jigs po la / / zhum paa (T. 115a2) med cing ma 'jigs par / /
mdo sde'i 'di ni bstan par'i yang / / byang chu 'di gsum pa' gsum 'dog gsum pa'i / / (= 1)
cho ga sbyod yul bser yin bya'i zhi / / 'du 'dzin med la gtsang'i bar bya / /
rgyal paa (T. 115a2) dang ni rgyal bu 'dang / / 'dris byed rtag tu spangs'i bar bya / / (= 2)

rgyal po'i 'zhugs 'bring gsum yin dang / / grol pa dang ni zol pa dang / /
mu stegs can ni de dag dang / / rnam pa kun tu'i (T. 115a4) 'dris mi byed'i / / (= 3)
dge slob 'dul dang lung gnas pa / / dgur bcom byan dus'i sems'i byed'i cing / /
nga rgyal can rnam btses'i mi bya / / tshol khrims 'chul rnam ston ston (T. 115a2) par
spangs / / (= 4)

dgod'i cing smra ba'i sbyod yul can / / dge slob ma rnam rtag du spangs / /
m'i brtan'i par'i ni'i mgon po yi'i / / dge snyan rnam kyang spangs bar bya / /
P'i (5)
dge snyan'i ma gang tse 'di (T. 115b2) la / / mya mtang 'das pa tshol byed pa'i / /
deg dang ni 'dris byed spangs'i / / 'di ni cho ga yin zhes bya / / (= 6)

Bth (Batham Kanjur) 116b4–

dae nas bcom ldan 'das kyi, don 'di rgyas pa ston cing '; de'i tshes (tshes'i) rgya brad pa 'di dag bka' stsal to / /

phyi (T.115a2) dus shis tu 'jigs po la / / zhum pa med cing 'jig pa med par. / /

mda sde 'di ni bstan par yang / / byang chu sens dpag 'dog 'dog pa / / (= 1)
cho ga sbyod yul stag bya zhi / / 'du 'drel'i med la gsum bar (T.115a4) bya / /
rgyal po dang ni rgyal bu dang / / 'dris byed rtag tu stag bya / / (= 2)
dge slob 'dul dang (T.115b2) lung gas stag / /
dge bcom pa dang / / snyan ma byed cing / /
nga rgyal can rnam brtan'i mi bya / / tshol khrims 'chul rnam ston par stong / / (= 4)
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tahun can:

derging

"tib thab" bhupi per

\(\text{４}+ \text{５})

derging

de "tib thab" bhupi per

\(\text{４}+ \text{５})

\(\text{１}+ \text{２})

\(\text{４})

\(\text{４})

\(\text{４})

\(\text{４})

\(\text{４})

\(\text{４})

\(\text{４})

\(\text{４})

\(\text{４})

\(\text{４})

\(\text{４})
現在欲護法 常雲(10)若非
(10a)住滅度地 是謂為威儀 (5) 188

Chin. Kj. 37b17-26

爾時，世尊欲宣如義，而說偈言：
若此若彼
若此若彼
若此若彼
若此若彼
若此若彼
若此若彼

第十三章 § 9 (KN.279-9-281.2; vss. 7-15)

XIII § 9 (KN.279-9-281.2; vss. 7-15)

G/N (Gilgile/Nepalese version), based upon D2. 76α-5- (D3. 115a1)

15 'tāsya bhāṣet sādā vīraḥ anolino saśāt Dw111,10,1,1b

19 sammodaye jātu kauśalyam kṣaṁ asaḥ prechihum

19 samstavam ca vivarjayātha saukarorabhikhe ci
ci (6) // (6)

20 (D2.76α) ye ca cii vividhaṁ prātīṇaṁ hinseyat bhogakaṁnaṁ // 39

māṃsāmāṁ sūnāya vikrentiṁ samstavamāṁ tair vivarjayet // (10)

stripasakā ca ye sarva varjyateṁ tehī samstavamāṁ

21 ātataṁ jhālakamalaṁ āte ye ānaye tadṛśa bhavet // (6)

viramaD2.76α, khyāhaṁ naṁ 3a, sevaitaṁ ye ācayeṁ bhogavartayaṁ / (6)

pratisammodanānāṁ tehī sarvasaṁ parivarjayet // (6)

22 yaṁ ca dhāram āhāryaṁ mātrāmrayaṁ pānditaṁ // (6)

na cikāha praviṣec tarā nāpi hāsya sthitro bhavet // (6)

yada piṁ praviṣed grāD2.76α,matāṁ bhojanārthiṁ punah punah // (6)

dvitiyaṁ bhikṣe maṇgetāṁ buddheṁ vam samamunṣet // (6)

28 acāradioha ho caṁ prathamo me nirajaritāṁ // (6)

viharante yena srayajāṁ dhārenāṁ sūtram idāyan // (15)

O (Khādālīq M. = "Kashgar" M.) 267a6-
ye tu tataśāyamāṁ krayaṁ dhāram pracchā (Gr)gbodhaye
tasā bhāsye: sādā vīraṁ anaulināṁ anitrataṁ // (6)

stri pāṇḍitaṁ kāci ca ye sarvāḥ samstavām tehī parivarjāt

dwhakātā cāpi kūmārayet ca vivarjayet // 8
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SIP (Petrovsky Collection: SIP/10, fol. 324a – BB. 33, p. 215, fol. No. 15) 324a1–25
ye ta" tasyāyūpāsamanvāyam" dharmām preche ("girabodhiye "
tasya bhāṣet sadā virah naaulinah anśishā[ri]taḥ"
7
strī pandakāt ca (1156a) ye savaṃ samstavam "tehi bhavyaje
20
kulesu vadhukat cāpi kumāraya ca viharasvajet (‘8)
na tām sammodaye jātāh "hāsyako-dhāraṇa" yaja samstavam "tekōbhhi varṣa samkṣeṭhbhrinā
cā ca 9
vividhi prānāt (e) [c] himsanti bhogākṣaramām"
mām,1156a sa sūkṣma prakriyā samstavam tehi bhavyaje
10
spītāsau kat ca ye satvajyavat tihi bhavant samstavam
25
natebhī (1156b) jalāmallehīr ye ṣānye tādrīa bhavat 11
vāramukhyān na seveta ye čaney bhogv[r]ītikā
pṛthīsamnodanaṃ teṣām (1156a) sarvāh [apa]vīravajeto (‘0)
12
yadā ca desayed dharmam mātṛgrāmayasā pandito
ta (e) [k] jayiṣet tatra nāpi hāṣya (1156a) sthitau bhavet 13
yadā ca prīvīṣhōd grāmam bhojanaṃbhū būṣa[naḥ]
vārityām bhikṣu maṅgeta bhuddham [v]ṣā samanuṣmaret (‘14)
ācāragacaraya (1156b) he eṣa prathamaṃ me prakṣāśā
viharamti sukhāṃ yena dhāreṇiḥ sūtryam idēsam 15
F (Farhād-Bēg) 17b2–
(173b) Ye tu tasyāyūpāsamanvāyam" dharmā preche ("girabodhiye "
tasya bhāṣet sadāt[na] vīca anolī(na) [a]niṁsā 7

bza' phiyi rna shams 'tshong'15 byed pa / / de dag 'dris13 byed rnam18 par spang12 // //
(= 10)
gang bsdug med gso byed dang20 // / gar mkhan gyel15 dang sild11 khrol ba20 //
gang gzhana de dang13 'dra ba yang / / de dag rnam dang 'dris13 byed spang // / (= 11)
res ma'i gso mo15 baten18 mi bya / / ji snyed longs spyod 'the6 bza' gzhana //
shin11 dga' ba de dag kyang15 // / rnam10 pa kun tu15 yongs su spang // / (= 12)
gs, mkhan pa bsdug med rnam la yang / / gang gi15 dus na chos 'chad pa15 //
der11 ni grig par15 ni 'gro ste // / 'insong cing 'dag par mi bya'o // (= 13)
gang the zas phyur yang dang yang / / greng du 'jag10 par14 byed pa na //
dge 'slong gnyis pa bsdal bar bya / / yang na10 sngas rgyas dran bar10 bya // / (= 14)
gang gis shes rab ldan pa dag10 // / mdo sde 'di 'dra 'dzin gnas pa'i6 //
cho gsa10 dang ni spyod yul dag // / thog10 (T.18mo) mar nges bsahd 'di yin no // / (= 15)

15 Bth (Barhang Kanjor) 117a1-
gang zhig de'i thad 'ongs nas / : byang chub mchog phyur chos 'di16 mi //
gnas pa med cing mi chen18 bar // / dga' bo rtag tu de la shod // / (= 7)
bud med ma16 dangs [se]m <can> gang // / (avta) de dang 'dris byed rnam par <spang>:
khym rnam su ni rma' ma dang : gnhon nu ma rnam rnam rnam par <spang> // / (= 8)
20 de dag nam du'ang dga' mi byed // / 'mka' dang reg dang 'di bsdug la dang :
phag 'thebogs ba dang (%) bstan10 bs dang ce / 'dris par byed pa rnam par <spang> // / (= 9)
gang dag srog <chag> <nr> rnam[s] dag la : longs spyod phyur ni good pa dang / /
bza' phiyi rna shams 'tshong byed pa / / de dag 'dris byed rnam par <spang>10 / / (= 10)
gang bsdug med gso15 byed pa / / gar mkhan gyi gsal dang sil khrol ba / /
ghyam dag de dang 'dra ba <spang> / / de dag rnam dang 'dris byed <spang> // / (= 11)
res ma'i gso mo bstan10 mi bya / / ji snyed longs spyod 'the6 bza' gzhana //
shin11 dga' ba de dag kyang15 : rnam [pa kun tu] yongsu15 <spang> // / (= 12)
mkhan pa bsdug med rnam la yang / / gang gi15 dus na 'dul10 chad he //
der ni chen10 mi 'gro ste // / rnal cing 'dag par mi bya'o // / (= 13)
gang the zas phyur yang dang15 snyigs / : gzhong du 'dung110 byed pa na / na :
dge 'slong gnyis pa bsdal bar bya / / yang [fmdog] ni (%) sngas rgyas dran bar bya // / (= 14)
gang gis shes rab ldan pa dag / / mdo sde 'di 'dra 'dzin (%) gnas par :
cho ga dang ni10 spyod yul dag : thog mar nges bsahd 'di yin no : / / (= 15)

Tib. Kho. (Tibetan translation from Khotan) kha s1a2-b2 (cf. It.S. 40,f.)
gang zhig de'i thad 'ongs nas / : byang ral mchog phyur chos 'di bs //
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XIII § 10 (KN.281, 3–8; rss. 16–18)

G/N (Gilgit/Nepalese version), based upon D2. 76a8– (D3. 115a4+)

O (Khādīq MS. = "Kashgar" MS.) 266a2–

SIP (Petrovsky Collection: SIP/10, fol. 324 = BB. 33, p. 215, fol. No. 18) 324b2–29

F (Farkhād-Bēg) 17b8–
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讀（大善院）A-10-2-2

（0-10）\\/// ++ + + + + [s]n[info] na pâyá (w 17)\\///

 Tib. Kajur version, based upon T. 1341a-28
gong ige la 'du byas 'du'us' ma byas : 'yang dag yang dag ma yin dang //
reb bring tha ma'i chos rnam pa la : rnam² pa kun tu² spyod pa med // (w 16)
\(\text{C Thomson} 'bran pa bad med ces ni spyod // sneys pa zhes kyang ni rig stey //
chos so cög² ni ma² sneys phyir // 'beal ba byas kyang ni mthong ba // (w 17)
'di ni byang chub sems 'dpa yi // cho gar² rnam² pr. (\text{C Thomson}) kun tu² bstan² //
de dag spyod yul ci 'dra ba // de ni mnam² par mswan par gyis // (w 18)
\)

Bth (Bathon Kangjur) 117a7-
gong (gshi) cii 'du byas 'du'us' ma byas : yang dag yang dag ma yin dang :
reb 'bring ta ma'i chos rnam la : rnam² pa kun tu spyod zhi² med // (w 16)
\(\text{C Thomson} 'bran he bud med ces ni spyod : sneys pa zhes kyang ni rig stey //
chos so cög² ni ma² sneys phyir // 'beal bha byas kyang ni mthong ba // (w 17)
'di ni byang chub sems 'dpa yi // cho gar mswan ser² (\text{C Thomson}) kun tu bstan :
de dag spyod yul [rnam²] ci 'dra ba // de ni mswan par mswan bha gyis // (w 18)
\)

 Tib. Kho. (Tibetan translation from Khotan) lha 51b2- (cf. ItS. 59f.)
\text{nam chog chen, la myi spyod pa // thua ma rab dang 'bring (kha ma) te dang //}
'du byas 'du'us' ma byas pa dag // khen dang gyi khen thormo cad la // (w 16)
\(\text{C Thomson} 'bran he bud med ces myi spyod // sneys pa zhes kyang myi rig stey //
\"hluhlu\" [lha ma byas pa la] 'beal khen mthong <kha> myi ³ rgnyi // (w 17)
\(\text{C Thomson} c'i byang ral sans dpa'i r // cho ga 'di sgam mswan pa ni //
de [kha] de 'i spyod yul ji 'dra ba // de dang 'rab du byehad gan ymed // (w 18)
\)

Chin. Dr. 108a20-25

[...]
XIII 11 (KN.281.9-282.2; vss. 19-22)

G/N (Gilgit/Nepalese version), based upoe D2. 76b2- (D3. 115a6- )
asanstak dharmae ime 'ca deita apradurbhâtę ca 'ajêta sarve /
sonyâ nîrîhâ sthita nîryakale' vapîrîtasamjîtihi'me vikalpita sa
ayam' gocaro ucayati panditânâm // ( =19)
avishvakarma samta uânti ti abhûta bhûtatah11 // ( =19)
anushtubâ12 cêpi ajata dharmâ13 'jâta (aya bhûta viparîtsakalpitâh12 // ( =20)
ekaprakritâthâ11 samamahatâ sâdâ Sumerukâsâm11 yasya sushtiitâ10 ca /
evam sthitaâ12 cêpi hi ta11 niriksh22 vishvakarma12 // ( =21)
sadhâ12 pitâ 'âkâtasamân âstrâkán anijita19 manyanvarijita19 ca / sthita hi dharmâ imi nîtyakâlam. ayam'18 gocaro ucayati18 panditânam // ( =22)

20 O (Khidâliq MS. = "Kashgari" MS.) 268a6-
asanstak <dharmas> ime ca 'identa apradurbhâtę ca ajata sa1920 yâ -
sonyâ nîrîhâ sthita nîryakalâm aya gocaro hy ucayati19 // ( =19)
vapi rîpurasamjîtihi'me vikalpita saanta sanâti abhûta bhûtatah20 'sthito116 -
anushtubâ12 cêpi ajata dharmâ13 'sthito-ebhi116 bhûtita viparîtsakalpitatâ 20

ekaprakritâthâ11 samamahatâ shabha11 Sume1920 fûkâtva susamahatitma -
evam sthito cêta nîrîkshâyam12 'âkâtasbhi imi sa1920 vishvakarma // ( =21)
sadhâ hi o1 akâtasamân hy âstrâkán anijita19 manyanvarijita19 ca :
sthito1920 vishvakarman sao1920 nîryakalâm aya gocaro ucayati sthrânam1920 // ( =22)

30 SIP (Petrskyov Collection: SIP/10, fol. 324 = BR. 33, p. 215, fol. No. 18). 324b5-20
asanstak dharmâ ime ca deita apradurbhâtâ ca ajata [sa]rve -
sonyâ nîrîhâ sthita nîryakalâm aya gocaro hy ucayati panditânam19 19
viparîtsakalpitisbhi imi vikalpeatsaanta santthâ19 abhûta bhûtatah
anushtubâ cêpi ajata dharmâ19 'sthietâ (aya bhûta viparîtsakalpitâ)20

3 e //

F (Farhâd-Bég) 18a2-
Tib. Kanjur version, based upon T. 1343-3.10

chos 'di dag ni yod pa ma yin bstan / /

thams cad 'byung ba med cing skyes pa med / /

rtag tu mi g-yo (T.1344) stong pa nyid du gnas / /

di ne mchhas pa rnam sbyod yul yin / (e 19)

'di' dag 'du shes "log pas brtags" pa ste / /

yang dag min la yang dag med la yod / /

ma byung ba dang ma skyes chos rnam (T.1344) la / /

yang dag nyid 'dang 'byung bar log" par brtags / (e 20)

sem sri rtag tu rse goig myam bshag" ste / /

Ri ral phung po ci ba'his rab tu gnas / /

di dekis 'dog nas "nam mchhas" la bar ni / /

(T.1344)chos 'ri dag kun la brtags" par bya / (e 21)

trag tu "nam mchhas" mthungs par snying po med / /

mi g-yo rlong sems rnam par spangs pa ste / /

chos' rnam's 'di dag rtag pa'i dus gnas pa / /

x 'di (T.1345) ni mchhas pa rnam sbyod yul yin / (e 22)

Bth (Barthong Kanjur) 117b-

chos 'di dag ni yod pa ma yin sras / /

thams cad 'byung ba med cing shes bya med : /

rtag tu mi g-yo stong pa nyid du gnas / /

di ni mchhas pa rnam sbyod yul yin (e 19)

'di dag 'du shes log par brtags pa ste /
yang dag min la yang dag  "yod ma yin : ma byung ba dang ma  (1570) skyes cho nsams la : yang nag nyid dang 'byung bar log par brtag ( = 20) sens ni rtag tu rtse geig mnyam bzhag ste / ' 
Ri rab phung po ci bzhin rab tu gnas : de bzhin 'dag nas nam mkha’ ba bcuo ni  (5) (1573a) cho nsams 'di dag kun la brtag par bya ( = 21) rtag na nam mkha’ṃ mtshungs par snying po med : mi g-yo rlon sens nam pan spangs pa ste // 
chos na mifes 'di dag  "brtag pa'i dus gnas pa // 'di ni (1514) mifes pa na mifes kyi spod yol yin ( = 22) 

Tib. Kho. (Tibetan translation from Khotan) kha 51b6~ (cf. Ikt.63f.) chos 'di dag <cn> yod pa ma yin byar // 
(15) thams cad yang ni msa skyes ma byung, (da.1510b) yin // 
rtag tu myi g-yo, stong pa nyid du gnas // 
de ni mkhas pa ra nams gi spod yol yin // ( = 19) 
log pa'i 'di sbe gros <cni> 'di dag ra nams par, (da.1513b) bytags // 
myed pa yod par myi bden bden bar te // 

tangs pa msa yin mza skyes, pa'i cho  // 
skyes stong byung bar log par, ra nams par, rtags // (da.1516b) ( = 20) 
rtag tu rtse geig mnyam ba, ghags pa sene // 
Ri rab phung po mra bzhin rab tu gnas // 
de bzhin 'dag nas de dag rtags pa ni // 
(20) 
(sho 1512),/ / ch(ons 'di thams cad nam bar gyoag par te // ( = 21) 
nam chigs 'nam ba' mtshungs par snying po myed // 
myi g-yo myems pa ra nams gi spangs gnos pa' nes // 
sha.1517 // rtags po chos 'di ra na mzes gna' pa gi // 
mkhas pa ra nams gi spod yol 'di sbe brus' // ( = 22) 

Chin. Dr. 108a26-b7 

(38) 覚得有所起 諸法無生 因相謂之 "而生法無" ( = 20) 
(39) 心常住 修習三昧 建立於行 若得圓滿 
(40) 所住如是 賦觀諸法 認一切法 猶如虛空 ( = 21) 
(41) 識若 "無無" 等無堅固 "不念取著 無所著損" 
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第 12 条 (1952.3.8；文. 23-25)

G/N (Gilgit/Nepalese version), based upon D2. 76b+ (D3. 115a10+)

iryyapotam yo iru rakṣamā.59.60 vṛtta bhikṣu 'mama nivṛttaṣya / prakāśyate suram idam hi loke na cāpi saṃśaya'tasya kācit// (12 23)

kāla ca51 cintāyāmānaḥ pūnditaḥ praviśayī samyamaḥ52 ca tathā ghaṭṭiyaśva// (12 24)

rājana tasyaṁ ca sātricāh karoti rakṣam ye rṣiputraś ca śrōtrī śūdras /

anve pī ca53 grhaṇaḥ brahmaṇaḥ ca parivṛtiṣya sarveṣaṣya śiśita bhavanti //

// (12 25)54

O (Kāhālīq MS. = "Kashgar" MS.) 268b5-

iryyapotam yo iru rakṣamā.59.60 bhaveta bhikṣu mamā nirvṛttaṣya / praksāyet sūtra bahūjānasya na ca (268a3) lāncito bhavijya55 kādācīr52.23

kāla ca51 cintāyāmānaḥ pūnditaḥ praviśayī lemaṇ56 (268b) tathā dvāra khaṭṭiyet//

vṛtta bhārmaḥ imi sarvī yauṁśe75.76 vyutthāya so śaśayī nau57 ca liṣy75.76.77 tī 2-45

rājāṁ tasya praṅaṁ ca ca śrūtīn ti rakaś ye rṣiputrāḥ ca (12 25) ca pāṇiśtī ti dharmam75

anve pī ca53 grhaṇaḥ brahmaṇaḥ ca parivṛtiṣya sarveṣaṣya śiśiḥ ca bhonti //

// (12 25)54

F (Feṇhūn-Bēg) 18a7-

iryyapotam yo iru rakṣamā.59.60 bhavita bhikṣuḥ mamā ni-cṛ vṛttaṣya / praksāyīt śūtra bahūjānasya ca ca lāncitaḥ bhaviṣya75 kādācīr// (23)

kāla ca51 cintāyāmānaḥ pūnditaḥ praviśayī lāncitaḥ tathā dvāra khaṭṭiyet//

vṛtta bhārmaḥ imi sarvī yauṁśe75.76 vyutthāya so śaśayī ca liṣy75.76.77 tī 24

rājāṁ tasya praṅaṁ ca ca śrūtīn ti rakaś ye rṣiputrāḥ ca śaśayī ti dharmam6
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anye pi ca grhapati brāhmaṇaś ca ca pariṣṭiya sarvi śṛṭitā (Sol 135a) bhonti 25

Lū (Lāshun Museum) A-10-b.a (cf. Jiang 1997: 76-77)

5 (A-10-458b) // (ni) + tasya prákatayet // (ci 23)

Tib. Kanjur versin, based upon T. 134a7-35

ngaśni mya ngan 'das nas dge slong gang //

'nga ya spyod yul 'di ni rab snga zhing //
de ni nam yang zhun pa med pa yis //

\'
\'
\'
\'

jig rten du yang mdo 'di ci 134a5, rab shod cig // // (ci 23)
mkhas pa dus su sens pas byed na na / /
khung bur zhugs te de bshin sgo bcad nas / /
chos 'di thams cad la ni tshul bshin bla // //

langs nas zhun pa med pa'i sens ci 134a3, kyis shod // // (ci 24)
gyal po rnam dang rgyal po'i bu gang dag //
chos nyen pa rnam 'di ni de la snga // / /

\'
\'
\'
\'

ghen yang khyiis bdag dag // dang bram ze rnam // / /
thams cad 'de yi" g-yog tu "khod par" gyur / // (ci 25)

Bth (Bsthang Kanjur) 117b4-

nga ni mya ngan 'das nas dge slong gang: nga'yi spyod yul 'di ni rab bhrung stig // //
de ni (di)jam yang zhun by med pa yi //

jig rten du yang mdo 'di rab ci 117a3, shod cig // // (ci 23)
mkhas pas dus su sens ser byed na na / /

"khung bur zhugs te de bshin sgo bcad pa" //
chos 'di thams de ni tshul bshin bla / /

langs nas zhun pa med pa'i sens kyis shod // // (ci 24)

\'
\'
\'
\'

(134a5) rgyal po rnam dang [1] rgyal po'i bu gang dag / /
chos mnyen pa rnam <di> ni de la snga / /
ghen yang khyim bzhug <dag> dang bram ze [e] rnam: thams cad de'i g-yog tu 'khod par' gyur / // (ci 25)

Tib. Kho. (Tibetan translation from Khotan) kha 52a2- (cf. ItS. 69f.)

\' tsey gwis nga'yi spyod lam bhrung pa ni //
\(w) nga ni mya ngan 'das nas (Bth 134a5) sce slong gwis / /
Chin. De. 106b7–15

我滅後後 若有比丘 敢能守護 如是法則
無所抵故 心不起想 為無數人 說此經典 (= 23)

35

其明燈者 所念以時 若入離眾 所行若法
觀解諸法 一切善淨 及然說法 不動離 interconnected (= 24)

國王帝王 及與太子 皆為聞法 皆為信之
舛越長者 及諸梵志 立諸善緣 無所希欲 (= 25) 35

Chin. Kj. 37c20–28

若有比丘 於我滅後 入是行處 及近處處 皆於經典時 皆為法器 (= 23)
善薩有時 入於靜室 以正達念 好義觀法 (= 24)
從說定時 赴諸國王 王子臣民 皆為護等
開化海說 說法經典 為人信依 無所使離 (= 24–25)

35

"火騰勝利 是名善薩 安住正法 能於後世 說《法華經》" 35

(to be continued)
Notes:

XIII § 1 Notes:

Notes on the Gilgit/Nepalese version

1. kumārabhūśa bhagavatam end aveca: D2. MS. kumārabhū + + + + + + + [b. ca].
Supplemented from D1/ etc.

2. /: D2. DJ 3/ etc. supplemented from B1, N1, C6 etc. (= KN); K, C4, C1 etc. /; /.

3. kalakeshāram: = D1, B1, N1, C4 etc. – K, C3, T2 etc. parameśvāram ( = KN); R, P2 etc.
padme hūk padini parameśvāram (w.r.). Cf. Tīkh. bhum et ake' har kṣīyā pa (= kalakeshāram).

4. sañcīkaram: = D1, N1, A1 (= KN); B1, N2, StP. sañcīkaram, T8, N1, P2, arādhām (inf.; probably a hyperform); K, C4, C5, T2 etc. arāda; cf. O. F. arādhām (probab. a hyperform for arādhām). I take arādhām as the past participle (arā-teh "to endure, to be able, to act with courage"); MWJ + a), used as a noun, meaning "resolution, strength of will" or "perseverance, continuous exertion, energy." Presumably, it was later replaced with a normal Sanskrit form with the same meaning from the same root, namely arāda. Cf. BHS. arāda ("firmness"); arādhām ("exertion, serenity"); Pa. arādā (ds). Cf. Tīkh. aupa kā (T.1131h); Dr. 107b-13. So vaśo ("to exhaust and please [them] is very hard to achieve"); Kj. 37a10. 堃大富類 ("they have taken a great vow").

5. /: D2. MS. (= D3). KN. /

6. bhagavatam: D2. MS. bhagavatam (= D3). I normalise the spelling on the basis of the reading; "taam" in B1, K, C4, N1 etc. (= KN); C3, C6 etc. "nam." 

7. samā: D2. MS. ayam (= D3). T8, N2. I normalise the spelling on the basis of the reading in thier Nep. MSS. (= KN).

8. bhimarājya-viśvaveṣa: D2. MS. rāma + + + + + + + + .
Supplemented from D3 etc.

Notes on O.

buddhāsā maḥāsā: = SIP, F; ≠ Dr. 大士 ("a great being"); = Kj. 菩薩. 声聞缘 ("a bodhiśatva-mahāsāra,"

9. arādhām: a hyperform of arādhām?

10. A large circle which indicates the end of the preceding chapter is drawn in the middle of the leaf.

11. kathā samākṣaraparajñata karoṣyāḥ: = F, SIP, Khalsa; = Kj. 37a12. 譽神……《法華經》 ("they will guard ... this Lotus Sutra"); cf. Krbh. 163.

Notes on SIP


13. arādhām: a hyperform of arādhām?

14. Manyāra: = BHS. Manyāra. The form Manyāra- is found also in § 2, Ksh. 62a1, F. 14b7; § 3, Ksh. 62a3, F. 15a2; § 4, F. 15a1; § 5, SIP (2) 12a3, F. 11a8, Lh. A-9a3, A-9a4, § 6, F. 16a4, 16b6, § 7, F. 16b7, 17a2, etc. The form manya- (c. Skt. matya-) occurs also in the verse 53 of this parivara: Ksh. 2961. Manyāraśākñiḥ, O. Manyāraśākñiḥ. F. Manyāraśākñiḥ; Kh. Manyāraśākñiḥ ...

15. A large circle which indicates the end of the preceding chapter is drawn in the middle of the leaf.

Notes on Tīkh Kanjur version

16. Cf. above T. 131ab. 堃大富類 (abk. J) 111b5; Stog Palag (abk. S) 152b2; Pung
Notes on Barhmar Kajjur:

"raman grang: s.e. for raman grang.

Notes on Chin Dr.

~ 1. Kaj: "a great being"; ~ O, SIP, F, bhistava mahattaras; Kj, bhistava, G/N; ~ cf. Krsh. 163.

2. Kaj: "to exhort and encourage (others)"; ~ G/N, waddham; O, SIP, F, antijam; cf. Krsh. 163.

3. Chapter Thirteen: Peaceful Pracitons:

Then Bodhidharma, a great being said to the Buddha: "O Great Sage, it is difficult for these bodhisattvas, receiving the World-Honoured One, to exhort and encourage (others). When should they preach this sutra to all people?"

Notes on Chin. Kj.

~ Chin. thang: "a bhistava-mahattaravak; ~ O, SIP, F, bhistava mahattarav; ~ Dr. d.h.~ cf. Krsh. 163.

Chapter Thirteen: Peaceful Pracitons:

Thereupon, Mahasattva, the prince of the Dharma, the bodhisattva-mahattarav, said to the Buddha: "O World-Honoured One, these bodhisattvas are manifest. Out of reverence for the Buddha, they have made this great vow: "To a future evil age, we shall hold, read and preach this Lotus Sutra." O World-Honoured One, how can a bodhisattva-mahattarav preach this sutra in a future evil age?" (cf. Murano 210; Kats 221; Harvita 208; Yuwana/Kubo 205; Watson 190).

XIII § 2 Notes:

Notes on the Cly磬/Nepalese version

~ (bhistava) ~ D2: MS. kham (s.e.). Emented on the basis of the reading in D3 and the Nep. MSS.

~ D2: Dh. om. Supplemented from the Nep. MSS. (~ KN).

~ Mahasattva ~ D1: Dh. Kj, K1, N1, C1, N2, S6p etc.; C4, T2, T6 etc. Mahasattva (~ KN).

~ samaye tampakamaitiyo ~ D2: MS. same ++ ++ ++ --. Supplemented from the
Nep. MSS. (= KN).  
1/ D2. MS.  
2/ Nep. MSS. (= KN).  
3/ KN put here / (= Nep. MSS.).  

Notes on O.  

"dharma[dharma]ya : Probably,  " + is s.c. for the visarga sign (ß); dharma[dharma]ya.  
4/ Presumably, this Visarga sign (ß) here also acts as a punctuation mark (·). For such an usage of the so-called "visarga-danda", see Karashima 2002 : § 1.  
5/ Nepal, in SIF  
6/ Cf. BB 11: 111.  

Notes on F.  

"cæmu ade : this phrase is found also 31a2, 188b, 6 in the same manuscript. The other manuscripts of the SF read cæmu ade instead. In Pali literature, the phrases cæmu tame and cæmu tame occur ade by side, though the latter is quite rare. C.e.g. SN. I.147. 14. cæmu tame (v. tame)  
7/ The word is to be read. Up. 70. cæmu tame ca ita to Sakkho.  
8/ kumärakaśāyaṇa : this form is not recorded in dictionaries. The other versions read kumārakaśāyaṇa instead.  
9/ Presumably, this Visarga sign (ß) here also acts as a punctuation mark (·). For such an usage of the so-called "visarga-danda", see Karashima 2002 : § 1.  

Notes on Tib. Kanjur version  

10/ see : P. ysung btsan (b.c.).  
11/ "grænh : T.M.S. bka' (b.c.). Embended on the basis of the reading in the other Kanjur editions.  
12/ ...; C. om. (b.c.).  
13/ ... ; L. ...;  
14/ ...; T.M.S. ; S. ; P. / ; cf. Bth. ; the other Kanjur editions om.  
15/ ...; S. the other Kanjur editions om.  
16/ "ram : P. rama (b.c.).  
17/ ... ; P. ...; (b.c.).  
18/ ...; S. the other Kanjur editions om.  
19/ yang dag par kha' in : T.M.S. yang dag par; S. yang dag. I emended the reading in T here on the basis of that in the other Kanjur editions. Cf. G/N. påwag motivating.  
20/ ...; S. p.chho (w.r.).  
21/ ...; P. chis ne (b.c.).  

Note on Chn. Dr.  

"The Buddha said to Bread-Head: 'After mastering the (following) two dharmas, a bodhisattva should then preach this sutra.'"  
22/ Note on Chn. Kj.  
23/ "The Buddha said to Maṅgala: 'If a bodhisattva-mahāsattva, in a future evd. age, wishes to preach this sutra, he should observe the (following) four rules firmly.'" (Cf. Munno 210; Kato 231; Hsuan-tšang 208; Yutama/Kabu 205; Watson 190).  

XIII § 3 Notes:  

Notes on the Gilgit/Nepalese version  

1/ Māṇḍūkya : C4, T8 ev. Māṇḍūkya (= KN); B4, N1 etc. "śrī; K, C5, C6 etc. "śrī;  
2/ samprakāsīṣṭayayin : B4, K, N1 etc. ; C4, samprakāsīṣṭayayin (b.c.); C5, C6, T2, N2 etc.  
3/ patima lati patima samay; samprakāsīṣṭayayin (= KN).  
5/ ca : B4, K, T2, B etc. om. (w.r.).  

126
Notes on O., c. 1.

1 Presumably the scribe mistakenly omitted katham gucara pratijñānā bhavati (= O).

Notes on Tib. Kanjur version

1'jam = T. MS. 'jam.
2 dpal = L. dpal /.
3 /: the other Kanjur editions om.
4 /: J. P. /: L. om. (s.s.)
5 'sha ga = P. 'sha gas (= dpal)
6 /: the other Kanjur editions om.
7 la = T. MS. om. (s.e.) Supplemented from the other Kanjur editions.
8 /: = S. P. D (= Rd); the other Kanjur editions om.
9 mam grang = P. mam grang (= s.s.)
10 dpal = L. dpal /.
11 /: P. om. (= Rd)
12 /: P. L. om. (s.s.)
13 /: = P: the other Kanjur editions om.
14 /: = S. om. (s.s.)

Note on Bakhung Kanjur

1 'sha = it had been once written here as 'sha, in which the character s was crossed out with a deletion mark.

Notes on Chin. Dr.

28 bzhin ma'i rgyan: "(a boddhisattva) understands the disciplines"; = O, F, SLP. dbyar-mo phreng-ba, cn. 10.
29 First, disciplines; second: proprieties. What is meant by 'a boddhisattva understanding the disciplines'?

Notes on Chin. Kj.

30 First, by observing the spheres of proper practices and proper intimacy of boddhisattvas firmly, be thou watch this sutra to all sentient beings. O Matyārā, what is meant by 'the sphere of proper practices of a boddhisattva-mahāsattva'?

(Cf. Murano 210; Kato 221; Hurvitz 208; Yoyama/Kubo 705; Watson 196).

XIII § 4 Notes:

Notes on the Gilgit/Nepalese version

1 yedui = K, C5, C6 etc.; Bj, C4, N1 etc. yedul ca (= KN)
2 kanyā śūrya (= KN), T6, N2. 'trek: K, N1, C5, C6 etc.
Notes on Tib. Kanjur version

57. T. 311486. J. 311491; S. 1513a2; P. 3006b; B. 1404a; Q. 1199a; N. 1576b; D. 1016b; C. 121a; L. 161a.

58. dpal: L. dpal /
      gi: P. gi (s.c.)
      ??: S; the other Kanjur editions om. Cf. Bth. 2.
      pa: P. par (s.c.)
      ??: S; the other Kanjur editions om.
      ??: = B, Q, L; the other Kanjur editions om.
      ??: S, L; the other Kanjur editions om.
      ??: = S, P; the other Kanjur editions om.
      ??: = S, L; the other Kanjur editions om.

59. phyag brag: = P. phyag dag (s.c.); Q. phyag dag (s.c).
      dpal: L. dpal /
      gi: P. gi (s.c.)
      ??: S; the other Kanjur editions om.
      tse: T. MS. tse.
      ??: P, L. om.
      lang: = N, L. lang.
      ??: = S; the other Kanjur editions om.

60. cho nuams: = S, D (in KN.275.10. dramsnamo); J, P, B, Q, N, C, L. cho kyi (P. kyi
      [s.c.]) rnam grangs. Cf. Bth. chos.

61. yang dag pa ji la ba: = S; J, P, B, Q, N, D, C. yang dag par ji la ba; L. yang dag par
      bka’ ba (s.c.). Cf. Bth. yang dag pa ji la ba; KN.273.9. yeshabhisam.
      da: = C. cu (s.c.)

62. la ste: = S, P, J, B, Q, N, D, C, L. la st (s.c.). Cf. Bth. ‘di la st (s.c.)
      nuams par mi spyad: = S, P; J, B, N, D, C, L. nuams par mi spyad. Q. ’mi spyad (s.c.).
      Cf. Bth. ’mi spyad (s.c. for spyad); KN.275.10. avicenretn.
      ??: = S; the other Kanjur editions om.
      ??: = S, P, L; the other Kanjur editions om.

63. dpal: L. dpal /

Notes on Baktang Kanjur

59. phyag dag: = s.c. for phyag dag.

60. spyad: = s.c. for spyad.

Notes on Chin. Dr.

64. 賛行式: “the norms of all kinds of behaviour”; O, SIF. sktaram, F. sktaram; cf.
      Krsb. 15.

65. eva bodhisatvah restrains his mind, is persevering, guards his mind, fears not standing
      alone, possessing a (steadfast) will like the ground; and if he does not see people existing,
      does not see people existing and practising the Dharma, (but) observes features (of dharmas) as
      they really are and their nownessnlessness — these dharmas are the norms of all kinds of behaviour,
      without any thoughts, thus this one might call the proper practices (of a bodhisatvah).”

Notes on Chin. Kj. —

66. 又根於意鏡所行: “He does not act with respect to dharmas”; G/N. na karmanmi dharmo carati;
      O, SIF (1), F. na karmat yathayah abhyaaya na karmat dharmo carati; cf. Krsb. 163.

67. if a bodhisatvah-mahatthavas abide in the stage of perseverance, is gentle and meek, is
      neither rude nor timid and furthermore, if he does not act with respect to dharmas, looking at

129
Notes on Hathang Kanjur——

Note on Chiz. Dr.—

115
Notes on Banbang Kanjur

khym 'dag: s.e. for khym dag. sa.
khym 'dag: s.e. for khym mi m. Cf. G.N. nathkhem.
shel (du): G.N. dansa-stod-sde. The translator of this Kanjur version seems to have taken the word (dansa "crown, line") wrongly for pa = P.'khor. stod (a Skt. stodhī "increase, growth").
gor: s.e. for gor.

Notes on Tsho Kho.

ghun nu = gzhum nu.
ghun nu = G.N. bnum nu dng/ghun nu ma dng = G.N. na kumāra-kam na kumāra.
Some Nep. MSS., e.g. B'l, K, C4, N1, C7, T2 ms., omit the phrase na kumāra, which agrees with the reading in Tsho Kho.

Notes on Chod Dr.

"sgron 'bras, yod. read sgron. Cf. Kh.998, 263.

Sanel: "one who has scabies (or leprosy)." G and J read sda instead. I emend the reading in G on the basis of that in S1, S2, S3 etc. Dharmaraksa seems to have confused Skt. panduka ("summon") with panduka ("judiciary"). Cf. § 9, n. 167, Kr.164.

Dharmaraksa seems to have taken Skt. samavatā ("coexistence") wrongly for a derivative from the verb sem, bzhad ("to stand still"). Cf. § 9, n. 170; Kr.164.

Sanel: J, S1 etc. read bzhad instead (s.e. G.N. pratistamadati ("greets, salutes").

Dharmaraksa seems to have taken Skt. samsāra ("coexistence") wrongly for a derivative from the verb sem, bzhad ("to stand still"). Cf. § 9, n. 170; Kr.164.

Sanel: J, S1 etc. read bzhad instead (s.e. G.N. pratistamadati ("greets, salutes").

Dharmaraksa seems to have taken Skt. samsāra ("coexistence") wrongly for a derivative from the verb sem, bzhad ("to stand still"). Cf. § 9, n. 170; Kr.164.

Dharmaraksa seems to have taken Skt. samsāra ("coexistence") wrongly for a derivative from the verb sem, bzhad ("to stand still"). Cf. § 9, n. 170; Kr.164.

Sanel: J, S1, S2, S3 etc. read bzhad instead.

Sanel: J, S1, S2, S3 etc. read bzhad instead.

Sanel: J, S1, S2, S3 etc. read bzhad instead.

Bodhisattva, mahāsattva should not favour lamas, claususes or relatives. He should not especially desire, to see beginners, young ladies and prayer the Dharma to them alone. Also, he should not visit and talk in great words
to nephews, nieces (‡), children, men, women or others. He should concentrate his mind only upon what he should preach. When one who has scabies (or leprosy) preaches the Dharma (‡), then (the bodhisattva should) not say there, nor exchange greetings with him. He should enter a room only with a single monk, except when contemplating the Buddha intently. If he, by force of circumstance, comes to preach the Dharma to a woman, he (should) not disdain the taste at that place. He should neither let her receive nor accept (the Dharma); but rather explain the doctrine. He (should) not stay with śrāvakas, nun, little boys or girls. He (should) always prefer to sit calmly, being very attentive and candid, and sit inside himself in quietude. These are the proper properties (of a bodhisattva)."**

**Notes on Chin. Kí.**

Further, O Mahājñāta, although it is evident that the bodhisattva should not, while preaching the Dharma to women, display an appearance which could arouse passionate thoughts in them, nor should he delight in seeing them. When he enters someone's home, he (should) not speak with young girls, unmarried women or widows. He (should) not approach the five kinds of hermaphrodites nor form an intimate friendship with them. He (should) not enter someone's house alone. If he, by force of circumstance, has to enter alone, he (should) contemplate the Buddha single-mindedly. When he preaches the Dharma to a woman, he (should) not show his teeth in smiles nor expose his chest to her. He (should) not be too intimate with her even for the sake of the Dharma, how much less for other reasons! He (should) not desire to keep young disciples, śrāvakas or little boys, not to delight in having the same teacher with them. He (should) constantly take pleasure in meditation in a quiet place, collecting his mind."

---

**XIII § 7 Notes:**

**Notes on the Gilgit/Nepalese version**

\[ \text{Note to CS56}: \ C5, C6, B etc. (= O, F); B, C6, N1 etc. (KN); K, um. (s.e.).

\[ \text{Note to CS56}: \ T6, P2, s.e. (a: 7) etc. (S3); N1, = O, F.

\[ \text{Note to CS56}: \ K, T6 etc. (s.e.); 33(K: F, F, f).\]

---

**XIII § 7 Notes:**

**Notes on the Gilgit/Nepalese version**

\[ \text{Note to CS56}: \ C5, C6, B etc. (O, F); B, C6, N1 etc. (KN); K, um. (s.e.).

\[ \text{Note to CS56}: \ T6, P2, s.e. (a: 7) etc. (S3); N1, = O, F.

---

\[ \text{Note to CS56}: \ K, T6 etc. (s.e.); 33(K: F, F, f).\]
"nirmitasrayabhatra-evacovayam": s.e. for nirmitasya.

19 Cf. G/N. asamat.

20 Cf. G/N. avayam (v.l. -).

21 Cf. n. 15.

22 Cf. F. abhajante prabhavat; G/N. abhajane (prabhavat). Cf. also Ksh. 165.

23 "abhaktena anabhavitam": s.e. for abhaktena anyabhavitam. O, F < Chin. Dr, 無相, 不想 (lit. "they' s, beyond thoughts, and do not contemplate"); K, 但以因緣有 ("they exist only through causes and conditions"). Cf. Ksh. 165.

24 "mekaritvam": presumably, s.e. for mekārasya.

25 "abhiśayam": s.e. for "abhiśayam.

26 "tirīyā": cf. Ksh. 165.

Notes on F.


28 Cf. G/N. avayam (v.l. -).

29 Cf. n. 15.

30 Cf. n. 16.

Notes on Lb.


32 "abhajitam": s.e. for abhājītaṃ (cf. Skt. abhīśayam); cf. § 6, n. 89.

33 "ayāntaśākhayamānaṃ": s.e. for Ayāntaśākhāyānaṃ.

Notes on Tīb. Kanjur version

11 T. 132bh 2. 114bh; S. 154a7; P. 301b5; B. 141a7; Q. 120a1; N. 159a2; D. 109a4; C. 122a8; L. 164b4.

34 dpañ": L. dpal /.

35 */: S, the other Kanjur editions omit.

36 tshang chub": B, om. (s.e.).

37 "p": T. MS. pa /.

38 I delete "✓" on the basis of the reading in the other Kanjur editions.

39 "ka": S, P (both Tīb. Kho). the other Kanjur editions read ka instead.

40 */: S, P, L (cf. Bth, ). the other Kanjur editions omit.

41 "ma long par": M, ma long par (= 3th); B, Q, mi long par (l.c.e.); cf. G/N. aviparita (vishnu).

42 */: S, P, L (cf. Bth, ). the other Kanjur editions omit.

43 "yang long pa": P, yang long par.

44 ge: Q, gum (s.e.).

45 "mi byed pa": J, P, N, D, C, L (both Tīb. Kho); S. mi skyed pa (= Bth); B, Q, mi long ha (v.s.r.); cf. G/N. acalām.

46 */: J, P, pa dang; L, pa /.

47 */: S, P, L (cf. Bth, pa dang /.

48 */: S, P, L (the other Kanjur editions omit).

49 */: S, P, L (both Tīb. Kho, pa /.

50 */: S, P, L (the other Kanjur editions omit).

51 "kha": S, (both Tīb. Kho).

52 */: S, P, L (both Tīb. Kho, na /.


54 */: S, the other Kanjur editions omit.

55 "ngag": T. MS, C, der (s.e.). I emend the reading in T above on the basis of that in the
other Kanjur editions.

"tmar par": P, dmar par (s.e.).
"pa": P, L, pa (=cf. Bth. bka").
"klu": P, L, klu (=cf. Bth. bka").
"mu": P, om. (s.e.).
"lha": S, L, the other Kanjur editions omit.
"lha": S, P, L (=Tib. kho), the other Kanjur editions omit.
"lha": S, P, L, the other Kanjur editions omit.
"lha": C, lha (s.e.).
"lha": P, gi (s.e.) (=Bth).
"pa": P, L, pa (=cf. Bth. bka").

Jag = T, MS, S, jag (s.e.). I emend the reading in T here on the basis of that in the other Kanjur editions. Cf. Gn. (aumgantka-ka) jinbas.

"pa": P, le (s.e.).
"lha": S, P, Bth. bka"). the other Kanjur editions omit.
"lha": T, MS, S, P, Bth. (=Tib. kho). Supplemented from the other Kanjur editions.
"lha": L, lha (s.e.).
"lha": S, L, the other Kanjur editions omit.
"sred yul": P, strog pa che sred yul (s.e.).
"lha": L, lha (s.e.).
"lha": S, the other Kanjur editions omit.
"sred yul": P, sred pa (s.e.). P, sred par (=fbh.)

Notes on Tshang Kangjur

"thend": abbr. for thoms ca.
"thend": abbr. for thoms ca.
"thend": abbr. for thoms ca.
"sred": s.e. for ’dus.

Notes on Tshang Kho.

"yang dang par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"yang dmar par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"la hor sred par sred ba": Cf. Tsh. kgur ’dus gnas na; Gn. gsum skyes ’dus nyid

Notes on Chinn Dr... —

"yang dang par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"yang dmar par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"la hor sred par sred ba": Cf. Tsh. kgur ’dus gnas na; Gn. gsum skyes ’dus nyid

Notes on Tshang Kho.

"yang dang par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"yang dmar par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"la hor sred par sred ba": Cf. Tsh. kgur ’dus gnas na; Gn. gsum skyes ’dus nyid

Notes on Chinn Dr... —

"yang dang par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"yang dmar par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"la hor sred par sred ba": Cf. Tsh. kgur ’dus gnas na; Gn. gsum skyes ’dus nyid

Notes on Tshang Kho.

"yang dang par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"yang dmar par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"la hor sred par sred ba": Cf. Tsh. kgur ’dus gnas na; Gn. gsum skyes ’dus nyid

Notes on Chinn Dr... —

"yang dang par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"yang dmar par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"la hor sred par sred ba": Cf. Tsh. kgur ’dus gnas na; Gn. gsum skyes ’dus nyid

Notes on Tshang Kho.

"yang dang par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"yang dmar par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"la hor sred par sred ba": Cf. Tsh. kgur ’dus gnas na; Gn. gsum skyes ’dus nyid

Notes on Chinn Dr... —

"yang dang par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"yang dmar par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"la hor sred par sred ba": Cf. Tsh. kgur ’dus gnas na; Gn. gsum skyes ’dus nyid

Notes on Tshang Kho.

"yang dang par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"yang dmar par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"la hor sred par sred ba": Cf. Tsh. kgur ’dus gnas na; Gn. gsum skyes ’dus nyid

Notes on Chinn Dr... —

"yang dang par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"yang dmar par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"la hor sred par sred ba": Cf. Tsh. kgur ’dus gnas na; Gn. gsum skyes ’dus nyid

Notes on Chinn Dr... —

"yang dang par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"yang dmar par ma byung ba": Gn. asambhuta (v.l.-).
"la hor sred par sred ba": Cf. Tsh. kgur ’dus gnas na; Gn. gsum skyes ’dus nyid

181 "use (to be) removed and extinguished"; cf. Gn. nirakarotiyanaharavacanjanis. I assume that Dharmaraksa confused yatharatna ("the use of an expression") with yathapadha ("distracting", yathapa-sa-ha-va-ba-va = "to destroy"); cf. Khsh. 164.
182 舍離: "are uncreated and insinominable" ∈ O. asambhuta asambhuta; P. na samkhypta na samkhypta; cf. n. 15; Khsh. 164-165.
184 (The Buddha) further said in Broad-Head.
"A bodhisattva, a great being, observes all dharmas as empty in accordance with what they really are (as
follows): they (i.e. dharmas) do not lapse into confusion, standing on orthodox truth and always stay in accordance with the Dharma; they (i.e. dharmas) hold their bodies and minds firmly, do not move, do not regress, do not regress, are removed and extinguished, are not born, do not exist, are non-existent, remain in a natural manner, are unconscious and insensible, do not possess anything, have attained the state of non-possession, are beyond words, do not stay in the state of non-activity, are beyond thoughts, do not contemplate and are able to subdue all doubts. If the bodhisattva observes minutely all dharmas as such and cultivates earnestly what he should practice, then he conforms always to the two matters, namely, disciplines and properties.*

* Note on Chin. Kj.

**Further, a bodhisattva-mahāsattva observes all dharmas as empty, in accordance with how they really appear (as follows): they (i.e. dharmas) do not get overstayed, do not move, do not regress, nor revolve; they are like empty space, without innate nature, beyond the reach of all words, are not born nor produced, do not arise, without name, without form; they have, in reality, no innate nature; they are immovable, limitless, without hindrances, without obstacles; they exist only through causes and conditions and arise (only) through perverse understanding and therefore, they are (fairly) deemed to be permanent and perpetual. (The bodhisattva-mahāsattva) observes the aspects of dharmas in this manner. This is what I call the second item that a bodhisattva-mahāsattva should associate himself with." (Cf. Murano 211-212; Kato 22); Hurvitz 210. Yayama/Kabu 206-207; Watson 1998).

XIII 8 Notes:

Notes on the Gilgit/Nepalese version


sattvāṃśānām tasyāḥ ca vyākhyātāḥ = C5, C6, T2(‘maṇḍa’ + ‘n’), T6, B, T7, N2 (‘maṇḍā’ + ‘r’ + ‘n’), N3 (κα.) etc. (≠ KN) = Tib. Kanā, Bb, Khro’; Bj, K, C4, N1, sattvarṣāṇāmāna. Cf. O; F. sattvarṣāṇāmāna tasyāḥ ca vyākhyātāḥ.

1/ : Nep. MSS. ≤

buddhiṣṭvā = Bj, N1, C5, C6 (≠ KN; = O; F); K, C4, T2, T6, B, T7, N2, N3 etc. ‘vē; F3, P2 etc. ‘vē (w.c.);

aśvetya = Bj, aśvetya (w.c.). Cf. O; F. aśvetya. ‘patākhaśe = D2; MS. mātaśe (w.c.). I emend the reading on the basis of that in the Nep. MSS. Cf. O; F. patākhaśaṃ. ‘mahāsattve = Bj, K, C4, N1, T2; C5, C6, T6 etc. madhyāvāsye (≠ KN). Cf. O; F. bhāvavāsye; Tibet. Kanā, Bb. sūn na jīp paśe; Tibet. Khro. sūn na mār na lan.

2/ : D2; MS. om. (= O; F).

‘saṃvavam = D2; MS. + + +. Supplemented from the reading in the Nep. MSS.

‘prakārama = D2; MS. + + + +. Supplemented from readings in the Nep. MSS.: C5, C6, B, T7, N2, N3 etc. prakāram, ‘bhūtike; N1, prakāram, ‘bhūtike; R, B, C1, P1 etc. prakāram, ‘bhūtike; K, C4, T3, T6 etc. prakāram, ‘bhūtike (w.c.). Cf. KN. prakārama (≠ MS.). Cf. O. prakārama (w.c.); F. prakāram, prakārama (w.c.). Lit. ‘vē (w.c.).

3/ : ‘vē (w.c.). Cf. O; F. Saṃvavam vē (≠ KN; = B; T2, T3; Jō; B1, N1, T7 etc. ‘vē (≠ KN) = Siṣa. 47.14; 47.14; Saṃvavam (inmetrical). Cf. O; F. La. ‘vē ‘vē (w.c.).

4/ : ‘vē (w.c.). Cf. O; F. Saṃvavam ‘vē (w.c.).

5/ : D2; MS. om. (= O; F).

6/ : ‘vē (w.c.). Cf. O; F. Saṃvavam ‘vē (w.c.).

7/ : ‘vē (w.c.). Cf. O; F. Saṃvavam ‘vē (w.c.).

8/ : C5, C6, T2 etc.; Bj, C4, N1; T6, B, T7, N2, N3 etc. ‘pārapaśe (≠ KN); Siṣa. 47.13; 47.13; ‘pārapaśe (≠ O; F). For the confusion between the endings of the instrumental and locative plural, cf. § 9, n. 14; § 10, n. 4; Karashima (301): 217f.
Notes on Tib. Kenjur version

19 T. 113a5; J. 115a4; S. 154b5; P. 302a3; B. 141b4; Q. 120a5; N. 159a7; D. 104b5; C. 122b5; L. 165a4.

I emend the reading in T on the basis of that in the other Kenjur editions.

19 = B; Q. do.
20 byd = P. Ayod (l.c.?).
21 às = C. ‘Asan (= Bth.) (l.c.?).
22 gwas = B. goes (l.c.?).
23 gong = P. gongs (= Bth.).
7 chak byng = T. S. zha brjös; B. zhun rim’s.c. for ring); P. zhun ringing. Q. zhbeh ring.

I emend the reading in T on the basis of that in J, N, D, C and L. Cf. G/N. (ŋa-a)-parma-; 8th. zhbeh ring (l.c.)); Tib. Kho. mgy (l.c. m).}

24 khun ru = J; Q. kwun da.
26 da = T. MS. ‘bd (l.lh).}
27 du = C. ‘du (l.c).}
28 um = T. Ma, S. myrme (l.c.?).

I emend the reading in T on the basis of that in the other Kenjur editions.

29 byad = Q. byad (l.c.?).
31 / = C. om. (l.c.?).
32 gbya = S, P (= Tib. Kho). The other Kenjur editions read rgya (= Bth.) (l.c.) instead.
Cf. G/N. rgya-. Cf. also § 9, n. 109.
33 ma = P. mú (l.c.).
34 bram = T. MS. bram (l.c.); S, P. bram (l.c.); C. bram (= Bth.) (l.c.). I emend the reading in T on the basis of that in the other Kenjur editions. Cf. G/N. (ŋa-a)-parma-. Tib. Kho. bram. Cf. also § 60, n. 28.
35 br = B. ba (l.c.).
36 bya = P. bya.
37 bya = P. bya (l.c.).
38 khe byen raams byang spong ba bya / / ; P. dge byen raams byang spong ba bya (l.c.); dge byen (l.c. for byen) raams byang spong bar bya (l.c.);

I emend the reading in T on the basis of that in the other Kenjur editions. Cf. G/N. yä ...; punam.}

Notes on Rarhang Kenjur

19 see above: diacritics.
Notes on Tib. Kho.

\[\text{rag nu} \quad \text{or} \quad \text{rag du}. \quad \text{The characters } \text{nu} \text{ and } \text{du} \text{ of the script in the manuscript is hard to discern.}\]

\[\text{gshung gna} \text{mar par gsal ba} \quad \text{su}: \quad \text{the translator wrongly took the noun Skt. } \text{sva}\text{y\textasciitilde{e}s} \text{ (or } \text{sva}\text{y\textasciitilde{e}}\text{-}) \text{ for a verb. See n. 21.}\]

197 bej[ef] the : MS. bej[ef]\thor\[ef]\[ef]\[ef]\[ef].

Notes on Chin. Dr.

\[\text{186} \quad \text{生}: \quad \text{J.} \quad \text{S}(1), \text{S}(2), \text{S}(3) \text{ etc. read 生; 生 instead.}\]

\[\text{塩}: \quad \text{"good and clear"} \quad \text{is} \quad \text{O. } \text{as\textasciitilde{e}}\text{m\textasciitilde{e}}\text{ntou} \text{ ("not impure"); F. 豎; \& } \text{G/N. as\textasciitilde{e}}\text{m\textasciitilde{e}}\text{ntou.}\]

\[\text{187} \quad \text{與}: \quad \text{J.} \quad \text{S}(1), \text{S}(2), \text{S}(3) \text{ etc. read 與; 與 instead.}\]

\[\text{188} \quad \text{常}: \quad \text{Probably, s.e. for 香. These two characters are often confused.}\]

\[\text{Go\textasciitilde{e}}\text{re} \text{ order to explain the meaning of this once more, the World-Honoured One spoke these verses.}\]

If a bodhisattva is predisposed towards preaching this sutra, then he will be brave and fearless in a future age. (1)

He (should) observe disciplines and proprieties as well as good, clear and pure practices. (He should) restrain himself from being intimate with kings, crowned princes. (2)

ministers, officials, heretics, leachers, butchers, hunters, and those who hate and do harm. (3)

He (should) not associate with monks who, while instilling virtue, neglect the Dharmas and the discipline. (He should) not converse with those who are arrogant. Also, he (should) stay away from those who violate the precepts. (4)

and monks and monks who speak in a jarring and ridiculing manner. (He should) stay away from women of pure birth and not exchange meaningless words with them. (5)

If one wants to attain the Dharmas in this present life, then one should always cease from doing wrong and delight in staying in the state of extinction. This is what I call disciplines. (6)

Notes on Chin. Xi.

\[\text{189} \quad \text{善}: \quad \text{spā\textasciitilde{e}}\text{tikā}; \quad \text{cf. s. 33.}\]

\[\text{190} \quad \text{Therefore, the World-Honoured One, wishing to state this teaching once more, spoke these verses.}\]

If there is a bodhisattva who, in a future evil age, wishes to preach this sutra with a fearless mind, he should enter both the spheres of proper practices and proper intimacy. (1, 2)

He should always stay away from kings, princes of kingdoms, ministers, chief officials, those who are engaged in dangerous amusements, amazons, heretics and Brahmanes. (2, 3)

He should not associate with excessively arrogant people, scholars of the three storehouses who adhere to the Hinayana, monks who violate the precepts, those who call themselves sages, those who being profoundly attached to the five desires, (nevertheless) seek Nirvana in their present lives — all these, one should not associate with. (5)

\[(\text{6}) \quad \text{cf. Murano} \text{212}; \text{Kato} \text{223-224, Hru\textasciitilde{e}v210-211; \text{Yuyama/Kabu} \text{207, Watson} \text{198-99.}\]

\[\text{XIII § 9 Notes:}\]

Notes on the Gilgit/Nepalese version ————

150
Note on SIB

17] Cf. XX 33: 112.
18] *: s.e. for ra (* O, F).
19] *: s.e. for *avrthe (* SIB, O).
20] s.e. for avahita (* cf. BHSG, s.e. uṣṭhitiya [uṣṭhiya]). Cf. O. anavīraḥ D2.
21] s.e. for tehai (* O).

Note on F.

17] vyaśādyā saṃsthāyaḥ: on *vyādyāḥ. The ending -ya, dat. sg. fem. of the i-stem, is found elsewhere in the same manuscript: KN.18516. saṃsthāya (* O) / F. 10.12a. saṃsthāya. Cf. BHSG § 10.102f.
21] saśvadāsya svaḥpya (* O, n. 18.

Note on Lk.

17] saṃkritārthābhāski *: s.e. for sāṃkritārthaś. Cf. O. saṃkritārthabhirvāna; SIB, saṃkritārthabhirvāna; G/N. saukrītrabhirvāna.
20] s.e. for sāṃkritārthaś. Cf. O. saukrītrabhirvāna; SIB, saukrītrabhirvāna; G/N. saukrītrabhirvāna.
21] s.e. for sāṃkritārthaś. Cf. O. saukrītrabhirvāna; SIB, saukrītrabhirvāna; G/N. saukrītrabhirvāna.
20] s.e. for sāṃkritārthaś. Cf. O. saukrītrabhirvāna; SIB, saukrītrabhirvāna; G/N. saukrītrabhirvāna.

Note on Dir.

17] *: s.e. for pravṛttit. for the opt. 3. sg. ending -cyam, see § 8, n. 58.

Note on Tib. Kanjur version

17] T. 1313b2: J. 115a4; S. 155a3; P. 302b1; B. 142a1; Q. 120b5; N. 195b6; D. 1054a; C. 127a1; L. 165b1.
18] *: s.e. for pravṛttit. for the opt. 3. sg. ending -cyam, see § 8, n. 58.
20] *: s.e. for pravṛttit. for the opt. 3. sg. ending -cyam, see § 8, n. 58.
21] *: s.e. for pravṛttit. for the opt. 3. sg. ending -cyam, see § 8, n. 58.
Notes on Batsang Kanjur

18.  "...: s.e. for 'dpa.

19.  shen: s.e. shan.

20.  mchos dng ngam: s.e. for mchog sngam.

21.  mchog: s.e. for mchog ("Bh. Kan.").

22.  rin: s.e. for 'byas.


27.  don du mkad con: see n. 131.

28.  mchog: s.e. for mchog ("Bh.").

Notes on Th. Kanj.

29.  du ba: Simonsson (ItS. 56; cf. de. 57) mistakenly transcribed de bar instead.

Notes on Chin. Dr.

30.  If people are not willing to go (and ask about the Dharma of enlightenment, DRIRIAB VI (2003))

31.  Dharmarakas seems to have wrongly taken G/N. cintam ("and [comes to] him") as ce (s Skt. con "[on]" to "him"); cf. Krsh. 165.

32.  G/N. cintam seems to have wrongly taken G/N. cintam ("and [comes to] him"); cf. Krsh. 165.

33.  Skt. cintam seems to have wrongly taken G/N. cintam ("and [comes to] him"); cf. Krsh. 165.

34.  the editions read instead.

35.  the editions read instead.

36.  the editions read instead.

37.  instead.

38.  instead.

39.  instead.

40.  instead.

41.  instead.

42.  instead.

43.  instead.

44.  instead.

45.  instead.

46.  instead.

47.  instead.
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100.  instead.
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106.  instead.

107.  instead.

108.  instead.
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111.  instead.

112.  instead.
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114.  instead.

115.  instead.
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117.  instead.
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119.  instead.

120.  instead.

121.  instead.

122.  instead.

123.  instead.

124.  instead.
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126.  instead.

127.  instead.

128.  instead.

129.  instead.

130.  instead.
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134.  instead.
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146.  instead.
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163.  instead.

164.  instead.

165.  instead.

166.  instead.

167.  instead.

168.  instead.

169.  instead.

170.  instead.

171.  instead.

172.  instead.

173.  instead.

174.  instead.

175.  instead.

176.  instead.

177.  instead.

178.  instead.

179.  instead.

180.  instead.

181.  instead.

182.  instead.

183.  instead.

184.  instead.

185.  instead.

186.  instead.

187.  instead.

188.  instead.

189.  instead.

190.  instead.

191.  instead.

192.  instead.

193.  instead.

194.  instead.

195.  instead.

196.  instead.

197.  instead.

198.  instead.

199.  instead.

200.  instead.

201.  instead.

202.  instead.

203.  instead.

204.  instead.

205.  instead.

206.  instead.

207.  instead.

208.  instead.

209.  instead.

210.  instead.

211.  instead.

212.  instead.
If people are not willing to go and ask about the Dharma of enlightenment, then the bodhisattvas should preach the Dharma to them without fear or attachment. (±7)

Sentient beings who have scales (or leprosy), their relatives, clanmates, women, young lads— from all these, the bodhisattvas should stay away. (±8)

He should not associate with them. He should instead accumulate the roots of virtue. He should stay away from those who sell and those who are arrogant and do not respect (him). (±9)

He (should) abandon every act of standing. He (should) not harm any kind of insects or flies for his own sake. He (should) not make a habit of eating meat. (±10)

He (should) abandon (transactions with) the untrustworthy and those who are apt to get angry, resent or hate. Also, he (should) not talk to those who conduct themselves in such a manner. (±11)

He (should) not associate with shameless people and those who are of selfish character. He should stay away from those who conduct themselves in such a manner. (±12)

When the sage (i.e. the bodhisattva), by face of circumstances, comes to preach to a woman, then he should not go there alone, nor linger there, making jests. (±13)

When he frequently enters a village to beg for food, he (should) take another monk with him. He (should) constantly contemplate the Buddha. (±14)

The Buddha (i.e. I, myself), has, therefore, shown these disciplines and properties previously. One who keeps this carta in mind with full respect, should practice these earnestly. (±15)

Notes on Chin Kj.

Those who say (animals) for profit, those who sell meat for their living; or procurers—with all these, he should not associate. (±10, 12)

He should never associate with brutal wrestlers, who are engaged in various kinds of amusements, or prostitutes. (±11, 12)

He should not preach the Dharma to a woman alone in an enclosed place. When he preaches the Dharma, he should not make jests. (±13)

When he enters a village to beg for food, he (should) take another monk with him. If there is no other monk, he (should) contemplate the Buddha single-mindedly. (±14)

These are then what I call the sphere of proper practices and proper intimacy. Staying within these spheres, one can preach at ease. (±15) (cf. Mazuno 213-214; Kato 224-225; Hervin 211-212; Upadhi-Kaldo 207-208; Watson 199-200).
123a7, L. 165b7.

11 'dub: P. 'du (s.e.).
12 'ravā: P. rāman (s.e.).
13 'katu: J. Q. kam do.
14 'pā: T. bījan pa (s.e.). I emend the reading in T on the basis of that in the other Kanjur editions. Cf. G/N. bhūra-. Cf. also § 8, 82.
15 'chug: P. chog (s.e.); cf. Bth. mo byung (s.e.). Cf. G/N. tarna-.
16 'mor: P. mor (s.e.).
17 'bras pa: P. dpal's ('s.e.).
19 'kan tu: J. kum du.
20 'brtan: B, Q. brtan (s.e.).
21 'ravā: P. rāman (s.e.).

Notes on Bstan 'byam Kanjur

23 'brtan ha: s.e. for 'brtan pa (v Tib. Kanj.).
24 mo byung: s.e. for s.e. of G/N. mab cung pa (v. G/N. mab cung).
25 'ram: s.e. for G/N. Kanj. sgyod yul = G/N. gye ras.

Notes on Tib. Kho.

26 'a's: for the meaning of the particle 'a at this place, see HS. Pp. 59, 61.
27 nbo dka' bsdul gser: = G/N. s.d. prakāśitāt. Cf. n. 15; 165. 62.

Notes on Chos. Dr.

29 gnyen: "does not recognise (my dharma at all)?" = G/N. sakyatād (v. O, F etc.). The translator seems to have confused gdākha ("unknown") with gpo 'dka ("unknown"). Cf. Ksh. 166.
30 gnyen: = J, S(I), S(2), S(3) etc. read bl instead.
31 'dbyin: "(Even) if a person, whether superior, mediocre or inferior, does not practice the Dharma, then people (bka') should always worship him, (because) everyone is without. (v. 18) A (real) man does not consume, is firm in will, behaves courageously. Does not recognise any dharma at all, nor sees extinction. (v. 17)"

These are what I call disciplines of all bodhissattvas. (Now) just listen carefully how to practise properties correctly (v. 17)

Note on Chos. Kj.

32 s.d.: s.d. "practises", a literal rendering of Skt. avaram ("does, acts") or caras ("does, practice").
33 gnyen: s.e. of n. 11; 12.
34 'dbyin: "One should not discern (fi bh. "practises") amongst the superior, mediocre or inferior dharmas, between the conditioned or the unconditioned, or between the real or unreal dharmas. (v. 16) Nor should one discern between men and women. He does not find, recognise any dharma. (v. 17)"

These are what I call a bodhissattva's sphere of proper practices. (v. 18) Cf. Mipano 214; Kato 215; Hurbvitz 212; Yuyama/Kako 208; Wasnon 200).

XIII § 11 Notes:

Notes on the Gilgit/Nepali version

1 dūtā: = D1, B; K, T2 (v. O, F; SIP, ce dūtāḥ); CA. ki dūtā; N1, C5, C6, T6, B, N2, N3 etc. prakāśitā (v. KJK), 'dātā.
2 yāpādābhūtā: = D3, Nep. MSS. We should read yāpādūtābhūtā (m.e.). KN. yāpādābhūtā
real. Even if there is something which arises, dharmas are not born. Through wrong thinking, all existing arises. (p. 20)

(A bodhisattva should always collect his mind, cultivate meditation well, practice resolutely, firm as the peak of Mount Sumeru. Staying in this manner, he should observe all dharmas as empty space, (p. 21)

like voidness, equal and without firmness, that dharmas (i) do not think of victory or have nothing to discard or have no fixed name at any place. This is called the proper proprieties of the wise." (p. 22)

Note on Chin. Kj. 166.

All dharmas are empty, have no innate substance, are not permanent, without arising or extinction. This is called the sphere of proper intimacy of the wise. (p. 19)

It is perverse to think that dharmas exist or do not exist, are real or not real, are born or are not born. (p. 20)

(A bodhisattva should stay in a quite place, collect his mind, remain firm and unmoving like Mount Sumeru, observing all dharmas as having no innate substance. (p. 21)

Like empty space, without firmness, neither being nor non existing forth, neither moving nor not moving, always remaining in their single form. This is called the sphere of proper intimacy." (p. 22) (Cf. Mvms. 214-215; Kato 225; Huvinna 212; Yama/ Kolkata 209; Watson 200-206).}

XII § 11 Notes:

Notes on the Gilti/Nepalese version:

yo ima := D3... + ma... most of the Nep. MSS. yo mama := (KN); + O; + Tih. Kanj. etc. B; mama ya (numeralic, a.e.). Cf. G. ya ida. Dr. 10868: BHS ("[Rājā] so suchas them"). Krah. 166.

rakṣamadha := D2. MS. rakṣamā +. Supplemented from the reading in D3 and the Nep. MSS. B; "rāṣmī (a.e.).

bhavita bhūya := D2. MS. + + a + kṣetra. Supplemented from the reading in D3 and the Nep. MSS.


prakāśaya := D3. MS. "kāśīya (numeralic, a.e.). Encended on the basis of the reading in D3 and the Nep. MSS.

saṃvyaya := (m.c ) saṃvyaya (cf. BHS, a.e.).

sa := = D3, C5, C6 (= O). We should read cf. m.c. C4, B, N2, N3 etc. = (KN; = Śīka...

va: = = D3, C5, C6 (= O). The characters ca and wa resemble each other in many scripts.

saṃvyaya := D3, C5, C6 etc. (= O; cf. "māna": B; K, C4, N1, C5, C6, B etc.

māna := (m.c ) māna (cf. Śīka... 352.8); KN; māna (a.e.).

ayāma := D3, C4, C6, C7, C8, T6 etc. (= Śīka... 352.8); B; K, N1 etc. layam, layama (= KN). Cf. O. lainam (= layaman), P. lainam (see). The verses 23 and 24 read as follows: na api saṃvyaya tvā tvā kā na api, pravāya laukāma... ("He will be ever free from similitude,... Having entered the hermitage,... he will be always without similitude.

The words laukāma ("hermitage, refuge"), aśītā ("dispirited") and saṃvyaya ("similitude") are all derivatives from the root lī ("to cling, to lie"). I assume that there is a wordplay here, which can be seen more clearly in the readings of the Central Asian MSS. O, F; sa tvā layam kānaiva va... pravāya laukāma (F. layam)... na tvā dhyāna ("He will not be dispirited,... Having entered the hermitage,... will not get dispirited ").


yāpātā := K, N1, C5, C6, C7 etc. (= KN); = Śīka... 352.9; + G, F; C4, T6, B, N2, N3 etc. yāpātā. B; yāpātā (a.e. for yāpātā). For absolutes in -i, see BHS § 5.49.; esp. § 35.51 (pañci); RgGr § 42.19, EV I. 282 (al Th. 1144). The alternation of yāpātā / yāpātā may also be
Notes on Pathang, Kanjur

44 yi: s.c. rgye- druts. For the alternation between these forms, cf. Beyer 354.

Notes on Chin, Dr.

46 他所感知，心不起疑：“He will have no timidity and conceit; no thought in his mind”, è O, F. nara shinvitā bhūta phaṭā kalātā, = G/N. na cey samjñāna tarṣa karṣa; cf. Krsb. 166.
47 依解蔽者： "to innumerable people", = O, F. labhasyam; = G/N. idānu ki loh; cf. Krsb. 166.

48 进行： "practices", = G/N. ghaṭṣaptakā ("having closed") (O F. śvāra khaṭṣyār). The verb ghaṭṣyāya means "shut, close", hence (cf. n. 1), but it also means "exert himself." Probably, as Dharmaakraśa misunderstood the meaning of the verb, he translated it as "practice." Cf. Krsb. 167, 337. cf. also Kern. 268, fn. 1

49 但不具足： "and does not fail", = O, F. ne (O.man) ca īṣyati, = G/N. śvāṣṭityāt; cf. Krsb. 167.

50 "If there is a monk who, after my extinction, is courageous enough to observe rules such as these, then he will have no timidity and conceit no thought in his mind, when preaching this sūtra to innumerable people, (+ 23)

A wise one (should) meditate at a proper time or once, a room and practice properly. He (should) contemplate dharmaś as completely pure and preach the teaching at ease, without altering. (+ 24)
Wishing to hear the Dharma, kings, emperors and crown princes make offerings to him respectfully. Householders and Brahmanas also provide retinues (for him). They all desire nothing." (+ 25)

Notes on Chin, Kc.

51 佛教化者： No parallels in the other versions.

52 但若有一僧： = O. sa (O.min) ca īṣyati; = G/N. śvāṣṭityāt; cf. Krsb. 167.

A bodhisattva should, at times, enter a quiet room and with right mindfulness, contemplate dharmas in accordance with the doctrine. (+ 24)
Rising from meditation, he should enlighten kings, princes, ministers, brahmanas and others by expounding and preaching this sūtra with a tranquil and unalarming mind. (+ 24-25)
O Mañjuśrī, such is called the bodhisattva who abides in the first of the four rules and will be able to preach the Lotus Sūtra in the future." (Cf. Mrazo 218; Kato 226; Haruwata 213; Yoyama-Kubo 209-270; Watson 201.)
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om. = omit
p = prose
P = MS. of the *Dampa'yi chos padma dkar po* in the Phyang Kangyur, No. 96, vol. 60, mDo ade.ja.
P1, P2 = MSS. of the *Saddharmapundarika-sutra* kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, No. 130-139, No. 140-141; respectively. Facsimile edition: SMS.
Pā = Pāli
pā. = participle
Pernioka, Vito
1958 *A Grammar of the Pāli Language,* Colombo.
p. = participle
pres. = present
RgieChos = Yuyma 1973
S2(I) = Zihā Edition of the Song Period (宋, 嘉福藏).
S1(II) = Qīhā Edition of the Song Period (宋, 經藏). Salteron, Richard
Saunders, Lore
s.e. = scribal error
Seti, Balogum
1995 *Synchronic Studies of Indic-Prāśānta Languages,* Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (Dīa for the Study of Languages of Asia and Africa 2, South-Asian Series).
Sīksa = *Sūktamācāra : A Compendium of Buddhist Teaching,* Compiled by Śisuddhā, ed. by Cecil Bendall, St. Petersburg 1902; Académie Imperiale des Sciences, Reprint Tokyo 1977; Meicho-Fukui-ki (Bibliotheca Buddhica 1).
SIP = Central Asian Fragments in the Petrushsky Collection, St. Petersburg, with the sigla Ser Ind.
Illegible part of an akṣara

Beginning or end of a fragment when broken

1. pīṭhaṃdīya

2. śramaṇa

3. avagraha, not written in the manuscripts, but added in brackets in the transliteration. (Note, however, that p in the verses is kept as it is).

4. Printing hole

5. a large circle which indicates the end of a chapter

6. siddhay

a. In the transliterations of the Central Asian Sanskrit MSS., the word "a" in the subscript indicates that it has no parallel in the Gilgit/Nepalese version, e.g. jñāna

b. In the transliterations of the Buddhist Kanjur and the Tibetan transliterations from Khotan, the word "a" in any square brackets indicates that it has no parallel in the Tibetan Kanjur version, e.g. dag.

(1) In the transliterations of the Central Asian Sanskrit MSS., the sign "h" indicates that the manuscript lacks the word(s), parallel to that (those), found in the Gilgit/Nepalese version, e.g. O. kālena dharmena; N/G. kālena kālon dharmena

(2) In the transliterations of the Buddhist Kanjur and the Tibetan translations from Khotan, the sign "h" indicates that the manuscript lacks the word(s), parallel to that (those), found in the Tibetan Kanjur version, e.g. Tib. kho - yong dag; Tib. Kanj. xang da yung dag.

In the transliterations of the Tibetan translation from Khotan, these signs indicate that the position of the word(s) is different from that in the Tibetan Kanjur version, e.g. Tib. kho - , dupa lu rang de la shad // pbe rnam pa ngag ston chen par / // pbe rnam po de la shad //

In the transliterations of the Buddhist Kanjur and the Tibetan translation from Khotan, a Tibetan word with a dotted underline indicates that it differs from its parallel in the Tibetan Kanjur version, e.g. pbe'

- Chinese character(s) with a dotted underline indicates a proper name, e.g. 嘉措子

Symbols used in Notes

- = stem of a word, e.g. dharma-

- = absence of word(s)

* = except for letters, following or preceding the sign, the word is the same as the preceding one.

α < β = the form α comes from β

α @ β = the form α is a scribal error, a corruption, or a hyperform of β

α ≠ β = does not agree with α

α % β = α is almost the same as α
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anābhyavāyukta- (<Skt. anābhyavāyukta-; anānāryaśeṣa->) § 4, n. 6
anuttara- (<Skt. an-uttara-; trai) § 4, n. 5
abhiṣeṣa (Lū < Skt. abhiṣeṣa) § 4, n. 84, § 7, n. 46
aya, aya (<ayam, m.c.) § 11, r. 8, 30.
āvatt "discernit" § 10, n. 1
āvadi (<Skt. āvadi-) § 6, n. 46
āha (O; s.c. for ēha?) § 6, n. 45
āśādhānam (Lū < Skt. āśādhānam) § 1, n. 4.
evam uṣṇa (F) / evam uṣṇa § 2, n. 10.
dārakā- (<Skt. dārakā-) § 6, n. 44.
āroñśaka- (<Skt. āroñśaka-) § 5, SIP (I), 311b1
āravikā- (<Skt. āravikā-) § 5, F. 15b4
kumārakāḥkāmam (F) § 2, n. 10.
lakṣāti- (<O; F; G/N. kaṣāya-) § 5, n. 31.
khatpayati (O; F; "gḥatpayati "close") § 12, n. 25
gavaśeṣā (O; <Skt. gavaśeṣā) § 6, n. 53
"gḥatpayati "(close") § 12, n. 13
ghaśīra (F; <Skt. gvaśīra) § 11, n. 43
ghora (F; <Skt. ghora) § 9, n. 91
jala- (O, SIP), jala- (O, SIP, F) (<Skt. jhala)- § 5, n. 36, 72, 81; § 9, n. 34, 70
jātāgājakaka- § 1, n. 70.
ātā (<ātā < Skt. ātā) § 11, n. 21
tō (<Skt. tō, instr. pl. masc.) § 6, n. 82; § 9, n. 85.
dantavādā- (<Skt. dantavādī) § 6, n. 40.
dhītra / dhītra § 9, n. 8, § 10, n. 7
nau (O; <Skt. mā < n = a) § 12, n. 17
dhāṣṭra (O; F) § 4, n. 44
pratishāmāna- (G/N); O, pratishāmāna-; F, Lū, pratishālāna- § 6, n. 56, 59, 85, 87
pravātī ("sells") § 9, n. 68
bhājati (SIP, F) < bhājati § 5, n. 80, 96
bhagamātrika- (F; < bhagamātrīka-) § 9, n. 89
bhogamātrika- (<SIP) § 9, n. 40, 89
bhogamātrikā (<O; F; < BHS. Mathūvīl) § 1, n. 15.
majjīka- (<Skt. majjīka-) § 5, n. 29
yatābātprayīśita- (<Lū, G/N. yatābātprayīśita-) § 7, n. 5
yatābātprayīśita- (<O; F; G/N. yatābātprayīśita-) § 7, n. 5, 29, 40
yātā (<F) § 12, 26
yanīcāna- (<O; i.e. yaniča-) § 12, 26
lyāna (F; s.c. for ēha) < lyāna- § 12, 31
lokapravārthākāra- § 5, G/N. D.2.75a8, O, 284a-8; SIP(I), 321a-5
Tibetan

khu char pa\' (Kho. khu 59b7) | T.133a7. zal pa | G/N. D.2.76a2. -maṇaṭika- | § 8 (vs. 3)
dgap / rdgal (Skt. bāṣya) | §8, n. 79; § 9, n. 109, n. 138
t, sn ("s.o.; numlus") | §11, n. 56
shub pa (Kho. khu 59a5. yung dag shub pa 'jag pa; de. yung dag thub par 'jug pa) | T.133b7. nam du yung dag 'jug la 'jag pa; de. nam du yung dag 'jug | G/N. D.2.75b7. pratimālasā- | § 6
du rul mo (Kho. khu 51a7) | T.133b6. res ma'i gos mo (Bth. res ma'i ... | G/N. D.2.76a6-7. vidanāhālyā- | § 9 (vs. 12), n. 127
bhad gir ... byul (Kho. khu 50a6) | T.132b7. sten (Bth. bsten) | G/N. D.2.78b6. stādhya- | § 6
nun ma' (Kho. khu 50a8, 52a1 etc.) | T.133a2. nun mūkha' (v.l. namkha' ("v.l. namkha") | T.134a6, T.134a6 etc.) | G/N. D.2.75b8, D.2.76b4 etc. akhyā- | § 7, § 11 (vs. 21, 22) etc.
spyad pa (Kho. khu 50b2) | T.133a6. gnyen pa | G/N. D.2.75b0. cāhara- | § 7
iva mula (Kho. khu 52a5) | T.134b1. brum se | G/N. D.2.76b6. bhātmanā- | § 12 (vs. 25)
mar 'dag (Kho. khu 50b7) | T.133a7. mu steg pa | G/N. D.2.76a3. stṛḥaḥ- | § 8 (vs. 25)
dia la (Kho. khu 51a6) | T.133b5. ni bṛhā bhya | G/N. D.2.76a6. bhālaka- | § 9 (vs. 11), n. 159
'zum ba (Kho. khu 50a3) | T.133b6. 'gyur ba | G/N. D.2.76b6. -āōkra- | § 6
zhun (Kho. khu 50b5. mri zhun) | T.133a5. zhun pa mo | G/N. D.2.76a2. moṇīṣa- | § 8 (vs. 1)
zhun (Kho. khu 52a4. mri zhun) | T.134a8. zhun pa mo pa | G/N. D.2.76b6. aṅkana- | § 12 (vs. 24)
gob na (Kho. khu 50a4) | T.133b7. gobon na | G/N. D.2.75b6. kramākara- | § 6
yi / yi | § 12, n. 46
rang la sten du (Kho. khu 52a4) | T.134a8. tebul bshin | G/N. D.2.76b6. yomito | § 12 (vs. 24)
rig (Kho. khu 51a1) | T.133b3. ḫyim | G/N. D.2.76a5. kuṭā- | § 9 (vs. 8)
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- a, nominative singular of -a stems in

- a, nominative plural of -a stems in

ablative "predicative ablative"

ablative singular neuter of -a stems in -am (<a <at)

§ 9, n. 66 (O, SIP, F, bhoga-kārenā / G/N, "kārenā"

absolute construction: genitive

absolutive in -i

accusative plural masculine tā ( < tām < Skt. tām)

§ 11, n. 21

accusative plural masculine of -a stems in -ām (<a <ām)

§ 11, n. 29 (mānyanavajjita it)

accusative plural of -a stems in -i

§ 8, 23 (addendum)

-a, instrumental plural of -a stems in

§ 9, n. 33 (G/N, nata)

-am, ablative singular neuter in

§ 9, n. 66 (O, SIP, F, bhoga-kārenā / G/N, "kārenā"

b / bh

§ 5, n. 80, 96 (kajati: s.e. for bhajati)

bh / h

§ 4, n. 6 (anabhāvyayaka - / Oil. anabhāvyayaka - / anabhāvyakata -)

bh / t

§ 9, n. 67 (O, prāṣaṇa, s.e. for prataśi), § 11, n. 10 (samikhā, s.e. for samā), n. 35 (O, cābārā, s.e. for abhā), n. 41 (SIP, samā, s.e. for samā)

-bh / -v

§ 9, n. 63, 69, 85 (O, SIP, tebhī varjīyā / G, ca vivṛjyate; G, SIP, tebhī varjīyā / F, te vivṛjyate)

-śrī / -sīrī

§ 5, F, 15b4, ardhārika - (< Skt. ardhaśīrī)

§ 12, n. 8 (G/N, ca / col va)

confusion of person and number

§ 11, n. 32 (chādi / [s], - nītikāda / [s])

confusion between the endings of the instrumental and locative plurals

§ 8, n. 15 (vajāyūpyéma / pusthē / pusthē)

§ 9, n. 34 (D2, jīlakamalāyā / Nep. Māss, jīlakamalāyā, jīlakamalāyā)

§ 10, n. 2, 4 (dhammā (prat. pl. -a), bhāya-udgāsāndayāma samādānayātmaṃ / kūṣtādāvara)

confusion between a punctuation mark and a vīśaya

§ 2, n. 7 (O, dhammaparāhyā / / dhammaparāhyyā)

§ 5, n. 59 (O, tebhī / / tebhī), § 5, n. 75 (do.), § 6, n. 68 (do.);

§ 7, n. 37 (O, makhā / / makhā), § 8, n. 66 (O, vīśaya / / vīśaya);

§ 9, n. 40 (D2, D3, bhogārthaya / / ṛṣṭaya), § 9, n. 58 (O, vīśaya / / vīśaya);

§ 9, n. 59 (O, anauśnāna / / anauśnāna), § 10, n. 16 (O, dhūra / / dhūra);

§ 11, n. 25 (D2, saradāhyā, s.e. for saradāhyā /)

-dē / -dē

§ 6, n. 40 (avādai / avādai)

-dē / -dē

§ 6, n. 52 (ādayāi / ādayāi)

-do / v

§ 9, n. 84 (F, (g)prabhāya)

§ 9, n. 8 (B, dvīna / dvīna);

§ 10, n. 7 (do.)

-dy / bby

§ 9, n. 19 (O, anādyāya, s.e. for anādyāya)

-ś, instrumental plural of -a stems in

§ 10, n. 2 (dhammā bhāya-udgāsāndayāma samādānayātmaṃ)
punctuation mark

\[ r / .SetActiveMatrix \]
\[ r / ri \]
\[ t / t \]
\[ same / same \]
\[ sandhi : a + a > -a (-) \]
\[ sandhi consonants -d- \]
\[ sandhi consonants -n- \]
\[ dh- / dh- \]
\[ prakritans? \]
\[ t / n \]
\[ c / mh \]
\[ -m < -ay \]

-\( a \), nominative singular of -\( a \) stems in

-\( d- / d- \)
\[ v / c \]

-\( m- / m- \)

visarga

-\( s- \), nominative-accusative plural feminine of -\( s- \) stems in

-\( y- \), nominative-accusative plural feminine of -\( s- \) stems in

Tibetan

\[ ' \]
\[ yi / yi \]

see: confusion between a punctuation mark and a visarga

see: confusion between a punctuation mark and a visarga

\[ § 9, n. 21 (D2. saukvantrābykshā / khrāçā) \]
\[ § 10, n. 1 (na / karat) \]
\[ § 8, n. 24 (v.l. vinay-d-agama) \]
\[ § 10, n. 20, 23 (SIF, F. prakītyuvu) \]

\[ § 11, n. 6 (G/N. v.l. ayu < ayuti) \]
\[ § 12, n. 4 (G/N. bhikṣu) \]
\[ § 2, n. 8, 12; § 3, n. 9; § 4, n. 4; § 5, n. 3, n. 66, n. 77, n. 79 \]

word play

\[ § 12, n. 10 \]

\[ § 8, n. 29 (O. F. bhikṣrapa) \]

\[ § 9, n. 15 (D2. bhumārpa) \]

\[ § 10, n. 40 (Tib. Kho. la'i) \]

\[ § 12, n. 46 \]
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kun (T.149a6. chen namu 'di dag kun) | Kho. kha 53b. (chos 'di) thon mag | G.N. D.2.76b. sarma (-sharma) | § 3 (vs. 22)
kyang (T.132b5. 14aa) | Kho. kha 50b2. 51b3. 53b4. gyung | G.N. D.2.75b5. api. 7b1- | § 6, § 30 (vs. 17)
kyi (T.134a4. muktas pa namu kyi ['T.134a7]) | Kho. kha 51b6. (muktas pa namu) gyi (- 53a2) | G.N. D.2.76b2. ganditsalam (v. D.2.76b4) | § 11 (vs. 19, 22)
kyi (T.134b1. senu kyi) | Kho. kha 52a4. (senu) gyi | G.N. D.2.76b6. -citad | § 12 (vs. 24)
ka' tsad n (T.133a5) | Kho. kha 50b4. gyung n | G.N. D.2.76b1. ahbhuta | § 8
khiasm (T.133b3) | Kho. kha 51a3. vjero | G.N. D.2.76a5. baale | § 9 (vs. 8)
"kho 'pa (T.134a1. g-yong tu 'kho 'pa) "gzur | Kho. kha 52b6. "lha (g-yong tu "lha 'pa)" | G.N. D.2.76b6. parciyetwa ... gnam bden ma’i | § 12 (vs. 25)
gangzhub (T.134a1) | Kho. kha 51b2. same zhig | G.N. D.2.76a8. yaad | § 10 (vs. 16)
galar (T.132b8) | Kho. kha 50b2. de te yang | G.N. D.2.75b5. suvet | § 6
dgra 'brom (T.133b1) | Kho. kha 51a1. dgra 'brom | G.N. D.2.76a3. upshka | § 8 (vs. 5)
dgra 'brom ma (T.133b1) | Kho. kha 51a1. dgra 'brom ma’i | G.N. D.2.76a9. upshka | § 5 (vs. 6)
dgra ’tsul (T.133b6) | Kho. kha 50a3. dgra ’tsul pa | G.N. D.2.76b6. stremuvara- | § 6
dgra ’sung (T.133a8, T.134a7 etc.) | Kho. kha 53b1. 52a3 etc. dgra ’sung | G.N. D.2.76a8, D.2.76b5 etc. bhikus- | § 9 (vs. 14), § 12 (vs. 23) etc.
dgra ’sung (T.132b6) | Kho. kha 50a4. dgra ’sung ’cha | G.N. D.2.76b6. bhikus | § 6
dgra ’sung (T.133a8) | Kho. kha 50b8. dgra ’sung pa’i | G.N. D.2.76a3. bhikus | § 8 (vs. 4)
dgra ’sung ma (T.133b1) | Kho. kha 50b8. dgra ’sung ma’i | G.N. D.2.76a3. bhikus | § 8 (vs. 5)
dgra ’bom (T.133a8) | Kho. kha 50b7. dgra ’bom | G.N. D.2.76a3. orkara- | § 8 (vs. 4)
yug dang (T.133b6) | Kho. kha 50b3. ’dum dang | G.N. D.2.75b6. -cikatra- | § 6
rgyal po (T.133a7) | Kho. kha 50b6. rgyal po’i tu | G.N. D.2.76a2. nijathupa- | § 8 (vs. 2)
rgyas par sum cing (T.133a5) | Kho. kha 50b8. ’dum po’i phyur | G.N. D.2.76a1. bshiyap gi dangdahya smar gnam gnam | § 8
ngal (T.134a1) | Kho. kha 51b2. nga ’ur | G.N. D.2.76a8 me | § 9 (vs. 15)
c’lha bu (T.149a3) | Kho. kha 51b5. j’lha bu’i | G.N. D.2.76a1. yaldiv | § 10 (vs. 18)
c’lha (T.149a3) | Kho. kha 51b3. che | G.N. D.2.76b1. ni | § 10 (vs. 17)
c’lha (T.149a3, che n og) | Kho. kha 51b3. shasu ca’i (ca’i) | G.N. D.2.76b1. sarma (-sharma) | § 10 (vs. 17)
shab (T.134b8. sbar gnyims shab) | Kho. kha 50b8. (sbar gnyims) leg po | G.N. D.2.76a3. da’ (jik) | § 8 (vs. 4)
ช่าห์ บิรีง (T.133a7) ရေး ပြု шаях биринг; Bh. शहिर बिरिंग) | Kho. kha 55a6. (ရေး ပြု) myi | G/N. D.76a2. (शहिर) pararac | § 3 (vs. 5)

ช่าน หนา (T.134a7, Bh. शान फ़ा) | Kho. kha 55a3. ले है | G/N. D.76a5. साम्यसिरी | § 12 (vs. 23)

ช่าน นัว (T.133a5) | Kho. kha 55a5. myi ช่าน | G/N. D.76a2. amolina | § 8 (vs. 12)

ช่าน นัว พู (T.134a6) | Kho. kha 55a4. myi ช่าน | G/N. D.76a6. altara | § 12 (vs. 24)

ช่าน นัว (T.133b7) | Kho. kha 55a6. ชาน นัว | G/N. D.76a6. शान नौ | § 6

ช่าห์ นัว (T.133b5) | Kho. kha 55a1. bud myed | G/N. D.76a5. kamul | § 9 (vs. 8)

ซอล โพ (T.133b7) | Kho. kha 55b7. ช่าห์ นัว | G/N. D.76a2. मानकङ्क | § 8 (vs. 3)

Yang (T.133b8, ช่าน น้า) | Kho. kha 55a6. (ชาน น้า) yang | G/N. D.73b7. parar (pararam) | § 7

Yang dag par myu bar hyad pa ma yin (T.133b9) | Kho. kha 55a1. dipa bar myi 'gyar | G/N. D.73b6. na pratisevamodari | § 6

yi (T.133b2, ช่าน น้า) | T.134a2. ช่าห์ นัว นุ่น dipa ยิ่ง | T.134a7. นุ่น dipa ยิ่ง [Bh. नौ दिपा] | Kho. 9 (kha 55a2. de); 51b4. ช่าน น้า นุ่น dipa; 52a4. น้า ยิ่ง) | G/N. D.76a4. ename; D.76b1. bodierevanta; D.76b4. inu (c.m. mama) | § 9 (vs. 7), § 10 (vs. 18), § 12 (vs. 23)

เรส วู กู นู (T.133b6, Bh. रेस वू गू नू) | Kho. kha 51a7. den da rod mo | G/N. D.76a6-7. सर्वभृत्युः | § 9 (vs. 12)

1G 3, n. 144.
Sanskrit Fragments of the Sutra of Golden Light, the Lotus Sutra, the Āryaśrīnabhādevīyākāraṇa and the Anantamukhanirbhāralbāraṇi in the Otani Collection

Seishi KARASHIMA

The Liuban Museum (旅館博物館) in Liuban (formerly known as Port Arthur), China and Ryukoku University (龍谷大学) in Kyoto, Japan, possess unique collections of Sanskrit manuscript fragments, which are part of the Central Asian documents, gathered together and brought back by the Otani expedition, led by Count Kono Otani (大谷光瑞; 1876-1948), from various parts of Xinjiang Province, in a series of three trips during 1902-1914. After preliminary classification and study by the Russian scholar, Nikolai D. Minrov (1880-1936), these documents were handed over to the then Guandong Office Museum (廣東館博物館) in 1929 by K. Otani. Most of these are still preserved there and are now known as the Liuban Museum Collection, although a few are also kept in the Otani Collection at Ryukoku University. Though these Sanskrit fragments are small in number, as they are quite old, they are very important, not only for the study of the history of Buddhism in Central Asia, but also for a philological study of Buddhist scriptures.

Amongst these fragments in both collections, forty-seven have been identified as parts of the Lotus Sutra by Minrov, Prof. Zhangxiong Jiang (張锡隆) and Hiromi Toda (戸田宏文). Recently, Prof. Jiang has published a facsimile edition and transliterations of forty-five of these from the Liuban Museum Collection (Jiang 1997), while Toda has published transliterations of two fragments from the Otani Collection at Ryukoku University (Toda 1983: 261-262). Also, Prof. Jiang and myself have identified thirteen fragments in the Liuban Museum Collection as parts of the Samavatthudhananipti1, and a facsimile edition of these together with transliterations of them is now in the press2.

Apart from these, a few years ago, I identified three up to then unidentified

1 I should like to extend my sincere thanks to my friend Petri Lau, who took the trouble to check my English.
2 Three of these fragments had already been identified by Minrov, who sent a transcription of these to Johannes Nobel on the 28th of January, 1927, who was at that time preparing a critical edition of this Sanskrit text (see Nob. p. 322, ch. p. 23, fn. 5).
3 Jiang/Karashima (forthcoming).
fragments from the Otani Collection at Ryukoku University Library, namely MS. No. 622, 624 and 6251, as parts of the Swarna-prabhãsottamãsatãra1 and Saddharmapundarikãsãtra, by reading the transliterations, found in CKB, pp. 76-77. Recently, through the courtesy of Prof. Takashi Iriiwa (入澤義) and Yushio Wakahara (若原雄昭), I have received CR-ROMs containing image data of these fragments amongst many others in the Otani Collection at Ryukoku University Library, which has enabled me to study them more closely.

Also, I investigated other photographs of the Sanskrit fragments in the Otani Collection, which had been reprinted in Saniki Koko Zofu (四恩考収録)(Kagawa 1915), and was able to identify two of them, which had, up to then, remained unidentified. One of them is the opening part of the Adbhudhadvayakalpa. The photograph and preliminary transliteration of one side of this paper fragment, said to have been discovered in Quinlura, can be found in Saniki Koko Zofu (19(2)) and CKB, p. 76, respectively. The other one, said to have been discovered in Khotan, is the opening part of the Ananta-manvantara-kalpadruma and its photograph and preliminary transliteration can also be found in Saniki Koko Zofu (22(2)(2)) and CKB, p. 77, respectively. As these two fragments cannot be found in the Otani Collection at Ryukoku University, they are now most probably preserved in Lushun.

1) Swarna-prabhãsottamãsatãra : No. 622a(P.4a3) at Ryukoku University
This fragment belongs to the same family as the following four fragments in the Lushun Museum Collection: 20.155/42(20.7b14a-2, 20.155/42(20.7b14a-1, 20.155/27(20.7b14c-3, 20.155/42(20.7b14a-3 and 20.155/27(20.7b14c-4.10 The reading of these (abbrev. Lü) is given here together with that in the Otani Collection. The underline in Nobel's edition indicates readings which have parallels in the

---
1 These three fragments are written on paper. The script is Early Turkic Sienese Bïshimi. Presumably, they are from Khotan, as the script in these fragments are absolutely identical with those of the fragments of the manuscript "B" of the Saddharmapundarikasutra in the Lushun Museum, which are recorded as having been discovered in Khotan (cf. Jiang 1997: 205). Cf. Jiang/Karashima (forthcoming), (b) The Swarna-prabhãsottamãsatãra (MS. A).
3 Sanskrit Manuscript in the Otani Collection at Ryukoku University Library 東京大学文学部仏教學研究所大学院文学研究科文献部主任, ed. The Institutes of Buddhist Cultural Studies at Ryukoku University, Kyoto 2001.
4 This fragment is written on paper. The script is Southern Turkish Bïshimi.
5 In the transliteration, the recto and the verso are mistakenly reversed.
6 P.4a3 is the original number given by Mirowsky.
7 Cf. Jiang/Karashima (forthcoming), (b) The Swarna-prabhãsottamãsatãra (MS. A).
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Otani Collection, while the dotted underline indicates readings which has parallels in the Lushun Museum Collection.

Recto

 Nob. 24.16-18. prosamantam dukkhaḥ // nityānām aparitrānām atārayam kṛtani ca // tṛatā teṣām bhravyam ca tataṃ tataṃ tataṃ tapasya ||

 Nob. 25.3-4. yac ca me pānākh karme kṛtāṁ pāpaṁ pāpaṁ / tat sarvam deśayi jāmi // "karma dāsaḥ dāsaḥ" /// (III vs. 18) (= Izumi 22.9.-10; Bagechi 13.5-6)

 Nob. 26.1-3. kālaṃ aprajñatam yat tat pāpaṁ kṛtam maya // avidvaramadattena cakrakbogamadana ca / tārāyu'damadattaṃ yat tat pāpaṁ kṛtam maya // (III vs. 19d, 20) (= Izumi 22.22.-14; Bagechi 13.8-10)

 Nob. 26.4-7. duṣyatvam duṣyastam ca duṣyastāyā karoṣā // anādīnāvatārayaṃ yat tat pāpaṁ kṛtam maya // bāhūbdhādhipradāvān aśvānatmavatvāca / pāpamitrāvān ca eva kēṣāyaśvāvāvata || // (III vs. 22d, 21a) (= Izumi 22.13-23;i; Bagechi 13.11-14)

 Nob. 26.8. + + + + k. tam ma ||

 Liu. Recto 3: jānāstā yat tu pāṇī[ṃ]pāṇi[ṃ] (ṛ)ṣ + + + + [s]taryāmādattene = +++++++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ ++ ++++++++ +

6 //it14
7 ///
8 ///
9 ///
10 ///

Verso

Nob. 28.8-30.6 (III vs. 36-47), 33.4 (III vs. 57/58 b)

1 /////
2 ///
3 ///
4 ///
5 ///
6 ///// +++++ .. kāre15 /////


Nob. 28.6-8. sthāpayyaye databhāmyāṃ sarvayataṃva ca acintyāṃ / databhāmuṣu sthāpayev ca sarve bhūṃsu tathāgatāḥ // ekākṣaya ca ca tattvāvive (III vs. 35-36a)

(Cf. Izumi 24.7-9; Bagchi 14.11-13)37

7 /// +++++ + sreṣu [kṛ] ///


Nob. 28.10-12. tenam saśrūṇāḥ deśevam gamihīrāṃ śteṣāṃ imām / Svarabhāsmottamā namam sarvakarmakṣayām karti // yena kāyakṣareṇ kṛṣṇam pāpaṃ sudārayaṃ (III vs. 37-38ab) (Cf. Izumi 24.11-13; Bagchi 14.15-17).

8 /// [r]. tukkaraṇi padai16 ///


---

14 The following five lines are broken off in our fragment. For the reading of these lines in the Līlāvatī fragment, see Jiang/Karashima (forthcoming), (b) The Svarabhāsmottamāthra (MS. A).
15 The following five lines are broken off in our fragment. For the reading of these lines in the Līlāvatī fragment, see Jiang/Karashima (forthcoming), (b) The Svarabhāsmottamāthra (MS. A).
16 Read: (ekem/ekay). According to Nobel, Mizunov transcribed ekem(ekaya) here in our fragment (Nob. 28, fn. 23).
17 Izumi and Bagchi read instead as follows: // ekākṣaya hi saśrūṇa.
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Nob. 87.7-8. nānāgandhābhāpalataćchāyati samakṣayanti / tathā cāya maññārājānaḥ Svayamabhūttasamayā rūdhenīravājasya (= Izumi 77.9-11; Bagchi 45.10-11)

Cf. Nob. 91.5-6. cama akte caturā maññārājānaḥ bhagavantam etad avocan // avya bhadasta bhagavan Svayamabhūttamanyat

2 // / [y] // [t]: [nāñ][ga][ndbh.]. + ///
Lū. Recto* 2: + + + + rābhāssautama[s]. + + + //
Nob. 88.2-3. Svayamabhūttamanyat rūdhenīravājasya pājārībhya nānāgandhābhāpalatā nīcarisayanti (= Izumi 77.12-14; Bagchi 45.11-12)

3 // [kā + + dh][l]: [l]...[l]... + + ///
Lū. Recto* 3: + + + [uddha]ksetrakotina + + + //
Nob. 88.4-5. budhakṣetrakotinīgatitaśatākṣaraṃ 29 anekāyam Gongadāvālakāśiṣṭām (= Izumi 77.15-78.1; Bagchi 45.13-14)

Cf. Nob. 88. 9. anekānām Gongadāvālakāśiṣṭāmī

4 // tasā + sahasrer... + + + ///
Lū. Recto* 4: sthānīyanti (= ) teṣu ca anē... + + //
Nob. 88.7. samakṣayanti / teṣa cānēkṣaṣṣa [uddha]kṣetrakotinaīgatitaśatākṣaraṃ (= Izumi 78.3; Bagchi 45.15)

5 // mā.i + + + + + + + + ///
Lū. Recto* 5: sena tān anekānī gām(d) + + ///
Nob. 88.9. anabhāgana tān anekānām Gongadāvālakāśiṣṭāmī (= Izumi 78.5-6; Bagchi 45.16)

Versed
Nob. 92.4-12

18 form of obhareṇī.

29 Mirutov transcribed "tāṭha imaṇa Svayamabhāva" here in our "fragment and Nobel took this phrase as corresponding to Nob. 91.5-6. avocan // avya bhadasta bhagavan Svayamabhūttamanyat" (Nob. 91, fn. 13). As Nobel notes (Nob. 87, fn. 18), the readings before and after this point in the extant Nepalese Sanskrit MSS. are quite disorganised. Also, the MS. J, which Nobel did not use in his edition, lacks the whole part of Nob. 87.3-90.10. The manuscripts, so both which the Lībhub fragment 20.1154/215(1.7b146) and our Orani fragment No. 624a in question belong, presumably originally lacked a lengthy paragraph of Nob. 99.10-91.4. Cf. Jing/Sarahima (forthcoming); fn. 126

30 s.k. for (ma)?

31 Cf. BHISD, t.k. vālīkā (= Skt. vālika, Izumi reads "kṣet̐rī (= Bagchi).
32 According to Nob. 88, fn. 25, instead of avocan, some MSS. read avacāntam (= Izumi, Bagchi).
33 Compared to the other lines, the space between the two fragments is too narrow. Either my identification is incorrect, or, in the original manuscript, there were some words which are wanting in the extant manuscripts and modern editions.
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8 // ...[i]. ...a + ... sya manusya + //

Lü Verso 8: + + + + + + + + + + + + + e ... ++ + + //

NoB. 92. 5-7. yekatatahagair ebhi ca sarvah sàrâh samagrá bharavigam... tasya manusyajñi/[19](Clf. IsuNi 82.6-8; Bagchi 47.14-15)

9 // 11.yaraj. ... ks[a]m karisy[ì] //

Lü Verso 9: + + + + + mttaraena + + + + + //

NoB. 92. 8-9. dharmamurtikaham samarpitah samánkah tasya amanuyayija ārañjena karisyamah (Clf. IsuNi 82.9-10; Bagchi 47.16)


3) Suddharmapundarikasūtra: No. 623(P.15d1) at Ruyoku University

Cover

KN. 365.1-366.1

(1) ++ + + + + + + + + + + + + //

(2) ++ [m] upare ce dz[c]f[ì]è[b]rah[m]a[ì] + + + //


19 Clf. RSS. C. F... praṛgaḥ, khsayam (F. yamah); see NoB. 92. fn. 11.

20 manusya-vijaḥ: Isumi and Bagchi read “vijaya instead.

21 According to Noble, Mironov transcribed “vr̥jate ārañjena” here is our fragment.

NOTE 28: 92. fn. 28)

22 manusya-akṣayāḥ: Isumi and Bagchi read “manusya-sāryākṣayāḥ” instead.

23 According to Noble, Mironov transcribed karisyamah sam ca viṣayā tā here in our fragment.

(20.2 etc. ca: Isumi and Bagchi read “ca instead.

"P.15d1" is the original number given by Mironov.
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KN. 365.1. yvad bhavagram upariṣ ca deva brahmā mahābrahmavimūcācārīnāḥ / (XVIII vs. 44ab)

O. 3516-7. yvad bhavagram upariṣ ca deva brahmā mahābrahmavimūcācārīnā / (XVIII vs. 45cd)

365.1/2. gṛhasthāṇīyam ṛddy tasya bhūti yo bhūtātva imu śūtra dharayet // (XVIII vs. 45cd)

365.1b/2. gṛhasthāṇīyam ṛdī tasya bhūti yo bhūtātva āda śūtra dharayet* // (4) /// ye iva[vā]ḥ[ā]ṁ /// [mil]jī ādayasā put(ū)c[ā]r(ā) ṛddi ///

KN. 365.7. ye śāraṇā ca dharmā[n]aḥ ca prakāśayata // (XVIII vs. 47a)

351b4. ye śāraṇā ca dharmā[n]aḥ [ji] + + + + + //

365.9-10. udāśe varṇayor cow ca ye sānta // parṣaṇu dharman ca prakāśayanta // (XVIII vs. 48bc)

351b6-7. udāśi ca ye sānta + + + + + + + + + + + + rūma prakāśayanti //

365.6. ye caḥ satavā ya śāraṇaḥ dharmam truṣṭa ca ye pratanam bhavanti // (XVIII vs. 50ab)

352a1-2. ye (cāpi) satavā ("yaḥ śāraṇaṃ caḥ dharmam (i)ṝṇa + + + + + + + + + //

365.11-12. bhavamastuṣṭī // (7) //

Verso

KN. 367.11-368.3

(1) /// ye .. ++++++++ /// (2) /// ye [ks] ++++++++ ///

KN. 367.11. api vahāḥ. O. 354a1-2. dharmastuṣṭaya • vahāḥ //

367.11-12. bhūkṣaḥbhūkṣayopātākṣpārakā api darānakāmā bhaviṣyanti / rājān / ye rājaṇgaṇa api

O. 354a4-5. bhūkṣaḥbhūkṣayopātākṣpārakā api tasya dharmanābhāvayate / rājan / rājaṇgaṇa api darānakāmā bhaviṣyati • rājāṇa / īpy arya darānakāmā bhaviṣyati • rājaṇgaṇa api darānakāmā bhaviṣyati / rājāṇuka bhaviṣyati / rājāṇa /

367.11-12. sambhuparurṣaṁ parivartā darānakāmā bhaviṣyanti / rājāṇa / (4) /// ā darānakām • (bhav)iṣyantī sa /// (5) /// hapa[sa] .. naigamsājāna ///

KN. 368.1. brahmāṇaḥ upaṭeyo naigamsājānāt //

apadāṁcyāṇa. //
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4) Aryaratmahadeviyanurana: now in the Lishun Museum?
A Gilgit Sanskrit manuscript of this text has been discovered, and our fragment corresponds with Gilgit Manuscript, vol. 1, p. 93, l. 2 – p. 94, l. 4 (able. GM).
This fragment corresponds also with a Chinese translation made by Amoghavajra (not?), Taiho, vol. 21, No. 1253, 大吉祥天女十二契一百八名熾焰大金剛, 253b8–18.
I am able to read only one side of it, the reverse side of the fragment presumably bears a further part of the text.

Recto?
1 +++++++ ++++++(eka)smiṃ <sa>maye bh<ga>vakā Su[kh](ā) + + viharati
GM. 93.2. evam maya ārutam ekasamaye bhagavan Śukhāvātē miharati
2 ++++++++ ++++++ tadyathā Avalokī + + [na] ca ho
GM. 93.4. ima mahātā bodhisattvavasubhāna sādhāṃ tadyathā Avalokiteṣvareṇa ca ho
2’ /// <<dhil[sa]tvana ma(hā)stvena >>
GM. 93.4. dhīstvarena mahāstvavana
3 ++++++++ ++++++ ca bodhisattvena mahāstvena ṭ.
GM. 93.5–6. Mahāśāmprāpamena ca bodhistvarena mahāstvena Sarvanīvārasikamānān ca bodhistvavana mahāstvena
3’ /// << na ca bho>dhisātvena mahā)stvena>>
GM. 93.6–7. Kṣitigarbhena ca bodhisattvavana mahāstvena Samantabhadravana ca bodhisattvavana mahāstvena
4 ++++++++ ++++++ na Vajrāpininī ca bodhis
GM. 93.7–8. Ākāśagarbhaṇa ca bodhisattvavana mahāstvena Vajragāpininī ca bodhis-
5 ++++++++ ++++++ tvena mahāstvena evam Sa-
GM. 93.8–9. tvena mahāstvena Sarvabhavyabahrena ca bodhisattvavana mahāstvena evam Sa-
6 ++++++++ ++++++ satvena Sarvapunyalaksana
GM. 93.9–10. ruvaṃgalaḥdharrinī ca bodhisattvavana mahāstvena Sarva-vyapunyalaksana
7 ++++++++ ++++++ Candraśrutạrasilokahārinī ca
GM. 93.10–11. dhārinī ca bodhisattvavana mahāstvena Candraśrutạrasilokahārinī ca
5) Anantamukhaghumārādhāraṇī ː now in the Lōsāhu Museum?

A complete Sanskrit manuscript of this text is not known. Formerly only two fragments were known to exist amongst the Hoernle Collection. One of these was studied and published in Hoernle, MR., pp 86-87, which corresponds closely with our fragment. The other one was identified and transcribed by Prof. Kasunobu Maeda. 43

There are also three fragments of Khotanese manuscripts of the text, a Tibetan translation (Tib[Q]), No. 539 = No. 808 ) and nine Chinese translations (Tainou, vol. 15, No. 1009, Nos. 1011-1018). Prof. Hisao Inagaki has published a diplomatic edition of this Tibetan version as well as a comparative study of the Chinese and Tibetan versions (Inagaki 1987).

Recito

1 /// * * (*k;i)[a][v][o] {a}anapadāpaḍāseṣu upa[ṇ][a][r] [Hoernle, MR /// dāvy-abhisamākāramadbhisamāyena yādav eva bhikṣavo janapadopaparyupamābhīṣyāt.]

2 /// * * deyaṁ\(^44\) ː \(\tilde{\text{w}}\)hāyamā Śāṇipu[ṛ] [Hoernle, MR. ya vihāreṣu tān sarvāṇ mahātvas kūṣaḍāśāyām samnipāṭyāvam]

\(^43\) His transilation and Prof. Hisao Inagaki's translation of this fragment are found in Inagaki 1999:20-22. I should like to thank Prof. Maeda for bringing the above to my attention.

\(^44\) \textit{deyaṁ} : s.t. for (tānnapāṭyāvam)
closely with Buddhabhadra's translation which reads as follows:

"The venerable Sāriputtara thought to himself: Now I shall enter a meditation, in which anything can be achieved, and ask all the monks who dwell in Jambudvīpa to assemble in the storeyed hall in Mahāvāna monastery.

"Having thought thus, he thus entered meditation and invited all the monks who dwell in Jambudvīpa to assemble. Then, three million monks gathered in the storeyed hall in Mahāvāna monastery. Then, the Buddha told Bodhisattva Showing No Delusion (Amogha-dārāja), Bodhisattva Prince Maharāja (Mahāprajā-rājaśāhī), Bodhisattva Leaving Evil Destinies (Ājīvīyaka), Bodhisattva Without Sorrow and Darkness (Sosrāpa), Bodhisattva Leaving Covetousness (Suvaca-ratvanivakshēmbhi), Bodhisattva Appealing Many Spheres (Sutavasīva-taṃmarīghāsana-vaññati), Bodhisattva Observer of the World's Sounds (Avalokiteśvara), Bodhisattva Fragrant (Dpsa)"
Elephant (Gandhāravīra) and Bodhisatta Maitreya: 'You, O sons of good families, go to all the other worlds in the ten directions which are as numerous as the sands of the River Ganges and tell the bodhisattvas there who will take up their places as buddhas in their next life. ...'

**ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS**

Bagchi = Suvacaratthakāraka, ed. S. Bagchi, Dharmagun 1967 (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts No. 8) (The Motihari Institute).


Kagawa, Mokujirō 高川一郎 1913 *Sākya-Kṣatriya* (Western Region Archaeological Photo), ed. Mokujirō Kagawa, Tokyo 1913 (講談社), Reprint: Tokyo 1972 (講談社書店); Beijing 1999 (学苑出版社).

Karashima, Seichi 1992 "Some features of the language of the Khāyaphañcavīra," in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the*
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A Newly Found Sanskrit Fragment from Dunhuang

DUAN Qing and PENG Jinzhang

In the following we are going to show a fragment in Brāhmi, which was unearthed from Dunhuang. Before we start with our main topic, we would like to say a few words on the archeological background of the new finds.

Dunhuang is a well-known name to everyone here. A hundred years ago, the discovery of a well-hidden library with thousands and thousands of manuscripts in very different languages and scripts made the small oasis city in Northwest China famous in the whole world. Today, due to numerous Mogau-grottoes at Mingsha mountain, which lies about 25 kilometers Southeast of the city, Dunhuang still attracts people from different countries. The Mogau-grottoes of Dunhuang are divided into 2 sections: the southern part and the northern part. The southern part with 487 caves, stretching over 1060 meters, provides visitors and scholars alike with a spectacular view of brilliant wall-pictures and reliefs, both well preserved. In contrast, the northern part with 248 surviving caves has been neglected for a very long time. The situation began to change, when the Dunhuang archeologists started a project in 1988, which focused on a systematic archeological investigation of the northern grottoes. Under the leadership of Professor PengJinzhang, dean of the archeological institute of Dunhuang Academy, the archeological operation has been going on for 7 years. When the project came to the end in 1995, archeologists could be satisfied with the results, because the northern caves yielded plenty of manuscripts and reliefs. As one might expect, the unearthed manuscripts are written in different languages, in Tibetan, Mongolian, Uigur, Xiixi (Tangut), and there is even one well-preserved manuscript in Syriac from the book Before and After. Numerous manuscripts contain well-known Buddhist texts, such as Swarnaprabha-bha-sriya, Saddharmapundarika-sriya, to name only a few examples. Dunhuang archeologists are planning to publish altogether 3 volumes reporting on their unearthed achievements.

1 This paper has been firstly presented on the XIIth Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies. Hereafter, we would like to express our sincere thanks to Prof. Harison and Okyo Ue Hunhbo who kindly spared time checking and polishing our writings, even though they were very busy during the conference.
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The 1st volume has appeared in print in 2000 under the title *Northern Grottoes of Mogao*. Two other volumes are now in press.

The Sanskrit fragment we are presenting here belong to the recent finds from the Northern Grottoes of Dunhuang. Altogether two large and several small fragments in Brahmi on paper came from two different caves. Fragments with the signature 464: 18 and 464: 75 came from the cave 464 which had also been visited by Pelliot in 1908. The fragment with signature B 142: 1 has been found in cave B 142, and B of the signature means a cave existing on northern side of the Mogao.

Generally speaking, those fragments from Dunhuang show a great similarity to the large portion of the well-known Turfan collection in Berlin. They are written in Brahmi script, in the called "Nordtürkistanischer Brahmi Typ b". Judging from the contents, the fragments apparently belong to the Abhidharma class. It seems to us that the remaining fragments represent different chapters of a lost work of the Abhidharma class. We could not identify a parallel version so far, neither in Chinese nor Tibetan translation.

Of the few Brahmi fragments, the one with signature 464: 18 is the best preserved and of great interest. Three Buddhist calendars can be distinguished based on this small fragment. Our presentation will deal with this fragment alone.

*About Fragment 464: 18*

The signature 464: 18 means that the fragment was found in cave no. 464. The size measures 17 cm by 10.7 cm. The writing material is paper, which is broken on both sides, but the upper and bottom edges are well preserved, so we know that the original folio contained seven lines of writings. There is a hole in the middle. After a careful reading, we are convinced that the hole in the middle is not the string-hole as usually expected on such a folio, but due to damage. Through the content, recto and verso of this fragment can be determined.

By a lucky coincidence, an interesting part of the text survives. In the second line of the verso, the word *paśaṇḍa* appears twice. The spelling of the word betrays the school which the author of this manuscript might be affiliated to. As demonstrated by Haiyan Hu-von Himtber, the form *paśaṇḍa* was preferred by Sarvāstivādins while the Mājasarvāstivādins used to write *paśāttha*. At one place of the preserved text, we can

---

1 Cave no. 464 had also been visited and examined by Paul Pelliot in 1908. In his record, the cave is listed as no. 181. At that time, he could return home with about 900 woodblocks for printing in Ugar script and hundreds of manuscripts in Ugar, Chinese, Tibetan and Mongolian alone found in this cave. The finds are preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.
observe that the author had quoted from Guanyaprabha's Vinaya-sūtra. Since we know that the Vinaya-sūtra is written by Guanaprabha, and that he was a famous ācārya of the Mulasāṃghikā-sūtra-school, it is really interesting to take note of a substitution of words: While we read in the original Vinaya-sūtra of Guanaprabha the word form pañjika, we find in the quotation, as preserved in this fragment, the form pañjika. This is good evidence that different Buddhist schools were aware of distinctions of words, and they consciously selected their own forms of words.

At first glance, because pañjika and different ityākṣa are discussed in the fragments, it suggests that the text might be the remains of a manuscript of the Vinaya class. But we read in the last two lines of the verse: yugati is kalīgati; whereby yugati may likely stand for the right form of yugati, but kalīgati appears to be the topic next discussed. Though the text at this place is broken, it is not to oversee that the author had changed his topic: Taking the changing of topics as an indication, we understand that the manuscript is engaging with topics, which concern Buddhist conceptions of time. Since conceptions of time are topics of Abhidharma, the fragment has an Abhidharma coloring.

It is amazing that in the small fragment two persons' names are mentioned. One is the famous Vasubandhu and the other is, as mentioned above, Guanaprabha. Two quotations can be sustained respectively, one is from the Abhidharmakakka, the other is from the Vinaya-sūtra. Through the mentioning of Guanaprabha, the question when the text was composed and written down can be solved in broad terms. Chinese pilgrim monk Xuan Zang and Yi Jing from the Tang dynasty, both wrote about him1. Thus we know with certainty that Guanaprabha must have lived in the 6th century. The fact, that no parallel version of the text as preserved in the fragment could be identified either in Chinese or in Tibetan translation, affords another proof that the manuscript must have materialized at a fairly late date, not earlier than the 8th century.

This fragment in Brahmi belongs to the rare finds of old manuscripts for which the archeological background is clearly recorded. Cave no. 464 also yielded manuscripts in other languages, as for example Uigur, Xitsa and Mongolian, and thus provides with evidence that the cave might be lively occupied - roughly estimated - until the fall of Mongolian the empire in the first half of the 16th century. Of course, we cannot read from a fragment a whole monastery at Dunhuang w'such a later epoch, but we may quote here an appropriate Chinese idiom: With one leaf the autumn is realized. Through

---

3 李希林等校注《大唐西域記校注》, 中華書局1995年版, 第209頁。王邦维校注《南齊書隋 丙案校注》, 中華書局1995年版, 第209頁。
the discovery of several fragments in Dunhuang, the fact cannot be neglected that the Savasvādvīda, going out of the Turfan oasis, survived until a late date even in Dunhuang.

Transliteration

464: 18-recto
1. // y. dehai // nyāyena samvatattṣarīc caitra niṣaḥ pratama bhavati ///
2. /// (phal)gūno māsa(caitra)cāyaṃ vasāto rhū tatra phalaṃāne niṣaḥ kṣay(a)pake ounarṣṭi ///
3. /// (bṛha)cāyaṃ cāyaṃ ṛtu tatraśādi kṛṣṇapakse ounarṣṭi śrav(v)a ///
4. /// (ya)(r)maḥ mahadūṭaye īrā pakhdyaye pī tasmād-uktam-pi ///
5. /// (ni)cāri gauri navama. (y)a+ (pava má)gaḥ su śīrō ṛtu sottas trope ///
6. /// (sam)c(r)bhṣaḥ prāraḥbhya ṭaṃno(y)ceṇa caitra-vāśāḥ na vasanta ṛtu ///
7. /// triṇāvam ṛtṝam triṇābhatvamyaḥvyaṃ vānām-pi * cāri yore [m] ///

464: 18-verso
1. /// stam piṅcacadakam-ini * bhavantagyunprabhena tu vina[y]a ///
2. /// (po)ṣaḥni bhavanti * tatra yatra (po)ṣarhaḥ pahcasaika bhavanti ///
3. /// [c]iṅcacadah + i + + niśvāśāvīrō ṛtu bhavati ///
4. /// (kal)(y)amvāsahandhara tu ko[sa](s)āstra uktam * hemaṣeṣaṃsvanivara[m]a(m) ///
5. /// (nipāṭ)yaṃ ounarṣṭi * adhyāryā śāke nirgata dūkṣe sene ‘rhamāke dvi[c] ///
6. /// [bh]. saivitra tu tir ṛṭavayāḥ 11 yathadur gyroṣṇi ini * kal[y] ///
7 /// svāsyaṇte dala smaśaṇaḥ anādyanty ti pratamaṃ ///

Translation

464: 18-recto
1. ... countries... accordingly, of a year, Caitra is the first month. ///
2. /// Phalgunī in months and Caitra month are the spring season. There in the dark half of Phalgunī month, (the minus-night...) ///
3. ... and Śrāvaṇa month are rains season. There in the dark half of Śādiha month the minus-month. Śrāvaṇa (month) ... ///
4. /// A great festival named ... also in the two-half-month. Therefore it is said ...
5. // Mārgaśira (mārata) is the ninth ... Posyā and Māgha months are the pre-mouthing season. There is in Posyā month ...

6. ... the year begins. According to this, Cātra and Vaiśākha months are the spring season. //

7. ... so it is said "the third and seventh have the minus." Four months ...

4/4: 18-verse

1. ... fifteenth," As (related) by Reference Gana-prabha in Vinayak(āmiti)...  
2. ... are Posathas. There are three Posathas on fifteenth. //

3. ... on fourteenth ... is the season having the rest of the month. //

4. /// As Ācārya Vaiṣṇavandhū had said in the Kaśi-gītrā: "Wixer, summer and rains ..."

5. ... the śatardhi happens. After one and a half months have passed, one in the rest of the half month, second ...

6. ... Here," "tir" shall be seen. As this "yaginā", kali-yaga ...

7. ... are left. "Ten thousand", "without beginning", the first ...

Notes and Commentary

Generally speaking, we are confronted with a text, which deals with different systems of the lunar calendar in which the months are subdivided into dark and bright fortnights consisting of fifteen days or fourteen days. It is indeed not possible to reconstitute the systems based on a single fragment, but through some key words preserved in the text and work done by scholars like Claus Vogel, problems arising within the text could be resolved to a great extent, and three calendrical systems can be distinguished in the preserved short text.

cātra māṁḥ pratāhno bhavati

"Cātra is the first month". Apparently we have a calendar of the year, which starts with the month Cātra. Thus it differs from the system of Mālāvaravīrvīḍa affiliation, according to which the year starts with Mārgaśira."

(phalijj.gov माथि=cātra=वैशाख =स्वातं रूप)

"[The] "śat" belongs to the sentence before and has no clear meaning for me. My translation starts with "śat".

"The Phalguna month and the Caitra month are the spring season." With this statement, we have a year divided into six seasons consisting of two months each. However, we meet here an interesting slight deviation from the normal Indian calendar. The spring starts with the month Phalguna. It does not coincide with the well-known season subdivision, as preserved in Xuán Zàng's description. According to him, the spring begins with Caitra15. Herewith a different system of season subdivision has emerged and will be clearly seen in the next context.

stra phalguna māne kṛṣṇapāke uñārīti

"There in the dark half of the Phalguna month, uñārīti ..." The manuscript is obviously explaining a calendar according to which a year is divided into 12 lunar months, each month into two fortnights — the white fortnight and dark fortnight, and each fortnight is reckoned at fifteen days or, with a few exceptions of dark halves, at fourteen days. Claus Vogel designated such a system as a lunisolar calendar16. His research showed that the system had developed fully by A.D. 380/381 and was later adopted by Buddhists, as shown evidently from literature of the Mālasaravastivāda and Theravāda schools17. Though differently arranged, the words which appear here and in the next 4 lines confirm that the author of this manuscript was familiar with the lunisolar calendar. The dark halves limited to fourteen days possibly to be identified in the fragment are: Phalguna, Āśātha, Pṛṣaṇa.

(phācunāma-vārāṇa rūṣṇa-kārtiyādha kṛṣṇapāke uñārītrit kauṇarīta)

Even though the line is broken, because of the similar sentence structure in line 2, the missing text before vārāṇa rūṣṇa could be restored. We expect here two months, and they must be Āśātha and Śrāvana. Unusual here is the month of Āśātha in combination with Śrāvana reckoned as the rains season. According to the Indian calendar, we encounter Āśātha normally in the summer season. The shift could happen only in the situation in which the month of Phalguna is reckoned as part of spring, and there are still three months connectable between Phalguna and Āśātha, namely Caitra, Vaiśākhā and Jyeṣṭha, as Xuán Zàng listed. We see also in line 5 that Pṛṣaṇa has been shifted into pre-spring, although it normally belongs to the winter months. It is amazing that we are encountering here a calendar only recorded in the Mahābhūtyapāta, a lexicon compiled in Tibet

mahaadastamah

Line 4 is mysterious. The first word seems to be "asima", and there is only a faint trace of long i to be read. What kind of a festival the mentioned great festival does mean is not clear so far.

(mati)gytira navama. l61

This is an unsolved problem. Matigytira is the ninth month, if a year opens with the month of Castra. But the meaning of the ensuing broken word is not clear.

With line 6 we are introduced to a new calendar, according to which a year apparently opens with the month of Castra and Castra and Vadiukhaure reckoned as two months of spring again. This is the familiar Indian calendar with 6 seasons to a year.

trya sutaptamayo=styilam

"The third and seventh have the minas." With this statement we are introduced to another system of dividing the seasons, whereby a year is divided into three seasons — winter, summer and rains, and each season has four months or eight fortnights. This is a specific calendar of Buddhist tradition is stated by Abhiṣambhakhi and by Xuan Zang. In the whole year there are altogether six fortnights counting fourteen days. Reckoned at eight fortnights of a season, the third and seventh fortnights must be reduced, because 'two lunar days each' in one solar day." Buddhist had to be familiar with the calendar, because the important ceremony of Putha happens fortnightly. Each school might have a different subdivision of the seasons, but the dark halves ending on the sixteenth

---


14 甲年中分為三月，甲年中月有九月，十二月為元月，以一年內分為六月。《引自玄奘譯《法宝頌集要記論》》第199年，第1558，第158頁第六，第149頁。

15 甲年中分為六月，甲年中月有六月，為一年內分為八月。《引自玄奘譯《法宝頌集要記論》》第199年，第1558，第158頁第六，第149頁。

18 As explained by Sir M. Monier-Williams under the word "simha". Sanskrit English Dictionary, p. 221.
remained the same. Such a calendar, according to which a year is divided into three seasons and so on is in existence in the Theravāda school, as revealed by Claus Vogel. In each season, there were altogether eight uposatha days, and two of them—the third and seventh—fell always on the fourteenth. Herewith we may quote Buddhaghosa’s *Kammatthevaramī* and the translation from Claus Vogel:

tatta hemantajihvavasthitam tīnṇaṃ uttānaṃ taryasattamapakkheṇa dvē dvē kāvā cla citudusākikā, avasē aṭṭhārasa paṭīrasakī ti, evam uccavacche catuvāsita uposathā.

"Of these (Uposatha days) six fall on the fourteenth, two each—in the third and seventh fortnights—having been laid down for the three seasons winter, summer, and rains; the other eighteen fall on the fifteenth. Thus (there are) twenty-four Uposatha days in one year."

What the sentence *taryasattama-vayānām* means, has been well explained by the quoted text. But we have in *nyūnam* a neuter form. The synonym for the omitted caṇ must be akin instead of tīti.

vinayāṣṇa

The work mentioned here may be *Vinaya-sūtra* or *Vinaya-sūtra-vidyott-abhidhāna-

The author was quoting Gunaprabha from either of his above works, and the passage concerned may supposedly be the following from the Tibetan version according to the Peking edition.

gōo sbyon bya’o 11 zla ba phyed phyed kyi thes bco lta la’o 11 ..... gan tig ne te bco rba’i dan bco lta pa’i rdi la’i mi thun mo geig gi ma chog pas der de rin rdi du thes bco lta lta’i tigs bya ba bya ba ste 1 gōo sbyon byed de bhs na bco bza’i pa’i ’dis bdu’u pa yin no 11 gan tig mło las sbyon ni grigs te bco bza’i pa’i dān 1 bco lta pa’o ’ems gua’u pa yin no 11 16


Here is the quotation of Vasantdeva from the Abhidharma-kosa concerning a subdivision of a year into three seasons. The sentence can be filled out with help of the extant Sanskrit edition of the same work, as follows:

Asīra-vasubandhūni tv tāna-pāñjera utkārtam. Bhavantu-grisum-varṣṭoam
adyantarke mānegate śrēse rādhanaśa vidvadhibhī nipātyate uttaratri

The Chinese translation of the quoted text:

寒熱雨中間，一月半已度。若所餘半月，習者知疫減。

However, there is a difference notable. It is in the second pāda:

The restored text: śrēse rādhanaśa vidvadhibhī nipātyate uttaratri

The extant edition: śrēse rādhanaśa vidvadhibhī uttaratro nipātyate

Whatever has the difference come into being, we would let the question open.

The text is too broken in order to judge if it were a mistake of the writer. We would prefer not to read a syllable as a mistake if it can make a meaning; it is a grammatical vayati and means the last syllable of a word.

yugati iti' kāti(y)

"yugati" must be a mistake. The right form shall be yugati, it is the plural form of yuga, as we can read in the next word kalaya. It seems that the author is changing the topic here, and that he starts to explain what is yuga and kalaya.

— these are conceptions of time according to Buddhists. As stated above, the changing of topic allows us to suggest that this fragment belongs to a text of Abhidharma class.

To sum up, fragments in Sanskrit found in northern caves of Dunhuang are not numerous. However the few finds can speak for some facts: There were influences of Sarvastivāda in Dunhuang which came from Turfan oasis. As proved by other finds from

22 (＜阿地地道長沙線＞. 《大正大藏經》第219冊, No. 1559, 頁22頁中間).
the northern caves, the fragments must belong to a work of later time. As demonstrated by the fragment with signature 464: 18, the tradition of Sāvastivāda school writing on Abhidharma seems to be well maintained even in a later time, and the fragment itself belong to a lost manuscript. The question in Who might write down a work which demands such rich knowledge. Perhaps the question will be open for a very long time.
The Ten Epithets of the Buddha in the Translations of Zhi Qian 支謙

Jan Nattier

The so-called "ten epithets of the Buddha" (十號, 十佛名) consist of: the most widely circulated lists in all of Buddhism. Not restricted to any one philosophical school (darśana) or ordination lineage (nikāya), the set of ten epithets appears to have emerged relatively early in the history of Buddhism, appearing in every category of canonical literature from the dharma to the abhidharma to tantric texts. These epithets were sometimes subjected to scholastic analysis, but they were also used in practice, for they served as the basis of an early form of "remembrance of the Buddha" (念佛, buddha-anumāna). The list of ten epithets was, in sum, widely known among Buddhists of a variety of backgrounds during the early centuries of Buddhist history, and it is still known and used in many living Buddhist communities today.

Despite the wide circulation of this list, however, the epithets of the Buddha were never fully standardized. There have been differences of opinion as to where the list should be divided—that is, which elements within the long string of epithets should be read together as compounds, and which ones treated separately—and differing interpretations of the meaning of some of its individual components. And although I have referred to the "ten epithets" above, the traditional division of these items in East Asia results in a total not of ten titles, but of eleven. These differences can be brought into sharp focus by examining the distinctive (and sometimes quite surprising) features of this list as found in the works of the third-century Chinese Buddhist translator Zhi Qian.

For an understanding of the early Chinese reception of Buddhism, the choice of Zhi Qian as an object of study needs no defense. Zhi Qian was one of the first translators to favor an "indigenizing" mode of translation, employing an elegant literary style and adopting a wide range of pre-existing Chinese religious terminology in his rendition of Indian Buddhist texts. (In this respect his works offer a clear contrast to those of his predecessor Lokakṣema, who employed an "exoticizing" style that favored transcription of foreign terms over translation, resulting in texts that were far less accessible to Chinese audiences.) Zhi Qian's approach was clearly effective, for his works were widely read by cultured sages and monasteries alike. They were quoted extensively in some of the earliest Chinese-scriptural commentaries, such as the Vināśāsūța 修持入體 (T1694, a commentary

1 Given the prominence of this list in Indian texts, it is interesting that no Indic-language name for the list as a whole appears to be attested.

2 See for example the Vināśāsūța, 198-213, and the Da chêna lüm 大智度論 (T1109), 25.70b-73b.

3 See the references given in PPTS 45a, s.vv. amunati and anumāna.
on An Shigao's text of the same name, 1603) and the interlinear commentary preserved in the first chapter of the *Damingguo jing* 大明度國經 (7275). They were also frequently cited in subsequent Chinese essays on Buddhism (e.g., the *Mouzai liun luan* 莫子理論篇 and the *Fengfa yao* 奉法要, both preserved in the *Hongmuji* 星周集, T2102). And not only were these translations read, they were actively appropriated—indeed, plagiarized—both by Buddhists (e.g., in the apocryphal *Pusa yingbo kongzi jing* 婆薩懸浮本無經, T1885) and by Daoists as well (in the *Lingbao* 靈寶 scriptures). 1 Later translators of genuine Indian texts—above all Dharmaraksa 法護 (8. 265-309 CE), whose vocabulary draws heavily from that of Zhi Qian—and also made active use of Zhi Qian's work, often borrowing words, phrases, or even entire sentences from his translations. Thus the impact of Zhi Qian's legacy, both overt and covert, on the religious literature of China is amply attested.

While Zhi Qian clearly served as a major source of inspiration for later Chinese Buddhist writers, he also drew his own inspiration from earlier Chinese Buddhist translations. In many cases he was actively involved in revising the work of others; in others he simply adopted individual vocabulary items coined by his predecessors. As a result, we find in Zhi Qian's translations traces of the work of every one of his second- and third-century predecessors.

Zhi Qian's translations represent, in sum, a major feature in the development of early Chinese Buddhism. Looking backwards from his time, we can see that—although he clearly preferred certain modes of expression to others—all the streams of prior translation terminology came together in his work. Looking forward, it is evident that his translations set into motion trends of interpretation that were to resonate in Chinese Buddhist circles for centuries. To examine the terminology used by Zhi Qian is thus not merely to analyze the work of a single translator, but to confront questions of meaning that engaged some of the finest thinkers in China over the course of the first several centuries of Chinese Buddhist history.

AUTHENTIC WORKS OF ZHI QIAN

To conduct an inquiry into the terminology found in Zhi Qian's translations we must determine, first of all, which of the fifty-two works attributed to him in the *Taishō*

4 *The Pusa yingbo kongzi jing*  is built around a number of passages drawn from Zhi Qian's *Pusa yingbo jing* 婆薩懸浮經 (T281).

1 Translations by Zhi Qian that have been incorporated into the *Lingbao* scriptures include the *Pusa yingbo jing* 婆薩懸浮經 (T281) in *LPW6* and *LPW5*, and the *Langbi jing* 龍師女經 (T377) in *LPW2*, *LPW16*, and *LPW23*. Bokenkamp also points to the strong likelihood that the description of Amatibhā's "pure land" found in the longer *Sukhāvatīyāmi* served as the prototype for the paradisial imagery found in *LPW16* (ibid. 472-473). Though recent work by Paul Hartman strongly suggests that TS62—the version referred to by Bokenkamp—is actually a (possibly revised version of) a translation by Lokshema, while TMS4 is the work of Zhi Qian, the two texts are very close in content and the imagery discussed by Bokenkamp could have been drawn from either one.

5 *Sarvantiraka's Pratihārītikā (TS75)*, for example, borrows heavily from the wording of Zhi Qian's earlier translation (TS74), and the versions of the *Dharmaprajñā jing* 寶華莊嚴 and *Sākiyamuni (T276* and T279, respectively) often retain elements of the vocabulary and style of the portions of the text that were included in Zhi Qian's version (T285).
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ZHI QIAN'S RENDITIONS OF THE TEN EPIPHETS

Several texts translated by Zhi Qian contain complete, or nearly complete, lists of the ten epithets of the Buddha. Still others contain only the first three (and by far the most common) elements, viz., the titles sakyamuni, arhat, and samyaksambuddha. In still other cases, some (though not all) of the ten epithets occur independently. The present discussion takes the list of ten epithets as its point of departure, but references to occurrences of these epithets outside that context will be included as well. As we shall

1 Listed by their tshig du numbers for the sake of brevity, they are: T54, 68, 76, 87, 128, 149, 185, 198, 225, 281, 474, 495, 532, 576, 557, 599, 581, 632, 708, 735, 790, and 1011. For further details see Appendix 1.

2 T6 (Bramacāra jīn māyā-vīra-corā), a version of the (non-Mahāyāna) Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra, and T361 (Pulang dīgha-pāla jā jāng 森林張婆娑婆伽, a version of the larger Sūtrāvatāra-nītra). For a discussion of the attribution of these translations to Zhi Qian see Appendix 1.

3 T216 (Upa jīn māyā-vīra-corā), a version of the Dharmapala, and T328 (Pulang), a version of the Sūtrāvatāra-nītra. For further details see Appendix 1.

4 The texts in this group, all of which were identified due to the typical (and in some cases, extremely rare) Zhi Qian vocabulary they contain, are the following: T260, T7, 507, and 511. The last of these, a version of the Padma-nītra (known in Zhi Qian's recension as "The Sixth of the Five Wishes of King Bimbisāra"), is a particularly strong candidate, since it is not only similar in vocabulary and style to Zhi Qian's other works, but is cited in the commentary on the Tīrthaṅka ra-jāṅg (三釋王) produced in the middle-third century in the Wu kingdom, a text which draws heavily (indeed, almost exclusively) on the translations of Zhi Qian and As Śāhōjo.
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see, there are sometimes significant differences between the translations of these epithets when they occur in isolation and when they occur as part of this list. In listing these items below, I have divided the Sanskrit terms in accordance with Zhi Qian’s Chinese renditions.11

Two observations concerning the nature of Zhi Qian’s translation work should be made at the outset. First, Zhi Qian is known for the tremendous variety of his terminology, often using a number of different Chinese equivalents for one Indic term even within a single text. Second, a number of his translations are not original works, but revisions of the translations of others. The fact that Zhi Qian was often involved in adapting or polishing existing translations may well have contributed to the lack of consistency in his terminology, though the occurrence of multiple equivalents for a single Indic term even in close proximity to one another suggests that his own preference for variety was also a factor. These patterns and their implications will be discussed in detail below. At this point what is important to note is that Zhi Qian’s vocabulary does not belong to any one translation lineage, but includes contributions drawn from a variety of streams.

(1) Tathāgata

(a) 如來

In the overwhelming majority of cases Zhi Qian translates the word tathāgata as 如來 “thus come,” a usage that will hardly surprise the modern reader, for it has been standard in Buddhist Chinese for nearly two millennia. Introduced at the very dawn of Chinese Buddhist translation activity, the term 如來 is found already in the translations of An Shiṣapapūraṇam as well as in those of his Han-period successors An Xian 安玄 and Yan Fangao 彦方 según Ts'ui (T152) and Kang Mengzhao 慶孟超 (T184 and 190).

Not everyone, however, adopted this term. Lokakṣema 萊蒼跋陀, alone among Han-period translators, generally preferred translation to transcription, and in place of the nearly universal 如來 he employs the unwieldy rendition 梵語阿難 in his corpus. Only in one text attributed to him—the Aññakapphala-sutta (阿毘憍離經, T313)—does the term 如來 regularly appear, and its very presence points to the likelihood that, if this is indeed Lokakṣema’s work, it was subsequently revised by others.12

It should be noted, of course, that the translation of tathāgata as “thus come” represents only one of the two possible meanings of the Sanskrit term. It is impossible to tell from the Sanskrit alone whether the word should be understood as tathā + gata “thus gone” or tathā + āgata “thus come.” Both of these interpretations were possible (and indeed, well known) in India, and they showed for productive word-play by Buddhist preachers.13 In the Chinese term 如來, however, only one of these two possibilities is

11 It is quite likely—indeed, virtually certain—that most or all of Zhi Qian’s translations were rendered on Prakrit rather than Sanskrit terms. Given the multiplicity of Prakrit candidates (Gandhāri being one, but by no means the only one), I have chosen to simply record each epithet in Sanskrit for convenience.

12 See Harrison 1991, pp. 166-167. Harrison’s discussion centers on features of T.313 that are atypical of Lokakṣema’s work; viewed from the other side, we can say that a number of these expressions are quite typical of Zhi Qian and his fellow Wo-kingdom translator Kang Mengzhao. The possibility that the original version of the Aññakapphala-sutta translated by Lokakṣema (or a member of his school) was revised in circles familiar with the work of these Wo-kingdom translators seems worth investigating in detail.
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Zhi Qian exhibits exceptional consistency in his use of 詞來 for tathāgata, but even here his terminology is not completely uniform. In a handful of instances—nine times in all, of which eight occur within a single text—he transcribes the word instead, rendering it as 多陀那, or (in abbreviated form) 多陀. or even (in Lokakṣema’s standard rendition) 也譯多陀. The fact that these transcriptions occur in only two texts, and are unknown elsewhere in Zhi Qian’s corpus, suggests that special circumstances may have been at work. And those circumstances may well have had to do with pre-existing versions of these two texts produced by Lokakṣema or a member of his school. The text which contains the majority of these transcriptions, the Tathāgata-pūna-muḍrā-samādhi-sūtra (T632, 瞭然三昧經), abounds in Lokakṣema-style transcriptions, including even some of his most unyieldingly “signature terms” such as 阿難陀舍羅 for apāyakauslaya “sail in means” and 阿難陀舍羅 for satya-kasminabā “armed with the arrow [of the buddhavatara].” In particular, T632 shares some extremely rare terminology with Lokakṣema’s Pratyāyupravāsa-buddha-samādhi-sūtra (T418, 般舟三味經), a text which was clearly subject to revision after Lokakṣema’s time. Moreover, T418 exhibits an unusually high percentage of translation vocabulary that is typically found in the works of Zhi Qian. The significant overlap in vocabulary and style between T418 and T632 (one attributed to Lokakṣema, the other to Zhi Qian) suggests a common background, and an investigation of the possibility that both originally stemmed from Lokakṣema’s circle, but were subsequently revised by editor(s) from the circle of Zhi Qian, might well be rewarding. The only other occurrence of a transcription of tathāgata in Zhi Qian’s corpus occurs in his version of the longer Sukhavativyasa (T361, 安樂具足平等離難), which has now been identified as a revision of an earlier translation by Lokakṣema.18

---

18 See for example the long dimension of the fact that “Tathāgata either come nor go” (or 詞 sharing the beginning of chapter 11 of the 阿難陀舍羅-prakṣaṭākṣa-sūtra, where the term tathāgata “thanes” is also brought upon tabular.

19 In T533, by contrast, the standard translation 瞭然 an hisformic form which can mean either 詞 come or 詞 go (it is 亦 come 亦 go) thus preserving the ambiguity of the Sanskrit while adding a respectful tone not made explicit in the original.

20 Lokakṣema’s 多陀那 occurs twice in T632, while the form 多陀那 occurs four times in the same text once in T61. The abbreviated form 多陀那 occurs twice, 請 alone in T632.

21 Examples include the unusual heaven-name 蒼然 the transcription of Śīmapuruṣa’s name on thīkāri, in which two transcription errors occur in both T632 and T418 but are unattested by any other text by Zhi Qian or Lokakṣema. The two texts also share the feature of using more translations (including terminology commonly used by Zhi Qian) in verse portions, and more transcriptions (including many of terminology commonly used by Lokakṣema) in the prose. In addition, they both feature verse sections in a highly unusual six-character style (though this is assumed in other Zhi Qian translations as well). For a concise discussion of the normal history of T418 see Harrison 1993, pp. 145-148, and for further details Harrison 1989, pp. 223-249.

22 T418 includes, for example, the expression 阿難陀舍羅 for apāyakauslaya (13.9.16.29 and 19.4.21), 阿難陀舍羅 for apāyakauslaya (9.16.22), 阿難陀舍羅 for apāyakauslaya (19.15.19), 阿難陀舍羅 for apāyakauslaya (9.16.10), none of which occur elsewhere in Lokakṣema’s corpus. All of these experiments, however, are commonly found in Zhi Qian’s works.
(2) Arhat

In contrast to the nearly total consistency exhibited by Zhi Qian in translating the word "arhat," his renditions of "arhat" are far more varied. Indeed it may be here that Zhi Qian's penchant for variety reaches its peak, for there are no fewer than nine different equivalents of this term in his work. Three of these are transcriptions, while the other six are translations. These expressions naturally fall into four distinct subgroups, which provide the framework for the discussion below.

(a) 阿羅漢, 阿羅誦 [var.-cf.], 罹漢

The first group consists of three transformed forms, which—as Zhi Qian's treatment of the word "arhat" would suggest—are the exception rather than the rule in Zhi Qian's corpus. Of the twenty-six texts reliably attributed to him, abhaksan 阿羅漢 is found in only six, one of which also contains the variant abhāb 阿羅誶 (〜ђ)^5. The abbreviation abhaks 阿羅誶 occurs in seven other works.⁶ The form 阿羅惹 is quite rare, occurring in Zhi Qian's work only twice, and it will be discussed separately below.⁷

Interestingly, there is no overlap whatsoever between the texts containing 阿羅惹 and those that use 阿羅誶—in other words, there is no text reliably attributed to Zhi Qian (nor even any "candidate text") that uses both. This strongly suggests that the shortened form 阿羅誶 was not merely an abbreviation resulting from occasional prosodic constraints, but was the product of an alternate tradition in which it was regarded as a full and adequate form.⁸

Whereas the transformed form of "arhat" occurs almost exclusively—among Buddhist texts translated before Zhi Qian's time—in the works of Lokaksesa,⁹ the transcription of "arhat" is far more common, and thus it cannot easily be used as a tracer for the sources of Zhi Qian's usage. The term 阿羅惹 occurs in the works of An Shigao and Kang Mengxiang as well as in those of Lokaksesa, while the abbreviation 阿羅惹, though not used by An Shigao, is found in translations by the other two.¹⁰

¹⁰See below, n. 121.
¹⁵T54, 68, 128, 169, 361, and 632; the variant "san" occurs only in T632. The overwhelming majority of occurrences of abhāsan (335) are found in T631, considered to be a revision by Zhi Qian of Lokaksesa's work. There is also one occurrence in a "candidate text" (T755).
¹⁷T6, 185, 210, 474, 516, 537, and 790. There are also five occurrences in a "candidate text" (T720).
¹⁸Both occurrences are in T632 (15.464a7 and 16).
¹⁹There has been strong pressure, throughout the history of Chinese Buddhism, to reduce more proper names and technical terms to dignity form. Even those whose "full" translations contain more than two syllables are often reduced to two-syllable form in popular usage (e.g., Guanyin 難音 for Samantabhadra 西方彥). There is one stray occurrence of the transformed term 阿羅惹 in the work of Kang Mengxiang (T144, 3.461b2). No other transcription of "arhat" has been identified in his work or that of any other Han-period translator besides Lokaksesa.
²⁰There is one occurrence of the term 【阿羅惹】in An Shigao's corpus (T602, 15.1672a), but this may well be the voice of the commentator who composed the interlinear explanations rather than that of An Shigao himself.
Though these terms are used in a wide range of translation texts, they are clearly restricted in their application, for there does not seem to be a single instance in which either of these translations is used to refer to the Buddha. Rather, both 阿羅漢 and 阿闍薄迦 —introduced to Chinese audiences at a time when Buddhism in India had already come to view Arhatship and Buddhahood as distinct and competing goals—seem to have been reserved, at least through the middle of the third century, for reference to enlightened beings who were not Buddhas. A corollary of this apparent specialization of usage is the fact that neither of these terms occurs, as a translation of the term arhat, in the list of the ten epithets of the Buddha.

In contrast to the substantial number of occurrences of 阿羅漢 and 阿闍薄迦 in the work of Zhi Qian’s predecessors, the variant 阿闍薄迦 is quite rare in texts translated before his time. In Han-period translations it appears only in the work of Lokakśema,26 and even there it is restricted to a very specific context. In all three of the texts in which Lokakśema uses this term (T224, 418, and 458), it occurs only as the middle component of the sequence 阿羅漢～三寶三僧 (i.e., tathāgata, arhat, and samuṭṭhadāna). The same is true of the two occurrences of this transcription in the work of Zhi Qian, where it appears only in his (slightly different) transcription of this trio of epithets (多陀阿～三寶三僧). A corollary of this quite limited usage is the fact that the term 阿闍薄迦—in sharp contrast to the use of the other two transcriptions discussed above—is used exclusively in reference to the Buddha.

Coblin (1983, p. 243, #56) has suggested that the transcription of arhat as 阿闍薄迦 reflects the Gāndhāra form araka (for which cf. Brough 1962, xx. 223). This may well be the case, but it is surely significant that this transcription appears only in this very limited context. Elsewhere in the very same texts Lokakśema uses either 阿羅漢 or 阿闍薄迦; thus we can assume that both 阿羅漢 and 阿闍薄迦 (or, in other texts, 阿闍薄迦) were being translated from the same language. It seems likely, therefore, that the governing factor in the generation of this particular transcription was not its pronunciation in a particular dialect, but the phonological constraints exerted by its position within a compound.

(b) 真人，至真，應真

A second group consists of three translation terms, all of which contain the character at “perfect” or “true.” In several of his translations—T6, T97 and T474—Zhi Qian uses all three of these expressions; the same is also true of one “candidate text” (T26).28 Thus it is not only their apparent similarity in meaning, but their actual distribution in Zhi Qian’s corpus, that points to the likelihood that these three terms form a distinct and related group.

Of the three terms in this category the oldest is surely 真人 “perfected one,” an expression made popular through its use in the Zhuangzi and subsequently employed in many Daoist texts.29 A reasonable working hypothesis, therefore, would be

---

26 This expression occurs only in T224 and T418 (frequently in both of these texts) and once in T458 (14.456c).

27 In addition to these three translation terms, T6 and T474 (as well as “candidate text” T26) also use the abbreviated transcription 阿羅.
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that 真人 provided the original basis for all three terms in this group, while the other two expressions (至真 and 至身) are its secondary derivatives.

Be that as it may, what is certain is that these three expressions convey different aspects of the Indian term arhat and were used by Zhi Qian in quite distinctive ways. Of the three, 真人 is used in the most generic sense—that is, when referring to arhats in the aggregate (e.g., "the Buddha was with five hundred arhats"), or to distinguish arhats as a group from other enlightened beings (e.g., "arhats, pratyekabuddhas, and Buddhas"). Thus far I have not been able to identify any case, in translations dating from Zhi Qian's time or before, in which the term 真人 is used to refer to a particular individual.

The expression 真身 "ultimately perfected," by contrast, has a significantly narrower range of application, for it is used to translate arhat only when that term refers to the Buddha. Not surprisingly, many of these occurrences we found in the list of ten epithets of the Buddha, though some occur in the shorter list of three. Given this quite restrictive usage we might ask whether the character 真 "ultimately" was consciously selected in order to convey the sense that the Buddha is supreme among arhats—that is, above and beyond the rank-and-file perfected ones (真人). Without direct access to the mind of the translator it is of course impossible to give a definitive answer, but the net effect of this usage is clearly to place this epithet at the pinnacle of the three terms within this category.

The final term in this group, 至身 "one who conforms to [the status of the] perfected," has yet a different nuance, for it is used to refer to arhanship as something that an ordinary practitioner might attain. It is this form that Zhi Qian uses, for example, in translating the list of the "four fruits" (从初果至四果) into arhat, and it is also this form that he uses when a text states that a particular individual has attained, or will attain, arhanship. Indeed, of the three terms in this category this is the only one that ever occurs in Zhi Qian's corpus in conjunction with the verb 至 "to attain."

In sum, it is clear that the terminological variation in this group was not used by Zhi Qian merely for literary effect. On the contrary, he has calibrated his terminology to fit three distinctly different senses of the Indian term. Thus in this case, at least, it appears that there is a clear rationale behind his seemingly kaleidoscopic variations.

Interestingly, there is no evident connection between the meaning of any of these terms and any of the popular Indian etymologies of the Sanskrit word arhat (to be discussed below). Thus they were probably intended not as literal translations, but as "cultural calques," designed to correspond to the highest ideal of human perfection in one culture with the corresponding ideal in another.

As mentioned above, the three terms in this category form a group not only by virtue of the common element 真, but also because they regularly occur together in the same texts. But if we turn now to an examination of the relations between these terms as

---

25 Given the fact that this term gained particular salience in Daoist scriptures only in the late 4th century and after (see Holcinek 1997, pp. 276-277 and point), we might speculate on whether the Buddhist use of the term fueled Daoist interest in re-appropriating it.

26 The only case I have been able to identify in which 真人 is used to refer to the Buddha himself is in a short (and aberrant) list of epithets of the Buddha that occurs once in Lokakṣema's (revised) जयभद्रधिः (T13, H.75a15: 如來真人是佛中尊).
a group and those discussed previously—that is, whether they do or do not occur together—an interesting pattern can be seen. First, there are many cases of the occurrence of 阿婆 and 真人 within the same text; in one case, the former is even defined in terms of the latter (阿婆者為真人也).25 There are also several cases of the coexistence of 阿婆 and 真人, and again in one case the two are directly juxtaposed (阿婆為真人者).26 Thus in what we might call the "twain 阿婆 真人 tradition"—i.e., in texts that translate the word arhat using this term—there was no restriction on the use of terms from the 真人 group as well.

The presence of the term 阿婆, by contrast, is a strong counter-indicator for the use of any of the three terms in this category. There is no text reliably attributed to Zhi Qian (nor even any "candidate text") in which both 阿婆 and 真人 occur, nor do 阿婆 ever occur together. The sole exception to what we might call the "rule of 阿婆 incompatibility" is 至真, which occurs in three of Zhi Qian's translations (T128, 169, and 361) where 阿婆 is also used. We might characterize this situation by saying that the word 阿婆—in Zhi Qian's work, at any rate—a strong traditionalist marker, signifying an attempt to retain Indian forms and to avoid assimilation to indigenous Chinese terminology. But while the term 阿婆 was viewed as adequate to represent most uses of the word arhat, it apparently seemed inappropriate (again, speaking only of this early period, i.e., of Zhi Qian and his predecessors) to use it in reference to the Buddha. Thus when an Indic text used the word arhat in this sense, other Chinese terms, such as 至真, had to be called upon instead.27

While the pattern of Zhi Qian’s use of the terms in this category is rather complex, to identify their source is a simple matter. The only Han-period translator who uses any of these three terms—and he uses them all—is Kang Mengziang.28 Since Zhi Qian is known to have produced a revised version of Kang Mengziang’s influential biography of the Buddha, it seems very likely that these terms were derived from this work.29

(c) 應備，應供

A third category consists of two terms having in common the character 真, meaning "conforms to, responds to," or alternatively, "is worthy of." Once again these have been grouped together not simply because of their similar appearance, but because they occur together in Zhi Qian’s work.

26 T470, 14.529a19.
27 There is also one text by Zhi Qian (T169) in which another translation-term for arhat, 無著, is used in reference to the Buddha where the term 阿婆 also occurs. For a detailed discussion of this epitaph see below, section (d).
28 There is also a single occurrence of 至真 in Lokakṣema’s T311 (T.756a15) in a short list of Buddhas-equates, but this is the sole instance of this term in his entire corpus, and it should be viewed simply as offering additional evidence that T311 has been revised. The term 至真 and 上真 never occur in his work.
29 It should be noted that Kang Mengziang’s work does not observe the clear pattern of distribution of these terms found in Zhi Qian’s work, for he uses all three of the terms in the 真人 category, as well as both 阿婆 and 上真, in both of his two translations (T184 and 196).
The term 価値 “worthy of offerings” will not surprise modern readers, for it is widely used by Kamārājava and others. The term 価値, however, appears rather obscure. The most natural reading of the Chinese would be “one who conforms to the rites”—that is, one who acts in harmony with what was seen as ritually correct behavior in China. Yet how this could express the meaning of the word arhat is unclear. Despite the fact that 僧 generally functions as a noun, it seems that in this case we are constrained to take it as a verb, and to translate this expression as “one who is worthy [reading 賞 giō, not 賞] of being esteemed [編].”

Though the term 価値 is more familiar, it is far less common in Zhi Qian’s work, occurring only once in his entire corpus (T76, 1,883c11). 価値 occurs, by contrast, numerous times in three different texts (T76, 225, and 352). In fact, it is likely that the sole appearance of 価値 in a text that regularly uses 価値 instead—is the result of a hypercorrection, whether deliberate or inadvertent, by a copist who was familiar with this later use. If this is the case, the apparent occurrence of 価値 should be discarded, and this category would then consist of the term 価値 alone. In this case we should also reduce the number of equivalents of arhat in Zhi Qian’s translation corpus from nine to eight.

One of the most striking things about Zhi Qian’s use of 価値 is its pattern of distribution, for it seems to operate as a strong counter-indicator for the use of any of the other terms for arhat discussed above. There is not a single case—either in an authentic Zhi Qian translation or in a “candidate text”—where 価値 occurs in a text that also contains any of the three transcribed forms in the 阿羅漢 group, nor is there any case (again including “candidate texts” as well as solid Zhi Qian attributions) where 価値 occurs together with any member of the 阿羅漢 group. At first glance there appears to be one exception to this rule, for in Zhi Qian’s version of the Apatthaboriṭa-panthajaradi-nāgara (T225, 大毘尼經)—a text in which 価値 is the preferred translation of arhat, occurring a total of ninety-three times—the term 価値 occurs once in a list of epithets of the Buddhas (8,480b8). But this turns out not to be a real exception after all, for this sole occurrence is found in the first chapter, a portion of the text which has been significantly revised and whose vocabulary differs in many respects from what is found elsewhere in the text. If we treat this first chapter as a separate work (which, in terms of its translation history and vocabulary, is certainly in the apparent exception disappears, for the term 価値 is never used in this chapter. Thus even here the apparent incompatibility between 価値 and all the other terms for arhat examined thus far still holds.

If we turn our attention to the sources from which Zhi Qian might have obtained this term, we must look beyond our previous candidates, for 価値 never appears in the works of An Shigao, Lokakkṣema, or Kang Mengzeng. In fact, there is only one Han-period translator—or rather, one translation team—in whose work it does: the team of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, who employ it as their sole translation for arhat in the Ugraparipūcčnāgara (T322, 法華經). Thus it seems that Zhi Qian has adopted not only the term itself, but also the pattern of its exclusive use, from An Xuan and Yan Fotiao.

Yet there is one term for अर्हत—as and only one—that does appear with some frequency in two texts (T125 and 332) that also contain the word निर्वाण. That term is अश्रु, the last remaining expression for अर्हत in Zhu Qian’s repertoire, to which we will now turn.

(d) अश्रु

Our fourth and final category contains only a single term, the expression अश्रु "unattached." Why this should be used as a translation of अर्हत is not immediately evident, and its derivation will be discussed below. The fact that it was indeed used to translate अर्हत, however, is beyond dispute. There are dozens of occurrences in Zhu Qian’s work of the list of the five three Buddha-epithets (तत्त्वक्ता, अर्हत, सम्पाकमठुद्ध) in which अश्रु serves as the middle element, including three translations that are solidly attributed to him (T169, 225, and 532) as well one “candidate text” (T807). Once again, however, this was not Zhu Qian’s own innovation, for अश्रु is also used to translate अर्हत in three works by An Shigao (T132, 101, and 603), one translation attributed to Lokaksetra (T313, again in a unique divergence from his usual terminology and thus providing further evidence that this text has been revised), and two works by Kang Minxiang (T188 and 196). This was, in any, one of the oldest Buddhist technical terms, and it was widely used by Han-period translators. It is only in the work of As Xuan and Yan Potiao (T332), who consistently use अश्रु rather than अर्हत, as well as in the unrecorded works of Lokaksetra, where transcriptions we preferred, that this translation fails to appear.15

Despite the widespread use of this expression among several early translators, however, its domain of use is quite restricted, for it is used to translate अर्हत only when that term refers to the Buddha. More specifically, it is used only when the word अर्हत occurs between तत्त्वक्ता and सम्पाकमठुद्ध in the first three epithets of the Buddha. I have not yet been able to locate a single instance in Zhu Qian’s work (or in any “candidate text”) of the use of अश्रु in the sense of अर्हत that occurs outside this context.16

Why, we may ask, should अश्रु be restricted to this very narrow context—or more broadly, why should a term meaning “unattached” be used to translate अर्हत at all? At this point we may recall that we have already seen another example of a word for अर्हत that appears only in this context, viz., the transcription 阿諸呂. Like अश्रु, this term appears—again, considering only works reliably credited to Zhu Qian or his predecessors—solely as the middle number of the series of epithets तत्त्वक्ता, अर्हत, and निर्वाण.

15 Or rather, it appears twice in the work of As Xuan and Yan Potiao, but only in the ordinary sense of “unattached” and not as a translation of अर्हत (T204, 20-21, 434). The form अश्रु is not used as such in T807, but its reference there is not clear. For further discussion of this enigmatic text see below, n. 102.
16 In all cases, I am including in the discussion the slightly variant form 阿諸呂. There is no difference in the use of these two forms in the translations discussed as in their Early Medieval Chinese pronunciations, both of which are reconstituted as early by Pulleyblank (1991, p. 122).
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samyakam-buddha. Could there perhaps be something in common between these two very dissimilar terms?

Indeed this unusual transcription does provide a clue, for of the three transcriptions in the阿毘達 group, what distinguishes阿毘達 from the others is that it lacks a final consonant. This raises the possibility that a Chinese translator might have failed to recognize arka as its root form, and instead interpreted the word—shown of its final consonant by virtue of appearing as part of a compound—simply as *suka, which in turn was understood as consisting of a -"not" (translated as 無) plus *rava (translated as 輔), whatever that might mean.

But what possible understanding (or misunderstanding) of an Indic term *rava could lead to its translation as 輔 "attachment"? If we think backwards from Chinese to Prakrit, a likely candidate quickly appears, for 輔 could easily serve as a translation of *rāga, "devoid of passionate attachment." Indeed, the elimination of the so-called three poisons of which rāga is the first, was the result of many definitions of arahant.

An objection might immediately be raised, however, for the shift of medial -b (in an original Prakrit *arabha) to -g seems unexpected. Yet two pieces of evidence found in surviving Buddhist texts indicate that we should take this possibility seriously. First, in the Gandhari Dharmapada the Sanskrit word rāga is consistently written in the form rāha (see Brough 1962, p. 307 for numerous occurrences). Thus we need not necessarily postulate a shift from medial -b to a voiced medial -g, but only to an unvoiced -k (at least in certain Prakrit dialects) for this interpretation to be plausible.

But does even this less extreme sound-shift ever take place? Certainly it is not among the expected changes from Sanskrit to Prakrit, though we should bear in mind Brough's comment that kh (though not k) is sporadically used for b in the Gāndhārī documents from Nīpa, suggesting "that we have here varying notations for sounds such as [č, r, l]" (p. 93, §41).

Yet we need not look to Gāndhārī for evidence of b becoming -k (or rather, of -b being treated as -k), which is not at all the same thing. In the extensive discussion of the ten epithets in the Viṃḍhiḥmaṇge, the very first paraphrase given by Buddhaghosa in the Pāli word arahat is bhūka ("isolated, remote").9 Not constrained by the length of the initial vowel, and not hesitating to substitute medial -k for b, Buddhaghosa offers an example which is, to say the least, quite unexpected.

Buddhaghosa's discussion provides us with an important reminder as we attempt to understand how Indian Buddhists interpreted the key terms of their own tradition: Buddhist preachers and commentators were not constrained by historically accurate etymologies or linguistically permissible sound shifts. On the contrary, they clearly felt free to indulge in word-play using "spurious" etymologies and "impossible" sound-shifts—spurious and impossible, that is, according to the strict rules of historical linguistics—in order to make an exegetical or didactic point. When Buddhaghosa tells us that the Buddha is called an arahat because he is a (for removed (araha) from all defilements; (b) because he has slain (keta) the enemies (ara), i.e., the defilements; (c) because he has destroyed (keta) the spokes (ara) of the wheel of rebirth; (d) because he is

9 Viṃḍhiḥmaṇge VII, 4; cf. Nik. 119, p. 192.
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worthy (anaha) of offerings; and (e) because he is free (a) of secret (vaibhuddha) evil-doing, it is clear that he is not interested in establishing the single "correct" meaning of the word, nor is he concerned with tracking its historical etymology. On the contrary, he is interested in what the word can do, and he deliberately adds layer upon layer of interpretation, making it resonate for his audience in a multitude of ways.

It is possible, of course, that some of the exegetical interpretations preserved in Bhuddhagosa's work were originally generated in other dialects. But the fact that he felt free to use them even when writing in Pali—where some of them do not "work" as plausible pronunciations—offers important evidence for how scriptural vagueness operated in India. Already in 1936 E. H. Johnston had drawn attention to the phenomenon of word-play based on Prakrit pronunciation in a text composed in another language when he pointed out that in Abhayagiri's Sanskrit poetry there are several puns that are effective only when the text is pronounced in Prakrit.39

When an Pali term is translated into another language, of course, a decision has to be made as to which part of its semantic range will be adopted. The Tibetans, as is well known, have canonized the interpretation of arhat as "enemy-slayer" by their translation of the word as diga vamn pa,40 while Chinese renditions of the term were much more varied. An Xuan and Yan Fottiao, in opting for 益德, chose to convey the sense of arhat as "worthy one" (xiaozhao the character 他 to indicate that what he is worthy of is "externe"), while 弥勒 in as we have just seen—conveys the sense of an arhat as one who is "unattached." The transcribed forms, which avoid the issue of translation altogether, did not force translators to make a choice, and they may also have conveyed the sense that no single Chinese term could serve as an equivalent of the Indian original.41 Of all the translations discussed above, however, "only those in the true group bear no visible relationship to any Indian etymological tradition and can best be understood (as I have suggested above) not as translations, but as "cultural calques." (3) Samyakamaitbuddha

Zhi Qian is considerably more consistent in his translation of the third epithet of the Buddha, a fact that is likely due at least in part to the far more restricted contexts in which it appears. Not only is this term reserved for Buddhas alone, it almost always appears in the list of the first three epithets of the Buddha (or, of course, in the longer list of ten). Nonetheless, as we have grown to expect of him, there is still some degree of variation in Zhi Qian's rendering of this term. As before, these renditions fall into several distinct categories, and they will be discussed according to this arrangement.

39 Johnston 1936, p. xii. I am grateful to Richard Salomon for having raised this question to my attention.
40 Labeled as one of the epithets of the Buddha in the Mahayana Sutra (no. 4).
41 This was surely one of the reasons that Xuanzang 弥勒, renowned for his concern with linguistic precision, aged to return to transliteration in many cases, even in the case of such familiar terms as buddhatva, for which he offered the cumbersome 益德. 219
As we have seen, Zhi Qian far more commonly translates rather than transcribing Indian terms, and his treatment of *samyakabuddha* is no exception. Two transcriptions of the word can be found in his works, both of which are extremely rare: 三界三佛 (1T32, 15.464.17 and 16-17), while 三界三佛 (1T36, 12.296.14). The two terms in which these transcriptions appear, it should be noted, are the same two in which we found transcriptions of the word *samyakabuddha*. These transcriptions are, in sum, quite atypical of Zhi Qian’s work, and once again the only previous translator who ever transcribes the word *samyakabuddha* is Lokaksema. Thus here again we may be seeing the lingering influence, in at least a small minority of Zhi Qian’s translations, of the terminology of Lokaksema’s school.

(b) 等正覺 (平等正覺, 正覺)

In the overwhelming majority of cases Zhi Qian translates rather than transcribing *samyakabuddha*, and his most common translation by far is 等正覺, “uniform and correct awakening.” The source of this terminology is readily apparent, for the only one of Zhi Qian’s predecessors who is known to have used this term is Kang Mengziang, who employs it in both of his translations (T184 and T196). The fact that 等正覺 is also used throughout Lokaksema’s version of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-puṇḍarīkagūra* (T131)—while it never appears in any of his other works—provides further evidence that, if this translation is indeed his, it has since been substantially revised.

The translation of the component *samyak* as “equal, uniform, identical” is unexpected, for *samyak* is usually interpreted (both in traditional Indian sources and in modern reference works) as “right” or “correct.” The component *sam* (translated by Zhi Qian as 正 “right, correct”) is usually explained either as “complete” or simply as an intensifying prefix. The apparent rendition of *samyak* as “uniform” suggests a possible confusion with *sama* “same, identical,” a confusion which could easily happen in a number of Pali treatments (cf. Pali *sama* “correct” vs. Pali *sama* “same”).

Yet it seems unlikely that this was simply a mistake on Zhi Qian’s part (or on that of his predecessor, Kang Mengziang), for this alternative interpretation seems to have been known in India as well. In the *Vajracchedika*, following a discussion in which the first part of *sametaraniruyayakabuddha* is explained by a pun on its initial syllables *sama* and the similar (but not identical) word *sama* “stom, smallest bit,” the text goes on to explain the component *samyak* through a play on the word *sama* and its opposite, *nirama* “uneven; dissimilar; wrong.” Though the stanzas as we have it is in Sanskrit, where the words

42 In Lokaksema’s corpus 三界三佛 is the standard form, appearing throughout his work. 三界三佛 does not occur as such, but cf. the strange form 三界三佛, which appears three times in his T362 (12.3.168-28, cf and 11).

43 This expression is used in T6, 87, 128, 169, 328, 361, 474, and 1011, as well as in the *candidate text* T30.

44 *Samyak* is the same term used in the list of the components of the Eightfold Path to refer to “right view,” “right resolve,” etc. Cf. also the Tibetan translation (Mahayanaśāstra, no. 5), in which *samyak* is translated as yang dag po “actually, rightly” and *samadhi* as rdug pa’i “perfect, complete.”

45 See the *Vajracchedikā-śāstra* (105), §23: sama in dharmas na veda bādi vītāmān i tathāyāt samyakabuddha 32.
samyak and sama are clearly distinguished, this word-play was certainly created with a Prakrit pronunciation in mind. This example should serve as a reminder that we should not jump to the conclusion, wherever we find an unexpected Chinese translation, that the Chinese version is simply wrong. Certainly errors have occurred in Chinese translations, some of them catastrophic.49 But in other cases—as in the translation of samyak (Pkt. sanna or samsa) as "uniform"—it may well be that the Chinese translator is simply conveying an alternative Indian tradition.

In one case the expression 等正覺 has been lengthened to 平等正覺, which serves to further reinforce its meaning as "equal" or "uniform" enlightenment.50 It is used here, however, not as an epithet of the Buddha himself but to refer to the state of enlightenment (samyakamūḍhā), as is also the case with the one prior occurrence of this term in the work of Kang Mengtian.51

In another case the term has instead been abbreviated, appearing simply as 正覺 "correct awakening."52 This time the context, however, is not a list of ten (or three) epithets of the Buddha, but a reference to Buddhas in general in which the latter are contrasted with Awakāra and prajñā Buddhā. Were this a free-standing translation of samyakamūḍhā—this is, if this were a term generated directly as a translation of that expression—we would have here a case in which Zhi Qian could be seen as drawing directly on the work of An Shigao, for whom this is the standard rendition of the term.53 The passage in which this abbreviated form occurs, however, is in verse, and the shortening of the term to only two characters appears to be due to metrical constraints. Thus this abbreviated form should probably be viewed not as a distinctive translation term in itself, but as a secondary derivative of the longer term 等正覺 which occurs elsewhere as a translation of samyakamūḍhā in the same stanza.

(c) 正真覚

An alternative translation used by Zhi Qian—and one that conforms more closely to our expectations—is 正真覚, "correct and perfect awakening." Yet it is considerably less common in Zhi Qian's work than the preceding one, appearing in only two of his texts (T176 and T52).54

It is a simple matter to locate precedents in Han-period texts for Zhi Qian's

49 Among the most disastrous mistranslations found in Zhi Qian's work are 不正之 "not establishing the district" for the bodhisatta's name, Anabodhisattva "not putting down the burden," 不勤之 "Heaven of joy without arrogance" for Nimajjana "Delight in Magical Creations," and 誠情 "truthful translation" for bhavakṣaya "strength of the heart." On similarly catastrophic mistakes in the translations of Dharmakūta see Bouchar 1998, especially pp. 476-485, and Kamoshita 1992, passim.

50 See T225, 8.490a23. 見以彼證所陀羅尼，作稱正覺道平等正覺

51 T196, 4.148c29.

52 See T361, 12.286c18-19. 挑 choisir le 第/第四/去/第二/第二/第二

53 The term appears three times in T52 (1.84b14, 15 and 19) and once in T65 (15.178b13), always in lists of epithets of the Buddha.

54 T76 (1.88b17 [followed by the additional character 郵] and 88a2-3), T532 (14.81b13-14 and 26-27). The expression is also abbreviated as 正覺 in T76 (88z12) note, however, that this is the same line in which 見真 has apparently been emended to 見真.
terminology, for 正真義 is used as a translation of samyuktaṃkhaṇḍhādha by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao as well as by Kang Mengzhang. Thus once again we are not seeing terminological innovation by Zhi Qian, but his appropriation of an existing term.

(d) 正真義最正義

The fourth and final rendition of samyuktaṃkhaṇḍhādha that appears in Zhi Qian's work is cumbersome at best, but we might translate it provisionally as "[one who has experienced] the highest correct awakening [to the correct and true Way]." This is barely a literal rendition of samyuktaṃkhaṇḍhādha, but we break it down into its individual components we can see that this long term consists of 正義 (used by several early translators for samyuktaṃkhaṇḍhādha) and 最正義 (presumably originally derived from abhiśekhaṃkhaṇḍhādha) 11. In some cases Zhi Qian and others use this six-character term to translate samyuktaṃkhaṇḍhādha (sometimes preceded by 當前事, for anantara). In others, however, it is clear—because the term occurs in a list of other Buddha-epithets—that it is intended to stand for samyuktaṃkhaṇḍhādha instead.

To describe this usage as rare would be an understatement, for in the entire Taishō canon there are only thirty instances in which the expression 正真義最正義 is used to refer to the Buddha (as opposed to referring to samyuktaṃkhaṇḍhādha in the abstract). Of these, twelve are found in Zhi Qian's Da minga jing 大明相經 (T225, excluding the revised first chapter where this expression does not occur); fifteen are in the Lusida jing 六度相經 (T152) of his near-contemporary, Kang Senghui, and one of the remaining three occurs in a "candidate text" (T307). The only other text in which this usage appears is TI45, an archaic translation of an account of parinirvāna of the Buddha's mother which has been attributed (certainly incorrectly) to Huījuan 慧遠. (The occurrence of the term in this sense in the Shi jishu 禪史論 (T2040) and the Xu gong zhengfu 佛骨信函 (T7960), compiled by Sengou 僧果 and Daoxuan 道宣 is almost surely a mistake, merely reflect the fact that they are citing the text contained in TI45.) The concentration of this usage in this small group of texts strongly suggests that the two whose status is

11 See T132 (12.17b-18) and T196 (6.159c), respectively. Note that the term is quite rare in these translations as well. It appears six times, however, in lists of Buddha-epithets in Kang Senghui's T152 (2.208c, 296.2, 15a17-18, 37v1, 42c10 and 45a14).

12 The term is used frequently by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao (T322), copiously by Lokakṣema but in his revised works only (T133 and 418), and it occurs four times in the works of Kang Mengzhang (T184 and 196). In almost every case the term is preceded by 當前事, with the entire term serving as a translation of anantara/samyuktaṃkhaṇḍhādha.

13 In some cases Zhi Qian notes 正真義 alone to refer to Buddhas in contrast to abhisaman pratyekabuddhas (T225, 4.182c25 and 48a4f). It is possible, however, that even here what is being referred to is not these persons in individuals but their various awakenings states. Elsewhere when Zhi Qian notes 當前事 alone it is almost always preceded by 當前事 (cf. the previous note).

14 See 14.77b1f.

15 TI45 is attributed to Huījuan, while another translation of the same sūtra (T144) is assigned to Bu Fon Bu (ex. 末佛). TI45 shares a significant amount of archaic and non-standard vocabulary, however, with a non-Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāna-sūtra attributed to Bu Fon (T5). If the latter attribution is correct, it seems likely that the attributions of T144 and 145 have been inadvertently switched and that TI45 is really by Bu Fon.
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uncertain—T145 and T507—may also have been produced in the same environment as T229 and T152, that is, in the southern Wu kingdom in the early to mid-third century CE.

Be that as it may, it is probably significant that this is the only one of Zhi Qian's renditions of sanyakamabhūta—indeed, the only one of any of the epithets less discussed thus far—for which no clear Han-period precedent can be identified. The first part of this expression, 正真𝑝𝑎𝑟𝑎, appears in "in Xuan and Yan Fotsao's T322, but only in the sense of sanyakamabhūta; the latter part, 正覺, does not occur. In one of Kang Mengzai's translations there is a single occurrence of 正真正覺 in reference to the enlightenment experience (sanyakamabhūta), but he does not use the same term as an epithet of the Buddha. A far greater number of occurrences (forty-six in all) can be found in Lokakṣema's Aṣṭa-khṛṣṭyapāṇih (T313), again in the sense of sanyakamabhūta, diverging once again from Lokakṣema's standard usage and providing further evidence that the text has been revised.

In Zhi Qian's own work the use of 正真正覺 in the sense of sanyakamabhūta is slightly more common than its use as an epithet of the Buddha, occurring a dozen times in the unrevised portion of T225 and once each in the 161, 474 and 1011. In light of this usage, it seems reasonable to conclude that the use of this term as a translation of sanyakamabhūta is a secondary derivative of its primary use as a rendition of sanyakamabhūta, a usage—though not a terra—which may have been coined by Zhi Qian himself.

Epithets (4) through (9): A Preliminary Note

While the first three epithets in the list of ten (or rather eleven in the Chinese versions of Zhi Qian and others) occur quite frequently, and the last two (budāka and bhagavat) are even more widely employed, epithets (4) through (9) are far less common. Most of them seem to occur, in fact, almost exclusively within this list.

The list itself, however, is far from symmetrically distributed throughout the canon. To take only the dharma collections as an example, the list of ten epithets occurs 83 times in the Chinese Madhyamakāgama (T26), but only twice in the Dharmagupta (T3), while in the Sāṃyāsika and Ekottara collections (T99 and T125) it appears 15 and 18 times, respectively. This raises the interesting possibility that this list may have emerged among a specific group of sāṅgha—e.g., those who memorized and transmitted the Madhyamakāgama—and thus might occur with particular frequency in texts stemming from this group. Or again, it may be that this pattern points instead to the different

---

1. "Xuan and Yan Fotsao are careful to distinguish between sanyakamabhūta (which they translate as 正真正覺) and sanyakamabhūta, in which they reserve the epithet 正真正覺 discussed previously.

2. T18, 1572a1. The expression does not occur in T99.

3. This statement should be considered approximate, since it is always possible that a variant of the list formulated by the standard tradition has been overlooked. These figures are the result of a search for the term 正真正覺 (also because it is used in the list of ten by almost all translators and because it has only a minimal number of occurrences outside this list), followed by the elimination of any occurrences of this expression that are not part of a list of ten epithets.
degrees of popularity of this list in the various ordination lineages (nibbana) represented by these four Chinese collections. Be this as it may, there are some noticeable presences and absences of the list elsewhere in the canon as well. To cite one of the most glaring examples, the list is distinctly underrepresented in the prajaparipada section (vol. 5-8) of the Taisho canon, where it appears with only about one fourth of the frequency that we see elsewhere in other extant collections.64 Like the Dhirayana, in other words, the Prajaparipada section shows a marked dissimilarity for the use of this list.

Whatever these patterns may tell us about the history of the list of ten epiphanies in India (a topic which lies well beyond the scope of the present paper), they do urge us to be cautious in evaluating the meaning of the presence and absence of the list in the work of early Chinese translators. While the first three epiphanies appear in the work of all of the translators referred to above, the list of ten (or eleven) is almost entirely absent from the body of Chinese translation produced in the second century CE. Thus far, at any rate, I have been able to identify only one occurrence in a translation by An Shigao (T1603) and another in a (revised) translation by Lokaksema (T313).65 Three other lists of Buddha-epiphanies identified by Paul Harrison are intriguing, but it is not clear to me that they were based on anything resembling the standard list of ten.66 In the early third century, however, the full list of ten appears again in the works of the last of the Han-period translators, Kang Mingsiang, where it occurs once in each of his two translations (T134 and 196).

Accordingly, at the present state of our knowledge antecedents for Zhi Qian’s translations of the following terms can be sought only in a limited number of previous translations. As we shall see, virtually all of his translation terms agree with those of Kang Mingsiang, while they often diverge significantly from those of An Shigao and the (presumably revived) text of Lokaksema.

(4) Vidyacarattaranatvam (a) 明行成 (fei - zur)

64 A search for the term 天人因—a rendition, as indicated in the previous note, because it is used in the list of ten by almost all translators, including Kumārajīva and Xuanzang, and because it occurs almost exclusively within this list—yielded 85 occurrences in the four prajaparipada volumes (1-8), while the "miscellaneous, steers" section (vol. 14-17) contained 340. The agama and Buddha-biography sections (vol. 14-15) offered 294 occurrences, while (to take another set of four for the sake of symmetry) vol. 9-12, including the Lata, Avasatpara and Rasabuddha sections, yielded 302.

65 For An Shigao’s list (found at 15.17861-1-15) see Appendix 2. Lokaksema’s list (or more likely, a revision by another hand of whatever may have been found in his original work) reads as follows (with the individual epiphanies separated for convenience): 如来、明星、女右近、善臂之行、行至四分 安世高 无上天人、行至之显、天无上天行、善央晃 (11.15361-14). The first three terms in this list are quite attested of Lokaksema’s rendition of this cluster of epiphanies, and their presence thus suggests (in addition to a great deal of other terminological evidence) that the text has been subject to revision.

66 See Harrison 1990, p. 243. The three lists are as follows (again I have separated the individual epiphanies for convenience): 1/2/2, 天人无上天无上天行 安世高 (4.841x10-11) in T410, 无上天人 地藏行、善央晃、善央晃、善央晃 (9.171x10-12) in T418, 无上天人 天行、善央晃、善央晃 (10.395x10-13) in T418, 天人无上天无上天行 安世高 (13.915x1-17) and 安世高 11.91.2-24)
The fourth epithet of the Buddha, *vidyākarṣāntānaṃpanna*, accomplished in knowledge and conduct, 1 is translated by Zhi Qian with almost total consistency as 明行成 (his wisdom and conduct accomplished) (so in 16, 128, 324, 474 and 1011), as well as in "candidate text" T30. The term is never transcribed, and in only one case (discussed under [b] below) do we find a significantly different rendition. In one text (T37) this epithet appears as 明行成, but it seems likely that, rather than being a genuinely different translation, this is the result of a copyist's alteration, given the widespread use of the latter form in several of Kumārajīva's translations. 16

Assurance for this rendition is not difficult to locate, for it is used by Kang Mengiang both times that the list of ten epithets appears in his work. 17 An Shigao's translation (明行已足), while virtually identical in meaning, is too different in wording to have served as its source. 18

(b)神通以足

It just one text—and one that has already diverged, in several respects, from the rest of its translations—Zhi Qian adopts a different equivalent for this term. In his version of the *Buddhamūsanta* (梵摩須達, T76) he offers the unexpected equivalent 神通 以足 (*this paranormal powers were complete*). 19 It is difficult to explain this choice, and in fact at this point in the list the correlation between the terms found in T76 and the standard list of ten epithets begins to break down. 20 If this is indeed intended as a translation of *vidyākarṣāntānaṃpanna*, however, the fact that 神通 is used elsewhere in Zhu Qian's corpus (and indeed, in much of subsequent Chinese Buddhist literature) as a translation of abhīvakā "paranormal powers" suggests a possible confusion between vidyā and abhīvakā. 21

Be that as it may, this form is far from a standard translation of this epithet, for it does not occur in this sense anywhere else in the canon.

(5) Sugata 善逝

With the epithet sugata "well gone" we find complete consistency in Zhi Qian's work, for he uniformly translates this term as 善逝 "well departed." The sole occurrence of what appears to be a variant reading is in a "candidate text" (T20) which has 善逝 as

16 T184, 3.472b17; T196, 4.147b11.
17 The form 成善之行 found in Lokakṣema's (revised) T31 points to the possibility of an alternative interpretation of *vidyākarṣāntānaṃ* as "the practice of knowledge" rather than "knowledge and conduct." In light of this rendition we can see, in retrospect, that there is no way to determine which of these was meant by Zhi Qian, for his translation (like that of An Shigao) could be read either way.
18 1.881b17. Perhaps we should amend this rendition to read 明行已足.
19 The list of epithets in T76, in full, reads as follows: 00 善逝 1.880a16-19.
20 In this connection it is interesting to note that one of the anomalous lists of epithets in Lokakṣema's T418 has as its fourth element the phrase 其威神勢有我勢 (1.917c23). If this is indeed an attempt to translate *vidyākarṣāntānaṃ*—which is very far from certain—it might serve as another example of the interpretation of *vidyā as "paranormal powers." I am grateful to Paul Harrison for calling this passage, and this possible interpretation, to my attention.

21
this point in its list. But if we consult note 10 to the Taishō edition—which gives 諒 as a variant, while the main text reads 習—we can see immediately that the word 諒 is the result of a copyist's error.69 Once again, Kang Mengxiang appears to be responsible for this widely adopted usage, for he is the sole translator to use it during the Han period.69 It should be noted, incidentally, that in several cases (both in the work of Zhi Qian and in that of others) this epithet is preceded by the extra character 父 "father, function as." Given that the other epithets preceding and following this one all consist of three characters, it seems likely that this was simply added as a prosodic filler.

(4) Lokavid

(a) 世間解

Zhi Qian's translation of lokavid "knower of the world" as 世間解 "one who understands the world" is almost entirely consistent and is quite unproblematic. This expression appears in the majority of texts by Zhi Qian that contain full lists of the ten epithets (T6, 128, 328, 474, and 1011) as well as in one "candidate text" (T20).

Among possible sources from which Zhi Qian could have obtained this rendition, once again we come directly to Kang Mengxiang, who is the only Han-period translator in whose work this expression appears.70 An Shigao's translation (為世間解) includes the same characters, but in a less concise fashion, and is unlikely to have served as Zhi Qian's source.71

(b) 世間父

Though 世間解 is used by Zhi Qian for lokavid in almost all cases, his work contains one unexpected variant. In his version of the Viśeṣādīkā-nāma (T187, 聖經), at this point in the list of epithets we find the expression 世間父 "father of the world" instead. While this is quite impossible as a translation of an original lokavid, it is easy to see what has happened here: there has been a confusion between -vid (presumably in a Pāli form gāda) "knower" and -pita (Pkt. pitā) "father." In this case alone, Zhi Qian has opted for the latter reading.

While this rendition is unattested elsewhere in Zhi Qian's corpus and is not found in the work of any translator before his time, there are two other scriptures in the Taishō canon which contain this translation, both of them the work of Dharmarāka.72 In one additional (and quite telling) instance Dharmarāka's version of the Lataśāsana

69 The character 諒; both here and in other contexts, seems to have been subjected to copyist's emendations with particular frequency. Especially numerous are "corrections" of the term to the homophones 諒 "row.
69 T184, 3.477b17; T196, 4.347c11. For a discussion of An Shigao's quite unexpected rendition of the term as 父 "father" see Appendix 2.
70 T184, 3.477b18; T196, 4.347c12.
71 Several epithets including the characters 世間 appear in Lokavijñāna's lists, etc. 安世高 in T224 (8.111c10-11) and T313 (11.759b13), the virtually identical 安世於梵 in T413 (both at 15.91c2, respectively), and 安世於梵 in T648 (15.91c23-24). It is not clear to me, however, what connection (if any) these expressions might have with the term lokavid.
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contains a double translation of this epithet as "father" (父) and once again as "wise" (明)."} 

(7) Anuttarapuruṣa [無上士] 

Zhi Qian's use of the expression [無上士] "supreme man" is not surprising, for this has been the standard Chinese rendition of the seventh of the Buddha's epithets for many centuries. In Zhi Qian's work, in fact, the translation of anuttarapurusa as [無上士] is so consistent that it is not a single alternative version to consider in this section. But although the term appears quite normal when viewed as Buddhist Chinese, from the Indian side it seems peculiar, for it is not clear that in India the list of epithets was ever divided in this way. That is, anuttarapurusa was treated as part of the much longer compound anuttarapurusa-damayantirsi "supreme (anuttara) charioteer (damayanta) of men (purusa) who are to be tamed (damya)." Alternatively, this long epithet was divided into anuttara "supreme one" and damayanta-damayantirsi "charioteer of men to be tamed." Whether or not there was an Indian precedent for Zhi Qian's Chinese translation, the decision to divide this epithet between purusa and damya would have important consequences, as we shall see, for the understanding of the following term.

As to Chinese precedents, on the other hand, once again Zhi Qian appears to have followed the lead of Kang Mengxiang, the only Han-period translator in whose work this term appears.

(8) Damayantirsi 

The eighth epithet of the Buddha, according to Zhi Qian's list, is the direct result of the word-division discussed in the previous entry. Having taken anuttarapurusa as a separate title, Zhi Qian and other translators were left to explain the epithet damayantirsi on its own. In India the word damya was regularly understood, together with purusa as "men who are to be tamed." But since the word purusa had been assigned to a separate epithet this interpretation became less compelling. Indeed, in the many Prakrit languages in which damya would have been written damma (including even the Pali form), another possibility quickly emerged. Ignoring the unsalted character of the initial d, this word was apparently read as dhama, and the resulting dharmasri translated as

72 For this term in Dharmanatha's work see T347 (1.78a18 and 188) and T349 (1.187c28). One additional example occurs in a text attributed to Kumara (T337, 1.808a29), but this is actually nothing more than a slightly amended copy of T349, and there is no reason to count it as a separate work (much less to attribute it to Kumara). 

73 See the discussion of this and other "double translations" in the work of Dharmanatha in Boucher 1998, pp. 489-492. 

74 Both the Vinadharmagga (207-208) and the Do chen tan kyi bsum (T1099, 25.72b) offer interpretations of this epithet in the which it is separated into these two parts. Both works also discuss the possible interpretation of anuttarapurusa-damayantirsi (Pali anuttaraprposadamaaryanta) as a single unit (208). It is worth noting that even in the Mahavyutpata, which has served as the standard handbook of Sanskrit-to-Tibetan translation since the early ninth century CE, the term is divided into anuttara (no. 9) and damayantirsi (no. 10). 

75 See T104 (1.47a14) and T106 (4.147.12). Cf. also the form found in Lokaksha's (revised) T311, 無上大士 (1.755.14).
"charityee of the Dharma." 6 This was not simply an isolated mistake; on the contrary, in all of the translations that can be reliably dated to Zhi Qian's time or before there is not a single instance in which damma (or Pkt. 'damma') is translated in this context as "to be named." Instead there appears to have been universal agreement that this term (in whatever Prakrit language or languages it was conveyed) should be understood as "Dharma."

(a) "(vart. - 善)法御"

Despite the pervasive agreement among early Chinese translators on the meaning of damyastra, Zhi Qian translates it, quite characteristically, in two different ways. By far the more common of the two is 禪法師, "Dharma charioteer," which appears in five of Zhi Qian's authentic translations as well as in two "candidate tests." 77 While a native speaker of Chinese might well read the characters "法師" as "method of the Way," the use of this expression as a two-character translation of dharma is known already from the time of An Shigao. 78 This equivalence appears also in several of Lokaksema's texts and in Kang Mengxiang's work, 79 as well as in nine authentic Zhi Qian translations and one "candidate text." 80

As to the epithet itself, the only previous translator to use 禪法師 as a translation of damyastra is Kang Mengxiang, who uses this rendition in both of his lists of the epithets of the Buddha. 81 A similar rendition occurs, however, in Lokaksema's (revised) T313, which contains the epithet 禪法師 as well. 82

(b) "(vart. - 別)佛御"

Far more common than 禪法師 as a translation of dharma in early Chinese scriptures is 佛御, an expression which might be interpreted literally as "method of the classics" but was widely used as a translation of the word dharma alone. Though it does not seem to have been used by An Shigao except in reference to the thirty-seven buddha-sūtras-dharma, 83 it appears ten times in the work of An Xuan and Yan Futiao as well as once in a preface

77 Interestingly, the term appears, within this opinion, as damma rather than dama in at least one place even in the Pali Text Society's edition of the canon (see PTSD 3145, v. 'dama').
78 T6, 128, 328, 474 and 1011; the two "candidate tests" are T20 and 507.
79 So used in his T143, 32, 150 and 620.
80 The term occurs in this sense—though not with great frequency, appearing between one and three times in each text—in Lokaksema's T229, 313, 362, 418, 498, 624, and 626. In Kang Mengxiang's work the term occurs four times in T196, but nowhere in T184.
81 The authentic texts are T6, 196, 210, 225, 281, 361, 474, 532 and 790; the "candidate test" is T20.
82 T184 (3.472b14) and T196 (3.475c12).
83 See 11.37b14. In light of this rendition we might consider the epithet 禪法師 found in T418 (13.97c24) as a possible translation of damyastra as well, particularly if we extend the character to 聲. Once again I would like to thank Paul Harrison for calling the passage to my attention.
84 An Shigao uses the expression 十二法御 to translate in T602 (15.16b25) and T603 (15.17c24 and 26). There is one doubtful occurrence of 聲御 alone in the general sense of "Dharma" in T150M (2.877b22-23, 25, and/or 聲御)
ascribed to the latter" and nearly 250 times in the translations of Lokakṣema. The term also appears widely in Zhi Qian's work, appearing in fourteen of his authentic translations as well as in one "candidate text." In the context of the epitaphs of the Buddha, however, there is only one text in which Zhi Qian translates the word damya (understood as "dhamma") using this expression, viz., the Viśukha-nāma (T38, 領阿那), where the epithet damyasūrabhi is translated as "經法師." This rendition has no precedent in the work of earlier translators, and in fact it does not occur anywhere else in the T'ang-lo canon.

(c) 法師 (7)

As noted above, T76 has become quite divergent at this point, and it is difficult to tell which of its terms are intended to correspond (if indeed they are) with the remaining items among the ten epitaphs. For the expression damyasūrabhi, however, there does seem to be an equivalent in 法師 here. Whether it is meant to be read together with any or all of the preceding characters (丈夫修論) or perhaps with the two that follow (見聖), is difficult to determine. Whether it is indeed intended here as a complete translation of damyasūrabhi, it appears to have a precedent in Lokakṣema's work, but once again this is in a text which has been subsequently revised. The sole occurrence of this expression in Lokakṣema's corpus is in his Akṣobhyabodhi (T313), where it occurs in a non-standard list of four Buddha-epitaphs.

(9) Sātā devamānsusyaṃti 天人師

With the epithet sātā devamānsusyaṃti "teacher of gods and humans" we return to a case of great consistency, for there is no variation at all in the translation of the term by Zhi Qian (or for that matter in any candidate text). The only minor difference is the insertion of the possessive particle -'i in T76, which has 天人之師 as the final epithet in its list. In all other cases—perhaps following the established three-character rhythm of the preceding epitaphs—the term 天人師 is consistently used.

Once again, the only clear precedent for this expression in Han-period translations is found in the work of Kang Mengguan, who uses it in both of his lists of epitaphs. An 欽敘's considerably longer rendition of this term cannot have served as its prototype, and there are no occurrences of this or any other translation of sātā devamānsusyaṃti in the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotao. Although Lokakṣema's translations contain

86 See T322, Tan Fotia's preface (to *xue which has not survived is preserved in the Chu xunang jiu (see T2145, 5560b12). 87 The suit exceptions are T380, T418 and the exceedingly divergent T731.
88 The term is used in T6, 87, 149, 185, 198, 22, 281, 361, 474, 493, 552, 632, 735 and 790, the "candidate text" is T72.
89 See T76, 1.488b17.
90 Cf. the somewhat similar language in Kang Seung-hui's T132 (3.41b6, 與佛所言語會之為天人師).
91 See 11.756a45 (荀家盛八部天龍天人之師).
92 T434 (4.47b18) and T396 (4.147c12).
93 T663 (5.17b15, 與佛所言語會之為天人師).
several expressions that include the characters 天下天下 (which can serve as a translation of drönam gnyanam, i.e., of "gods and humans"), it is not at all clear that any of them should be considered to be a translation of this Indic term.\(^{35}\)

(10) Buddha #

It might seem that there is nothing at all to say about this very familiar term, for it has been standard in Buddhist translations since the dawn of Chinese Buddhist history. Used already in the works of An Shigao, the transcription of बुद्धा as 菩 (Early Middle Chinese 菩) does not even register as an issue for most specialists in Buddhism. Accordingly, it is hardly surprising that this is the only term for बुद्धा found in the list of ten epithets during this early period, whether in Zhi Qian's version or any other.\(^{37}\)

Yet this was not the only transcription of the word बुद्धा known in Han-period China. As Edwin Pelleyblank has pointed out, secular sources use other spellings, such as 菩薩 (Pali: bo 陀) and 菩達 (達).\(^{38}\) Thus it does not go without saying that the character 菩, which records only the first syllable of the word, should have been chosen as the standard rendition of this term.

Given that An Shigao seems to have introduced this expression—or at least, that his translations are the earliest texts in which it is recorded in written form—it is worth noting that his native language was Prakrit. And what little evidence we have for Parthian Buddhist vocabulary suggests that the Parthian language, too, did not record the final syllable of this word.\(^{39}\) Indeed, among all the Central Asian languages that would have been spoken by the earliest Buddhist missionaries to China—for virtually all of these men were from western Central Asia, and not from the Indian subcontinent itself—there is not a single one in which the word बुद्धा consists of more than this initial syllable, with the sole exception of Bactrian, where it is written (in Greek script) as ΒΟΔ ΔΩ.\(^{40}\) In light of the fact that the Han emperors were so intent on active diplomatic relations with the Kushans, who used Bactrian as one of their official tongues, it seems quite possible that the two-syllable forms of the word बुद्धा recorded in secular histories were based on Bactrian originals. The one-syllable form 菩, by contrast, might well have been based on the Parthian pronunciation of An Shigao.

These suggestions are of course merely speculatively, but they serve as a reminder that when considering the transmission of Buddhist vocabulary from India to China we are not dealing merely with Prakrit pronunciation, but also with the native languages (often, in this early period, not Indian but Central Asian) of the early translators themselves.\(^{36}\)

(11) Bhagavat

\(^{35}\) See for example 天下天下 (T313, 11.753a14), 天下天下於乎iaz 黃 (7224, 8.43a1b), 天下天下

\(^{37}\) A few two-syllable forms do occur in other contexts (e.g., in the transcriptions of sānghakumāra discussed above), but only the one-character term 菩 was ever in general use in Buddhist texts.

\(^{38}\) Pelleyblank 1983, p. 78.

\(^{39}\) See for example Sino-Williams 1993, p. 133.

\(^{40}\) See de Jong 1968.

\(^{41}\) See Dwyer 1982, p. 178.
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The Sanskrit term bhagavan "blessed one" is one of the most frequent appellations of the Buddha, appearing both in the list of ten (or eleven) epithets and for more commonly outside that context. Indeed, virtually every Buddhist sūtra opens with this term, for it is routinely used to refer to the Buddha when specifying where, and to whom, the scripture in question was preached.

Perhaps the very frequency of use of this term, and the multiplicity of contexts in which we find it, contributed to the variety of ways in which it has been translated (see just by Zhā Qian but by others). Even the list of ten epithets Zhā Qian translates the term in two different ways, and in other contexts he employs several other renderings as well.

(a) 居士

The most common translation of bhagavan as one of the ten epithets of the Buddha in Zhā Qian’s work is 居士, “mass of blessings,” a rendition which conveys quite well the etymology of the term, which consists of bhaga “blessing, good fortune” plus the suffix -ari “possessing.” The term occurs in this list in three of Zhā Qian’s translations (twice in T16, once each in T124 and T1011) as well as in one “candidate text” (T20). Other translations use the alternative rendition 耆郝 (discussed immediately below), but we should note that two of Zhā Qian’s texts (T76 and 87) as well as one “candidate text” (T107) end their lists before this point, and thus contain no equivalent of bhagavan at all. Indeed, there seems to have been some variation in this respect, with some scriptures including the full list of eleven epithets, while others end with buddha, or even before.

Precedents for this translation are not difficult to find, for An Xian and Yan Fotiao use it throughout their sole translation (T322), while Kang Mengxiong uses it in one of his two lists of the ten epithets (T196) as well as in numerous other places in the same text. It also occurs twice—though not in a list of ten epithets—in an early translation attributed (though certainly wrongly) to An Shigao (T109). The term is never used, by contrast, in the works of Lokakṣema, where it does not appear even in the revised

88 It must be emphasized that this statement applies only to individual words that would have been transmitted orally (what I have referred to elsewhere as “soundplace vocabulary”) and not to the existence of entire scriptural texts, whether written or oral, in Central Asian languages. The translation of Buddhist scriptures into Central Asian vernaculars appears to have begun quite late—an earlier than the 6th century CE—and the practice seems never to have spread to western Central Asia. Even the recent discovery of two fragmentary texts in the Bactrian language with Buddhist content (Grieve-Williams 1997 and 2000) does not, in my view, validate the general rule that no Buddhist scriptures in a Central Asian language has been ever been found west of Kahger (see Nettles 1990, p. 205). Rather than being translations of Indian Buddhist writings into Bactrian, for these fragments appear to be the product of literal copying of formulas of homage (together with references to where the devotee wishes to die in the resulting merit).

To put in another way, no Buddhist text in Bactrian that consists of anything other than such formulas of homage has yet been identified.

89 T196, 4.147c12 and passim. The term 居士 is not used, however, in T186.

90 Zürcher rejects this attribution (1991, p. 300), though he does consider the work to be an authentic Late-period text. Sengassy (drawing on Dąbrowski’s earlier conjectures) does in fact attribute a translation by this name to An Shigao (T1245, 15.6a19), but according to Zürcher the text contains stylistic features that do not normally appear in An Shigao’s work (Zürcher 1991, p. 300).
version of his Akṣobhyaśāntaka (T313).  

(b) 世尊

An alternative translation of bhagavat which is also frequently employed by Zhi Qian is 世尊 “world-honored one,” a rendition that has become quite well known through its subsequent use by Kumārajīva and others. Though 世尊 appears in the list of ten epithets in only two of Zhi Qian’s translations (T328 and 474), it is used widely elsewhere in his work in other contexts, occurring in no fewer than twelve of his translations as well as in one “candidate text.”

An etymological connection between this term and its Indic antecedent is not immediately evident; it is tempting, but probably far too speculative, to ask whether the second character might have resulted from a play on the suffix -aḥ/i “possessing” interpreted as a form of the verbal root heart “praise, exalt.” As we have seen in the discussion above concerning Buddhaghosa’s variety of interpretations of the word anātha, the fact that a given etymological interpretation is widely improbable (even impossible) in terms of the rules of linguistics did not prevent Indian exegetes from invoking resonances of meaning that they, and their intended audiences, might perceive in the sounds of a given word.

I have not been able to locate any discussion, however—whether in an Indic language or in Chinese—in which bhagavat is explicitly interpreted in this sense. Thus at the present stage of our knowledge it seems prudent simply to assume that 詩尊 was coined as an interpretive rather than an etymological translation—in other words, that we have here another example of what I have referred to above as a “cultural calque.” Indeed, as pointed out by Paul Harrison (personal communication, 2003), the word “Lord”—widely used as an English rendering of bhagavat—is also a “loose cultural translation” rather than an etymological explanation of the word.

Whatever its ultimate source, precedents for Zhi Qian’s usage were easily available, for the expression occurs widely in both of Kang Mengxiang’s translations (T184 and 190). It is not used, however, by An Shigao or by the team of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, and in Lokakṣema’s corpus it occurs only in two texts that are known to have been revised (T313 and the verse sections of T418).

(c) 天尊

Considerably less frequent in Zhi Qian’s translation corpus is the epithet tiṃśaṃ 天尊 “honored [by] heaven.” This expression never occurs in the list of ten titles of the Buddha, but it occasionally appears in other contexts in which it is clear that the underlying term would have been bhagavat. Such is the case in two of Zhi Qian’s translations (T76 and T381, of which the latter is the sole text in Zhi Qian’s corpus to use 天尊 alone without the term 世尊 appearing as well). There are also a handful of occurrences in T225, but the fact that they are clustered together in one relatively short section of this very long text (8.490b-492a) suggests that this passage has been subject to revision.

Once again the only solid precedent for Zhi Qian’s usage of this term is in Kang Mengxiang’s T196, though the fact that this expression occurs only once (4.149v23) in the rather lengthy text, and never occurs at all in Kang Mengxiang’s other work (T184), makes this a rather tenacious foundation. If the sole occurrence is not original to Kang Mengxiang, but is rather a late intrusion introduced in the course of transmission of his text, then the sole remaining possibility for the appearance of this term in a text prior to Zhi Qian’s time would be in the 成就光明意密之蕴 (T630), a work which is attributed to the Han-period translatoor Zhi Yao 支謙 but which is, in my view, of doubtful authenticity. 149

It is difficult to find an etymological connection between the word 上供 and the Chinese term "world-honored one" (世尊), matters we all the more acute with this expression. The time and place of its introduction are matters of dispute, 150 though there seems to be a general agreement that the term is a Chinese coinage not intended to serve as a literal translation of any Indic term. Indeed it seems likely that 世尊 is a derivative secondary of an earlier 世敬, inspired perhaps (as suggested in Bokenkamp 1997, p. 375) by the famous assertion of the newborn Buddha that "in heaven above and here below, I alone am respectworthy" (天上天下唯我独尊) found in two early Chinese versions of his biography. 151

Be that as it may, while 世尊 was to become a standard translation of भगवान in coming centuries, 世敬 remained what might best be described as a persistent but peripheral translation. 152

149 T630 is included by Zicher in his list of authentic Han-period translations (1991, pp. 290 and 299), though Zicher’s reference to the text as "attributed to" rather than "translated by" Zhi Yao suggests that he was less than certain about the attribution. I have my doubts about its authenticity (indeed, about whether it is a translation of an Indic text at all). To cite only a single example, the text’s attribution of the composition of the fifth manuscript (dhyanas, here given as =-) to the basis of the Chinese characters above: 佉闍羅 = [xhade] + 聲 = [s] + 世 = [s] + 尊 = [s] + 異 = [s] + 心 = [s]. Like (xhade) ROOT. It is difficult to imagine this sort of categories of the word dhyanas—focusing on meditative practices but to worldly social relations—could have been coined by an Indian author. Whatever its origins may have been, it is clear that this site represents a terminological "dead end" in Buddhist translation history, for its very distinctive vocabulary—e.g., 異界 for "outside" (xhade) —and (apparently for "buddhās"") 聲並 was already in use in Dafo circles prior to the beginning of Buddhist translation activity in China, and that the Buddha’s usage is therefore a borrowing of the Dafo term (1981, p. 39) and perhaps. By this logic the term 世敬 would have been created as a secondary derivative of 世尊 (or, at the very least, in an environment in which the latter expression was already known). Suelzo, on the other hand, argues the reverse—that the term 世尊 was a Buddhist coinage, which was etymologically dropped by Buddhist translators as it became increasingly popular in Dafo circles (Suelzo 1994, p. 332, and 1988-1990, p. 280). Both of these theories are based on the assumption that 世敬 enjoyed early popularity among Buddhists but was subsequently abandoned; this does not, however, seem to be the case. 世敬 seems always to have been a peripheral term in Buddhist translations, appearing in early works only in three translations by Zhi Qian (T76, 225, and 581) and one by Kang Senghuo (T152), in addition to one stray occurrence in the work of Kang Mengxiang (T196), the term continues to occur occasionally in the work of other translators thereafter. Of the supposedly Han-period translations only T330 uses this term with any frequency. As mentioned in the previous note, however, the status of this text as a genuine Han-period translation deserves re-examination; the earliest solid evidence for its existence, in fact, seems to date from the late 4th century CE, when it is cited in the Jingjiao 菊桃. 151

152 So, in Kang Mengxiang’s T184 (3.46x13) as well as in Zhi Qian’s revised version of the same (T185, 3.47x3c).
alternative, appearing only 152 times in the first seventeen volumes of the Taishō canon, while 世尊 appears more than ten thousand times in the first two volumes alone.

(d) 天中天

Like the expressions 世尊 and 天尊, the epithet 天中之天 has no visible etymological connection with the word bhagavat. Its similarity to the Sanskrit term devatānām “god above gods,” by contrast, is evident, and this has led some scholars to conclude that wherever the term 天中天 appears in a Chinese translation the underlying Indian text must have read devatānām.188 It is far more likely, however, that this Chinese usage is the reflection of a location widespread in Iranian languages which is reflected in Chinese as 天中天 and in Indic texts as devatānām.189 In Zhi Qian’s corpus this expression occurs in T76, 225, 361, 557, and 632, with precedents in the work of Lokakṣema (who appears to have been the first Chinese translator to use the term) and Kang Mengxiang. As Boucher has documented for the works of Dharmarāja, where Indic-language texts are available for comparison it is generally possible to determine that this expression was intended as a translation of bhagavat.189

(e) 佛

In addition, of course, the word bhagavat is often translated by Zhi Qian and others simply as 佛, especially in the opening lines of sutras where this usage is, prior to the time of Kumārajīva, quite standard. This translation is not used, of course, in the list of ten epithets, where 佛 is used exclusively as a translation of buddha and the term bhagavat is translated with other terms.

A Special Case: The Ten Epithets in the Pusa bonyi jing 菩薩本業經 (T281)

One of the most widely circulated translations in all of Zhi Qian’s corpus is the 菩薩本業經 (corresponding to parts of the Avadattaka-sūtra), yet it has hardly appeared in our discussion at all. This is because—although it does contain a list of “ten epithets” of the Buddha—the titles found here cannot be aligned in any way with the epithets found in other Indian and Chinese texts. Indeed, Zhi Qian’s list does not even match those given in other Chinese and Tibetan translations of the same scripture, whose own lists—though themselves non-standard—generally match one another.188

The passage in question reads as follows: 有如名彼為大聖人，或有名彼為大沙門，
或名眾生，或名神人，或名勇賊，或名世尊，或名法僧，或名賢聖，或名天佛，或名最勝他 (10.49a14–17). This list does contain a few familiar epithets, such as 僧伽 and 世尊, as well as 天尊 (which may be a shortened form of the epithet 天人所 which does appear in Zhi Qian’s more standard lists of the Buddha’s titles). But most of the names

188 See for example Schouten 1978, pp. 68–70, n. 217.
189 See Nastier 2003, p. 211, n. 28.
188 See T280 (10.86c7–11), T279 (9.419b11–14), T279 (10.8c15–17), and for the Tibetan version see Peking/Čuṣum no. 701, 79.5.40.1–1.1.
found here do not match the expected ones at all. While some of the epithets sound Buddhistic (e.g., 深入門, 獨風), others have greater resonance with indigenous Chinese religious beliefs (大聖人, 師人, 尊仙), and one even has an explicitly Confucian flavor (躬德). The list as a whole is well characterized by my student Shi Hikuk, who explains the situation as follows:

[Presumably Zhi Qian tried to utilize Chinese indigenous traditions, namely Confucianism and Daoism, as parallels to the concepts of Buddhism, so he did not precisely follow or translate the original script: even if he had the same source as Lokakeśa and the other translators. Zhi Qian considered the needs of his audience and the meaning of the original text rather than trying to preserve the language found in the original… (Shi 2000, p. 43)]

ZHI QIAN AS TRANSLATOR: AUTHORSHIP AND AUTHENTICITY

Having seen the great variety of Zhi Qian’s translation terminology, at this point we must raise a troubling but unavoidable question: can all these texts possibly be the work of one man? Granted, Zhi Qian is well known for his preference for variety in translation terminology, often using multiple translations of a given term (e.g., भुजेश्वर or 仏影) even within a single text. Yet an appeal to stylistic preference alone seems insufficient to account for what we have seen. In particular, how are we to understand the fact that Zhi Qian’s corpus includes several distinct clusters of translation styles—for example, a “Lokakeśa-like” group consisting of texts that abound in translations introduced by Lokakeśa (including T169 and 632 and, to a lesser extent, T361), and an “An Xuan-like” group that features the distinctive translation terminology introduced by An Xuan and Yan Foting (T76, 225, 474, and 472)? And how are we to understand the sub-clusters of other kinds within his corpus, such as the mutually exclusive distribution of the terms 阿閦閾 and 阿閦閾, or the fact that some texts belonging to the 阿閦閾 group also use vocabulary belonging to the 真人 group while those belonging to the 阿閦閾 group do not? If these differences were merely the result of a penchant for variety, surely we would find combinations of every kind, rather than patterns of usage that fall into such discrete and clearly defined categories.

An obvious place to turn for an explanation might be to the role of Zhi Qian’s translation assistants—that is, the possibility that these shifts in vocabulary were due to the input of the various translation committees with whom he worked over the course of his long translation career. For Zhi Qian’s predecessor Lokakeśa and his successor Dharmarakṣa (to cite two of the most outstanding examples) we have detailed accounts of the various groups of assistants with whom they worked, whose members hailed from a wide range of ethnic groups. Some of the discrepancies in terminology and style that we find in translations attributed to Lokakeśa or Dharmarakṣa can surely be attributed to the changing composition of these committees, whose members were generally responsible for recording each Chinese translation in its final form.188

188 This sounds term occurs in two other translations by Zhi Qian, one of which contains a gloss explaining that बुध represents बुध and बुध stands for बुध (T188, 1.473a27), while the other has an exact Sanskrit parallel in which बुधेस्वर is indeed the corresponding term (T225, 8.406b3).
Yet we will search in vain for comparable evidence concerning Zhi Qian’s own translations. In only one case—the translation of the Dharmapada (T210, 法句經)—are we explicitly told that Zhi Qian worked with others, and here Sengyou informs us that while the Indian monk Zhiang Jiaoyuan produced a rough Chinese translation, it was Zhi Qian himself who prepared the final text. In retrospect this is hardly surprising, since Zhi Qian (unlike Lokaksema and Dharmaraksya) was a native speaker of Chinese, having been born and raised on Chinese territory despite his grandparents’ Yuehzi origin. It stands to reason, therefore, that he had no need of assistants like those who aided Lokaksema and Dharmaraksya (or for that matter An Xuan, who was assisted by the Chinese monk Yang Fotiao) in converting an initial rough translation into at least minimally passable Chinese. On the contrary, our sources report that Zhi Qian’s literary Chinese was not only adequate, but quite elegant in style.

If the distinct terminological clusters within Zhi Qian’s translation corpus cannot be explained by the input of assistants, might we then appeal simply to the translator’s prerogative to change his mind? This seems an attractive hypothesis, especially in light of the fact that Zhi Qian’s translation career spanned nearly three decades and included his migration at the end of the Han dynasty from north China to the south, where other translation conventions might already have been in use. The difficulty with this approach, however, is that we have no reliable information that would allow us to arrange Zhi Qian’s works in chronological order. It might seem reasonable, in light of the statement in his biography that he had originally been a pupil of Zhi Lang 司馬光 (who was in turn a disciple of Lokaksema), to suppose that Zhi Qian’s earliest works should be the ones that show the greatest similarity to the translations of Lokaksema, while his later works would be those that depart from this “nuancing” style with its preference for transcriptions and long arhythmic sentences and adopt a more polished Chinese literary stance. If this was indeed the case, we should place works such as 春明菩薩經 (T169) and 嘉那三昧經 (T63) in the early part of Zhi Qian’s translation career, while the more elegant and literary 菩薩本業WhatsLanguage (T281) and 無量相輪陀羅尼 (T474), for example, should be assigned to a later period.

Yet it is not simply a matter of progression from an early, more Lokaksema-like style to a later, more An Xuan-like one. The presence of a variety of distinct subgroups within Zhi Qian’s corpus does not permit such a simple and unidirectional description, and moreover, the only text that we can localize in time and space is the 菩薩行 (T210, 法句經), which Sengyou tells us was produced after Zhi Qian’s arrival in the south. In sum, while it may well be that T169 and T63 are some of the earliest works in Zhi Qian’s corpus, there is no clear-cut direction of development in his work. Thus while changing preferences may account for at least part of what we see, this is difficult to demonstrate in concrete terms.

There is one other possibility, however, which—though rather disconcerting—must nonetheless be taken seriously: the possibility that many (or most, or even all) of Zhi...
Qian's supposed "translations" were only re-editions of existing Chinese texts. What little evidence we have, both internal and external, points to the fact that he was regularly involved in revising the translations of others, and aside from a formulaic mention in his biography of having studied "barbarian writings" (胡書) at the age of thirteen and being "proficient in the languages of six countries" (精通六国语), there does not seem to be any mention of Zhi Qian actually working directly from an Indic-language text. Could it be that Zhi Qian was not in fact a "translator" at all, but merely a revisor, his work limited to polishing the vocabulary and style of his predecessors?

One piece of evidence which would seem to support this hypothesis is the fact that, among the terms discussed above, there is not even a single expression that was coined by Zhi Qian himself. Every word—though not the sin of every word—seems to have a precedent in translations by others. Indeed, a solid majority of the translations and transcriptions used by Zhi Qian elsewhere in his work appear to be drawn from the vocabulary of earlier translators. This is not merely due to the fact that there was, by the early third century, a substantial body of pre-existing terminology upon which Zhi Qian could draw. This was indeed the case, but it was even more true of figures like Kumārajīva (early 5th century) and Xuangang (mid-7th century), who nonetheless introduced a large number of new technical terms. Innovation, it would seem, is less the result of the quantity of translations that have gone before than it is a product of the translator's relationship to his text.

But if Zhi Qian was simply revising pre-existing translations, who could have been responsible for the original Chinese texts that served as the basis for his work? Only a handful of translators are known to have worked before his time, 110 and only a small (though significant) minority of the works attributed to Zhi Qian can be identified with texts previously translated by any of these men. 111 If it were the case that most or all of Zhi Qian's texts, and not just these few, were re-editions or "polished" versions of existing translations, whose versions would he have been able to revise?

It is true that we know the names of only a few translators who can be placed with certainty prior to Zhi Qian's time. Yet when Dao'an produced his famous catalogue in

110 See the Chu sanjou jii (T2145), 55.97b22-23. The more expected figure would be his six contemporaries, beginning with...

111 I am excluding Zhi Yao from this list because I am not persuaded that the role extent work ascribed to him (T616) is an authentic Han-period translation. See above, n. 102.

112 In addition to Zhi Qian's translated role in the final stage of the Dharmapada (T210), his version of the life of the Buddha (T115, 大方等學本末經) is considered to be a reversion of Xiong Mengzhang's earlier work (T116 and the first part of T119); see Zelter 1991, p. 284, while his version of the shorter Perfection of Wisdom Sutra (T225, 无量智經) is clearly a revision of Lokakṣema's translation (T224, 龙树本 藏), Zhi Qian's translation of part of the Abhimanyuavatara—in my view, an early prototype of which this substitutive scripture [later grew (T278, 妙法藏經)]— posedates, and may well have been produced with reference to, the earlier translation by Lokakṣema (T2085). I strongly suspect, incidentally, that T283 and 285 are the Lokakṣema's work and that they originally comprised a single text, including what is now T286.) In light of recent work by Paul Harrison (1998 and 1999, and Harris et al. 2002) Zhi Qian's version of the longer Subhadraśīleśvarottara (T361, 松罗供养所集经) can be seen as a revision of the ancestor of T362, i.e., of a work originally translated by Lokakṣema. This, of the two-hundred six extent term that can be attributed with confidence to Zhi Qian, we have strong internal and external evidence that fire of them are revisions of works by other translators whose identities are known.
374 CE, he included a list of 142 texts for which the translator's identity was unknown. By the time Sengyou compiled his *Chu sanzang jii* in the early 6th century CE, the total number of such works had escalated to an astounding 846.

These numbers exclude—it must be emphasized—scriptures that either Dao’an or Sengyou considered to be spurious or doubtful; thus these lists include only those texts which, in the view of these careful cataloguers, stood a reasonably good chance of being authentic translations of Indian works. Modern scholars have generally treated the works in these lists with great suspicion, viewing them as apocryphal at worst and unlocalizable in space and time at best. But for the purpose at hand it is the sheer number of such works that is of interest, for it points to the likelihood that there were numerous translators laboring in obscurity to whose work Zhi Qian would have had access. Thus it would be quite possible, at least in theory, for his primary function to have been that of an "inner-Chinese" translator, taking what he perceived to be crude and poorly written translations and rendering them into elegant classical Chinese.

Yet a close comparison of the works of Zhi Qian for which we have earlier extant exemplars shows that his translation choices cannot be explained simply with respect to these pre-existing Chinese texts. The names of the Buddhas, bodhisattvas, and bodhisattva-fields found in his *Vimalakirti Sūtra* (T241), for example, cannot be derived simply from the transcriptions found in Lokaksema’s earlier version (月界經, T280), nor can the opening lines of Zhi Qian’s *Dai Ming Weiyi* (大明義記, T225), where Subhūti and Mahājata are described as the leading *āryaka* and bodhisatta in the audience, respectively, be derived simply from Lokaksema’s version of the same text (強行般若義, T224), where Sariputra and Maitreya are mentioned as well. While Zhi Qian’s life of the Buddha (月界善跡傳, T185) corresponds character for character with the work of Kang Mengzhang (強行本起經 and 中本起經, T184 and 196) in certain passages, in other places its content is quite distinct. Likewise, Zhi Qian’s version of the larger *Subhuti Sūtra* (無量清淨平等覺經, T361) diverges from the (revised) version by Lokaksema (阿耨陀尼三耶三佛所護持護法經, T362) in content—e.g., in the all-important list of Amithābha’s vows—as well as in style. In sum, while instances of Zhi Qian’s reliance on earlier translations can easily be found, there is not a single case in which his rendition of a particular text can be explained solely on the basis of a pre-existing Chinese version.

The most likely scenario, in sum, appears to be that Zhi Qian relied heavily on earlier Chinese translations whenever they were available, but that he consulted Indic-language versions as well. The fact that a high percentage of the terms first attested in Zhi Qian’s work—that is, terms that he himself appears to have coined—are erroneous points to the strong likelihood that, while his expertise in classical Chinese is undisputed, his understanding of Indic languages lagged far behind.113

113 It is actually true that nothing at all can be said about their chronology, for in some cases they are cited in early (and dubious) commentaries or essays, while in others they can be shown to be quoting known (and dubious) texts. Much remains to be done on the study of these important lists, many of whose members are surely authentic early (even Han-period) translations.

114 These erroneous translations, as well as the extensive borrowings by Zhi Qian from the terminology of other translators, will be documented in detail in my *Lexicon of the Buddhist Translation Terminology of Zhi Qian (in preparation).*
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CONCLUSIONS

Any attempt to explain Zhi Qian’s Buddhist vocabulary offers particular challenges to the interpreter. Not only does Zhi Qian exhibit a strong inclination for variety—often using a number of different equivalents for a given Indic term even within a single text—he also draws heavily on the vocabulary of his predecessors. Indeed, it could well be said that all streams of previous translation terminology meet in Zhi Qian’s work. Thus our discussion of his terminology has required, of necessity, an examination of its precedents—or in rare cases, the lack thereof—in the translations of Zhi Qian’s predecessors.

As a result of his own penchant for variety, as well as the cohesiveness of multiple translation streams in his work, Zhi Qian’s translations preserve valuable information on the multiple ways in which even the most standard epithets of the Buddha were understood during the formative period of Buddhism in China. Some are straightforward etymological renderings, e.g., the rendition of sugata as "buddha" "well-departed." Others, such as the translation of arhat as 真人 “perfected one,” are best described as cultural calques—that is, expressions which attempt to convey the significance rather than the literal etymological meaning of the underlying word, using terminology already current in the recipient culture. In some cases—as in the rendering of bhagavan as 天中天 "god among gods"—we have evidence of a special sub-category which we might label “third-party cultural calques,” where the translation term is based not upon that of the recipient culture but upon the terminology of an intermediary language. Yet another approach to translation—though this occupies a significantly smaller place in the work of Zhi Qian—is not to translate at all, but simply to transcribe the sounds (never an easy task with the cumbrous Chinese writing system) of the Indic term in question.

One unexpected result of our survey of Zhi Qian’s terminology has been the finding that some Chinese translations which seem fanciful at best or completely erroneous at worst may in fact reflect exegetical traditions known already in India. The rendition of arhat as 無所著 "unattached," for example, finds unexpected support in the work of Bodhidharma, while the apparent unanimity among early Chinese translators that the long epithet amitāyurvamsatajñatattvavṛtti should be divided into two separate components, with the latter understood not as dharma or "charioter of those to be tamed" but as dharma "Dharma-charioter," raises the possibility that this understanding was widespread in India as well.

In sum, as our understanding of Chinese Buddhist vocabulary increases, we may find that the vocabulary chosen by these pioneering translators offer us a wider range of information than had previously been thought. Certainly their terminology conveys a wealth of information (not all of it easily decipherable) about local concepts that Chinese thinkers brought to their encounters with Buddhist terms, but it can also cast light on alternative understandings of Buddhist terms and concepts that may well have been circulating in India. While some strange translation choices clearly point to the linguistic limitations of a given translator or his assistants, in other cases they may be the result not of an erroneous interpretation of the Indian source-text but of a consciously calculated
decision on how best to convey its meaning to a Chinese audience. In sum, the more we can learn about the process by which individual translation terms were chosen by Zhi Qian, his predecessors, and his successors, the closer we will come to a rich and multifaceted understanding of the conceptual world within which these pioneers of Chinese Buddhism produced their work.
Appendix I

Provisional List of the Authentic Works of Zhi Qian

Banshuian jing (T16; cf. Pali Mahaparinibbana-sutta, DN16) 189

Suanmen ben se zhi jing (T14; cf. Pali Culaavahakkhambhandhara, MN14)

Laizhihegu jing (T08; cf. Pali Atthapadaphutta, MN82)

Qianmu jing (T176; cf. Pali Brahmavatthu, MN91)

Zhai jing (T87; cf. Pali Visakhadatta, AN III, 70)

Ye sheng ye shan jing (T166; *Cudaviprahbasotissatta-sutta; cf. Samadhiheka-

sutta, th. 34, *Tahava)

Tatsui myoju huny jing (T185; a biography of the Buddha, no corresponding Sanskrit of Pali version extant)

Yuzui jing (T198; Skt. *Arihavargyas; cf. Pali Arihakaccagaridhi)

Feijin jing (T210; cf. Pali Dharmagaha, Skt. Uddatvanagaha)

Da mingdu jing (T225; Ittakatha-kabakaprajana-vamsati-sutta)

Puji jing (T281; a proto-Avasthisaka-sutta)

Xiuai jing (T128; *Sattavi-sutta)

Wuliang jing (T361; Skt. *Amiyanvaha-samyak-

samahuddha-sutta)

Ruo shi jing (T474; Skt. Vimaktesvarinidatta)

Anan shi jing (T493)

189 attributed to an anonymous translator of the Eastern Quan, but certainly—as apparently first suggested in U. Hake, 南印度佛教文獻之考 (Taipei: Tsinstun shupian, 1971), pp. 517–532—an authentic work of Zhi Quan. Skt. argument rests largely on the testimony of various catalogues, beginning with the Chao sheng ying jing which attributes a *Mahaparinibbana-sutta* (Da mahaparinibbana jing of Zhi Quan; see T 5 5.6.15) but he also points out that the text contains some distinctive Zhi Quan vocabulary (p. 523). The examples he cites are not in fact unique to Zhi Quan, but there is another quite distinctive text that is: the names of the Buddhist heavens occur in forms not used outside translations by Zhi Quan, with the exception of T5 (another Mahaparinibbana-sutta, which appears to be dependent on this one) and T1485 (a Chinese apokryphon which borrows heavily from Zhi Quan's T281). The relationship between T5 and T1485 yet to be fully elucidated, but at present it seems more likely that T5 is dependent upon T6 than the reverse.

190 Ascribed to "Vigahna et al." by the Tanah catalogers, but Sengyou makes it clear that Vigahna was merely the person who brought the text to China, while the actual translation work was done by an Indian monk named Zhi Xianggang, who produced a "more Chinese version" and finalized it Zhi Quan (see T215, 55.7.63 and 6.6.21, respectively). Moreover, he states that in his own time Lo Yen's version had been lost, while Zhi Quan's translation was still in circulation (cf. cit; cf. also 96a.27-28). Pending further study of this text I have provisionally included it here.
松川半啓 Siheon jing (T312); "Simaoomori-nitra".
喜房土師家 Pusa shengqi jing; 蕃摩羯所問篇 Chamejie suoren jing (T33; "Kamuni-bora-pariyokshita-nitra").

女鬼觀 Qian jing (T356)
驚魂女鬼 Longchimu jing (T357); Skt. *Naigadatsatiraka*
老女鬼 Laoamu ren jing (T359); Skt. *Mahalakshmi-pariyokshita-nitra*

八部鬼 Baubi jing (T381)
鬼入三昧髻 Huayin sanmei jing (T392); Skt. *Yashdatta-jihana-mudra-samadhin*
了本生死經 Liushen shengsi jing (T708; Skt. Śālīcāmara-nitra)
四願經 Siyuang jing (T735)

字經抄 Bojing chuo (T790)
無畏門軍密持禮 Wuliangmu zemichi jing (T1011; Skt. Anantamukha-sadākta-dhāraṇī, var. Anantamukha-nirbhāra-nāma-dhārāṇī)

"candidate texts" (possible translations by Zhi Qian or his circle):
佛教編梵志阿難經 Fo kaiji fanzhi ah jing (T20; cf. Pāli Amodhatattana, DN3)
七知經 Qizhi jing (T27; cf. Pāli Dhammatattanat, AN VII, 64)
未生童子 Weishengyi Xun jing (T30); "Aśvastāma-rūra"
清沙三念經 Pingshaansang muyan jing (T511; cf. Pāli Dhītenābbhiga-mutta, MN 140 + Buddhaghoṣa's commentary on the same, MA v.33-63)

注: A version of the larger Sukhavatīvyūha-nitra, traditionally attributed to Lokakṣema but actually by Zhi Qian (as suggested first by Paul Harrison [1998] and discussed in detail in Harrison 1999 and in Harrison, Hartmann and Mansol 2002. My own examination of the vocabulary and style of T361 in comparison with other Zhi Qian translations strongly supports Harrison's original suggestion that this is indeed Zhi Qian's work and that the attributions of this text (by Lokakṣema according to both medieval and modern catalogues) and T362 were switched at an early date. Note that Sengego attributes an Asmiya jing to Zhi Qian (53.6c5); the full title of T361 (仏師阿難観音三階護摩華鬘曼藥人畫) is mentioned by Sengego only as an alternative drawn from another catalogue. The Sanskrit title given here for T361 is my own reconstruction; a long-winded discussion of the reasoning behind it is available upon request.
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Appendix 2
The Ten epithets of the Buddha according to An Shigao 安世高

Only four occurrences of the complete list of ten titles of the Buddha have yet been identified in Han-period translations. Two of these are found in the work of Kang Mengxiang, and I have mentioned them repeatedly above because their terminology so often matches Zhi Qian’s renderings. In the single extant text by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao (T322) the list of ten does not occur; in the much more extensive corpus of Lokaksema, only one list that appears to include all ten items occurs, and that in a work of his that has been revised (T313). The earliest list to occur is Chinese Buddhist translations, however, is found in An Shigao’s Pinshing jing 出没 Primer, but it is in such an unusual form that it has not, I believe, been documented in existing reference works.

An Shigao’s list, as printed in the Teishō edition of the canon, reads as follows:

如來無所著正覺親行已足為善, 為世間首歸, 無有戲, 是法具法體為師, 為教天上天下為佛 晚上 (5.15.17851-15)

Several of these epithets are clearly recognizable in light of our previous analysis of Zhi Qian’s terms. In some cases, however, the Teishō text is waggily punctuated, and one character appears to have been altered at a very early stage in the transmission of the text. These and other errors will be discussed in detail below.

(1) tathāgata 如來
(2) arhat 無所著
(3) sanyakamudde 正覺

Viewed in light of Zhi Qian’s translations, there is nothing unusual in An Shigao’s treatment of these terms. The only point to be noted here is that An Shigao regularly

127 The two vertically identical lists found in Kang Mengxiang’s works (with the individual epithets, separated for convenience) are the following: 如來 諸法 皆若 一切 佛名 皆可 世間 普天 語mind 天 人 皆成 如來 (T36, 3.47.3.17-18) and SDR 諸法 皆若 一切 佛名 皆可 世間 普天 語mind 天 人 皆成 (T191, 4.145.51-12).

128 See above, note 61, for other lists of Buddhist epithets. In Lokaksema’s work (though not, apparently, another full list of ten see also note 61). An additional list of just four epithets—aqua quite idiomatically—appears in T313 (如來 諸法 皆可 世間 天 人, 11.756.14).

129 An Shigao Zhechui has pointed out in the ground-breaking study in which he first identified Chapter 6 of the Psalms of the Pali counterpart of An Shigao’s Pinshing jing, in number of cases An Shigao’s translation provides complete lists of terms when the Pali version abbreviates (Zhechui 2002, p. 79). This is one such case, for where An Shigao lists all ten epithets the Buddha the Pali has only in pr a dharmo dharmam (Pindapata, p. 111, line 23). This is very an abbreviation for the list of ten epithets, however, as suggested in the the translation by Satyaprakasa (Pakke-Dicke, p. 178), who points to a parallel in the Anguttara Nikaya (AN ii.1.28) which reads in pr a dharmo sammadishodho vajirocana sa cabbato na (Pindapata, p. 111, line 23). I would like to thank Sieke Zhechui for directing me to these Pali passages.
uses 正如, alone as the equivalent of samyakamaitikāh, translating samyak as 正, and not providing a separate translation for the component sam as 正; apparently treating it simply as an intensifying prefix.

(4) *vidyakaramesupanna* 聆行已足

Here An Shigao uses slightly different terminology than does Zhi Qian (i.e., 聆 in place of 听 and 足 where Zhi Qian has 好), but the meaning is essentially the same, and his rendition of this epithet is comprehensible without difficulty.

(5) *mrga* 为乐

Here, however, we encounter something completely unexpected, for An Shigao seems to have interpreted an underlying "mrga" "well gone" as a form of "mārga" "blisternal". This mistake seems to have been made during the original translation process; at any rate, it appears already in a third-century commentary on the text. I have not been able to identify any other expression that could represent the word mrga elsewhere in An Shigao’s corpus, and it thus seems possible (though somewhat unexpected) that he was unfamiliar with the term.

(6) *lokavid* 为世间已解

Though slightly more expanded than Zhi Qian’s standard 世管理系统, An Shigao’s rendition of this epithet offers no difficulties.

(7) *amatapraparupa* (无有過・是) → 無有過士

Here we have what seems to be a compounding of errors, including both wrong punctuation by the Tusi’s editors and a quite surprising mistake in translation. Given what we have seen in the work of Zhi Qian and others (where this epithet is widely translated as 無上士), it seems likely that the original orally transmitted text was 無有過士, with 士 serving as a translation of parupa (a word which is otherwise unaccounted for either in this or in the following epithet). Could it be that, as An Shigao dictated a rough Chinese translation, the word 士 (EMC *da1sh1*; EMC *da2sh1*) was misinterpreted as 是 (EMC *da2sh1*;EMC *da2sh1*) by a Chinese scribe? In any event it is clear that the character 士 was introduced quite early, for it appears in the third-century commentary mentioned above. The apparent translation of amata as 無有過 "without transgression" is initially surprising, but if we take the character 好 in its more basic meaning of "to cross over, surpass," then a connection with amata as "supreme, unsurpassed" is not difficult to find. In this case An Shigao’s translation of amatapraparupa as "unsurpassed (無有過) sam (士)") would correspond in meaning, if not in wording, to the translation 無上士 used by so many others.

123 See T1694, 33.21b-16.
124 T1694, 33.21c12.
(8) damyutarkha 法取法難

If An Shigao revered the long epithet anusāraparṇanamamyutarkha in the same way that Zhi Qian did—i.e., separating it into two components, as anusāra and parṇanamamyutarkha—the eighth epithet in his list should represent his attempt to translate the latter. Like his successors (including Zhi Qian), he appears to have understood an underlying Prakrit śramaṇa as dharmma (i.e., dharmasa). But here we have not one translation of this epithet, but two. The term damyutarkha is translated first as 法取 "Dharma chanoteer," then translated again as 法難 "Dharma follower." The latter rendition, though unexpected, would be comprehensible if An Shigao interpreted śramaṇa as a form of the verbal root य “run after, chase.”

What we have here is a classic case of “double translation,” conveying in Chinese two quite different ways of understanding an Indian term. Unable to decide between these alternatives, the translator (or in other cases, the Chinese scribe who was transcribing the foreign translator’s explanation of a given term) has simply recorded them both.18

(9) sārūta decanamanyutarkha (為難 = 為難為難上天下) → 為難為難上天下

Here again the Taishō text is wrongly punctuated, but when this is corrected this group of eight characters, taken as a unit, can be seen as a reasonable translation of the ninth epithet, “teacher and instructor of [those in] heaven above and [here] below heaven.”

(10) bhūtak 體佛

An Shigao’s final epithet in the list is entirely unusual, for he employs the standard term for “buddha” which he himself may have introduced. There is apparently no equivalent for the term bhūtak in An Shigao’s list.19

18 An Shigao may also have been influenced by a knowledge of the commonly used term ānasaṃ “follower,” which is derived from the same verbal root.

19 On such “double translations” in the work of Dhammarakṣa see Touche 1998, pp. 499-494. While Touche is inclined to see such confusions as due mainly to misspellings in pronunciation (whether in Dhammarakṣa’s reading of his Prakrit text or in homophones generated by the collapse of distinct Sanskrit terms into a single Prakrit form), it is also likely that some of these multiple interpretations simply reflect varied, even contradictory, understandings that were already circulating in India.
Appendix 3
Kumārajīva’s Version of the Ten Epithets of the Buddha
in Light of the Translations of Zhi Qian

Readers who turn to Nakamura’s Budzryudayijen in search of the Chinese names of the ten titles of the Buddha will find there the following list (with the corresponding Sanskrit counterparts): (1) 如來 (tathāgata), (2) 阿羅漢 (arhat), (3) 正等知 (samyak-sambuddha), (4) 明行足 (swāyā-caraṇa-ampasse), (5) 世尊 (mahārāja), (6) 年出上士 (asustava), (7) 佛陀(太子) (parnaraunjā-dvārā), (8) 人天師 (āditya-devamāneṣupattā), and (10) 智者 (bhikṣu-bhikṣujñā). The sources given by Nakamura for this list are rather unexpected (including such works as a 13th-century Japanese Zen text and a Song-period Chinese translation of a stūpa on the Buddha’s titles), but—whoever may have used this list in subsequent centuries—this version of the ten titles was already being used at the beginning of the fifth century by Kumārajīva.159 As such, this list will be familiar to most scholars who have worked extensively with East Asian Buddhist sources.

In light of our analysis of Zhi Qian’s handling of these epithets, however, we can see that several features of this list are worthy of comment. In particular, Kumārajīva’s renditions of the second, third, and eighth epithets—all of which he seems to have introduced for the first time—exhibit some noteworthy features.160 In the following discussion I will deal only with these three epithets, considering what the examination of Zhi Qian’s renditions of these terms given above can help us to see in them.

(2) 阿羅漢 “worthy of offerings” (arhat)

A quick perusal of Kumārajīva’s translation corpus will demonstrate immediately that the epithet 阿羅漢 is not Kumārajīva’s usual translation of the word arhat. On the contrary, his standard rendition of the term is the quite normal-looking translation 阿羅漢, a term which appears well over 7 thousand times in his translation corpus. Indeed, Kumārajīva appears to use 阿羅漢 as a translation of arhat only when the latter appears as one of the Buddha’s ten epithets. Like arha of his predecessors, therefore—none of whom used their “normal” terms for arhat in this context—Kumārajīva appears to have felt the need to use a different Chinese word for arhat when the term was used in reference to the Buddha. It appears to be a consistent rule in his translation corpus that 阿羅漢 is used to

160 It is difficult to establish this with complete certainty, but I have been unable to locate any instance of the use of any of these three expressions in a text that is certain to precede Kumārajīva’s work. In particular, it is probably significant that the two ayama collections translated into Chinese prior to the beginning of Kumārajīva’s translation work (T26, the 金刚般若 and T125, the 智者 in the 金刚般若和 T99, the 年出上士) use all three.
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translate *arhat* only when that term refers to the Buddha, while his standard form 阿毘羅 (rarely 阿毘羅) is used only when it does not.

The characters 惇供 do occur, it should be noted, outside the list of the ten epithets, when Kumārajiva is translating an expression that simply means "worthy of offerings" in the generic sense. But in these cases he employs the three-character expression 惇供佛, reserving the two-character form 惇供 for use as an epithet of the Buddha alone.

(3) 正解知 "[one who possesses] correct and all-pervasive knowledge" (samyuktam buddha)

This expression, which also appears to have been introduced by Kumārajiva, is not restricted to the list of ten epithets, but it does occur only (naturally enough) in reference to a Buddha. Kumārajiva follows the tradition established by An Shigao (and subsequently adopted by An Xuan and Yan Fottao) of translating *samyuktam* as 正 "correct," but he introduces a new rendition of 耕 as 耕 "all-pervasive" (presumably based on an understanding of the underlying Indic term as meaning "complete"). Likewise it is noteworthy that he uses the rather generic-sounding character 知 "knowledge" to translate the component buddha—but once again, he does so only in this context.

(8) 調御丈夫 "[one who] regulates and tames men" (parsadamyāstraṇa)

In Kumārajiva's translations the epithet 無上士 "supreme man" occurs seventh in the list of ten, just as it does in the works of Zhi Qian. We would expect, therefore, that he—like Zhi Qian and others—would be left with only the latter half of the long compound *aṣṭottaraṃparsadamyāstraṇa* (i.e., damyāstraṇa) to account for, as was the case with Zhi Qian and his predecessors. Yet Kumārajiva's eighth epithet also seems to include an equivalent of *parusa*, here translated as 夫. Reading back from Kumārajiva's Chinese version to a postulated Indic source-text, we might expect that his seventh and eighth epithets should correspond to an underlying *aṣṭottaraṇaparusa* and *parsadamyāstraṇa*, respectively. What seems to have happened, in other words, is that Kumārajiva appears to have translated a single expression, *parusa*, two times.

But such a procedure would be, to say the least, unexpected, and I believe that a better explanation can be found. What Kumārajiva seems to have done is to retain the seventh epithet in its traditional form (i.e., as 無上士), while at the same time correcting the eighth title based on what he knew from his Indian sources (i.e., connecting *parusa* with the latter part of the compound, and translating *dama* as 佛 "to tame, regulate" rather than as 龍 "Dharma" as Zhi Qian and others had done). 105 The word 耳, meaning "charioteer" or "tamer," was not in need of correction, and it carried over unchanged.

The resulting list, however, includes a double translation, for the word *parusa* appears once as 佛 and again as 夫. This is no, however, the only time that Kumārajiva

105 It should be noted, incidentally, that the elements 供 [offerings] is at interpretive gloss not represented in the Sanskrit term *arhat* itself.

106 Cf. T1509 (25.72b-c), where the long compound is divided into *aṣṭottara* and *parsadamyāstraṇa*. 247
made such an emendation, for the same phenomenon—the updating of a traditional Chinese rendition based on his knowledge of the underlying Indic term, resulting in the double translation of one of its elements—can be observed in his rendition of the name of Avalokiteśvara (or rather, of an easier form 'avahakṣetara) in the now universally recognized form of 觀世音.' 104

104 I have discussed this derivation in detail in Notier 2001 (Appendix 1, pp. 344-345).
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The Rediscovery of Three Early Buddhist Scriptures on Meditation: A Preliminary Analysis of the Fo shuo shi’er men jing, the Fo shuo jie shi’er men jing Translated by An Shigao and Their Commentary Preserved in the Newly Found Kongō-ji Manuscript'

Stefano Zacchetti

1. Introduction

It is becoming increasingly apparent that manuscript collections kept in Japanese temples have managed to preserve a valuable treasury of Chinese Buddhist texts that were believed to have been lost for centuries. Surprising as it may sound, this is still a largely unexplored – and hence very promising – research field.

A ground-breaking study in this respect has been Prof. Toshinori Ochiai’s research into the Nanatsu-dera 七寺 manuscript canon\(^1\) which provided scholars of Chinese Buddhism with a number of hitherto lost texts. Thus it is not a matter of mere coincidence that Prof. Ochiai is also involved in the important find discussed in the present article.

In spring 1999 Mr. Kajura Susumu (Kyoto University), a foremost expert in ancient Chinese and Japanese manuscripts and printed editions of Buddhist texts, contacted Prof. Ochiai about an intriguing scroll he had noticed while surveying the...

\(^1\) This is the revised version of a paper given at the 13th IABS Conference (Bangkok, 8-13 December 2002). I am grateful to several scholars present at that conference for their precious suggestions, especially Dr. Mark Allon, Mr. Lance Comins and Prof. Jan Nattier. I also wish to express here my gratitude to Prof. Ochiai for allowing me to join the Kongō-ji research group after I moved to Japan in 2001. My gratitude also goes to the other members of the group, as to the discoverer of this important manuscript, Mr. Kajura, always prepared to share with liberality his profound knowledge of ancient documents, and to Prof. Deleuvi, with whom I had the fortune – and the pleasure as well – of discussing in detail the Kongō-ji corpus: he has helped me in many ways. I also wish to thank my senior colleagues Prof. Kanou and Prof. Karashima for a number of invaluable suggestions. Last, but not least, I am grateful to my wife Yang Kan for her continuous help and to Mr. Linda Stephen for checking my uneven English. Needless to say, I am the exclusive copyright-holder of the errors remaining in this article.

\(^1\) Ochiai 1991.
collection of manuscripts kept at the Kongôji 金剛寺, a temple located in Ōsaka Prefecture.²

This scroll (hereafter the MS)³, presumably copied, as was most of the Kongô-ji collection, between the late Heian and early Kamakura period (11th-13th century AD)⁴, seemed to contain some unknown documents bearing witness to the earliest phase of the "Buddhist conquest of China", to use Prof. Zürcher’s felicitous expression: that of the translation of Buddhist scriptures into Chinese by the renowned Parthian An Shigao 安世高 (active in China since 148 AD, during the Later Han 後漢 Dynasty).

Having found enough evidence of the authenticity of at least a portion of this rediscovered scriptural corpus,⁵ Prof. Ochiai, later that year succeeded in establishing a research group for studying these important documents, under the auspices of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

The present article aims at introducing some of the texts contained in the Kongô-ji MS. Although I could greatly benefit from some preceding works (notably Kajura’s 2001 ground-breaking article), I am aware that my research will raise many more questions than I am able to answer. However, I hope that scholars better endowed will take interest in this "new" important source.

2. The Kongô-ji manuscript: general remarks

The Kongô-ji MS can be subdivided into two main sections, according to content:

a) Arhat shovun jing 安般守護經—section (lines 1-281). This part is chiefly made up of a scripture on Anapânasati completely different from the text transmitted in the canon under a similar title and ascribed to An Shigao (佛說大安般守護經 T 602,

³ See Ochiai 2001: 132 and Deleanu (forthcoming, introductory section). The most detailed study on the Kongô-ji find so far published is Kajura 2001: see pp. 27-34 for a comprehensive discussion of the whole manuscript collection, and pp. 55-56 for a description of the two manuscripts relevant to the present study.

⁴ There are in fact two closely related manuscripts in the Kongô-ji collection (甲本: MS A, 乙本: MS B) containing the texts under issue. MS A and B bear on the edge of the external side of the scroll the title (甲版: 佛說大安般守護經: on the wrong record see: see Kajura 2001: 65, and 安般守護經 respectively. As to their general features, I quote Deleanu’s description (forthcoming, section 1): "MS A has 21 sheets, 29 columns per sheet, 17 characters per column. ... MS B has 19 sheets, 32 lines per sheet, 17 characters per column" (the number of 17 characters represents the average figure, as remarked by Deleanu n. 6). For details on the relationship between MS A and B, which appears to have been written by different scribes, see again Deleanu’s forthcoming study. It has not yet been established whether B is merely a copy of A, or both are independent copies of the (possibly same) original. In the following discussion I shall refer, as a rule and unless differently stated, to MS A, which appears on the whole more correct.

⁵ Kajura 2001: 28-29; dating remains conjectural, as neither MS A nor B have a colophon with details about the circumstances of the copying.
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hereafter ABSY] T 629, Yet this scripture (hereafter K-ABSY), lines 60-274 is preceded by the same preface (l. 1-59), by Kang Senghu, who actively (active during the second half of the 3rd century AD), that is prefixed also to the ABSSM T 602.

Three short glosses, all ascribed to a certain "master" (雛川), are attached to the end of the *sttras* (l. 275-281), apparently as a concise exegetical appendix on the K-ABSY]. Short and fragmentary as they are, these glosses constitute a testimony of pivotal importance for our research, as I will show later (§ 6.2.2).

In spite of the historical puzzles it poses, the K-ABSY] can be considered without excessive doubt a genuine translation by An Shigao, as is suggested by some quotations from this text found in early commentaries* and chiefly by its style and terminology**.

b) *Shir'men 十二門-section. This portion contains two sttras of similar content, a longer and a shorter one: the Fo shuo shir'men jing 梵說十二門經 (l. 282-504, hereafter SMJ) and the Fi shuo je shir'men jing 佛說解十二門經 (l. 556-584, hereafter [SMJ]). These two sttras are followed by a rather long commentary which bears neither title nor author's name (l. 585-583, hereafter [SMJ][comm]) largely devoted to an explanation of the "twelve gates" 十二門 dealt with in the two sttras (mainly, it seems, with reference to the SMJ)**.

A striking feature of the whole MS is that all the texts it contains are in fact anonymous, no author or translator's name being mentioned anywhere. Not only does An Shigao's name not appear at all, but even Kang Senghui's is not directly referred to, although his preface to the Aohan shouyi jing beginning the MS is indeed a well-known document**.

---

* On the uranic problems raised by the discovery of the Kongtji Aohan shouyi jing, especially with regard to its relation to T 602, see Prof. Deleaun's detailed study (2003 and forthcoming, section 2, pp. 13-29) and Ohsato 2002: To my knowledge, the only modern translations of the ABSY T 602 are those by Uti (1979: 201-244) and Du Jiewen (1997).

** See Deleaun forthcoming n. 20.

*** Zachers 2002 b.

**** See Deleaun's detailed treatment of this issue (forthcoming, beginning of section 2).

** The at the end of the scroll the title Shir'men changoung 十二門經 (l. 584), Dhyana-sttras as the twelve paths, is attached: this might refer to the Shir'men 十二門 section as a whole.

*** This fact — whatever its actual cause — lends the Kongtji MS a somewhat archaic appearance. Cf. for instance, the Buddhist manuscript contained in the Nanban-dera 七寺 collection (七寺一卷17-3 = ABSY] T 602; photograph kindly provided by Prof. Ohsato), which bears the indication (後藤安理英). We ought not to forget that many Buddhist manuscripts, before Daext's work, were not considered as attribution (at times conjectural) and classification, must have looked not too distinctively from our MS. As we read in Duan's biography (CSSJ] p. 108a 19:21; lao zhu shang 高僧傳 T 2059 p. 552a 28—b 1; cf. Tokumo 1990-94 n. 18), "From the Han, Wei until the Jin dynasty the scriptures were coming to China in increasingly high number, but the translators' names were not mentioned, and none of those who in later periods searched for [these data] had been able to estimate the epoch [of a certain translation]. —* (高僧遁敏, 道安抄, 高僧傳入三. 148, 149; 道安僧傳. 高僧傳代. 114). Cf. also
Another general remark which should perhaps be made here is that our MS, apart from having preserved texts lost in China at a very early date, seems also to have preserved them rather well. Scribal errors, regrettably common in An Shigao's corpus, seem comparatively less frequent in this MS, although this is, of course, difficult to assess with precision in the absence of a parallel textual tradition which could provide us with a measure of comparison.

3. The two 斯特羅ns on the Twelve Gates: A synthetic description

In order to facilitate the following discussion, and mainly because the MS is still unpublished, I shall give here a somewhat detailed description of the two 斯特羅ns contained in the Shèr 湘南-section of the Kongō-ji MS. The SMcomm, which poses particular problems, will be dealt with apart (see § 6).

Zürcher's remarks (1972: 30-33). Whether this Kongōji MS, in spite of an interval of so many centuries, indeed reflects a pre-Dao-an edition is a question I must leave to experts in codicology. 13 See Vetter and Harrison 1998: 198-200.

However, they are by no means absent. For instance, I have noticed (in both MS A and B) the word for 慈悲 (MS A1 292 and 294); cf. the correct reading on L 489). See also n. 30, 33, 89 and 122 below for some seemingly corrupt passages. There are also a few instances of later correction: e.g. some characters skipped while copying the text have been inserted between L 309-301 and 493-494.

14 The only exception is Kang Senghu's preface, which is also found in the 慈愚. This document, too, deserves a detailed analysis in the light of the Kangōji MS. Here I will mention only one example. There is one passage in this preface which appears corrupt in the whole available tradition. It is an interesting metaphor of the mind's activity: as prefixed to the Fu zha dà dànhào záiyì jīng 摄大法湛《大苑意經》 T 602 is reads (p. 16a 14-16) coll. Zanghao Daosangong 《大護三藏觀》. Beijing 1984: 1984-1988 - hereafter Zanghao - vol. 36, p. 159b 13, apparatus p. 115c); 從江州( createState 12th century AD = 慈愚) 隨手撰種有未緣果人不識此種種不於其種類, The text of the same passage as recorded in Senguo's 聖果's 慈愚 jì 聖果師記 (hereafter CSZJ) T 245 p. 45a 9-10 (cf. Zanghao vol. 53, 91b 15, apparatus p. 919): reads: 從江州( createState 5th century AD = 慈愚) 隨手撰種有未緣果人不識此種種不於其種類, As we can see, the problem is in the seventh (and it part also in the eighth) character. Link (1976: 69-70) translated this passage as: "This may be linked to a stupid farmer's (wrong) tiny seeds, when these seedlings flourish there will be a million [new plants]. Nevertheless, as of now] bystanders do not see their forms, nor does that farmer know the number of [their inevitable yield]." He then remarked in a footnote (1970: 70 n. 34) that: "... The Chinese for this sentence is very licent and it appears corrupt in part. ... I assume two characters missing, a verb meaning 'to sow' after 逐緣果. In-Link conjectured a lacuna of two characters because on the one hand he considered 慈愚 (attested in the CSZJ) a genuine reading (see id. 5a 35 p. 70), while having, on the other hand, to account for the four characters proverbial pattern consistently applied in this portion of Kang Senghu's text. Cf. Nakajima (1997: 8 n. 7) who, reading 慈愚 as a noun ('sower'), or to interpret 逐缘果 as the main verb, reading it as a mere filler. In fact, the reading found in our MS, both A and B and provides us with the solution to the problem: (L 10-11) 逐緣果 establishments. (The MS actually has a variant for 慈愚 with the radical 狐, of which I could find no record in the main character dictionaries). I would translate: 'It resembles a sower who picks up tiny seeds in the darkens etc. This fact too, trivial as it may seem, corroborates the impression that this MS, though materially copied at a comparatively late date has, in fact, preserved an old and rather genuine textual tradition.
Putative originals of some terms discussed in this article are as a rule given in Sanskrit: this is done merely for the sake of convenience and without any implication as to the language of the original texts\(^9\).

My punctuation and translation of the passages quoted, as well as, at places, my reading of the MS, merely represent a first, tentative step toward the interpretation of these often difficult texts\(^10\).

3.1. The Fo shuo shi’er men jing

This scripture, the most important *stūra* of the Shi’er men-section, is made up of two main sections, preceded by a short introduction.

The twelve mediative stages (*門*), after which the two *stūras* are named, are described in a direct and at times lively way, with comparatively few technicalities. The description of each “gate” is closed by a formula repeated with minimal variants, e.g.: "This is practising in accordance with the fist [second etc.] gate"\(^11\).

This first exposition is followed by a conclusive, shorter section which provides the reader / hearer with a more technical interpretation: the twelve methods are either directly identified, or made identifiable through the description of the factors associated to them.

This scripture has neither initial (evam mayā śrūtam etc.) nor closing formulas. Details are as follows:

(l. 282) Title: "*Stūra* on the twelve gates preached by the Buddha”

(l. 288-287) Introductory section: the condition of people "fallen into craving" (貪著) is even harder than that of prisoners kept in jail. Therefore the Buddha taught these twelve gates as a method leading to escape (this metaphor is in fact the main reason for provisionally translating *門* as "gate"): of course "method", "teaching" etc. could be preferable in a different context.

(l. 288-295) First gate: when observing his own body (自觀身), one has to keep his mind on the impurities of which it is made up\(^12\) in order to avoid the craving

\(^9\) In fact, generally speaking, Sanskrit seems a rather unlikely hypothesis for the originals of An Shigao’s translations; see remarks by Harrison 2002: 25.

\(^{10}\) Conjectural emendations of the readings attested in the MS are marked as follows: * substituted readings; <+ character(s) to be added; - (character[s] to be deleted).

\(^{11}\) 境德慧二門行 294-295.

\(^{12}\) Cf. Dīgha II 229, 19 – 204, 4 (Mahāsāṃghikasūtra), where this particular contemplation of the body’s parts is described as one of the various practices of the *Aṭṭhakathāpaññāsa* (see Gethin 2006: 40); cf. also the corresponding section of the *NanCHA jing* 仁愛經 found in the Chinese *Mādhyamāgama*, 十愛經 聖 368b 17-18 and see Makita 1975: 751 n. 52 for further references. An interesting parallel occurs also in the *Lu du ji jing* 露戴經 T 152 translated by Kang Senhui.
originating from a positive evaluation. The same method is to be applied to the observation of another person’s body.

(I. 206-303) The second gate is devoted to the observation of sensations (vigour, vedanā), i.e. in short: "By carefully considering how painful sensations [always] follow pleasant sensations, the wise person having obtained [something] does not feel happy, having lost [something] does not grieve"19.

(I. 301-504) The third gate deals with the observation of mind (citta); again, as in the first gate, both one’s own and other people’s mind (self-awareness, awareness by oneself). Given that unregulated mental activity (volition is, delusion is) causes the cause of distress and makes the mind agitated (the wise person, hence, removes thoughts (slant); having removed thoughts, the mind gets fixed20.

(I. 305-510) The fourth gate, following the list of headings of the suttavimutthana, contains an analysis of dhāmanā, here specified as positive and negative courses of actions21. More precisely, the analysis seems to be focused on the principle of karmic causality22.

(hereinafter LDL) I 152): see p. 414 5-10 (p. Link 1976: 128). This is closer to the SMJ passage so far as this contemplation is connected to the attainment of the dhamma (cf. below f. 5 and Lamotte 1949: 1025 and n. 1). According to Link’s analysis this portion belongs to the introductory chapter, composed by Kang himself, to the Dhyānaratnasūtra section of the LDL I 152: however, this interpretation has been questioned in a recent study (see Shi Tchiunfung 1998: 96-97).

I tentatively presume: 許可枝即是題, 識自內心; 题自死者, 許可枝 (f. 296b-299a, or from 297a-299a, etc.). In the exposition of this gate, the sthāna is apparently used and used in the sense ‘heaviness’ indicated in my translation (though not without some ambiguity): cf. HUD 8. 920a. A similar definition is also found in the YCJT T 1699 p. 11c: 5-8: 夫為難理, 識自內心, 行行處處, 用事者, 失之不覺, commenting on vedanāāhupassutā: this gloss seems somewhat reminiscent of this passage of the SMJ (comment), and could in fact be the underlying interpretation of the well-known archaic translation of vedanā as 頭痛 (i.e. “painful and pleasant sensations” vs. “sensations [in general]”). Note also that 識自內心 is fairly common in An Shigao’s corpus e.g. see the Chang when shi huo fang jing. 頭痛十喻法經 T 10 (Dhatatantrika, hereinafter SBJ.) p. 234b 2: 四頭痛: vāraṇī Triśalī: see the Jing 1900: 1053, on this usage see also remarks by Zürcher 1972: 531 n. 88 and Fang Xin 1997: 145-146.

19 頭痛十喻法結 T 10 (Dhatatantrika, hereinafter SBJ.) p. 234b 2: 四頭痛: vāraṇī Triśalī: see the Jing 1900: 1053, on this usage see also remarks by Zürcher 1972: 531 n. 88 and Fang Xin 1997: 145-146.

20 頭痛十喻法結 T 10 (Dhatatantrika, hereinafter SBJ.) p. 234b 2: 四頭痛: vāraṇī Triśalī: see the Jing 1900: 1053, on this usage see also remarks by Zürcher 1972: 531 n. 88 and Fang Xin 1997: 145-146.

21 自動性: 非意, presumable = dhāmanā, adhimana. In the light of some parallels from An Shigao’s translations I read the first character of the list of negative behaviours (I. 306) = non-d, not too clear in either MS A or B, cf. f. 830 BBC T 15 p. 2a 10-11. 識自內心 = one’s own thought, thoughts, in the sense of 識自內心: etc.; and ARBQ T 602 p. 165c 28: 觀思惟心等; cf. if this interpretation proves correct, the list of भविष्य would be the same as in this passage of the ARBQ T 602. On the other hand, the positive behaviours (list) are, more generally, “obedience, [and] doing [other similar] positive deeds” 22 賣者十喻 T 107 (cf. ARBQ T 602 p. 164a 21: 布施等一切都是: The pattern: negative — positive dhāmanas (to more than this) is also met with in the relevant section of the Mahāpātimokṣa-dātānātha — i.e. dhamma-maññatā-dātānātha (Dīgha II 300: 4-314, 10; see Devin 2001: 95, as well as in the corresponding sthāna of the Chinese Madhyamagama (T 106, p. 541a 14- b 14). But the viewpoint expressed in the SMJ seems rather different.

The text of this paragraph is a bit obscure. According to the SMJ, the wise person, through careful consideration, “will understand [the principle] that by doing this one would get this [as a result]”, this being able to determine (decide?) the causal pattern, either positive to be followed [256]
(l. 311-314) The practise of the fifth gate consists in being able to control one's mind and keep it even and free from agitation in front of enemies, offences, slander etc.

(l. 315-318) The sixth gate too preaches self-control toward hostility, though not just of enemies: here the attira also mentions "the five kinds of relations: an acquaintance as well as wife, children, father, mother" as possible offenders. However, a different attitude is emphasised at the end of the section: "he [viz. who practises this method] is constantly compassionate, constantly devises expeditents to make [all the beings] be released."...

(l. 319-324) Seventh gate: whenever one gets relief from an unpleasant condition (such as cold or hot weather, hunger etc.), he should think of extending the same benefit to other beings: "as to the people of the worlds in the ten directions, I will let them be like myself"...

(l. 324-329) The eighth gate preaches equanimity toward other people's actions, either negative or positive (slander or praise etc.).

(l. 329-332) Ninth gate: "the myriad of things having appeared, successively in the future (?) [... do not exist [any more]; not existing any more, they are empty. Why empty? They are empty because they manifest themselves impermanently. Having understood this idea, [the practitioner] will be aware of empty space; such is practising in accordance with the ninth gate."...

or negative (to be avoided), and (by acting accordingly) to "get reward, proceed on the Path, attain the Path". 論入調解証, 使如: 可是普通, 使因縁縁。不修行不果得, 使因縁因緣, 使得福, 行道, 得道, I. 367-369.

15 Gates 5-8 deal with the four apramāṇa. Here the exposition of these categories is mainly carried out from the viewpoint of the negative mental states opposed by each infinitive (cf. Abhidharma-kāśita p. 909, 9-19; tr. La Vallée-Poussin, Rhïès ch. 8 p. 196: "Quatre Apramânas qui, dans l'ordre, s'opposent à l'hostilité, l'ignorance, etc.").

16 The translation of the Japanese is somewhat cumbersome and has been somewhat simplified.


18 See the glossary for the full form (l. 317-318).

19 使如: 以之; 令之; 使之, 今如法, (l. 522-525).

20 Unusually, the eighth and ninth gates begin in the same paragraph as the preceding topic (in both MS A and B).

21 Given the context, I take 論 to correspond to "stūpa", "empty space".

22 The reading of this whole passage is rather difficult also because, I assume, it was wrongly transmitted at one point. Tentatively I read; 第九門行空等; 譯曰第N相空 本來來時的(已初所), 已初所平, 預空; 非實見空; 非實見空; 已初所平, 預空, 今如法, 譯之第九門行(329-332).

23 Note, however, that the part I propose to expunge, (33), seems to have been added later and is partially written beneath the inferior margin of the folio in MS A, though not in B, a fact which would seemingly exclude a mere scribal mistake, at least on the part of the scribe of the MS.
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(L. 333-336) Tenth gate: once the mind of the practitioner has been applied to the empty space (若意已空, 空念, 聲空), he will then realise that his mind is not yet released because of his being mindful of empty space (便自計: "聞未得開解, 則以放? 念空放? "). Then he lessens his concentration and mindfulness of the space and, as a result, he will now become instead aware of consciousness, and will then consider (again), that his mind is not yet released. To consider (2) in this way is practising in accordance with the tenth gate.

(L. 337-339) Eleventh gate: the practitioner of the preceeding meditative method (行者) understands that his mind is not yet released because of a residual "pain" related to consciousness (L. 338: 常有識苦故; awareness of this leads to restraining the consciousness (L. 338-339: 常識故)

(L. 340-341) Twelfth gate: "..." thinking of this [certain thing], one will fall within [the sphere of] perception-activity; eliminating [this], one will fall within [the sphere of] no-perception (L. 340-341: 已念是, 便復思想行, 斷, 便復無有思想)"

(L. 343-344) Second section of the stūtra: the twelve gates are listed anew, and each is followed by a short explanation. Here all the gates, except the first four, are in fact defined more or less explicitly. For instance, the seventh gate is defined and elucidated as follows:

"Seventh gate: the sentiment of joy (喜心, 欣喜) Why the sentiment of joy? If one obtains for himself the profound teaching (深義), and preaches it in turn to others; one obtains for himself wellbeing, and makes others too well, [this] is because [their] minds share the same joy."56

On the other hand, this is the explanation, without definition, of the first gate:

"The first gate possesses thinking (思) and dealing with [the object of thinking] (思) [Why? Because the practitioner's] mind is not turned toward listening to the teaching (Dharma)."

In short, the function performed by this second section is to provide the key to the various practises described in the previous part. It appears quite clear that the twelve topics discussed in this stūtra can be subdivided into three fourfold groups.

---

54 便不復觀空, 梟不念空, 己故住空, 同時覺滅, 便應計: "聞未得開解, 則以放念空放念", "聞未開解, 則以放念空放念", (L. 354-355).

56 In view of the context (阿毘婆沙論阿毘婆沙論, 統説), it could also be interpreted in the more negative sense of "suppressing the consciousness".

57 The initial phrase of the passage on the twelfth gate is very obscure and possibly corrupt.

58 Alternatively: 己念是: 便復思想行, 斬, 便復無有思想? Note that, in any case, this does not seem to correspond perfectly to 阿毘婆沙論阿毘婆沙論 (cf. below § 39).

59 第七門: 喜心, 何以故喜心? 自他深勝, 聽轉人說; 自得安樂, 亦使此人安樂, 爲眾開導 (L. 854-855).

60 On these terms see below § 5 n. 95-96.

61 第一門言及, 有摩, 何以故? 慎不於開轉放 (L. 343).
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Leaving aside for the moment the group of the first four gates, which poses particular problems (see below § 5), the other groups are defined as follows:

gate 5: even mind (等心, *samcit—see below § 4.4);
gate 6: compassionate mind (慈心, *karunā);
gate 7: sentiment of joy (喜心, *mudita);
gate 8: controlled mind (徳心, *śuptaśī);  
gate 9: being mindful of empty space (虚空);
gate 10: no-desire (無愛);
gate 11: consciousness (識);
gate 12: without perception and also having perception (*).

In other words, the second and third groups of gates are the "four infinitudes" (catvāry apramānānā) and the "four immaterial attainments" (catāvara dātīpya-samāpattayaḥ) respectively.

3.2 The Fo shou jie shi' er mei jing

The second astra⁶ contained in the Shi'er men-section, the JSM, is a much shorter text (i. 365-384), being in fact slightly shorter than just the second section of the SMJ. This is no coincidence; in fact its structure and content closely resemble that part of the preceding astra, the JSM, too, lists the twelve gates, providing short definitions. Nevertheless, these are clearly two different, albeit closely related, texts. On the whole, the JSM's terminology is consistent with that of the SMJ, but not without exception.

The result of my analysis is that the definitions and explanations of gates n. 5, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 found in the JSM are approximately consistent with the

---

⁶ The text of the last two definitions (tenth—eleventh gates) is difficult to understand, and the correct interpretation of the relevant categories is in fact only made possible by the first section of the SMJ (i. 339-349, see pp. 237-238 above). Unless I have missed something in the argument introduced by the astra, it would appear that the definition provided in this section for the eleventh gate, 聲 (i.e. *śūdra), would better match the preceding gate, which is obviously (cf. the first section, as paraphrased above) the viśuddhānāmāyāvatāna. On the other hand, 智 remains problematic for me.

Note, however, that almost identical definitions are also found in the JSM. It is true that viśuddhāna is normally mentioned within the exposition of the dīkṣāpratyākṣa (e.g. in Vinnatthināga (pp. 275-276 or even in this same SMJ i. 540-542), but only as a stage to be surpassed.

⁷ 見有心亦有是心 (cf. the Foochun renhen yueh jing 梵修人本護生經 T 14 p. 240a 29; 見有心亦有是心). U 1971: 405; this might simply be a slightly inaccurate translation of prajñāpratītyaśamputa (dīkṣā), with the double negation interpreted as a straight affirmation. But this point was debated by the schools, and in fact the Theravāda opinion was that there is satisfaction present in this meditative stage (see Bhikkhuskit 1953: 61 n. 8; Bareau 1955: 218 thesis 83).

⁸ In a previous study devoted to the Kāngjiān (see Kajura 2001: 49), the JSM has been tentatively considered part of the commentary which indeed follows it (i.e. the SMJ commentator). However, apart from the title (樓記) and the content, this text can be identified as an astra from its closing formula (see below).
corresponding passages of the second section of the SMJ. For instance, this is how the JSM defines the seventh gate (cf. above):

What is the seventh gate, the sentiment of delight (17)? One should make all the people of the ten directions get to know and practice with reverence the deep teaching this is dear to oneself.48

Here is, in short, the structure of the JSM:

(l. 565) Title: *Śīla* preached by the Buddha explaining the twelve gates*

(566-585) Exposition of the twelve gates.

(l. 583-584) Closing formula: "Thus having spoken the Buddha, the disciples rejoiced and took it up."49

Given that the SMJ and the JSM were probably translated by the same person, one wonders why a translator should have taken the trouble to produce two texts that are so similar. A possible answer is that he did so because the two texts were originally edited together, forming a pair of *āṭṭhas* dealing with the same subject.50 The Pali *Samyutta-nikāya* and *Aṭṭhakathā-nikāya* contain many scriptures linked in this way.51

This observation brings us to another problem: the identification of the *Āgama* to which these two *āṭṭhas* originally belonged. However, in the absence of precise

---

48 愛心 is somewhat puzzling for the expected *mudita* (cf. Zecchetti 2002: 85 n. 58).
49 僧正心 資與等 2 身內所宜善風。 今命十王方時善脚行 (l. 575-576).
50 僧正心 資與善行。 今命十王方時善脚行 (see Froning and Harrison 1988: 211).
51 I wish to thank Dr. Mark Allen for a number of references (see n. 45 below) and invaluable suggestions on this point. In a personal communication of 26 December 2002, Dr. Allen also kindly drew my attention to some features of the two *āṭṭhas* I had overlooked in drafting my Bangkok paper. As noted above, the SMJ has an introductory section acting as a sort of *mīładātu*, two main sections and no closing formula. On the other hand, the JSM has the closing formula but no introduction, and its text is very similar to the second section of the preceding *āṭṭha* with some variations. These facts, too, would suggest a close editorial relationship between SMJ and JSM: according to Dr. Allen, "it is possible that in the case of the second *āṭṭha* one should understand or 'reconstruct' when resting the introduction and the first of the two main sections of the first *āṭṭha*. Similarly, the conclusion of the second *āṭṭha* should be added to the first *āṭṭha* to make that complete. The structure of both *āṭṭhas* would have been: introduction; ii) topic part A; iii) topic part B (vibhaṅga or defining of concepts given in part A); iv) conclusion. The two *āṭṭhas* differed only in section iii). That the two texts, at least after having been transcribed, were meant to be edited in sequence, as they are preserved in the Keng-ji MS, is also suggested by the JSM’s comm., which follows the SMJ but ignores from the SMJ (see below § 6.2.1 p. 284).
52 For instance, *Sagārīya II* pp. 60-65, *āṭṭhas* n. 27 (Pacayu and 28 (Vakkhāla); pp. 56-60, n. 33 and 54 (Nāsasa vatagra) 1-2; pp. 65-68, n. 58-60 (Cetani 1-3). The *Ottakānupitaka* of the *Aṭṭhakathā-nikāya* also contains a number of *āṭṭhas* linked thematically: see Allen 2001: 18-19 for a general treatment of this subject. Perhaps also the *Oleśa; Mōḥē* pairs in the *Mūla-sūtra-nikāya* (see Norman 1983: 44-45) should be mentioned here.
parallels in other canonical collections (Pali, Chinese etc.), any hypothesis (also with regard to the closely related problem of the sectarian affiliation of SMJ and JSM[*]) would remain at best speculative. The strictly numerical arrangement of topics in both attiras – a feature, in fact, shared by many attiras of all collections – is noteworthy, as it perfectly fits An Shigao’s corpus as a whole.[6]

4. The history of SMJ and JSM

The two scriptures described in the preceding paragraph are not found in any known edition of the Chinese canon. Thus one of the main problems posed by the Rougo-jō finding is the identification of the texts contained in the manuscript.

In the following paragraphs, I will survey the information relevant to SMJ and JSM available in early bibliographical sources, so as to trace, at least in part, the history of these texts and to come up with a hypothetical identification.

4.1 Dao’an’s prefaces

The C20ZJ preserves two prefaces by the celebrated fourth century master Dao’an 連安 (512-585 AD) that are relevant to our research. They are probably the earliest,

[*] About this problem (aptly called “a buddhological minefield” by Harris in 1997: 279; I can say little, apart from making the very general observation that if An Shigao was indeed the translator of the SMJ and JSM, there are reasons for believing (with much caution) that his other attiras translations belong to the Suyuweizhuan (see Harris in 1997: 280 and 2002: 23-24). Cf. Zucchetti in 2002: 94.

[6] Some early bibliographical catalogues, in mentioning the two Shīrū men jing (i.e. in all likelihood, as I will show below, our SMJ and JSM[)], give some information, or, more probably, make some conjectures, about their origin. There are two distinct traditions on this point (see also Forte in 2008: 188-189). According to the first, apparently originating in the highly unreliable Iduo sannü jì (latitude triad) by Fei Zhangping (Fengzhang) 蘭若尊者 T 2054, and taken over by other subsequent catalogues (e.g. the Zhisheng’s intelligence lituan Shi jin 卷元精條錄 T 2154 p. 40th [17-18]; note that this catalogue was completed in 790 AD when the two texts were already lost in China), the two Shīrū men jing belonged to the Duckigāna (see T 2054 p. 50th 10:11). 大十門龍 一卍… (出師精等). This seems very unlikely in view of the limited size of both texts; yet it is not impossible to explain Fei Zhangping’s mistake (see n. 107 below). On the other hand, in the 36 Zhou mental reading changing male, the two attiras are listed among the Ekottarīkāgama transactions (see T 2153 p. 622b16, 23 and 624a 15). We have no way to determine on which basis the compilers of this catalogue came to this classification. Primarily, given the numerical structure of these attiras, it seems to make more sense than the preceding one. But a nigata of the twelve is not attested in any known Ekottarīkāgama. Norman (1988: 55) points out that some attiras at the end of the tenth nigata of the Alagātana-ālākāya include groups of 20, 30 and 40; but these may be seen as further combinations of ten. By exclusion, a Ekottarīkāgama origin would seemingly remain the most plausible hypothesis in view of the structure of the pair SMJ and JSM (discussed above) and of their comparative shortness, although the latter is hardly a conclusive argument: for instance, the Medhācandakāya (T 26) contains a number of short attiras (e.g. n. 44, 45, 47–) which is much shorter than our SMJ, JSM etc.; cf. also Allon in 2001: 15-16.


and definitely the most significant surviving historical sources on the *Shārīer men*-section of the MS.

The first is the "Preface to the *Shārīer men jing*" 十二門經序，found in CSZJ [p. 48b 26 – 46a 13]). The content of the *Shārīer men jing* is summarised at the beginning of the document as consisting of three meditative categories: "diyāna, espansion, empty (space meditation)" (19). Given that the last two terms are to be interpreted as a reference to the "four infinitudes" (caityavāramatattvāni) and to the "four immaterial attainments" (caturāra ārthiyasaṃsattayān) respectively (on the four diyānas see § 5 below), the content of the scripture available to Dao’an appears to have indeed agreed with the "twelve gates" expounded by both the SMJ and the JSMJ.

The rest of Dao’an’s text is largely devoted to an exposition of these leitmotifs, carried on in the often baroque style which, to modern scholars’ despair, is characteristic of Dao’an’s prefaces. The information concerning the translator is, as usual, to be found at the end of the document. We learn that Dao’an composed a commentary on this scripture, which he conjecturally attributed to An Shigao in view of its content, indeed one of the Parthian’s strong points (see also § 6.2.1 for further remarks on this preface) (20).

The second document is the "Preface to the Larger *Shārīer men jing*" 大十二門經序 (CSZJ [p. 46a 14 – b 18]). The description of the scripture’s content, as we can read it, or rather guess at, beneath the heavy stucco-work of Dao’an’s prose, is also

---


20 For this description see Donnéville 1956: 355 n. 1.
consistent with that of SM and JSM, although the learned exegete did not adhere to the sequence of topics found in the stīras.  

This translation, unlike the one dealt with in the preceding preface, is definitely attributed by Dao'an to An Shigao, and in fact excelled as the most detailed of the dhyānasūtras.  

This stīra, too, was commented on by Dao'an.  

It is impossible to establish with absolute certitude the dating, either absolute or relative, of these prefaces. However, they were clearly composed in close connection to the commentaries to the two stīras, which, in turn, probably date back to the early phase of Dao'an's career.  

4.2 The indirect tradition  
As in the case of the K-ABSV, the most significant evidence of the authenticity of the SM (see also below, § 6.2.2.2 p. 286 for the SM (comm. is provided by the indirect tradition. As already observed by Prof. Ochiai, the Feng fa pa 3.43 most probably is a Buddhist catechism (as Zürcher describes it) composed by the prominent layman Xi Chao 西曄 in 356–377 and preserved in Sengyou's 隊鶴 Authorology 大藏記 ji 弘明集 T 2102 (p. 86a25 – 86b2), contains a quotation from a Skt men jing which in part matches a passage of the SM:  

[Chinese text]  

Although theoretically one cannot exclude the possibility that he was quoting from a slightly different text, I think it is much more likely that Xi Chao, instead, quoted rather freely from our SM. Apart from a number of minor variants, he
omitted the beginning of the passage (因為觀其), thus making it difficult its full understanding, and condensed into a few characters the phrase on examining another person’s body.

Inaccurate as it may be, this quaestion makes the hypothesis that the SM, at least, is an apocryphal work quite improbable.

Yet the Feng fu yao, while providing us with this precious piece of evidence, also poses a rather puzzling problem. A few lines before the passage discussed above, we find another quaestion:

“我出十二門經者，人有難，持詣施之，有病，宜令飲之。
(T 2102 p. 87a 21-29)"

I have not been able to trace this passage in the MS, nor to find any other mention of this “我出十二門經”. At present I see no convincing solution to this problem.

4.3 The catalogues

The CSZJ list two Shi'er men-related scriptures in the catalogues of An Shigao’s translation:

* Larger suzen on the twelve gates, one scroll. Lesser suzen on the twelve gates, one scroll.

In my opinion, this classification was probably worked out by Dao’an, given that it was apparently still absent when he composed the first preface discussed above (cf. n. 57) and is not mentioned by Xi Chao; however, it is already employed in the list of his commentaries quoted in the CSZJ:

"The *Larger* and the *Lesser suzen on the twelve gates* are the saccrine storehouse of the dhyana thought; I have composed an extensive commentary on each of them: in two jiao on the *Larger suzen on the twelve gates*, in one jiao on the *Lesser suzen on the twelve gates* (nowadays existing)".

* Makita 1975: 702; Zürcher 1972: 107) translates: “It is said in the separate exists of the *Shi'er men* -shing. What is proof in a man should always be kept hidden, but what is evil in him must always be clearly exposed". In note 51 p. 376, Zürcher remarks that the two texts quoted by Xi Chao should be the larger and smaller *Shi'er men jing*; this would be indeed the most logical interpretation (see also Ut 1956: 98 and Makita 1975: 720 n. 299): if the MS were not available to us!

** However, it is interesting to note that the CSZJ (p. 7a 31) lists a hou Shi'ermen dangjia jing (recorded in the Bula 禪經 - on which see Forte 1968: 185-186 - but not in Dao’an’s catalogues) translated by Zhiguan 真諦 (see also T 2108 p. 116c 17: T 2135 p. 486a 5).

** On the catalogues’ testisacity concerning the Shi'er men jings, see Forte 1968: 184-189 and Kajura 2011: 38.

** 大十二門經一卷；小十二門經一卷 (CSZJ p. 5c 25-27). According to Hayashi’s reconstruction (1941:590) this record was drawn from Dao’an’s catalogue: The figure “one jiao” +1 was used as a conventional unit for whatever scripture could be contained in one scroll (ranging from a few lines to the entire scroll). See, for example, the *Zengming mai* 之明利法 T 2148 p. 185a 2. 现存多此经一卷 一卷 and passim. I am also grateful to Mr. Kajura for elucidations on this topic.

** 大小十二門經，釋尊之奥秘也，為各作注，六作注。大十二門二卷，小十二門一卷 (今存) (CSZJ)
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The Zhongjing wula 衆聖目錄 T 2146 (compiled by Fajing 法性 and others in 594 AD) records the Larger and the Lesser stūpas in the section "Suttoništa,aka of the Lesser Vehicle (i.e., the 梵聖多羅頌 T 2146 p. 128a 13-14), but given that this catalogue did not differentiate extant and non-extant scriptures87, it is impossible to establish whether the two stūpras were still in circulation at that time. However, the homonyms catalogues composed a few years later (692 AD) by a team led by the famous monk Yancang 彦悰 (T 2147)88, lists them among the lost texts 驚本 (T 2147 p. 178a 12-14). At all events, it seems unlikely that our texts vanished in the very short lapse of time which divides the compilation of the two catalogues89, during a period when, moreover, Chinese Buddhism was enjoying considerable support from the Sui 蘇 court90.

Be that as it may, all the subsequent catalogues list our two stūpras as lost91.

Does it necessarily mean that the ancestor of our MS reached Japan before the Sui? Perhaps not. In fact, at least parts of the text(s) seem to have circulated as excerpts since a comparatively early date92. Therefore it is not impossible that the text(s) could have survived in this way, or perhaps under a different title. So, for instance, the very same catalogue which recorded the early disappearance of the two stūpras contains an entry, in the section devoted to the "independently circulating

87 p. 9b 8-9; see also the preceding note. According to Fajing (1968: 189), Senjō's annotation, "nowadays excised," refers only to the commentary on the lesser stūpa. Cf. Zhongjing wula 衆聖目錄 T 2146 p. 148a 29-37 (Kajitani 506: 40): 某十二門說法經（釋道安）: 十二門喃喃法経（釋道安）.
90 There is in fact some evidence that Yancang had also taken part in the compilation of T 2146 (see Chen 1992: 45).
91 If the two stūras at times were indeed lost in the main calendrical collections at that time, then it would seem logistic to assume that the had happened during the harsh anti-Buddhist persecution carried out by the Northern Zhou 北齊 dynasty in 574-577 AD, which also involved destruction of Buddhist scriptures (e.g., see Kanata 2002: 445). The fact that Fei Zhongying's 上軫和尚 Lidai zhengfo ji 原始三寶記 T 2054, composed in 597 AD, records the two SN 文的 men jing within the list of An Shigao's translations (T 2054 p. 506: 18-11) would seem to rule out this hypothesis. But Fei Zhongying's catalogue is a notoriously unreliable source (e.g., see Tokuno 1990: 44-47; Force 1995: 81-82).
92 p. 186.
93 E.g., see CNJ, T 2147 p. 10a 4-9; 第二四門經 one (出大十二部經)、第二四門經—等 etc. (cf. T 2147 p. 184b 24-25, where one of these excerpts is also mentioned); see also Kajitani 2001: 58. On the biblio-graphical category "condensed scriptures" (詰経), which also includes excerpts, see Tokuno 1990: 94-96 and 41-42. Interestingly, this way of subdividing the SMJ (cf. also n. 15 below) may well have originated in the SMJ comm itself; see t. 410:11-11: 僧伽、行第三四門典、等; 行第二四門典, 等; i.e., "attaining 'complementation' (upapada); one practices the 勧提摩術 consisting of the first four gātes; attaining 'burning' (viparitas), one practices the dhyānaśāstra consisting of the second four gātes; attaining purification (paribodha), one practices the dhyānaśāstra consisting of the third four gātes" (on the terminology used in this passage of the SMJ comm, see p. 283 below).
excerpts from [scriptures belonging to the] Lesser Vehicle” (小乘阿含)9 which is

worth noticing:

十二門禪經—卷(T 2147 p. 177a 19; also in T 2160 p. 137c 25)

We have, of course, no way of knowing what this text contained. But, as remarked
in § 1 (n. 10), 十二門禪經 is the title found at the end of our MS.

4.4 Attribution

To sum up our discussion: we have a Laszer and a Lesser Twelve guses sittasus 大/
小十二門經, ascribed to An Shigao, well attested in the catalogues and said to have
been lost at a comparatively early date. We must admit that there is no direct
evidence linking the texts found in the Kongō-jō manuscript to the two scriptures
described by Dao'an in his two prefaces and subsequently listed in the catalogues.
However, if we try to assemble all the pieces of this puzzle (especially in the light of
Xi Chao’s quotation), the most reasonable hypothesis is that the SMJ and the JSMJ
are indeed the Da shi’er men jing 大十二門經 and the Xiao shi’er men jing 小十二門經
respectively.

There is, of course, the problem of the titles. While that of the SMJ virtually
corresponds to the one quoted by Xi Chao (and that should be the 大十二門經 if we
accept that this label 大 was added by Dao'an for sake of bibliographical
classification), the title of the JSMJ (佛說解十二門經), while perfectly logical in view
of the explanatory nature of this text, is not recorded elsewhere to the best of my
knowledge. It seems to have remained unknown even to Dao’an if, again, my
hypothesis ([SMJ = text prefaced in Dao’an’s 十二門經序 = 小十二門經 listed in the
catalogues) is correct. Yet I would not be overstatement this problem, given that
variations in the titles of sitrasus, especially in early translations, are far from
uncommon in the Chinese canon.

The fact that the K-ABSY is probably a genuine product of An Shigao’s workshop
(cf. § 2), provides us with another, albeit indirect, argument in favour of An Shigao’s
authorship (other corroborating evidence can be gathered from the SMJ comm: see §
6 below).

Internal analysis (style, terminology, etc.) is generally believed the most reliable
method for establishing an attribution (or at least for preventing us from excluding a
given attribution). I definitely agree in principle, but how carrying out such an
analysis, in practice, may present a bit of a problem.

9 On this category see Tokuno 1990: 42.
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Style would be the most reliable yardstick, as it is considered to be less easily borrowed than vocabulary. Yet an objective, reliable and detailed analysis of An Shigao’s style (especially contrasted to contemporary translators) is to my knowledge still to be written.

The same holds true for language (i.e., an analysis pointing out which constructions, particles etc. are typical of An Shigao, other absolutely or in terms of frequency, which could be very important too). Thus, we are mainly left to personal impressions. In this respect, both texts, SMJ and JSMJ, are plainly archaic in my opinion, and I see no reason for rejecting the attribution of these texts to An Shigao. Indeed, many terms and expressions found in these two scriptures have parallels in Parthian’s corpus (e.g. see n. 19, 21, 25, 95, 123).

In fact, it is not too easy to obtain definitive evidence solely from the analysis of terminology. An Shigao’s terminology was more widely adopted by other early – and not just early – translators than it is usually believed. Only semantic Indic-Chinese correspondences that are at the same time precise and peculiar to a given translator (especially translation errors and unusual interpretations) could provide significant evidence. Unfortunately we still have no precise Indic parallel of SMJ and JSMJ. This means that the only words for which we can reconstruct with a reasonable degree of certitude the Indic original, and which we can then in turn compare with other translations, are those taken from canonical lists, i.e. exactly those particularly liable to being adopted by other translators. With this caveat in mind, I will quote a few examples from the list of “four infinitives”, i.e. goes 5-8.

善心 translates *kasiti* in both SMJ (l. 550) and JSMJ (l. 571). This does not seem a particularly common rendering (although it is listed in Hirakawa 1997: 918b, obviously without references), and we find a similar usage in the Chang Anhun shi baofa ying (p. 55a) (hereafter SBFJ). T 13 p. 256a 3-4:

...有善悪定表...; this corresponds to *Dastottarastra* ed. Mital 1957: 77: ... (maktho) me<br>neetashamadhir ... (here 調寄養子 inverting)*18*, given that the parallel at p. 256a 9 suggests that *etashaṁmadhiḥ* is translated as 定表.\[...

As we have seen above, the third term of the list of infinitives is 善心 in the SMJ (l. 554); this rendering too – though itself far from being peculiar, unfortunately! – is paralleled in the SBFJ: see T 13 p. 256a 13:

...有善心等定表...; cf. *Dastottarastra* ed. Mital 1957: 78: ...maulīś me etashaṁmadhir ...

\*18To my knowledge the only text from An Shigao’s corpus so far edited and studied critically in comparison with an Indic parallel is the translation of the *Bhaktasūkanītīṭa* (pars. of T 150a): see Vetter and Harrer 1968.
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The fourth infinitude, *upekkhā*, is translated as 慈心 in SMJ (l. 355) and JSM (l. 377). This usage has a number of parallels in the Ym ch. ru jing 究竟入流 T 603 (hereafter YCR)79, e.g. p. 177 a 11: "... 以得_... here the text is on the whole very obscure) ~ *Peśapadopa* द 127, 5: *upekkhā va... sattathatā*80.

In short, three out of four81 renderings found in SMJ and JSM—the first possibly being of some significance—have parallels in other translations of An Shigao. If this, as observed above, is by no means conclusive, the opposite also holds true: lexical inconsistencies between SMJ and JSM, as well as between both texts and other translations by An Shigao, do not suffice to rule out An Shigao’s authorship82.

So, for instance, *vīraka* and *vīrāna* are apparently translated in both texts as **和** respectively (see p. 272 n. 95-96 below for further details). On the other hand, the SBE has the following translations (T 13 p. 254a 2-3):

...欲念...不善念...亦善念不善念...: cf. *Daśottaravāra* ed. Mittal 1957: 58: *svairākaśa svērākaśa aśubhāśubha vīrākaśa vīrākaśa anāśubhā* (i.e. here 欲念 = vīraka, and 善念 = vīrāna: cf. the SBE:comment: *n. 20*, p. 99).

Further analysis should perhaps focus on less technical usages, where our knowledge of the lexicon of the various early translators is still too limited to allow us definite conclusions as to the peculiarities of each author. I will, however, give an example here.

---

79 Here 無 is a bit unexpected, also the mention of 無_慕_在... in the following lines (SBE 256a 15-16) seems out of place (cf. Mittal 1957: 79 § VI.3 (b) b).

80 It occurs also in some later translations, although not too frequent: e.g. cf. Dharmakara's *Pu jiao jing* 佛敎經 (Longavatara) T 186 p. 523a 5: *...ගཉིས་ཀུན་ཐེག་པ་...*; *... and...* (cf. also the *Zengzi All jing* 增廣佛教 T 125 (Ekottarāyanas), e.g. p. 552 a 14 and 503 (some renderings as those by Dharmakara): cf. Thāk HānyāVi and Sākkañcha Prākārīka 202: 187 n. 26). Yet this translation is not entirely clear.

81 Nāpasloci, 1964: 172 p 511 translates...: *...onlooking-eporrity...* (as what it) shapes itself not... see also his remarks in n. 500 (p. 171). Note that in the preceding occurrences of this formula An Shigao seems to have translated *upekkhā* 無_慕_在 (p. 176, 22 and 177 a 1); cf. also 177 a 5-6.

82 I have not yet found a significant parallel in An Shigao's translation to the second apramāṇa, *慈心* (*karuṇā*) in both SMJ and JSM. Of course this rendering is not, as such, problematic at all: see for example, Dharmakara’s *Gaugā saṃ jīg* 光觀經 T 222 p. 1566 5: *...�行_大_愿...* Pathavivāsaṭhāsaka Prājanātāparāś ed. Dutt 62, 5; medtkaruṇā (cf. also Kassapa 1998: 61).

83 Elsewhere (Zacchetti 2002: 88 n. 74) I have mentioned two significantly different renderings of the same term found in the YCR T 603 and the SBE T 18, both generally ascribed to An Shigao (these two texts deserve a careful lexicographical analysis, as both have a comparatively close Indic parallel). Such lexical variations are quite frequent in An Shigao’s translation, as well as in other early translators’ works, even within the same text. Indeed it is lexical inconsistency that is, to a certain extent, one of the Parāhā's most conspicuous peculiarities (e.g. see Zacchetti 2002: 79 n. 64, p. 87 n. 72). This is not so surprising if we consider that the translation of these scriptures was a very complex team-work, involving assistants about whom (at this pioneering stage) we know nothing. Not infrequent is the fact that An Shigao’s activity stretched over a considerable lapse of time (see Forte 1995: 86).
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In the SMJ the verb at 计 (in various compounds such as 历计 1.286, 数计 1.355, 自计 1.354, 357) is at times employed to introduce one’s reflections and considerations:

... 自计 “I heard/heard about...” “(the practitioner) considers... my mind has not yet got released...” (1.357).

This particular usage is also found in other translations ascribed to An Shigao61. Of course, only a detailed analysis of all the early translations could enable us to judge whether — and to what extent — this is indeed a lexical peculiarity of An Shigao’s corpus. But, just to mention a roughly contemporary important translation, in Lokaksaṃa’s Dao sūng jīng 追行經 T 224 (Aṣṭasahasrika Prañāparamitā) the verb 計, though in itself rather frequent, is never used in this way.

Curiously indeed has been the destiny of these scriptures, if we accept their identification with An Shigao’s Da / i Xia shí’ěr zhēng jīng 大/小十二門經. Mr. Kajura’s recent rediscovery of the ancient scrolls which preserved, by a rare chance, the SMJ and JSM is indeed the revival of a drama already played many centuries ago. As Dao’an informs us in his preface to the Larger sūtras on the twelve gates 大十二門經序, discussed above, this scripture (i.e. hypothetically, the SMJ), after having been copied in a layman’s home in Jiayen 建麟 (the present Nanjing) in 288 AD, as witnessed by a colophon incidentally, not found in our MS), remained sealed in a box and out of circulation for “about two hundred years” (and yet, soon after having been rediscovered, it was almost lost again in a fire).62

Unfortunately we do not know to what extent Dao’an’s testimony reflects the actual history of our text (I mean: if the text to which he wrote this preface had been indeed absolutely out of circulation between 2nd and 4th century — which would be an extremely important information, especially in helping to determine who the author of the SMJ is). Nevertheless, it is quite possible that these scriptures did not enjoy much notice before Dao’an’s period. Both SMJ and JSM seem to have been barely studied within the circles which managed to keep up An Shigao’s doctrinal tradition after the fall of Han dynasty. They are never directly quoted in the early

61 E.g. Dao ji sūng 追行經 T 607 p. 232b-22. — 倫会会中計 “I have decided...” SBJ T 13 p. 287b-25; 立行衡量計行 “I...” SBJ T 13 p. 286a 63. 62 自計 “I have heard...; I have heard...” SBJ T 13 p. 304a 68 (on this text see below, end of § 8.2.2) p. 304a 68 (on this text see below, end of § 8.2.2). 63 自計 “I heard/heard about...” “(the practitioner) considers... my mind has not yet got released...” (1.357). This usage is simple a particular application of the meaning “to think, consider, reflect etc.”, indeed very frequent not only in Buddhist translations but also in Chinese literature in general (see Fang Yinun 1997: 71-72 and HUB S. T., vol. 19: 12a 85).

64 (CNPZ) P. 488 8-9; on the significance of this short document, see Zurcher 1972: 48-49 and 1978: 115. The figure of “about two hundred years” is obviously to be referred to the time when the text was translated (see Leib 1956: 97).
commentary on An Shigao's *Yin chi ru jing* 隕持入經T 608, the *Yin chi ru jing* 陰持入經注T 1694 (hereafter YCRZ), although this text, as well as the ABSVJ T 609, contain cryptic references to the "twelve gates".

However, there is enough evidence that two main translators of the 'Three Kingdoms period, Zhi Qian and Kang Senghui were acquainted with at least the SMJ (see below § 6.2.2).

5. The *Shi'er men: some doctrinal issues and scriptural parallels*

We have noted (§ 4.1) that Dao'an summarised the content of the text which, we may assume, corresponds to the SMJ of our MS, as consisting of the four *dhyānas*, the four *appamāṇas*, and the four *ārūpyacittas* that Dao'an's interpretation is also supported by the SMJ, a fact potentially not devoid of significance, as we shall see.

Yet the treatment of the first group of four "gates", the *dhyānas* in Dao'an's analysis, is somewhat problematic. We ought not to forget, at this point, that the terminology of the texts is often obscure and erratic, as is typical of archaic translations. We cannot exclude that this distorting factor may influence, to some extent, our understanding of the more technical aspects introduced by these scriptures.

This having been said, let us consider our main text, the SMJ. In its description, the first four practices are four forms of "observation" or "contemplation" arranged according to the well-known headings of the four *samyukta dhammas* ("establishing of mindfulness"), the first group of *bodhipakkāya dhammā* / *bodhipakkhiyā dhammā*: *śīla* (*khyo*), *sīla* (*vedana*), *citta* (*citta*), and *dhammā* (*dhammā*).

We can profitably compare the text of the SMJ with a passage from the SBFJ (T 18 294a 19-21):

Second, the *śīla*-phāsa, *sīla*-phāsa, *citta*-phāsa, and *dhammā*-phāsa.


---

65 YCRZ T 1694 p. 15a 2: "七言便落通三界, 齊出十二門; 不得別論." (This is a gloss on the seventh term of the eightfold path, *sammā-sati* "right mindfulness"; ABSVJ T 600: ... 如日出時, 淨諸出十二門;... (T 602 p. 168: 26-27). (Y 1971: 241), though referring this passage to the "twelve-gate dhyāna" dealt with in our texts, interpreted it as part of the original sūtra and not of the interpolated commentary (ib. p. 220); cf. remarks in n. 161 below.

66 On these denominations, see Gehin 2001: 284 ff.

67 Cf. also YCRZ T 605 p. 176b 29 – 177a 9 on the four foundations of mindfulness (四正念, *sattā-panāhiṇās*, see Zaschotti 2002: 81); cf. also the sūtra (n. 14) described by Harrison 2002: 12.

68 In this passage the SBFJ comes closer to the Pāli *Datteddanasutta* (Dhag 111 p. 276); see also remarks by Mittal 1957: 61 n. 5), which has the formula *ātipti sampājīto sattāṁ vināyavāhe*.
If we now go back to the first gates in the SMJ, as quoted above (in 311.1 (smṛtyupasthānānaṁ/ketu/mātām) on 18.3 (smṛtyupasthānānaṁ/ketu/mātām) says kṣīryapdayaṁ/smṛtyupasthānānaṁ), we can safely conclude, on the basis of the wording used there (e.g. note तत् is अनुपासयति or related words), that our text is indeed introducing the same topic.

Also the pattern of contemplation (at first applied to one’s own body, then to other persons’ bodies etc.) introduced in these four gates is closely reminiscent of the smṛtyupasthānānaṁ.

Then we have to turn to the relevant portions of the SMJ-second section (J. 545-549) and of the SMJ (J. 556-570). Here the pattern of exposition is, as already noted, completely different from the preceding section, switching from practical description to a more scholastic typology of analysis.

We see that the first four gates are described as follows (I mention the facts essential to my exposition; some of the attached explanations are rather obscure):

1. gate: provided with “thinking” (कैरण) and “dealing with [the object of thinking]” (भाष्य);
2. gate: provided with [SMJ: only] “dealing with [the object of thinking];
3. gate: provided with [SMJ: only] joy (सुख).”

The reference to पद्म (see note 8 below) is not found either in the Sanskrit nor in the Pali parallels.

Here is the complete text of the portion relevant to the first four gates as presented by the two sources, SMJ-section 2, second-second. In both, how is it different? Are the arguments the same? How is it different? How do they differ?

from the passage in the SMJ: "The significance of the term ajñātyam and helabdhā is clear enough from the Abhidhamma texts towards which refers to oneself within and that which refers to other beings and person (para-netta, para-puggale) is without." (Gethin 2001: 55). Cf. the SMJ: अरिक्षक... अर्थनामकाः.

That ācarana is indeed to be taken as a single word (as it is normally in Chinese: see HD 6: 1477b “happy, happiness etc.”) is demonstrated by JSM 1.570 (see below n. 94), where the last stage is said to involve the abandonment of these things (e.g. arguably अन्ते and अन्याय).
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4. gate: SMJ: "thinking, dealing with [the object] as well as joy/ bæoccessed." cf. JSM: "What is the fourth gate, one-mindedness?" It is abandoning the above [mentioned] three things."

As we can see, here the text is introducing an ascending course in which the gradual elimination of the two categories defined as "thinking" (念) and "dealing with [the object of thinking]" (作) appears to play a pivotal role.

The interpretation of these terms is a bit problematic. However, given the context and the structure of this passage and, above all, in the light of a significant parallel, I think that 念 and 作 translate in all likelihood "vīrāka" and "vīrata" respectively.

56 作 - 念 - 識別 (SHJ L. 387).


56 翻訳：作 - 念 - 識別 (SHJ L. 387).

56 In a recently published article, Paul Harrison (2003) has convincingly demonstrated that the anonymous Sanskritāgāna anthology entitled Za ak hon ājīvā appāna in T.101 is probably to be ascribed to An Shigao. Shiwa n. 15 included in this collection (T.101 p. 672b 12), on the dharmacakramātā, contains the two terms at issue. As closest surviving parallel, in T.101, 2003: 15 is viśāra 912 of the main Sanskritāgāna translated into Chinese (T.99). The attīva contained in T.99 is shorter than An Shigao’s counterpart, but the wording of the two is sufficiently consistent to allow a detailed comparison of the relevant passage. T.101 p. 672a 7-8. 念 - 作 - 翻訳: "Vīrāka/vīrata" (cf. Sedar 2003: 65) is a dohā, a devotional dharmacakramāta cultivated, kept in mind, much relied upon, then the body will get purified, the mind, thinking, dealing with (the object of thinking) cease and do not exist (anymore). Cf. T.99 p. 205a 10-17 (the punctuation given on the T.101 appears incorrect). 念 - 作 - 翻訳: a Chinese version of the dharmacakramātā seems clear that 念 - 作 - 翻訳: T.101 correspond to the Sanskritāgāna in T.99. 念 - 作 - 翻訳: we indeed very common renderings of vīrāka, vīrata and related words (e.g. T.99 p. 73a 12-13, 124b 25 and passim; cf. Kumārāṇḍapuśa T.223 p. 219a 15): 念 - 作 - 翻訳: Vīrāka/vīrata (N. viśāra 1923: 11, viśāra 1923: 11-12, viśāra 1923: 11-12). 念 - 作 - 翻訳: in the Chinese translations of the Viśvakarmanava (T.212-215) render pravādika/vedata (instead a most puzzling rendering).

56 It seems to me that 念, taken by itself, poses no particular problem as a translation of vīrāka cf. Cowling’s remarks on viśāra (1992: 139): "It is clear that it can always rendered as ‘thinking’ or ‘thought’ (although we must note that 念 is in fact ‘normally reserved for viśāra in the early translations; but cf. Willemen 1978: 55, note to stanza 18). On the other hand, 念 is less easy to understand. The etymological meaning of this word (see HD: 390-941) is ‘to wait for’; then ‘to treat [of],’ ‘to entertain,’ ‘to address upon’ [of],’ and also ‘to depend on’ (especially ‘if having support’); see HD 6: 1155b). Perhaps in the present context [was meant to convey the idea of ‘to deal with’] (an object brought to notice by means of the preceding Viśāra) without haste. The definition provided by the second section of the SMJ itself (see above n. 59) may be of some significance in this respect: 念 अक्षरादित्तरित्वम् (T.101: 6 444-454); Le ‘[why the second gate] is only provided with ‘dealing with [the object]?’ Because while it does not tell extra thought, it still has residual thoughts.’ This could mean that at the second stage, viśāra having ceased, no new object is being brought to the practitioner’s attention. This definition at least makes clear that 念 must be understood in a psychological sense. In fact these are in the early problematic translations of the pair viśāra/vīrāka. Indeed, these categories seem to have superseded the Chinese translators and exegetes of the early period. We find an increasing variety of renderings in the aristic manuscripts, even within the same text. For instance, in a passage on the three stages of māyātāla found in
Then the scheme described above resembles, quite clearly, that of the four *dhāyanis*. But there is at least one remarkable difference: the second stage is described as still provided with *vīrāja*, while, as is well-known, in the canonical exposition of the four dhāyanis both *vīrāka* and *vīrāra* are forsaken after the first stage. This topic is taken up again in the SM[com], in even more explicit terms:

*The first *dhāyaṇa* (has) both *vīrāka* and *vīrāra*; in the second *dhāyaṇa* *vīrāka* is eliminated, and there is only *vīrāra*; in the third *dhāyaṇa* there is neither *vīrāka* nor *vīrāra*, only *joy*; in the fourth *dhāyaṇa* joy is removed, and breathing is stopped*.  

Dharmaśāstra’s *Gangūja-mūla* (222 p. 1406-6-7, to be compared with the Gilgit Manuscript of the Pārshvanātindrabhāśa, folio 11 - 9 - 1; cf. Dutt’s edition p. 20, 9-11), we find *vīrāka* rendered as विरक्त (while विरक्तकाँड is वीरक्ताकान्तका), on the other hand, *vīrāra* is translated as वीरकार (which is Dharmaśāstra’s standard *emotivational* rendering of the derivatives of *रूप* cf. however *वर* 222 p. 180a 13-14: विरूप ... वरूप), on the other hand, *vīrāra* is rendered as वीरकात (which is the most common sense of *फंग जिंग* (123 T 222, the two terms in the corresponding passage (p. 18: 18-19) are rendered as वर & वरं respectively). The *Āṣāman* on the other hand, on the other hand, the Āṣāmanīśātra retains traditionally ascribed to An Shigao (C32) p. ta 2: Forte 1968: 171-177). Although this *āṣāmanī* is implicitly rejected by Zscreen (cf. 1991: 297-298), the list of terms he considers genuine An Shigao’s translations does not include this title, at first sight the text presents archaic features. Here (T 1557 p. 906b 5-6) we find *vīrāka* translated as जिंग and *vīrāra* as जिंग; the text also mentions the definition, typical of the Bārdvītikās (see Crouse 1992: 1147), of this two terms as *गृहस्ति गोत्रित* and *शहीद विषयम्* (शहीद विषयम्: अपबोधयिता जिंग; शहीद विषयम्: अपबोधयिता जिंग).  

E.g. see La Vallée Poussin, Zanda ch. 8: 282-139; Smart-Fox 1989: 81-82; Lamotte 1989: 1028-1090; Bromskorl 1998: 88-89. The *Vīrākārāvīraśāstra* (p. 128, IV § 149) further specifies that (Nāṇamoli 1991: 154) ... while the hindrances are abandoned at the moment of the access of the first jhuna, in the case of this jhuna [viz. the second] the applied thought and sustained thought (विद्वारकविन्दा) are not abandoned at the moment of its access. It is only at the moment of actual absorption (अभास्कल्कितस्त) that the jhuna arises without them.  

*Loosen*: this would fit in with the description of the fourth *ḥatāma* provided within the scheme of the *four successive Conceptions* (संस्काराविवरण): “for one who has reached the Fourth *dhāyaṇa* breathing out and breathing in (समस्कारपितम) have ceased” (Bromskorl 1988: 89).

*Loosen*: अन्वयविश्वसनीय: द्वितीया, दूरविश्वसनीय: तीन विश्वसनीय: च, दूरविश्वसनीय: च, दूरविश्वसनीय: च (क्योंकि जैसे एक तीन च, दूरविश्वसनीय: च (क्योंकि जैसे एक तीन च, दूरविश्वसनीय: च (क्योंकि जैसे एक तीन च (क्योंकि जैसे एक तीन च (क्योंकि जैसे एक 273
This seems quite a peculiar tenet. Even though in the two *śūtras*, unlike the SM (comm., there is no direct mention of the *dhyāna*, we still have to account for a *fourfold* structure—whose second stage apparently is without *vāraka* but with *vīra* 

Surprisingly enough, this pattern has a remarkable resemblance to the structure of the *samprājñāte-samudāya* described in the *Yoga-sūtra* (I.17), which, as made clear by Couzens in the light of the *Bhāṣya*, also involves four stages: I. with *vīra* 2. with *vīrasya*, 3. with *śānta* (sāntapravāhār), cf. (compare [*paritā* in SM and *SMJ*]), 4. only with sense of I (left) *asmitāsatātra*. Apart from the last stage, the two descriptions appear consistent. The significance of this peculiarity displayed by our *śūtras* in terms of both doctrine and history, is certainly worth further research. Perhaps it is not merely incidental that in the second section of the SM and in the *SMJ* only the first four items are not directly defined.

All i.e. the three *anumāṇikā* and the four *dhyānas* is treated with admirable clarity by Couzens (1992: 151-155). It seems to me that none of the various options of "strategies" adopted by the Buddhist schools fits the frame introduced by our text perfectly. For the *Abhidharma* matmos the main problem was harmonizing the stage *avatāra* *vāraṇa-saṅkhāra* (second *śānta* with the four *dhyāna* stages (Couzens 1992: 192). Both the classic *Abhidharma* solutions— the *dhyāna-saṅkhāra* "intermediary stage between (first and second) *dhyāna*", held by the *vaiśevadī* (see *Mādhyamikā* 15/4 p. 290-294 and 818 19-26; *Abhidharma-kosa* 9/3, 12 - 904; 24, 25; 26; *La Vallette Pusinini, Kāla d. b. 180-183), and other schools see *Kālāvartana*, PTS combined ed. 1979 (rep. 1999) pp. 505-570 (XVIII, 12; 1958: 126; 197 and 97 thesis 59) and the *śīla* introduced by the *Theravāda-sāstra* (Couzens 1992: 152 table IV) - involve *dhyāna* five-stage structure (whose second stage is indeed without *vāraka* but with *śīla*). Lance Couzens (personal communication of 6-2-2003) suggests that the description of the *dhyāna* we find in the *SM* (see the preceding note) could reflect a related *Abhidharma* tradition distinct from those of both the *Theravāda* and the *vaiśevadī*. Here, in fact, the first *dhyāna* could have been split in two as in the *Theravāda* list of five *śīlās* while the second and third stages were combined into one, thus creating the present four-stage list. "The rationale for this would be concerned with the debated nature of *paritā*... In effect if *paritā* is considered to be a type of bodily pleasant feeling i.e. a kind of vedaṇa, then it is not different from *śīla* from a strict *Abhidharma* point of view. So the second and third *śīla* of the *śūtras* could be combined into a single *śīla* from the 'higher' *Abhidharma* perspective... Something like this might in fact be the original position of the *Pātikkopadāna*. See for example the footnote to *Nārada* 1964: 191 ff. (ms. 586/2 and 586/3)".

102 The first stage is to be understood as having all the four factors (*vīraka, vīra, śānta, and asmitā*) which are gradually dropped one after another at each subsequent stage (see Couzens loc. cit.).

103 See Couzens (1992: 156 n. 9); cf. also Frankhorst 1995: 74 n. 7); "The four factors given by the *Yoga-sūtra* are simply a modification of the various *Abhidharma* lists of factors. *śīla* is in any case a synonym for *paritā* and *śīla* is sometimes for upokṣa (or tattvāgama) with an eye to Dharmakīrti theory (buddhī) ... Generally speaking, it is very probable that this passage of the *Yoga-sūtra* was influenced by *Abhidharma* tradition (Couzens 1992: 157, 148 ff.; Frankhorst 1995: 71-75)."
To sum up, we may provisionally assume that in SM/J second section and in JSJM the first four prācītes – which have been at first, in SM/J first section, expressly expounded as four kinds of anupayānāṇa and, in fact, are the four sāṃtyupasthānāṇa – are implicitly (but explicitly in the SM/J comm. connected (certainly not without problems) to the dhyāna by means of the factors associated to and removed from each stage.

At least in this respect our texts come close to certain passages in the Nākṣatram which show a tendency to associate sāṃtyupasthānāṇa to jhāna in the same way (i.e. using terminology normally associated with the attainment of the jhāna). The particular kind of combination suggested by the SM/J (i.e. kāyānāṃ sāṃtyupasthānāṇa with the first dhyāna, vedaṇānāṃ sāṃtyupasthānāṇa with the second etc.) may at first sight look rather artificial, but it is not unparalleled, and is in fact fundamental to the Petakopadesa and the Neppakkaraṇa.

As already noted, I have not been able to identify a parallel version of either SM/J or JSJM. But once we have concluded, at least provisionally and with the necessary caution, that the first four gates can be connected to the dhyāna, we can indeed find many parallels to the overall structure of the SM/J [or JSJM] (i.e. to the sequence four dhyānas, four spramaṇas and four āśāpyamāṇapattis).

119 See Ghedin 2001: 50-51; cf. also Cousins 1992: 142: (on the occurrence of vākāra in conjunction with vākāra in the Nākṣatram): “This is nearly always in context associated with jhāna or samādhi”. It may be also interesting to quote Lin Li-kouang’s remark on sāṃtyupasthāna (1949: 119-122): “Cette extension du terme possède à l’extrême… était connue chez les Sravakācārin. Ainsi dans le Samayabhāṣyapuruṣottamakāra de Vismitra nous lisons que, selon les Sravakācārin, de sāṃtyupasthāna comprend sous les dhyānas…”. (on the thesis recorded by Vismitra, indeed not too clear, see also Bareau 1955: 160 thesis 20).

120 As a possible interpretation of this connection, we may assume that the four sāṃtyupasthānas (here mainly considered from the viewpoint of the objective fields / supports of smṛti i.e. as body etc.; see Ghedin 2001: 52-53; cf. Id. 50) are meant to involve a process of gradual abstraction – from kāyā to dhāma – which would entail a correlated thinning out of mental functions comparable to that undergone while practicing the four dhyānas (cf SM/J comm L. 461-464, which though not too clear, could be taken to mean something similar).

121 see for example- Petakopadesa p. 247, 18 - 248, 19; Nettakkaraṇa p. 119, 25 - 121, 31 (I am grateful to Lance Cousins for these references). We find in these texts a series of terrains including, besides jhāna and sāṃtyupasthāna, a number of other categories (the four infinities included) combined in this way: “The first meditation fulfilled the first foundation of mindfulness etc.” (Śrīpaññi 1964: 554-555).

122 Perhaps the most significant is to be found in some versions of the Saṅgīti-stṭhā found in the Chinese cañon: see the complete Dīpkkakārga, Chang An-lun jing 長安論經 (T 5 p. 1: 9a-28; the other Chinese translation of this stṭhā, the Foshū da jī fēng jīng 婁談法經 (T 12 presents the same sequence in a more expanded reading (T12 p. 223B-229 C-29 C). Cf. on the other hand the Sanskrit fragments (representing the Sravarkśin version) edited by Stace-Rosen (1968: 96-97 and vol. 2 n. 57 pp. 66-67); as reconstructed there, the order of these categories is different (see also Bronkhorst 1985: 507). Given that the lists which form the structure of this and other similar stṭhās reflects in all probability a very ancient common layer (see also Bronkhorst 1985: 507-508; Frauwallner 1925: 14-15 and n 1 p. 211), it is obviously impossible to infer any sort of direct relationship between those
Still all these parallels merely show to us that the material dealt with in our two scriptures presumably originated from some old lists (perhaps even very old as assumed by Bronkhorst 1985). Perhaps other passages in the Nākāyana and Āgamas that attempt to combine these three sets of practices are of greater significance to our understanding of the SMJ. The assimilation of dhātuma and āśīpya – indeed one of the main leitmotifs in the development of Buddhist meditative practices and thought – is discussed in detail by Bronkhorst 1985, who also plausibly explains the relationship of the four infinitives with these other meditative practices.

What remains a peculiarity of SMJ and JSM is the fact that here these three sets of practices are angled out to form a distinct āśītra – a dialectic path of its own 190:

scriptures and our two texts. But it is quite probable that the reference to the Cang Aham āgama list in the source of the SMJ found in some catalogues (see above n. 47) was based on these parallels. Another similar partial parallel is in the Śaṅgkhyāyana preserved in the Chinese canon, the Za Aham āgama list T 99, see which see Kosmo 1980: 79-78, aśītra n. 954, p. 374b 18-20: \[...\] āśītra. This passage is also found in the corresponding aśītra (n. 198) of the Chinese canon T 100 (Kosmo 1980: 76-75), p. 447, 11-12 (partially different), but not in the Mahāmāyācakṣusūtra (n. 73), Māyām-māyā n. 1-89), which is the Pali counterpart according to Akamasu's Catalogue (1982: 88) and the Taishō apparatus. The sequence which makes up the twelve gates in fact occurs (also as part of a larger list) even in the Pali śāstraśāstraśāstrāšāstraśात्मकासूत्राः सिंहवत्स्को जैनेश्वरियोऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राचीनम्योऽस्य प्राची
succession, samyn (sugongwihwa), based on the sugongwihwa mentioned above (n. 198) are sometimes described as a path leading to the cessation of dharma, i.e. liberation (Boukhout 1993, 91).

A major issue in the history of the texts discussed in this article is the interpretation of the reference to the "twelve gates" found in a number of Chinese Buddhist texts (for an useful survey see also Mohinshiki Shinke [Buddhist不动心], Tokyo 1991-1996, vol. 3, pp. 2540-2541). The earliest is a passage occurring in the Xuangongjing mingzhi sutra tu (T. 146), the first part of the Buddha's biography translated at the beginning of the 3rd century by Kang Mengxiang 覃玄朗 and others (Zürcher 1991: 248 and 299). I am grateful to Jan Nattier for a number of suggestions and references on this topic, pps. 287 and 289 we read: 經部卷下; 一卷; 二卷; 三卷; 四卷; 五卷; 六卷; 七卷; 八卷; 九卷; 十卷; 十一卷; 十二卷; 1461: 2 tab. 1076: 105 n. 180, translating this passage as quoted in Zhu Qian's T. 185, interpreted 菩提四門观 as "He [n. 180, the Bodhisattva] applied himself to the three 'doors' productive of the 'twelve gates'". Apart from the very reference to the "twelve gates", we note in this passage the enumeration of the six aspects of the dharma mentioned in close proximity to the colonialization of the twelve practices themselves (here referred to as 十二支). The wording of this passage, though in itself not particularly peculiar, is reminiscent of the SMjocom: e.g. see 498-502 (see pp. 287-288 below), where we find the "three groups of four" gates combined with the same six aspects: also the expression 列十二門 (probably to be interpreted as "to leave the twelve gates [i.e. in order to go on to further stages?") occurs often in this commentary (e.g. l. 403, as quoted below n. 116: 416; 416: 444; 448; 455; This passage of T. 194 was later included in Zhu Qian's T. 185 Taizi xingzong læjung mingjing 太子性空法經 (see pp. 296-297) with some very interesting expansions which will be discussed in § 6.6.2 (p. 286). This was the reference to the twelve gates already present in the originally translated by Kang Mengxiang and his team (cf. Zürcher 1992: 335 n. 60), or it was taken from an already translated source (i.e. supposedly our SMjocom). In short: T. 184 is to be considered a source on the Indian side of the textual history of the SMjocom, or on the Chinese side: Answering this question would require a retelling of its own, involving detailed comparisons with other sources preserved in Sanskrit, Chinese and Tibetan (for a general discussion cf. Matsuda 1988, esp. pp. 28-29). However, Zürcher's description of T. 194 and T. 196 a noteworthy: "In these works, the literary influence is very marked: frequent use of certain elements and stylistic embellishments ... The new element is a terminological miscrem. Foreign terms and Buddhist expressions are rendered by means of a mixed vocabulary borrowed from various eastern translators ..." (Zürcher 1991: 284). One may wonder whether, apart from terminology, T. 194 and T. 196 were not also open to more substantial borrowings. Given the mixed outline provided by Prof. Zürcher, I think that we cannot rule out that the reference to the "twelve gates" was drawn from our SMjocom. This hypothesis can be strengthened by the following observation. In T. 184, following a narrative pattern that is found in all the traditional biographies of the Buddha (see Heinevetere 1995: 67-73 p. 69), the short passage on the "twelve gates" occurs in a description of the dhyāna as the basic practice conducive to Śākyamuni's awakening. Now, the SMjocom too refers the practice of the "twelve gates" to the same narrative content (I, 3:45-45:3; text p. 71, note 10, p. 1, p. 416-417). In the Šīla-jānaṃ saṅkṣāra T. 020 p. 42B3-42B4, in the Dharmakṣaṭṭhā niyama saṅkṣāra T. 020 p. 42B3-42B4, in the Kṣetra-veda T. 271 (acrified, almost certainly wrongly, to An Shigao) p. 55A2-55A3, in the Anuṣṭanta compass T. 780 B. 729 A. A detailed evaluation of these and other sources containing references to the 十二門 or 十二門三法 beyond the scope of the present article and must be left for future research.

115 E.g. see his Shi shentuzhusheng zhidai fanyang 般若波羅蜜多品翻音論 (T. 1916: 489a 22-29; 489b 9-12).
6. The commentary on the Shi'er men jing

On the line immediately following the closing formula of the [SMJ], i.e. l. 385, a new text begins, bearing no title, as noted above. Yet even a cursory look at the content will suffice to make it clear that this is a commentary (SMjcomm) on the preceding texts (particularly on the SMJ), although it touches on several other topics (all related to meditative practices). The SMjcomm quotes, at times, the stūtra (SMJ), but it is by no means restrained by the text commented upon.

This exegetical portion goes on up to the very end of the MS, on line 583 (followed by the already mentioned closing titles: 十二門論, l. 584). In other words, this commentary consists of almost two hundred lines, i.e. roughly about 3800 characters, and is perhaps the longest text included in this MS110.

The SMjcomm is often very obscure. A detailed analysis of this commentary will require a study of its own. Here I will confine myself to a summary description and to raising a few main questions.

6.1 An outline of the SMjcomm

The SMjcomm could hardly be defined a systematic text: it often switches from one topic to another without apparent pattern. Yet for practical purposes we may approximately divide it into two main sections.

1. In the first, shorter section (l. 385-451) the main topics discussed are indeed the twelve gates111. The commentator introduces various classifications and combinations (so typical of early Buddhist exegesis composed in China) of these practices with other categories. For instance:

   "There are three released112: the first is abandoning craving (貪欲, *sāla), the second is abandoning hatred (瞋恚, *dveśa), the third is abandoning delusion (愚癡, *moha). If one practices

110 the K(ABSY) has in fact a few more lines, but at first sight it looks less "dense", so to speak, having many more paragraphs and blank spaces, and, hence, probably fewer characters, than the SMjcomm.

111 Actually at the very beginning of the SMjcomm (l. 385-396) three more gates are added: 布施 (*danaśā), 不斷 (*atighatī), 不順 (*aparamīdā). These make up the "fourth group consisting of three gates" as 聲聞十二門 (l. 386). These are further combined with the three vīramukkutāñcha (l. 387-389), 十二, and thus we find also the expected 相應 (*anutti). Then these categories (especially 相應 and 布施) are in turn used to explain l. 380-356) two passages of the SMJ, i.e. the fifth (context l. 3.132) and eighth, (upon l. 254) gates. Here the commentator is in fact elaborating a short passage occurring at the end of the SMJ (l. 305), where the three vīramukkutāñcha are indeed pointed out as a higher stage following the twelfth gate (i.e. the 十二門論śāla-dveśa-mahā-bhakti). This sequence makes good sense, and is in fact attested in a number of passages in the Pali canon (see Harvey 1986: 20-27 and relevant notes for references). 112 The passage of the SMjcomm appears to support the convincing elucidation of l. 38. An Shingleton's translations by Voor and Harrison 1994: 260. In SBE 7.15 p. 254a 11 三世通義translates trīpi vīramukkutāñcha (Dhottaravatīra ed. Mital 1957: 60), and indeed even here the SMjcomm is dealing with the same topic combined with the twelve gates (cf. also the preceding note).
the first four gates cravle cease; if one practises the second four gates hatred ceases; if one practises the third four gates delusion ceases. [But] without going beyond the twelve gates, the root of the threefold poison (三毒根) are not yet eradicated: only by practising the three gateways [leading to release] (三门), *vīramahādālihāra* 134 after having left the twelve gates, does one succeed in eradicating the three evil destinies and thus obtains the protection 135. Obtaining the protection means that [the practitioner will know either] in which category of go-to he will be reborn, or [if he will be reborn] amid men  136.

The way the content of the *sūtra* is placed here into a broader context (by mentioning a further set of practices and referring to the theme of rebirths attained through the various meditative stages) is quite typical of the SMjocomm. As noted above, at times the SMjocomm interprets a particular passage from the *sūtra* (only from the SM), it would seem; see also n. 99 above for another interesting example):

"... Having left the twelve gates, [the practitioner] goes on toward the three [gateways leading to release] 137. What are the three gateways? The first is turning toward Emptiness (空, *śūnyatā*), the second is no-perception (無観, *ānupalitā*), and the third is wisdomness (智, *prajñā*). Emptiness is controlling the mind; no-perception is only within, and not does not produce (?)

134 Cf. Anguttara I p. 299.
135 According corresponds to *vīryavāraṇa.* On *vīryavāraṇa* in this sense, as found in the *Agama,* see Ishikawa 1957 (esp. pp. 54-55), Masuda 1960: 180-181; a partial parallel to this abridging (従一門) is found in some transmutations by Dakurmāraka (see Wara 1972: 158, Karashima 1998: 25). Cf. few line below:  今二十二門有菩提意等，於時行行道（I. 411-412). In Kang Senghu's (1321) T. 152 T. 152 *vīryavāraṇa* seems to be used only with reference to the attainment of Bodhisattva (e.g. T. 152 p. 154 5; 佛果正道，即無観妙法空等同）。
136 In the collection of the SMjocomm, where the twelve gates are combined with the three rōmōkaihāra (see n. 114 above). The reading "among men" is a bit problematic. Perhaps we could simply reverse the last two characters; 行三門 (indeed cf. the parallel occurring on I. 405 quoted in the preceding note).
137 As is well-known, the two characters 行門 are often confused in Chinese translations: not only because of their phonetic and graphic similarity, but also because of more substantial reasons. Hence, however, the presence of 行门 is not enough to take 行门 as a mere scribal error for 行門. This could in fact reflect a deliberate interpretation. 行門 is probably the most common rendering of *samākñya* and *sāvatthī* in An Shiguo's corpus (as well as in other early translations), either as the three ṣaṅkñyaḥ khaṇḍha or in different contexts. Now, *samākñya* and *nimitta* are connected in the well-known definition (Abhidharma-kārikā p. 56, 9) *samākñya nimitratapairsubhāgī, “samākñya consists of grasping various things”, typical of the Sarvāstivāda (see Vetter 2000: 280). A similar definition (though stipulated not just to *nimitta*, but to its distortion) is provided by Pakesapadisa  ch. 6 p. 120, 15: "... ye (cf. Nagasvami's remarks, 106: 165 n. 485) [nimitrata pairsubhāgī, ayaṃ sattva-sārāfīlāhanā. This definition was known to An Shiguo, who translated it as (YCT) T. 603 p. 175: 5-6). In the Sanskrit *nimitta* is seen most likely as "what is perceived" for *nimitrata.* Here, the occurrence of *nimitrata* out that *nimitrata* is merely a graphic variant for *nimitta.* Thus it is not impossible that *nimitrata* in the SMjocomm is also a similar, albeit problematic, interpretation of *nimitrata,* laying emphasis on the subjective side of the process: cf. the *sūtra* on the three *samākñya* in the Ebottaramikāgaṇa एबोटरामिकागण I T. 125 p. 658 6-8: *निमत्ता निमत्तत्वानां समस्याम्* न दौर्यति निमत्तत्वानां सन्निधिः मया निमत्तमुक्तिवर्तमानः. For the new reading *samākñya* 入三門, see Lacombe 1970: 1213-1214. 279
In other instances the commentator does not quote directly from the SMJ, but merely paraphrases the content of the sūtra:

"Turning" constitutes the eighth gate (i.e., upadhyāya); either when one sees an error, or when one sees the (true) examen, [his] mental attitude shows no difference: [to be] love [his] parents and love the enemy without any difference as to mental attitude. 

2. The second and by far longer section of the SMJ (L. 452-383) is almost entirely devoted to the four dhyanas. It deals in detail with various factors associated with the four stages, as well as hindrances opposed to their attainment, including a discussion of the pair vitarka / vicāra (L. 467-472 and 492-498) which, in spite of a somewhat confusing terminological inconsistence (cf. n. 99 above), is truly

[This phrase, however, is far from clear (it occurs also in the lines following this passage), although it is probably to be connected to the common interpretation of the nirvāṇa as external (see Harvey 1986: 26). Here the commentaries seem to suggest a particular causal connection between the three vijnānakusumānī as they are described in this passage: through mental cūnta (citayata) one puts an end to the mental activity (that consists in apprehending external signs) (sūtra 33.17.2: nuiyātā, thus not producing intentions! Reactions?) [not: he is then "stilled" (sūtra 33.17.2: nuiyāt, see Dellewos's detailed discussion of this term in 2006: 93-95 n. 23) and "does not generate any more suffering"). Such a connection between nimittam and apramāṇa, provided that I have understood the SMJ correctly, makes good sense: cf. a similar interpretation in the Da śāku lai 大般涅槃《1 609 p. 246c 16-17 (1 Lamato 1970: 1218 and Dellewos 2006: 94); the former translates: "Il y a non-prête en considération apramāṇa quand ayant connaissance des inconnues, on n'y plus aucune réaction.");

The transmitted text is difficult to construe. Tentatively I add some brackets given that this passage seems to provide separate definitions for each vijnānakusumānī following the enumeration of the three in the following lines.

99 諸人言勝樂來向己: this is a quotation from the SMJ (L. 312, fifth gate: masālīta. As to the expression of, if two parallels in An Shīqī's corsets: 南部地論並載雲： (TIMS) 13 p. 235a 1: protection desireful; 與願是望之門 (Da Shaku lai 大般涅槃《1 607 p. 255c 105). Cf. also Leibovitch's Da sūtra jing 進行巣 224 p. 454a 1-2: 與願是望之門: "...all came with evil intentions!"

100 Here the MS ends 諸入人. However, this very likely refers to a passage of the SMJ (L. 325-324, eighth gate: upadeśa which has a slightly different reading (諸人). The latter makes better sense and I have followed it in my translation (albeit more radio could paraphrase... 諸人, but this seems less convincing). Hence that the SMJ'somma quotes here two short passages from the fifth and eighth gates expanded in the SMJ -- i.e. the first and fourth apramāṇa -- I take this as a shortened reference to the whole group of four infinitives.

101 諸入言善知識：同前。阿耨多羅三藐三菩提？者，向空：者，佛果額：者，無思惟：者，世出；有求者，何等緣故名出；是人時著和即已。若人出(後)世出不，是善因不名。 (L. 386-386).

102 默 (vīkāra) is the fifth of the six aspects of apramāṇa dealt with in the K-ABHY and ABHY T 602 (see below pp. 287-288).

103 隊入八門：同前。有善者，有善者若，善入者：善入者，善入者，善入者 (L. 413-414).

104 Actually the passage occurring on L. 452-455 could be taken as a sort of interlude bridging the two sections.
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remarkable and to my knowledge quite unparalleled in early Chinese Buddhist literature.

Only a detailed comparative analysis of the material contained in the SMJcomm and the relevant Abhidharmiya literature could tell us more about this intriguing document and its scholastic background.

6.2 The nature and authorship of the SMJcomm

Two main questions arise immediately: is this SMJcomm also a translation? Or was it composed in China? And, if so, by whom (provided that the SMJcomm is indeed, as it seems, the work of a single author)?

Although the first hypothesis cannot be ruled out with absolute certitude, it is in fact more likely that this text was composed in China; but the main argument for this interpretation is also the key piece of evidence of the authorship of the SMJcomm: therefore I should like to leave the issue hanging for a while.

6.2.1 The hypothesis Dao'an

Dao'an is the only author known to have composed a commentary on the two Shi'ers men jing — i.e. our SMJ and JSM — as shown in § 4. Thus, it was quite logical to take Dao'an's authorship as an initial working hypothesis.

There are, however, some facts which make Dao'an an unlikely candidate for the authorship of the SMJcomm.

— An obvious starting point for future research would be Petakapadana pp. 156-155 (cf. Nikanom: 1964: 166-200), i.e. the final part of chapter 5, as established by Nikanom: (Nikanom: 1964: 187 n. 569f.). Not only does this text deal with largely the same subject (pajata) as the second section of the SMJcomm, but it was also, arguably, known to An Shigon, who translated the preceding portion of the same chapter (V'kar 'T 603), a fact potentially very significant when considering the probable connection between the SMJcomm and An Shigon's devotional tradition. Here I shall mention just one interesting point (see also n. 164 below). The Petakapadana, too, contains a detailed discussion of vikalpa and vichara (Petakapadana 142, 5-143, 8; cf. Nikanom: 1964: 190-191). There are, in fact, many discrepancies between the two sources in the treatment of these and other categories, but also some interesting similarities. The SMJcomm provides the following definition of vikalpa and vichara: samon bhavavyutthitam samyo: 'vikalpa' (Petakapadana 8: 460f.; i.e.: 'As to thinking (2), *vikalpa*, the fact that the mind arises on an object without [further] following it is thinking, as to dealing with [the object of thinking] (8), *vichara*, the fact of pondering [that object] ever and ever again is dealing with [the object]'— According to Cousins' convincing interpretation, in the Petakapadana 'Vikalpa is defined as the first shifting (of the mind on an object), while vichara is the exploration (vikalpa) of what has been understood (by vikalpa)' (Cousins: 1992: 144); cf. Petakapadana 142, 5-6; tantra pathamadhikshipto vikalpa, vyakhyadhanam vikalpasya vichara.

In other words: it was found by the translator in the original Indic manuscript which contained also the two stitras — or added from an independent source — and translated together with SMJ and JSM; cf. the very interesting fragments of exegetical literature in Glandhari included in the British Library Collection, introduced by Salomon: 1999: 22-29 (I am grateful to Prof. Debasish for this reference).
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The first, and quite basic one is the typology of Dao’an’s two commentaries. Although they have not survived in the Canon, their form can at least be guessed at with a reasonable degree of certainty.

Let us consider again the testimony on Dao’an’s commentaries preserved in the CSZJ: ① 爲名作注，大作注，(T 2145 p. 90c 9; see above pp. 294-295). Now, 注 normally means an interlinear commentary (see BD 5: 1093b 5; and Prof. Kanno’s study in this issue of the ARIRIAB, pp. 302-305), of the kind indeed represented by the earliest specimens of Chinese Buddhist exegesis known so far ②. This interpretation is substantiated by Dao’an’s description of his commentary on the [Xiao] Shī’èr mén jīng in the relevant preface (see 十二門經序, CSZJ p. 46a 11): 故作者于句下，which is probably to be interpreted as “I dared compose glosses at the end of [each] phrase” ③.

In the catalogue of Dao’an’s exegetical works, a few lines below the above mentioned record of the Shī’èr mén jīng commentaries, the CSZJ lists also the commentary to the Ren ben yu shèng jīng 人本欲生經 T 14 translated by An Shigao. This text has fortunately survived beyond Sengoy’s time: it is still preserved in the Canon as the Ren ben yu shèng jīng zhū人本欲生經註 T 1693④. This text is described in terms consistent with the lost Shī’èr mén jīng commentaries⑤. Given that the text we can read today is in fact an interlinear commentary, we can safely assume that this was also the case of the two works Dao’an devoted to the Shī’èr mén jīngs ⑥.

Apart from all these somewhat extrinsic considerations, the style and exegetical method displayed by the SMJcomm are very different from what we find in Dao’an’s Ren ben yu shèng jīng zhū T 1693⑦.

---

① E.g. the YCRZJ T 1694, the commentary included in the first chapter of the Du mingdu jing 大明度經 T 225 and, on the basis of the way the glosses got mixed into the main text, arguably also the commentary on the ARBYJ authored by Cheng Hsi 楊震 and Kang Senghui. I am grateful to Prof. Sengyo for a number of suggestions on this topic.

② See also Nakajima 1997: 27.

③ Translated in kanbun style together with An Shigao’s version of the sūtra by Ui Hakujû (1971: 37-51).

④ 人本欲生經者，九品八教之妙載也，為我譯此一卷 (CSZJ p. 30c 16-17).

⑤ The Shī’èr mén jīng does not include any of Dao’an’s prefaces - prefaces, in fact, to his commentaries on the Shī’èr mén jīng: this may be considered an additional, albeit not very strong, argument. The fact that it is Kang Senghui’s preface, not Dao’an’s, that is prefixed to the K-ABVJ could also indirectly corroborate the hypothesis that we may face a pre-Dao’an exegetical tradition. Of course, this would make sense if we were allowed to credit this scroll with a certain degree of editorial consistency (an anthology of An Shigao’s dhyāna texts?); and the three glosses on the K-ABVJ, one of which is a quotation from the SMJcomm (see below pp. 287-288), indeed strengthen this impression.

⑥ Ven. Shi Guoping’s recent study (1998) contains a very detaileled survey of the extant early Chinese Buddhist commentaries, and notably those by Dao’an (Id. pp. 168-170). One of the most remarkable features of Dao’an’s exegesis is the attention paid to the wording of the translated text: and to translation problems in general. For instance, in many glosses of T 1693 we find the expression 句下, 282
But the strongest argument comes from yet another quarter. There is, in fact, some evidence suggesting that Dao'an knew the SMJ comm. In both prefaces (i.e., to the Lager and [Leser] Shīrēr meno jing) he seems to be hinting at previous commentaries. Of particular interest is the first of the two, the "Preface to the Shīrēr meno jing" 十二門經疏 (cf. above § 4.1). At one point in this document, Dao'an introduces a digression on ostragras and exegesis:

"The ostragras then, no matter whether large or small, we issued from the Buddha's mouth; what the divine mind has conceived is said to be a treasure for the world. [However], the sum of wisdom having set, the three realms were deprived of sight although the collection of the ostragras survives, its profound Word is hard to fathom; who, if not a person provided with most exquisite insights, could penetrate its subtleties? Hence all the Bodhisattvas and Arhats composed explanations to [the ostragras] (註疏), explaining their profundities, clarifying their discrepancies and implications then indeed [the meaning of the ostragras became] clear and easy to discern. What could one possibly add to such a pinnacle of wisdom?" [The text] from the Twelve gate [注疏] onward is such an exegesis (註疏)."^19

The key point in this passage is obviously the last phrase, "from the Twelve gates onward is such an exegesis." And indeed Ui Hakaju, in his discussion of this phrase ("of difficult interpretation," as he writes) concluded that, in view of the current meaning of [註疏], "exegesis"¹¹⁶, Dao'an might even have been referring to a commentary on the Twelve gates following the ostragras, but that the lack of the text at issue made impossible to decide this question."¹⁰⁹

The Kongō-ji MS now enables us to reconsider this hypothesis. We know, in fact, that this preface should refer to our SMJ, which is indeed followed by the SMJ comm in a way that fits Dao'an's description. Because, as already noted, the commentary is easily distinguishable from the preceding ostragras, thanks to the canonical formula that closes the latter (and that is why Dao'an was able to define this scripture Leser ostragras in his catalogue: had he counted the SMJ comm as part of this ostragras, the latter

i.e. "the sentence is [to be] reversed" (see T 669 J p. 1b, 1c, 10, 15, 28 and parash; and Shi Guoqu 1988: 167-170); e.g. (1c 95): "從事旅舍之善語"; from Zang songs: "from somewhere there is this dharma." This exegetical approach is perhaps to be connected with Dao'an's theorization of translation problems, the famous "five points where the original is to [be] lost and the three [main] difficulties" (五失本・三不相): indeed, the first p-jian discussed by Dao'an deals with differences in word-order between the Indian of the original text and the Chinese translations (CZJ) p. 52b: 24; 都識別變; 有五失本: 一者・語調虛字而便從事; 一失本也。); On this topic see Ch'en 1966: 185 and cf. Zurcher 1972: 203. At any rate, in the SMJ comm we find nothing of the sort.

¹⁰⁹ 註疏的, literally "thoroughly investigating the numerous, understanding the changing" (see HD 8: 405a), a formula taken from the Yi jing 易經.
¹¹⁰ 趙錫成 (1971-72: 185): 《都識別變》(都識別變, 原文所見); 《原識別変, 原文所見, 但不同, 趙錫成, 附記; 禪按: 趙錫成, 附記; 趙錫成, 附記.}


¹¹² On this see HD 11: 52a.
¹¹³ 趙錫成 (1971: 389): Nakajima does not comment on this passage, but his translation (Nakajima 1997: 27) seems to interpret it as referring to a portion (or text) coming after the "Twelve gates" (the latter should be a portion of the "a-nisshin seirō dōkō")."
would have been by far the Larger SMJ). But prima facie there is indeed nothing suggesting that the SMJocomm is not a commentary originally attached to the *sitra* and translated together with it (and hence the mention of “Bodhisattvas and Arhats”). This features could also account for the fact that no catalogue mention the SMJocomm.

A problem with this interpretation is that the SMJocomm is mainly a commentary on the first *sitra*, the SMJ; it would follow the SMJ only when the two *sitra* are edited together in sequence as in the present scroll. This arrangement makes good sense in view of the structure of the two scriptures, as already noted, and in my opinion reflects very probably the original format of these texts (i.e. as they were translated by An Shigao; cf. n. 44 above). But everything in Dao’an’s two prefaces suggests that he came across these scriptures separately (i.e. SMJ + SMJocomm, on the one hand, and SMJ on the other). Yet I do not think that this is an insurmountable difficulty.

Apart from the very reference to the commentary, we can find, in Dao’an’s preface, echoes of themes indeed touched upon in the SMJocomm. First of all, we observed (§ 4.1) that Dao’an was able to identify without hesitation the first four “gates” as the four *dhyañnas* this connection is in fact established by the SMJocomm, but, in itself, it is not obvious at all (cf. § 5).

However, this is not the only clue. Let us consider, for instance, the passage immediately following the one quoted above (CSZJ [III 45c 28 – 46a 1]):

> *Every learner, by practising the twelve gates, still [nearly] accomplishes the base of supernatural power (怖畏, *pariprabha*; extinguishing the noxious perception of external objects: this is defined as achieving the five powers (*pahibhājita*). But with the three gateways [leading to release] (the three, *rūnakaramaññā*), all the faculties [of the practitioner] advance to the extinction of the internal forms: this is defined as exhausting the outflows (流, *stūrpa*). When one has just entered into [the stage of] exhausting the outflows, he is called [one who does not turn back] (the three, *sāraññaramaññā*). Then the Buddha would praise [him] and predict his accomplishment of the title [of Buddha].”*

143 The fact that Dao’an’s commentary on the *Do shiçe ren jing* was indeed longer than that on the *Dao shiçe ren jing* (六十二門遊行, 小六十二門遊行切略; cf. n. 66), though obvious in itself, would indeed be difficult to account for if we assume that the second scripture included also the SMJocomm. It is possible, albeit speculative, that Dao’an (who, as we see from his preface, recognised the SMJocomm as something different from the *sitra*) left that text out of his own commentary.

144 If follow U1 and Nakajima in reading 五通 (found in the Ming version) instead of the 五通 attended in the Taimü.

145 U1 (1956: 96) and Nakajima (1997: 27) interpreted this 三通 as the stage of the *sādāgmyā*, and the three sets of practices making up the twelve gates respectively (although Nakajima 1997: 26 n. 21 also mentions the correct interpretation). However, apart from the SMJocomm, cf. n. 114 above.

146 許其注譯 (as obviously a paraphrase for *vākāraṇa*, as remarked by U1 1956: 95) (also Nakajima 1997: 27), on 許 in the sense of the sense of “to predict, prediction etc.” see Karashima 2001: 128.

147 凡在者行十二門。諸佛所應出世止軀。漢有五通。三通諸根。諸根內舍。諸諸覺息等。於入還
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Thus interpreted, Dao’an’s text would be summarising in fairly clear terms the ivaṣṭi of the very same commentary he has seemingly mentioned on the preceding line: as noted above (pp. 278-279 and n. 114), the SMJ begins by introducing the three vinokamrāṇaḥ, indeed termed ivaṣṭiḥ, as a stage next to the twelve gates and producing higher spiritual gains crowned by a vṛṣṭemanyuṣa (though not referring to the attainment of Buddhahood as in Dao’an’s text).

Another noteworthy passage occurs at the beginning of this same first preface:

"The [pr-treṣe of] concentration has three meanings in this [stārā]: dhvasti, equanimity, empty space [meditation], by means of which the practitioner can heal the continuous series of serious illnesses caused by threefold poison [ājñā]."

This text, further developed in the following lines of the preface (CSZJ 45c 1-20), is discussed by Tanaka as reflecting Dao’an’s own interpretation. In fact here Dao’an is, again, very likely paraphrasing the SMJ-commence cf. l. 15-19 (as quoted and translated above pp. 278-279 and n. 118) where the three groups of practices are related to the threefold poison in exactly the same way.

6.2.2 An alternative interpretation

But if it is not by Dao’an’s hand, as I have demonstrated in the preceding section, this text is even less likely to be a later work. Indeed, in terminology is patently archaic, not counting the fact that, as Deleuze (forthcoming section 2) rightly observes, the new translation projects accomplished between the 4th and 5th centuries149 all of a sudden made An Shigao’s text and exegetical tradition a venerable docto.

However, if we take the SMJ-commence as a pre-Dao’an text, we ought not to forget that, as Dao’an himself tells us, the SMJ at least had been lost since around the middle of the 3rd century. Thus we find ourselves pushed back at least to the very epoch (and area: Jianye, Kingdom of Wu 神話, where the stāra was copied, witness the colophon quoted by Dao’an; see n. 82 above) when, presumably, the few earliest extant specimens of Chinese Buddhist exegesis (mainly related to An Shigao’s tradition) were composed.

Although, as already remarked, we can only speculate about the accuracy of Dao’an’s remarks on the early circulation of the SMJ, this terminus ante quem can be extended also to the SMJ-commence thanks to another source.

138 呂不道語：聞而善數。記名此語。（CSZJ 45c 28-36a 1）
139 途有三義：得也，達也，空也。用出三義翻譯之。（CSZJ 45b 28-29）
140 Tanaka 1971: 385-386; cf. also Tsubokoro 1979: 614
141 See also Ochiai 2001: 135. I am thinking not only of the scriptures introduced by Kumārajīva and Buddhahadra, but also of the Abhidharma and Āgama translations sponsored by Dao’an himself at the end of his career (see Zürcher 1972: 202-204).
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We observed (n. 111) that Zhi Qian’s T’ai-i rang-hsing fen-hsing 太子排揟本起經 T 185 contains a reference – drawn from one of its models, T 184 – to the twelve gates (T 185 p. 476c 27–29; 蕭鳴玉; 出十二門). However, what makes Zhi Qian’s text a key source for the history of our texts is another passage, occurring few lines after the mention of the “twelve gates”:

實在三向，一蓮向空，念滅不生，無滅無生，二蓮向想，心定不起，善業不生，三蓮不觀，不變三界，不復生者，便得三法，一蓮觀行，二蓮隨領，三蓮無極，無頂宣講（T 185 p. 477a 16–20; also translated by Link, references as in n. 111 above).

Although here Zhi Qian displays his customary skill in polishing other authors’ texts, this is easily recognisable as an elaboration of some passages from the SMJ commenting (l. 387–401, see pp. 278–280 and n. 125 and 118):
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We note that Zhi Qian altered some of the obscure explanations found in the SMJ commenting (e.g. 早內不出, dropped the portions commenting directly on the SMJ) and forced the original text into a four-syllable pattern. But, apart from the content, the terminology is remarkably consistent with the SMJ commenting (e.g. 三向, 三法, both not particularly common), etc., to the point of preserving the original wording (不願... 不願不願). 180

We may speculate that Zhi Qian was prompted by the reference to the “twelve gates” he could read in Kang Mengxiang’s text to consult directly An Shigao’s translations (which we know from the colophon quoted by Dao’er, were available in Jiaoye exactly when Zhi Qian was there; see n. 82 above) and the attached

180 Zicher (1978: 119; cf. also Matsuda 1988: 28) made clear that T 185 is not a translation but compilation based on a number of previous translations, including T 184. Thus it is not surprising that in such a miscellaneous work Zhi Qian could have also referred to the SMJ and the SMJ commenting. For an analysis and translation of the entire passage containing the reference and quotation from the Shāhān nek corpus see Link (1974: 212–214 n. 7 and 1976: 105–106n. 180). Inadvertently it is noteworthy that Kang Mengxiang, who made use of Zhijian’s text (see Link loc. cit.; cf. Niu Taochang, 1998: 98–100), did not mention the “twelve gates” in his LTJ T 152, although there is ample evidence that he was familiar with the SMJ commenting (see below n. 165 and n. 178).

181 Link was puzzled by this occurrence of 三向; he translated and commented upon this passage as follows: “He then gained three insights (texts give san has san; Denkmäler has suggested that has been emended to read sw) [1976: 106 end of n. 180]; cf. n. 115 above.

182 This interpretation of sprākṣaṁśa is interesting (cf. Do shaka in T 150 p. 207A 16–20), as the aspects of sprākṣaṁśa 聞聞有關類的勝作法會名相, tr. Lamotte 1970: 1223 § C.5). Also the definition of utsnaya as mental control (pravāha) does not seem particularly common, and yet is reflected in Zhi Qian’s text (text does not, 聞聞類), in these three vinayasūtras: nisiddhāra, cf. Lamotte 1970: 1213–1215, Deletrano 2009: 74 (and relevant notes) and, with reference to the Sarvāstivādin position, Kawamura 1966 (resp. pp. 210–211 on emptiness).
commentary. What matters is that the SM/comm was already in circulation by the time Zhi Qian compiled his biography of the Buddha105. Indeed, there are a number of facts attesting the close relationship between the SM/comm and the school or circle which during the 3rd century AD was dedicated to keeping An Shigao’s doctrinal lineage alive106.

By far the most important is the short exegetical appendix attached to the K-ASYJ (L. 275-281; cf. § 2 above). The first of those three glosses, introduces a combination of some of the aspects of the anugṛha practice (for which I follow Deleault’s renderings: see forthcoming section 1) with the four dhyānas:

The master said (say): “Comming breaths (pranāma) constitutes the first dhyāna, pursuing (anugṛha) the second dhyāna, focusing (sthāpita) the third dhyāna, contemplation (upāsana) the fourth dhyāna.”

Now cf. the SM/comm:

The master said (say): “Comming breaths (pranāma) constitutes the first dhyāna, pursuing (anugṛha) the second dhyāna, focusing (sthāpita) the third dhyāna, contemplation (upāsana) the fourth dhyāna.”

105 Of course, if the echoes of the SM/comm that can be traced in Zhi Qian’s model, Kang Mengxiang’s T 184 (see above n. 111) were due to direct borrowing, that would be the definitive evidence that the SM/comm, and a fortiori the two anthologies, date back to the Han. Although this hypothesis is quite probable, I think that the parallelism we find in T 184 is more generic than the one displaced by this passage of T 185.

106 The most detailed treatment of this tradition is Link 1976; see also Tang 1980: 67-69; Zürcher 1972: 52-54. The hypothesis that there has been a uninterrupted doctrinal lineage originating from An Shigao’s activity at Loyang during the Later Han, which was later transmitted to Central China at the end of the Han is based, ultimately, on Kang Senghui’s account contained in his preface to the Asan amaleng jing yongluoshu (see C24); p. 45b 27 – c 3; tr. Link 1976: 80). This document has been convincingly analysed by Link (1976: 63-64). What is more significant, is that this tradition is fully corroborated by the content of the surviving texts ascribed to that circle. Given that it will be of some importance in the following discussion, I think it is not improper to list here the relevant sources. The most important is the Fan chi ju jing (zhongli shu) T 1964 (YCRZ), a commentary on Pāṇḍitaśāstra ch. 6 translated by An Shigao (T 605); the YCRZ is traditionally ascribed to Chen Hui 陳慧 (i.e. one of the laitymen who transmitted the ABSTJ to Kang, as stated by the latter in the above mentioned preface), but bear signs of Kang Senghui’s collaboration (see Zürcher 2002: 93-94). Another important source, clearly to be used very carefully, is the ABSTJ T 602. Originally a translation, this scripture now contains, as it well-known, a number of glosses from the early commentary composed by Cheng Hui and Kang Senghui. Although it is often difficult to discern the glosses from the original text (e.g. see below n. 161), the ABSTJ T 602 remains an important source on An Shigao’s doctrinal lineage. According to Link (1976: 65), this scripture mainly consists of Dao’an’s commentary, but I think that Zürcher (1978: 110) is correct in pointing out that “... the language of the glosses in the Ts en-phon du-w zmang is archaic; ...” There is every reason to suppose that they basically represent the exegesis transmitted to Kang Seng-hui by the three laymen from the school of An Shih-kao, as stated by Kang in his preface to this scripture”. Apart from these exegetical texts, the «version of Kang Senghui’s preface is also a valuable resource for our research: besides that on the ABSTJ, the one on the Lu jing jing (zhongli shu) T 46b 10 – c 11, and those prefixed to the various sections of the LDJJ T 152, especially the fifth, on dikṣāṇāśāstra (translated by Link 1976: 105-124).
It is clearly the same phrase (incidentally, not a common treatment of the four dhyānas); yet not only is this not marked in the SM[comm] as a quotation, but, as shown by the final remark (H;y;
"they are the first four gates")139, it is part of a particular broader context (i.e. exactly the exposition of the Śīlaṃ [men]).

In short: the first gloss, that attached to the K-ASVY, is without doubt a quotation from the SM[comm].

A partial, but intriguing parallel to this interpretation occurs also in the YCRJ7 T 1694 p. 21a 1-25:

"Counting breaths constitutes the fixation (āśū ṭa) of mindfulness related to the body (kāyānubhāva); kīya-kṣaṇamārgaḥ (kīya-kṣaṇamārgaḥ), pursing constitutes the fixation of mindfulness related to the sensations, formless constitutes the fixation of mindfulness related to the mind, contemplation constitutes the fixation of mindfulness related to the dharmas; when these four bodies139 are fixed, the five observing elements (ākara, akṣara-haṃsa) are fixed; this constitutes turning (viveka); turning to purification (sārūpyaḥ) this is complying with the four dhyānas139."

What the author(s) of the YCRJ is (are) trying to do here, is quite obviously, to link the six aspects of the ānāpānasati to some categories found in the YCRJ. The first four equations are of particular interest to us: here the sārūpyagacchānas are matched to four aspects of the ānāpānasati. There is no literal identity between this portion of the YCRJZ and the passage from the SM[comm] discussed above, it is true. In the SM[comm], it is the four dhyānas that are matched to the same ānāpānasati categories139. There is, however, a remarkable doctrinal consistency if we consider the standpoint characteristic of the SM: because in the latter scripture, as noted above (§ 5), the dhyāna - or, anyway, what the author of the SM[comm] interpreted as the four dhyānas - are indeed connected, in a rather peculiar way, to the sārūpyagacchānas139.

139 The classification of the content of SM and SM [SM (Sr-Śīlaṃ. 104-Śīlaṃ 105. 104Śīlaṃ and 1-Śīlaṃ 105) is a constant refrain in the SM[comm] e.g. see Il. 404-408, 404-454, 416, 419, 422-424 and passim.
139 śāla-haṃsa- treattah ("four grounds for selfhood" according to Nāgārumī 1606: 166 [485] mentioned by YCRJ 172: 15-15; cf. Petkachev 121, 1-4, cf. Zacchetti 2002: 85, where I wrongly mentioned 2 as the only translation of anātha-bhāva; the YCRJ text quoted at that point should be corrected to anātha-bhāva, which is indeed An Shiho's literal rendering of anātha-bhāva; cf. YCRJ T 605 p. 175: 13. 175: 15-15; anātha-bhāva (translated by Us 1975: 145 as अनात्ताय भावम् (as it is not represented in the Chinese translation). In this case YCRJ's gloss is a bit misleading: the term & [less] the body etc. (T 1694 p. 21a 24).
139 śāla-haṃsa- treattah ("four grounds for selfhood"
139 the passage of the YCRJZ connected with gacchāna m as one of the ātis bya, in YCA T 605 p. 277b 24-26 = Petkachev 128, 25 = 139, 6).
139 Delano (forthcoming n. 30) observes that Kaṭaṃ Senbhisīūroū to the vedānta śūdrīkya also displays "a combinatorial pattern of the six matters of the [ānāpānasati] and the four gates" similar to the gloss attached to the K-ASVY (see CSZI p. 48a 14 - 6 b, tr. Linn 1976: 72-76).
139 On the combination of gacchāna and dhanamārga ("dharmas", see also ASVY T 605 p. 170a 17-
Let us now consider the second gloss found at the end of the K-ABSY]. Here all the six aspects of the anupanasmiti are combined with the seven sets of the bodhipakṣikā dharmas:

The master said [say:] "Counting breaths (pātāla) constitutes the four fixations of mindfulness, purening (samyogita) the four forms of right abandoning, focusing (dhyāna) the four kinds of supernatural power, contemplation (upadhyeya) the five faculties and the five forces, and turning (vṛtta) the seven thoughts [which make up] awakening, purification (pārīśuddhi) the eightfold Path."

There is no reason to doubt that this is the same "master" referred to by the immediately preceding gloss. Now, this second gloss also occurs, in almost the same words, in the ABSY] T 602 (p. 164b 18-19):

In the light of the parallel found in the MS, this passage too gives every appearance of being a gloss, one of the many interpolated in the text of the ABSY] T 602.

What can we conclude from all these pieces of evidence? The author of the SM[comm (who also authored the three glosses attached to the K-ABSY]) was a prominent figure in the tradition which produced the YCR]Z and the commentary inlaid into the ABSY] T 602; not only is he referred to as a "master" in the MS, but his interpretations were authoritative enough to influence, directly or indirectly, the commentaries on An Shigao's two main scriptures produced by that circle.

Apart from this, the three glosses also provide us with the main (though, admittedly, not conclusive) argument for not considering the SM[comm a translation from an already existing Indic original: the fact that the person whose interpretations are quoted in these three passages is referred to simply as the "master" 先师, without further qualification, seemingly implies a certain degree of familiarity and proximity (and indeed we find such "masters" referred to in the same

---

188 This expression, 四神足念 (whereas the gloss in the Kongō-ji MS has only 四神足, "the four pātāla"), indeed none too clear to me, occurs also elsewhere in the ABSY] T 602: e.g. p. 106c 6, 166c 10 and 170c 25.

189 Note that U. Hakuji, who in his translation of the ABSY] T 602 attempted to separate sūtra and glosses, took this passage as part of the sūtra (U. 1971: 204; cf. Aramaki 1971: 157). It is hardly necessary to say that it would be entirely unfair to criticize U.'s work (indeed a remarkable scholarly achievement and still very useful; see also Zimmer 1978: 118) on the basis of a source he could not access. But, unavoidably, in a number of cases his interpretations remain speculative (see also Delamarche's remarks: forthcoming, 55).

190 We ought not to forget that the commentary interpolated in the ABSY] T 602, though composed by Chen Hui with Kang Sinhu's assistance, was very probably based on An Shigao's own exegesis of this sūtra, as amusingly demonstrated by Link (1976: 64).
way in other early commentaries: the YCR[Z T 1684 and that on the first chapter of T 225). If we now turn to the text of the SM[comm], we will notice a number of remarkable features, intriguingly and significantly dialectical, so to speak.

a) Unlike the other surviving works of An Shigao’s followers (see p. 287 n. 154 above), the SM[comm] does not seem to quote explicitly from other sources (especially translated stūpas)

b) While using very often the combinations of numerically arranged categories that are typical of this tradition (apart from the examples quoted above, see YCR[Z T 1694 and ABR[S] T 692) and even, as I have demonstrated, with some significantly precise parallels with other early commentaries, the author of the SM[comm] remains firmly rooted in Buddhist terrain. I mean that the daring interpretatiostra and the adoption of categories typical of Chinese non-Buddhistic thought, not rare in the YCR[Z T 1694, seem to have no room here.

c) In fact, there is some evidence, still largely to be evaluated, I must admit, suggesting that the author of the SM[comm] was directly familiar with Indian Buddhist sources (I mean not through translation).

See, for instance, a passage on 1. 422-428 where the author gives a rather detailed description of the fruits / rebirth to be attained through the practice of one of various gates:

195 CL S. 474 as a possible exception (but that passage is very obscure).

196 A passage from Petakapadana ch. 6 is also worth mentioning in connection to this topic (cf. n. 129 above). Petakapadana p. 145, 7-18 (tr. Nāmarāja 1966: 194-195, § 594-597, under the subtitle “Combination with various ideas”) introduces various patterns of combination of the four dharmas with a number of other categories. Just to quote an example (from Nāmarāja’s translation, 1964: 195 § 597): “(Again) the first meditation is through the Dispositions, the second meditation is through the Void, the third meditation is through the Sigalas, the fourth meditation is through Mindfulness of Breathing” (Petakapadana 145, § 11: Aputtikātha pethāṇa jilūna, attānagga dārājan jilūna, antātīṭaṇa tātikāna jilūna, ājīvikaṇa tattvāna jilūna). Although I have not found, so far, any precise parallel to these passages of the Petakapadana in either SM[comm], YCR[Z T 1694 or ABR[S] T 692, the formal similarity of this treatment of the dharmas with a number of glosses occurring in these early Chinese commentaries is striking and undeniable (cf. the glosses found at the end of the K-AB[S] discussed above, pp. 287-289). This is a potentially very significant point not just for the study of this text, but, in more general terms, for our understanding of the beginning of Chinese Buddhist exegesis. In discussing the early phase of Chinese Buddhist translations, Prof. Zürcher observed that “some elements in a scripture could – for a variety of reasons – ‘catch on’ and become productive factors in Chinese Buddhism, whereas other motives figuring in the same text would remain alien and undegusted” (1991: 277). This seems a case in point. These patterns of numerical combinations were, as I have observed elsewhere (Zürcher 305: 82 n. 47), naturally appealing to the Chinese audience of the Han period, witness their frequency in the early Buddhist commentaries. And yet we see that they were not (or not only) the product of artificial thought. The influence exerted by the Petakapadana hermeneutical methodologies – with which An Shigao must obviously have been acquainted – on early Chinese Buddhist exegesis is a topic deserving careful reconsideration.
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One also notices the reiteration of  "to fall" in the sense of "to be reborn", a meaning not normally associated to this word in Chinese17; e.g., 現七天 "is reborn among the gods of the seventh [class] etc., etc.,". This might be the calque of an Indic word (possibly a derivative of upa-paśa). But what is perhaps most interesting is the occurrence of some phonetic transcriptions which to the best of my knowledge do not seem attested elsewhere in the Chinese canon. I quote here two of these transcriptions, by way of an example (the pronunciation is reconstructed after Collin 1984)18:

- 阿 nghèo the phonetic *a ni gian tia nia xia dan na (akāśānayaśāvataṁ);
- 尼逝若先伽先伽 the phonetic *ni sian xia ni sian nia xia dan na (nairasamajjilānayaśāvataṁ)19.

Another noteworthy passage occurs in the second section of the SM:com1

"Sounds are the enemy of the first dhyanas; 'dealing with the object of thinking' (10), *vāciṣṭra is the enemy of the second dhyanas; joy is the enemy of the third dhyanas; resurgence is the enemy of the fourth dhyanas. In the case of the first dhyanas, why are sounds the enemy? Because of 'dealing with the object' and thinking (5) (10, *vāciṣṭra and *vāciṣṭrā) (upon such sensations). In the case of the second dhyanas, why is 'dealing with the object of thinking' the enemy? Because of the desire (that remains) when the practitioner has left the state of dhyanas (7). In the case of the third dhyanas, why is joy the enemy? Because of its seeming mental agitation. In the case of the fourth dhyanas, why is resurgence the enemy? Because when one has gained the fourth dhyanas, resurgence urges (11) [the] mind, as he has not yet gone up to the second group of four gates"19.

Some of these explanations are rather obscure, but this discussion of the Jhyānas is unmistakably reminiscent of a canonical passage:

"Sound is a thorn to the first Jhāna, mental and sustained thought are a thorn to the second Jhāna, joy is a thorn to the third Jhāna, breathing in and out is a thorn to the fourth Jhāna"20.

1543 p. 357f. x7-x8: "The aśraṇa only says that there are twenty-eight categories of gods. I.e., from the rātra-nidrā, until the gods of the naivasaṃjñānaśāvataṁ [includes]... the four misfortunes are forever exterminated."
17 CS HD 5: 1506. Incidentally, for some reason which escapes me, the verb  seems to have had particular appeal for an Indian, as it occurs repeatedly in his translations, in a variety of meanings.
18 Other two transcriptions, unfortunately of difficult reading, occur in an immediately preceding passage of the SM:com 3: 436-437.
19 This transcription has a partial parallel in the Aśvākaś bhārata lobha the translation of the *Alāttāhaṇaśajjāvahitaśāvataṁ accomplished in 583 AD: T 1543 p. 785c 29: 尼逝若先伽先伽. a translation of the 阿 nghèo the phonetic *a ni gian tia nia xia dan na (akāśānayaśāvataṁ). An additional verse from the *Alāttāhaṇaśajjāvahitaśāvataṁ accomplished in 583 AD: T 1543 p. 106c 14-15: 阿notEmpty = 阿notEmpty the phonetic *a ni gian tia nia xia dan na (akāśānayaśāvataṁ); but the sense would remain unclear. "in the absence of such a passage..."
20 The reversed order of the list is unexpected. I would not exclude that here ज्ञान is used as a verb, unrelated to व्रजिका; but the sense would remain unclear. CS ABY 6 60 p. 1505 14-15: ज्ञान ज्ञान = ज्ञान ज्ञान the phonetic *a ni gian tia nia xia dan na (akāśānayaśāvataṁ)."
The Chinese has "enemy" (敵), which is also a legitimate interpretation of Pali
and Sanskrit *apalāka, "enem]. Note that the author of the SMJ concent did not
explicitly mark this passage (on which he further elaborated in the following line) as
a quotation; in other words, this looks very much like the reminiscence of a canonical
passage freely inserted into a general discussion of the alyyana35. This way of
handling the passage suggests a familiarity with canonical sources rather than
uncommon in early Chinese Buddhist exegetical literature.

D) On the other hand, I could not find in the SMJ concent any significant
trace of those mistakes originating from the already translated text that I have pointed
out elsewhere (Zacchetti 2002: 23 n. 108), make very unlikely the identification of the
"Master" mentioned in several glosses of the VCRJ 27: 1669 as An Shigao.

In short: the author of the SMJ concent was certainly related, from an authoritative
perspective, to the circle, representing the continuation of An Shigao's tradition, active
in the 3rd century Kingdom of Wu, but he was probably not a Chinese. Then, indeed,
we start to wonder who was he, among the few persons known to us to have been
affiliated with this tradition.

There are, in my opinion, two possible hypotheses: Kang Senghui or An Shigao
himself36. Certainly Kang Sengui, who was also a translator, must have been directly
familiar with Indian texts. And indeed we find in his writings some obvious parallels

35 Yang Senghui's (1137) T 152 (p. 393c 25 - 30) contains an interesting parallel to this passage of
the SMJ concent: 時，云而異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異
難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異
難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異
難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異
難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異
難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異
難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異
難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異
難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異難，三板，心即異
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36 Less likely An Xiun and Yan Fouli, Zhi Qian, who was familiar with the SMJ concent, as noted
above, is also a hypothesis worth considering. But apart from the style, the doctrinal content of
the SMJ concent appears rather remote from what we know of Zhi Qian's activity (the completion of
Jean Nattier's major lexico-grammar project on Zhi Qian's corpus will certainly shed more light on
this issue; cf. her article in the present issue of ARIRAB); Incidentally, nowhere in the catalogues or
the biographies related to all these persons is a commentary on the SMJ mentioned. I do not
know how decisive this negative argument could be. But if it has any weight, it would be less serious
in the case of An Shigao. In fact Van Fossa (see below p. 295) describes the formola's production of
oral communities as a rather sizeable one.
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so the SMJ-comm (see n. 165 and n. 178). But the style displayed by Kang’s other known works is completely different from the present text, which show few signs, if any, of the literary mastery typical of the aristiclate Sino-Sogdian author.

The Buddhism of Kang Senghui, and in general of the Wu area in that period, was the first systematic attempt to put foreign (Buddhist) wine into Chinese bottles. Then it is quite clear that the SMJ-comm reflects a different context. For instance, as already remarked above, The "Master" of the YCRJZ glosses reveals a familiarity with non-Buddhist Chinese thought — or, rather, a willingness to make use of Chinese traditional categories (such as "original ether" or "soul" or "ghost") to interpret the Buddhist text — of which there is no trace in the SMJ-comm.

In fact it is Zhi Qian’s reference to the SMJ-comm (cf. p. 286 above) that may, again, provide us with the strongest argument. We do not know when, precisely, the Taisi ruanying benqi jing T 185 was composed. However, according to CSZJJ p. 97c 10 (従黄武元年至建興中) Zhi Qian’s activity as a translator ended around 253 AD (see also Zürcher 1972: 355-356 n. 186). In fact when Kang Senghui moved to Jianye, in 247, Zhi Qian had already left the capital of Wu to live in retirement on the Mount Qionglong 峪龍山. Apart from other considerations, this makes the hypothesis that Zhi Qian, in his Taisi ruanying benqi jing, could have quoted from a commentary composed by Kang Senghui (who, in fact, in his LDJJ T 152 drew in turn from T 185), seen above n. 150) extremely unlikely.

If this analysis is correct, An Shigao’s authorship would remain the most logical working-hypothesis. Then, given that Kang Senghui was certainly acquainted with An Shigao’s exegetical works, the parallels between the SMJ-comm and Kang’s LDJJ T 152 we have observed are to be interpreted as borrowings from the former into the latter: it is quite possible that Kang could refer to the SMJ-comm and other commentaries by the Parthian forming the doctrinal common fund of the school...

[Note 16: I think that Prof. Zürcher’s tentative identification of the Master of the YCRJ as Kang Senghui remains the most likely hypothesis (Zürcher 1972: 54; cf. also Zachetti 2002: 94 n. 112). Perhaps it is not a mere coincidence that the parallel discussed above between the SMJ master’s gloss and the YCRJ passage does not occur in a gloss authored by the YCRJ “master”, if the hypothesis I put forward in Zachetti 2002: 93-94 and n. 111-112 — i.e. that the YCRJ is the outcome of a team-work similar to the one originated Chen / Kang’s commentary to the ARBJ T 94 and 95 — it is correct, it is possible that T 1994 also contains An Shigao’s interpretations, as the common fund of the school.]

[Note 17: T 1994 p. 96 13; 108 b 1; 136 6; 146 7 etc. For a different evaluation of this commentary, see Lai 1986.]

[Note 18: Zürcher 1972: 49 and 51.]

[Note 19: As a corollary, this hypothesis on the authorship of the SMJ-comm — and consequently, also of the three glosses attached to the KABJ — would also demonstrate that the ARBJ T 602 indeed contains traces of An Shigao’s magnum opus.]

[Note 20: The passages which I have traced of influence from the SMJ-comm occur in paragraphs of the LDJJ T 152 (23-5-7 6) etc., according to Shi Tianzhang’s analysis (1998: 97), were composed by Kang himself and reflect the official translation of An Shigao].
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A well-known preface by Yan Fiao 袁发表了, who was one of An Shigao’s disciples, informs us that part of a master’s production consisted of oral explanations (或說 or 說). In the Canon under the names of An Xuan 安玄 and Yan Fiao 袁发表了, is in all probability a remnant of An Shigao’s exegetical activity and an example of “oral explanation” 訴 noted down by his assistants.

Perhaps the SMJ (comm) was the “oral explanation” on the SMJ – a lecture on this श्लोक (perhaps delivered after the translation) that develops into a detailed discussion of the अन्ध्यात्म. Syntactically, our commentary seems consistent with the Akan कृष्णि त 1508. A detailed comparative analysis must be reserved for the future, but we may easily notice, in both, a somewhat rhapsoedic form (perfectly understandable in such an oral explanation), the lack of quotations (or, at least, of explicit quotations) from other translated scriptures already noted above, the systematic recourse to numerical lists and the frequent use of the pattern question / answer (何等何等 ... / 何等何等)

In conclusion, the SMJ (comm) is in all probability one of the earliest surviving Buddhist exegetical texts composed in China. Though related to other commentaries, it stands as a very distinct text in terms of both typology and doctrinal content.

Its authorship cannot be decided with absolute certitude at the moment, but An Shigao remains, in my opinion, the most likely candidate, although I have to admit that there remain several questions awaiting answers.

168 [CSZJ] T 2115 p. 69c 19 – 70a 8; on this document see Forte 1905: 66.

169 Zurcher 1901: 208; Forte 1908: 190-194 and 1905: 82 n. 40.

170 E.g. T 1508 p. 55a 8; 55a 14; 55a 20 and passim; cf. SMJ (comm) I. 387: 589; 407 and passim. On the significance of this pattern in early Chinese exeges, especially with regard to An Shigao, see Tang Yingying’s remarks (1985: 80-82). Of course this stylistic feature is very common in Indian commentaries as treaties (e.g. cf. the Pāñcakhaṇḍa). By a curious coincidence, the SMJ (comm) and the Akan कृष्णि त 1508 have almost exactly the same length.

167 I mention here just two of the main problems to be addressed in a future research on the SMJ (comm): the first is the evaluation of the phonetic transcriptions found in the SMJ (comm) (see above p. 292); can these transcriptions date back to the Han period? And which underlying Indic language do they reflect? Incidentally, it is true that An Shigao tried to avoid such transcriptions in his translations (Zurcher 1991: 283), but it is not difficult to imagine that, while giving oral explanations on the texts he translated, he might have mentioned or passed some original Indic words, which were noted down by his assistants. The second problem is the peculiar treatment of the अन्ध्यात्म-stages we find in this commentary: which अनिवार्य tradition does it reflect? And, supposing that An Shigao was indeed the author of the SMJ (comm), how did this text influence the exegetical tradition that originated from the Pa_liṇa’s activity at Loyang? Apparently there is no trace of it either in the ABSVT T 602, in the YCRJZ T 1694 or in Kang Bengjun’s corpus (e.g. cf. LJJ T 152 p. 29c 22).
Chinese Buddhist Sutra Commentaries of the Early Period

Hiroshi Kanno

The Problem Stated

The foremost composition of commentaries to the Buddhist sutras could well be said to be one of the characteristic features of Chinese Buddhism. Translation of Buddhist scriptures into Chinese began around the latter half of the second century, thereby making it possible for the Chinese to study Buddhist teachings in their native language. The Buddhist scriptures were traditionally divided into three broad categories of sutra, vinaya, and treatise. As the study of Buddhist teachings progressed, commentaries began to be written for various works among these recently translated sutras, vinayas, and treatise materials. There had already been a long-standing tradition in China of compositing commentaries for the Confucian classics and philosophical works such as the Laozi and Zhuangzi. This indigenous literary tradition is thought to have provided a stimulus to the production of commentaries on the Buddhist scriptures. Because the sutras, among the Buddhist scriptures as a whole, were considered to be the most legitimate basis for investigating the thought of the Buddha, expository works on the sutras (i.e., "sutra commentaries") came to be produced with utmost fervor. Generally speaking, when Chinese Buddhists wanted to express their own thoughts, they did not necessarily shun independent treatises. Instead, the common practice was to convey them through the medium of the sutra commentary. However, it is important not to overlook the fact that such collections as the Hongmang ji 弘明集 and Guangzhongming ji 康弘明集 preserve quite a few independent tracts and according to the catalogue of the Chu samang ji 出三藏記集, numerous treatises were compiled that are no longer extant today.

Enishi Ōchō wrote an article titled, "Investigations into the History of Sutra Exegesis" (Shakkyōshikō), which was specifically concerned with transitions and developments in the exegetical practices used in sutra commentaries over the course of Chinese Buddhist history.1 Being a superb study that deals with the entire span of Chinese Buddhist history, I have consulted it extensively in the course of writing this article. However, this paper will focus on the investigation of sutra commentaries from the time of their inception in the Later Han down to the commentaries of Jōgyō
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Huiyuan 惠能 (523-592), Zhìyì 智顗 (538-598), and Jiūzāng 智藏 (549-621). So doing, I will attempt to provide an overview of developments in the form, content, and exegetical method of written commentaries to the Buddhist sutras that took place during this early formative period.

1. The Distinction Between 'Interlinear' (zhú) and 'Exposition of the Meaning' (yìshū) forms of Commentary, and the Evolution from the 'Interlinear' to the 'Expository' form in Chinese Buddhist History

Ryūichi Kogachi, in his article on "The Ritual of Offering Food to Earlier Sages and Masters (xiào lǐ) and the Scholastic Tradition of the Expository Commentary," raises the question of how we are to understand the basic distinction between the 'exposition of the meaning' or 'expository' (yìshū) style of commentary, which took shape and became mainstream during the period of the Northern and Southern Dynasties, and the 'interlinear' (zhú) style of commentary that was popular from the Later Han through the Wei and Jin periods. Using commentaries to Confucian texts as his primary material, Kogachi defined the 'interlinear commentary' as a form that reproduces passages from the original scripture in their entirety. Explanations are then applied to the text, so that the original sūtra text is accorded priority and the interlinear commentary itself does not stand independent of the subject scripture. On the other hand, the 'exposition of the meaning' style of commentary (which we shall call the 'expository commentary', for short) does not reproduce the entire text of the sūtra. It includes only selected passages (duly abridged and edited by the author), to which comments are then added, making it something that must be regarded as the work of the compiler himself. When we apply this distinction between 'interlinear' and 'explanation of the meaning' forms of commentary to the sutra commentaries composed during the early period of Chinese Buddhism (in this paper, the term "commentary" will be used inclusively to refer to both the interlinear and expository forms), it is clear that the oldest extant commentaries adopt the 'interlinear' form, while commentaries that adopt the 'expository' form (Daosheng's 僧生 Mínga lüehsien jīng zhú 僧法蓮華經釋 表 being a representative early example) come into vogue at a later date. This developmental transition from the interlinear to the expository format in Chinese Buddhist exegetical literature possibly reflects the influence of a parallel change from the use of the interlinear to the expository style of commentary in the exegetical literature of the Confucian classics. But might not this shift from the interlinear to the expository style of commentary just as well be connected to a feature distinctive of Buddhist literature?

As indicated above, the interlinear style of commentary entailed reproduction of the original sūtra text in its entirety, followed by a suitable segmenting of the text's constituent passages, with explanations inserted either beneath or after the respective

2 Ryūichi Kogachi, "Sōkenron to Gōshukon," in Ichiro Kominami (ed), Chigeki no yori to yōrō (Kyoto: Hōyū shobō, October, 2001).
passage. Hence, if one were to compose an interlinear commentary for a sutra of unusually great length, might it not become an enormous burden, even to the point of practical impossibility? Even in the case of Buddhist commentaries of the 'expository' style we find many examples where explanations tend to become shorter as one proceeds to the latter part of the sutra. When we further consider the increasing number of translated sutras as well as their textual explanation, might not the shift from the interlinear to the expository form of commentary have been a necessity? Some extant interlinear commentaries indicate that they were generally written for shorter sutras. In the case of the Dapan niupan jing jijie 大般涅槃經集解, the text of the commentary incorporates the Southern Edition of the Nirvāṇa Sūtra through citation of its opening and closing lines. If the text of the commentary incorporated the Nirvāṇa Sūtra in its entirety, it would have become unduly long.

Moreover, the analytic division or parsing (分科) of the text content of commentaries of the 'expository' style is quite difficult to apply to interlinear commentaries. Even in the Jingang horechubumi jing zhu 金刚般若波羅蜜經注 (Interlinear Commentary to the Diamond Sūtra), which we shall take up later, analytic parsing of the sutra can be found, but these divisions involve no more than a simple analysis of the body of the sutra into three broad sections.

However, we must also consider the philosophical background of the shift from interlinear commentaries to expository commentaries. Whereas the interlinear commentaries tended to pay attention to relatively superficial matters, such as the meanings of the words themselves, the expository commentaries tended to focus on the underlying themes of the texts as we can see, for instance, in Wangbi’s Wudi (216-249) and Daocheng’s treatment of the Chinese classics and Buddhist sutras. I will discuss Daocheng’s attitude toward the sutras in the latter part of this paper.1

Now, we know from the Chu ssanq jijie that, early on, Zhiqian 支謙 (end of the second to the middle of the third century) composed an interlinear commentary to the Liaotien gengyi yue 了本生死部, and that Kangsheng 江僧會 (7-280) produced an interlinear commentary to the Ashok shouyi jing 安般守意經, the Faqing jing 法經, and the Daobao jing 大寶經, although these commentaries no longer survive. The following commentaries from the early period, composed in the interlinear style, are still extant in their complete form.

The first is the two fascicules Yin chi ru jing zhu 隨持入般注, written by Chenhui 陳慧 (from the kingdom of Wu) for An Shigao’s translation of the Yin chi ru jing 隨持入般. Chenhui’s Yin chi ru jing zhu 隨持入般注 is attached to the text as a preface. Therein we find some fifteen citations that begin with the phrase “the master says 鈐云,”.2 In addition, the words “one interpretation states - 詩云” (with the alternate phrasing - 詩説云) 3

1 Both Wushi and Daocheng placed primary on the exegetical approach of “grasping the meanings and letting go of the words 一字一句.” I was motivated to include this explanation of the shift from interlinear notes to expository commentaries based on personal discussions with Prof. Bernard Faure as the IABS conference in Thailand, December 2002.

2 Chu sanq jijie, 13, T 55, 97a, 97b.
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言) appear three times. Thus we have clear reference to other explanations or commentaries. In addition, citations from some thirteen different sources appear in the commentary, the titles of which Zen’etsu Tsukamoto has already brought to our notice.1 Evidently, Tsukamoto was concerned primarily with citations from the Zhengyin jing 中
心经 (two such quotes are to be found) and the question of whether this Zhengyin jing is the same text as the Tszenjening 淡真经, Lokaksema’s 李那伽耶 Thatzonzentaruus muwuen tsubiki sanmei jing 末果摩羅所聞如來三味經. It is clear, however, that the reference is to the Zhengyin jing 心経 translated by Tanwulan 曹雲朗. However, there is no anachronism here, for the Chinese translator Tanwulan was active during the fourth century, the period of the Eastern Jin, and, thus, postdates Chenhui. On this basis, Tang Yongtong has suggested that credit for translating the Zhengyin jing, the original translator’s identity being unknown, was later ascribed to Tanwulan.2 Aside from this, there are three places in the commentary where we find the words “a sūtra states” 佛曰. Two of these are citations from the Foji jing 佛吉經, translated by Zhijian as the Shihemai jing 张頌脈經. (The source of the third citation is unclear.) In addition, we find two instances where the text uses the phrase, “a sūra says” 佛曰. However, the source has not been identified. Finally, there are four places where the commentary says, “the Abhan explanation states” 伽般解曰. This probably refers to the interlinear commentary in the Abhan shary jing 阿難說經 compiled jointly by Chenhui and Kangyemui.3

Second is the interlinear commentary that we find embedded in the original text of Zhijian’s translation of the Daminglu jing 大明湖經. The Daminglu jing contains six fascicles in total. The commentary is supplied only for the first fascicle, the Practice Chapter. The identity of the commentary’s author is uncertain, but the style of commentary is also interlinear. The text contains some twenty citations that are introduced by the words “a master states” 大師云. The argument that these statements might refer to Zhijian is persuasive.4 In addition, citations also appear from Weijian’s 维简的 translation of the Foji jing, Zhijian’s Lao ben shengai jing, Lokaksema’s Chanchen jing, and Zhijian’s Haidin sanmei jing 華帝三味經.5


3 This same sūtra passage is cited in the Daminglu jing shuo 大明湖經說, where the source is identified as the Chanchen jing 仍契經.


7 This same citation also appears in the Tipitaka grup jing. See note 7 above.
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Third is the Ren keng yu sheng jing zhu 人本佛教經注, another interlinear commentary composed by Daoan 道安 (314-385) for An Shigao’s translation of the Ren ben yu sheng jing 人本與生經. This also includes Daoan’s preface, the Ren ben yu sheng jing su 人本與生經序. One of its special attributes is an inclusion of citations from the three sutras of the Yin chi ru jing, the Fa jin jing, and Zhiqian’s translation of the Qifa senguan jing 七處三觀經. In addition, we find text critical remarks concerning the original form of the sutra. For example, the expression, “The sentence order is reversed 句倒,” appears five times in the text, indicating an error in the order or syntax of the phrasing of the sutra. We also find such statements as “[The character] xian should be xian 獲當為見,” which reflects a concern to correct the orthography of the text. There are statements indicating that words or characters we missing or have been added, and of particular interest, we find such remarks as “Indian language is straightforward, having no qualms about elaborating in extensive detail,” indicating that, although the verbose repetition often found in the Buddhist sutras was regarded as bad literary form in China, it was a feature distinctive to Indian language.

As Enchi Ochô has pointed out, the three interlinear commentaries discussed above find a common attribute in the fact that they do not show evidence of analytically dividing their sutras into discrete sections.

We have a fourth example in the Jingang hore boluomi jing zhu (Interlinear Commentary to the Zambala Sutra) attributed to Senghao 僧浩 (384-414). According to Hakuju Us, this commentary is not by Senghao, but is actually the work of Xie Lingyun 戴靈運 (385-413). Although it is not identified as a preface to the sutra, before launching into explanation of the opening phrase, “Thus have I heard,” the commentary inserts a section that is akin to a sutra preface. In that text, there is a line that reads, “The [Fundamental] principle [expressed in the Jingang hore jing] is reverence to the middle way and the core tenet of the two truths,” where we find evidence of discussions concerning the two truths and middle way. In addition, this introductory section provides an explanation of the title of the sutra similar to those routinely encountered in sutra prefaces. Moreover, we find the statement, “The essential substance of this sutra takes the wisdom of emptiness as its focus,” and we see evidence of a

12 My paper takes up interlinear commentaries extant in their complete form. However, I would like to mention the fragments of interlinear commentary to the Vimalakirti Sutra preserved in a Dunhuang Manuscript, See Shi Giang, Dunhuang xiquan P006 Zhiqian ben Wenhao jing zhuju kao 敦煌譜序 P006 [支謙的譜序] (Beijing: Tauffer wenhua, 1998. According to her opinion, this commentary should be attributed to Daoan.
13 T. 19, 1b, 3b, 3a, 4a.
14 T. 19, 1b, etc.
15 T. 3, 33, 4a.
18 Z (大日本隗領) 38.3. 208c.
simple analytic parsing of the body of the sutra into three sections. This arrangement specifies that the first section clarifies the emptiness of dharmas; the second section, the emptiness of wisdom; and the third, the emptiness of the bodhisattva. Moreover, the scripture itself is accorded the status of being the first sutra preached during the “four phases or installments in [the preaching of] the prajñā [sutras]”. Frequent use of the term “principle” (四谛) in the passage by passage explanations of the sutra content is another distinctive feature of the commentary, a feature that it shares in common with Daosheng’s commentaries. One senses that the text resembles the commentary of Daosheng in literary form as well. Also, we find various technical exegetical terms that often appear in later commentaries, such as the terms “recounting firmly” (續述), “concluding firmly” (結述), “establishing doctrinal correspondences or equivalents to the simile” (合論).

Aside from the four commentaries singled out above, we also have An Shigao’s translation of the Abhāsāyānajīva. In this case, the interlinear commentary is integrated directly into the text of the sutra itself, making it difficult to distinguish clearly between the two. In Kangxenghui’s preface to the text, the Abhāsāyānajīva was (included in facsimile 6 of the Chuanzang jīji, we find the statement, “Chenhuai composed a commentary to the text, and I have assisted in revising it.” From this we know that Chenhuai wrote the interlinear commentary and Kangxenghui lent his hand to it.23

So far we have introduced various extant interlinear commentaries. However, at this point we should mention the Zhen weimo jyō hoshū jōng 注釋摩訶所依觀 (Interlinear Commentary to the Vimalakīrti Sūtra, hereafter abbreviated as Zhen weimo). This is a work that reproduces the text of the Weimojō jyō or Vimalakirti Sutra in its entirety, incorporating it into the comments of Jiulouzhi 海藻志, Sengzhao, and Daosheng. Such reproduction of the complete text of the sutra is representative of the interlinear commentary format. However, there is some question as to whether the constituent commentaries of the Zhen weimo were interlinear commentaries or commentaries of the expository type prior to their combination into a single work. Since a separate interlinear commentary by Sengzhao has been discovered,24 we presently know for certain that Sengzhao’s commentary was an interlinear commentary to the Weimo jōng before it was incorporated into the Zhen weimo. Moreover, Masaya Kudo has armised that, in contrast to Sengzhao’s commentary being of the ‘interlinear’ variety, Daosheng’s commentary

8 Same as above.

20 See the Preface Chuppee of the Sanskrt bhe jōng 仁王經印記, T 821b, where it gives the list, “Mālo bhe ho bholam 裏側陀波俱跋摩, Jōngyō bhe ho bholam 般若陀波俱跋摩, Tathāgatgyō bhe ho bholam 唐陀跋波俱跋摩, and Guanyun bhe ho bholam 月輪陀波俱跋摩.”

22 T 55. 43b-c.

23 Daosheng’s Zhen zhu su (included in facsimile 6 of the Chuanzang jīji, states, “At the beginning of the Wei, Kangxenghui wrote a commentary to the Abhāsāyānajīva but its meaning was obscure and not yet fully illuminated,” (T 55. 43c) indicating that it was Kangxenghui and not Chenhuai who composed the commentary. However, in actuality it was probably composed jointly by Chenhuai and Kangxenghui.

24 An interlinear commentary by Daosheng appears only in one place. T 55. 371c-372a.
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might have been of the 'expository' variety. This makes sense. Daosheng's "Miaofa lianhsua jing shu" (Expository Commentary to the Lotus Sutra) is the only extant text among his writings to survive intact, yet it is an 'explanation of the meaning' commentary. Be that as it may, what do we actually know about the commentary by Daosheng included in the Dapai niupan jing jijie? When we consider the sheer size of the Dapai niupan jing (the southern edition of the Niupan jing or Nirasaka Sutra in thirty-six fascicles) and the fact that the recorded comments by Daosheng actually addressed to sutra passages are so few in number, we can infer that Daosheng's commentary, after all, was of the 'expository' variety.

Sengren's 'Pinmaihsuedi jing yiuxu xu' (Preface to the Expository Commentary to the Vimalakirti Sutra) is preserved in fascicle eight of the Chu sanzang jijie. Thus we know that Sengren authored an 'expository' commentary to the Weimo jing, although it no longer survives. Some ten comments from Sengren's text are cited in Duiyi's 'Jingming jingying jiuwan jing khiu' (Preface to the Vimalakirti Sutra), which was included in T. 85.

Sengren's preface to the Vimalakirti Sutra is attached to the Zhu weimo as well. Sutra prefaces, on the whole, include records of such things as the central concept of the sutra, the explanation of the sutra's title, and particulars of its translation. However, later these topical foci develop into the so-called 'profound meaning' (szundi 禪典) or 'profound treatise' (szundi 禪論) commentarial literature typical of figures such as Jinang and Zhiyi. Moreover, we should take note of the fact that, just like the interlinear commentators to the three other sutras described above, division or paring of the sutra text is not discussed in the Zhu weimo.

2. One of the Oldest Surviving 'Explanation of the Meaning' Commentaries: Daosheng's "Miaofa lianhsua jing shu"

24 Janos Uda, in "Yamakagisho Soji ratchitboh," Sichuwatoki kumkyo 11 (December, 1977), introduces a text discovered at Turfan that contains exclusively of the interlinear comments of Sengren. Chi Luan, "Touko aleha Yumakagisho," Budogaku Bunkenkyo 50.1 (December, 2001), introduces the oldest extant version of Sengren's independent interlinear commentary, which has been preserved in the former library of Luo chensy 廖承彝. See Maeng Kuiho, "Ch'osang Dhubaebi tu okun chihamubu," Teukl gi galsol 42 (November, 2009), also, "Ch'osang tu okun chihamubu hwaem tu tew," Budogaku Bunkenkyo 48.2 (March, 2009).

25 The Dapai niupan jing jijie sections the southern edition of the Niupan jing into 2,864 passages and incorporates comments on the various sutras for each. However, therein comments by Daosheng appear in 260 places. In some thirteen of the twenty-five chapters of the sutra not a single comment is cited from Daosheng. It is difficult to imagine that Daosheng would not have written any commentary for so many chapters, and so the compiler probably neglected and did not adopt Daosheng's explanations for these chapters. Hoshin Kanon, "Daihensanbenso jijie ni koseki kumkyo," Tsuchikawa 66 (February, 1986).

26 Similarly, Jumamashitsu's disciple, Duowong (du.), seems to have composed an 'exegesis of the meaning' commentary to the Weimo jing. The biography of Duowong in the Gwanjoshitsu notes, "Exegesis of the meaning commentaries compiled for both wuxu to the Pahua, the Dapai jijie, the Jingmingjungjung, the Sanbi, and the Weimo, all of which circulate in the world."
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Commercaries composed by Daosheng for the Fabu jing, the Weiwei jing, and the Neiyan jing survive today. However, his commentaries to the Weiwei jing and Neiyan jing do not exist as independent works, but have been integrated with the commentaries of other authors. For example, when it comes to the commentary by Daosheng contained in the Dapan neiyang jing jiyu, in some thirteen of the sutra’s twenty-five chapters explanations by Daosheng are not mentioned at all. This probably stems from the fact that in the difficult task of combining commentaries from as many as eighteen different authors, the compilers opted for an editorial policy that centered on the commentary of Sengiang 塔贊.

As we noted above, Sengiang and Daoxiang composed ‘explanation of the meaning’ commentaries for the Weiwei jing, so it cannot be claimed that Daosheng’s Miaofu lanhua jing shu (Expository Commentary to the Lato Sutra) is the oldest ‘explanation of the meaning’ commentary. However, we can say that it is one of the oldest extant commentaries of this type. Thus being said, let us briefly review the distinctive features of Daosheng’s commentarial style, using the Miaofu lanhua jing shu as our basic source. Daosheng’s Miaofu lanhua jing shu is considered to have exerted a major influence on sutra commentaries of the later Sui and Tang periods. The commentary does not make an independent preface for the sutra, but prior to embarking on its passage by passage explanation of the sutra’s textual content, a brief discussion of the circumstances of the commentary’s authorship and the meaning of the sutra’s title does appear. In the explanation of the sutra’s title, we find the doctrinal content of the sutra classified according to the four ‘groupings’ of the Wheel of Dharma and the thematic thrust (zang) of the Fabu jing identified as the ‘Great Vehicle’. During that period, the task of ascertaining the relationship between different sutras by illumining the ‘thematic thrust’ of each sutra — a practice akin to what would become ‘classification of the doctrine or teaching’ — was a key concern, as Enichi Oschi has pointed out. Here, however, I would like to draw out several points that bear on Daosheng’s etiological method, based on the section of his commentary that provides passage by passage explanation of the sutra text.

(1) First let us look at the formal features of his commentary, including such points as:
(a) the retention of a section that resembles the section on explanation of the ‘intention or motive behind the sutra’s origin’ (layi 来意) that we find in later commentaries; (b) evidence of explicit segmentation or division of the sutra text; (c) indication of the passage that is to be explained (through citation of its opening and closing lines); (d) explanatory notes on transliterations; and (e) inclusion of alternative interpretations that differ from that of the author.

9 See note 25 above.
(a) Before Daosheng embarks on explaining the specific content of passages from each chapter, he discusses the placement and significance of the chapter within the overall sutras and provides explanation of the chapter title. In the commentaries of later figures such as Jizang this is referred to as the statement of intention behind the sutra’s origin (tsien). As such, it is a feature encountered widely in sutra commentaries of later periods.

(b) Daosheng broadly divides the text of the Fâhuà jìng into the three sections of ‘assimilating the three causal paths to the one cause’, ‘assimilating the three fruits or results [of the three paths] to the ‘one fruit or result’, and ‘assimilating the three persons or practitioners’ [of the three paths] to the ‘one person or practitioner’. This differs from the threefold division of a given sutra into ‘preface’ (fù 順序), ‘main discourse’ (zhengzhuan 正觀), and ‘dissemination’ (fànshì 訪施) sections that becomes standard for later periods. However, in addition to using the terminology of ‘preface’ and ‘dissemination’ when he discusses the placement of individual chapters in the overall work, Daosheng also uses the expression ‘exposition of the principle’ (liúliú 理流) (which, in terms of content, refers to the Lotus Sūtra’s doctrine of one causal path and one result) in a way that resembles the idea of the ‘main discourse.’

What we call ‘analytic division or parsing’ (fenjie 分析) does not just involve this sort of generic division of the sutra’s content, but a much more analytically dense division. In Daosheng’s commentary we find various analytic divisions imposed on the section extending from the Preface Chapter through the Belief and Understanding Chapter. Multiple layers of division can especially be seen in the prose and verse sections on the ‘burning house’ in the Simile and Parable Chapters, making this analytic division of the commentary on which Daosheng exerted the most effort. Therein, we find some technical terms of exegesis such as ‘external simile’ (wai 參) and ‘inner meaning’ (nei 內). Later on, Fuyan’s Fâhuà jìng uses such exegetical formula as ‘introducing the simile’ (kai 叮騨), ‘establishing indexical equivalents or correspondences for the simile[s]’ (shou 合審), ‘external similitude’, and ‘internal correspondence or equivalent’ (nei 參). It is worth noting that, although Daosheng uses the term ‘external simile’ and does not yet make use of the technical expression ‘inner meanings’, he does, in fact, convey similar content with such statements as ‘establishing doctrinal correspondences or equivalents for [the similes] on the basis of their inner meaning’ (以內兼合之).’ Incidentally, ‘internal correspondence or equivalent’ refers to the act of explaining what the similes actually strive to convey in the way of doctrinal meaning. In essence, the sutras themselves, after they set out their similes (known as ‘introducing the simile’), often explain just which these similes intend to convey in terms of actual content (this is known as ‘internal correspondence or equivalent’). However, in the case of Daosheng, the meaning of these similes is referred to as ‘inner meaning’, while ‘establishing doctrinal equivalents’ means just how or to which aspects of the simile’s content this ‘inner meaning’ corresponds. In

32 ZHI 34.4 411d.
33 Ibid., 402d.
contrast to referring to this as 'internal' equivalent or correspondence, the sitze itself is called the 'external' simile.

To sum up, when we compare Daosheng's analytic parsing of the sutra to the dense analytic division of sutra content seen in the commentaries of later figures such as Fayun and Jizang, it amounts to little more than a general sectioning. Nonetheless, the fact that it stands as a forerunner to the commentaries of later periods is perfectly evident.

(c) Daosheng reproduces only those passages in the sutra for which he supplies explanations. In this respect his technique differs from that of commentators such as Fayun. But that said, the passages for which Fayun provides direct commentary are only sections of the sutra. Nonetheless, through use of such shorthand expressions as "from here on..." or "from [the words such and such] on..." Fayun provides analytic parsing for the entirety of the sutra's contents. As a result, he ends up representing the entirety of the sutra's textual content.

Moreover, even though Daosheng presents the sutra text whenever he designates an analytic division, he does not reproduce the entire context within which the specific section is embedded. Hence his manner of presenting the sutra text must be characterized as incomplete. In instances where the passage in question is comparatively short, he will reproduce the entire text; where it is long, he will present it in abridged form using such expressions as "[the passage] from A to B...A...B." This approach continued to be used in sutra commentaries of later periods.

(d) Explanation of transliterations with respect to names of individuals is indicated through such formulaic expressions as "in Song it says or means..." or "in Song we say..." The term 'Song' refers to the Liu Song dynasty (420-479) under which Daosheng lived. This format is something that periodically turns up in the Zhu tsume "jing as well.

The fact that Daosheng never cites other sutras or treatises in order to legitimate his own interpretations has already been pointed out by Enichi Ochô. In a related capacity, the mention and critique of different interpretations in order to advance the orthodoxy of one's own explanation is a format that often appears in later commentaries. However, in Daosheng's case only in two places does he introduce alternative explanations by using the expression "one interpretation states..." as well.

(2) Secondly, let us inquire into Daosheng's explanations of the sutra's verses.

In terms of literary form, the sutras are comprised by both expository prose and rhymed verse, expounded alternately. Daosheng identifies four basic motives for using verse in the sutra. The first is that the verses are preached for people yet to come after the prose passages. The second is that the verses are preached for persons who have not yet understood the prose. The third is that because the prose is laconic, the verses are

---

32 I.d., 1986c.
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elocuted in order to elaborate on the contents of the prose. Fourth, is the idea that song washes forth when one feels the exaltation of a boundless heart. This takes the perspective of the subjective feelings of the person who expounds the verses, which is to say that emotional exaltation spontaneously gives rise to poetic verse.

The third point, concerning assessment of the relationship between verse and prose in terms of the relative brevity or detail of their contents, becomes even more profound in the latter place of the explanation of the Preface chapter. In essence, it refers to cases where elements contained in the prose sections are not reiterated in summary verse, or cases where material not found in the prose section is newly introduced in the verses. Moreover, given the diversity of these relationships between the prose and verse, and the desire to eschew them, it makes it clear that one must identify a relationship suited to the respective occasion. It also refers to the fact that, elsewhere in the text, there are cases where the verses are more detailed or more laconic in content than their prose counterparts, or else something expounded in the prose section is not repeated at all in the verses.

Daosheng’s comments to the verses are actually very brief, but their central concern is to indicate the strict relational correspondence to the analytic divisions that he applies to their counterpart prose sections. That relationship of correspondence is expressed by the formula, “A sets B to verse (A 皆 B),” in other words, passage A in the verses is a poetic rehearsal of passage B in the prose. As a fixed form of expression for indicating the relational correspondence between verse and prose, this continued to be used in later commentaries as well.

(?) The Fundamental Orientation and Theoretical Organization of the Interpretations.

As Enichi Ōchi has previously observed, Daosheng’s basic perspective for interpreting the sutras takes its stance in the firm and certain belief that the concrete phenomenal content of the sutras (such as the emanating of radiant light, the quaking of the earth, and the manifestation of the jeweled stūpas), as well as the similes, are all possessed of profound conceptual significance. Moreover, no matter how we try to understand that significance, the words of the sutras remain analogous to a weaver or trap used to catch a fish or hare. At the stage when the profound meaning implied by the sutra is illuminated, it is extremely important that one not cling to the concrete phenomenal aspects and illustrations of the sutra.

Next, we briefly touch on some of the structures that Daosheng uses to provide integral consistency to his interpretation of the sutra. The first structure concerns the transcendent nature of the enlightened ‘sage’ (sdeg gnyen dge lha) [or Buddha]. The manifold

33 Ibid., 199b.
34 Ibid., 409a.
35 Ibid., 413c.
36 Ibid., 411d.
activities of the sage, such as his preaching of the Dharma of the three vehicles and his entry into nirvana, are undertaken in order to accord responsively with the actual circumstances of enlightened beings (jeonfu 儒夫), whereas the sage, in his own being, exists in such a way that transcends these activities. Secondly, the concept of 'stimulus and response' (ganying 感應) is adopted as the practical framework for explaining such similarities as the burning house parable of the Simile and Parable Chapter of the Lotus Sutra and the prodigal son parable of the Belief and Understanding Chapter. The salvific impetus (prajña) which represents the "constructive aspect of the sentient being that moves the Buddhas and bodhisattvas to manifest and, subsequently, receives that response," acts to stimulate or move (gamak 感) the sage. In response to that stimulus, the sage manifests (jeong 禪). This point is considered to have had a major impact on later sutra commentaries. Third is the frequent use of the general concept of 'principle' (ili 理), a term that especially appears in connection with the idea of the One Vehicle. This interpretive strategy is also picked up and continued in later sutra commentaries.

3. The Dapun niepan jing jijie and Fayun's Fabinu yiji

(1) The Dapun niepan jing jijie (Assembled Explanations of the Nirvana Sutra).

The Dapun niepan jing jijie (the Jijie, or Assembled Explanations, for short), in seventy-one fascicles, is a compendium of commentaries to the Southern Edition of the Mahayana Niepan jing (Nirvana Sutra) compiled from respective commentaries by some eighteen different monks ranging in time from Daosheng, who was active during the Liu Song Dynasty, through the Southern Qi and Liang. For the history of transmission of the original text and its compiler, one might wish to consult this author's prior work on the subject.10 but here let me simply say that the theory holding Falang of Jianyan Monastery 建元寺法頥 to be the compiler is compelling. (He is the same person as Huiliang 頤鑒, of whom we have record in the Jijie.)

The current text of the Jijie or Assembled Explanations fills seventy-one fascicles. Its first fascicle comprises various prefaces to the sutra, including the Dapun niepan jing yin xu (Preface to the Nirvana Sutra) that Emperor Wu of the Liang composed for Baoliang of Lingwei Monastery. 體味寺寶亮, as well as prefaces by ten different Dharma masters, such as Daosheng, Sengliang, Senggeong 僧宗 and Baoliang. In addition, the compiler of the Jijie parsed and organized the contents of these prefaces by the ten Dharma masters into eight topical categories: (1) explaining the title (釋名), (2) distinguishing the substance or essence of the sutra (論體), (3) describing the original or fundamental nature of existence (論本性), (4) discussing the severs or transcending of designations (破相名), (5) explanation of the word "great" (釋大字), (6) etymology of the word "sutra" (釋經字), (7) revealing or setting out the doctrinal import or meaning (義教意), and (8) determining the divisions of the sutra (列科說). To put it another way,

10 Hirosi Kanoo, aforementioned "Daibodaisoninbunyoo jijie no kioushi koukyo."
be identified statements in the sutra prefaces that bore a common connection to each of these eight topical items, and placed those portions of the prefaces under their respective topical indices. Therein, names of eight other persons of renown are mentioned beyond the ten Dharma masters who composed prefaces for the sutra, including Songshao and Fayan. Their commentaries are also introduced. From the second facsimile on, the text lamellae into a passage by passage explanation of the sutra's meaning. It pairs the thirty-six facsimiles and twenty-five chapters of the Southern Edition of the *Niopan jing* into a total of two thousand eight hundred and sixty-four passages, under which the commentaries of various masters are grouped. Apart from nine among the ten Dharma masters noted previously for their prefaces to the sutra (Tanhuai's commentary actually does not appear even once), the names of nine additional individuals who composed commentaries to the sutra are mentioned, including Huiling and Zhiyang. However, making for a total of eighteen commentaries. Among these eighteen monks whose commentaries are incorporated into the text, Songliang's commentary is cited two thousand one hundred and seventy times; Songtong's commentary, one thousand one hundred and forty-five times; and Baoliang's commentary, one thousand and eighty-one times. By contrast, the commentaries of Huiling, Huifeng and Zhiyang are cited only once. To edit together commentaries by so many different monks is quite a complicated task, but it seems that the editor accomplished this by taking Songliang's commentary as his standard and determining, and adopted other monk's comments which had the special distinction of deviating from it.

As one of the outstanding features of the commentaries in the Dapan *niopan jing jiye*, we should pay particular attention to the compiler's analytic division of the prefaces of the ten Dharma masters into eight topical categories mentioned above. Various points in common can be found between these eight topical items of the *jiye* and the topical rubrics evident in commentaries authored by later figures such as Zhiyi and Jiaxu. In so far as sutra commentaries from the Liang Dynasty have, for the most part, been lost and no longer exist, we should give close scrutiny to this eightfold rubric.

Under the first topical heading, 'explaining the title', the *jiye* explains the meaning of the term *niopan* in the sutra title, Dapan *niopan jing*. The fifth item, concerning explanation of the term "gong", explains the meaning of the word *gong*, and the sixth item, "analysis of the term "sutra"", involves elucidation of the word *jing*. Taken together, these three topical divisions explain the sutra's title, Dapan *niopan jing*, in its entirety. In late periods, explanation of a sutra's title was not divided into three sections like this, but treated in its entirety under the single rubric of 'explaining the title' The cases of Zhiyi and Jiaxu are no exception to this rule.

Under the second topical category of 'distinguishing the substance or essence',

8 Apart from the eighteen mentioned above, the commentary of a certain Mingjun 明君 is cited some eighty three times, as the last among the commentaries of the various masters. One group of modern scholars has pointed Mingjun to be the editor/compiler of the Dapan *niopan jing jiye*, but there is an alternate theory which affirms that it was a later commentary integrated into the original text after completion of the original work was completed. I would subscribe to the latter theory.
discussion of the sutra’s fundamental essence is pursued. This feature is consistent with Zhiyi’s and Jizang’s rubric of ‘distinguishing the substance’. The third topical heading of ‘describing the original or fundamental nature of existence’ advances the notion that nirvāṇa is the original nature of existence; and the fourth, ‘distinguishing the severance or transcending of designations’, discusses the general idea that the Dharma-body and nirvāṇa are fundamentally beyond designation. These latter two categories concern notions of the Dharma-body and nirvāṇa that are, themselves, fundamental to the Nirdvāṇa Sūtra (Nirvāṇa jing). Their orientation would seem to be topically close to the notion of the ‘central thrust or theme’ (zong 味) found in sutra commentaries roughly contemporaneous with the Dapam nüepan jing yu. However, on the other hand, we can infer that in later periods there was also the possibility of organizing such concepts on the basis of the category of ‘distinguishing the substance’.

(2) Fayun’s Fubua yu (Notes or Notices on the Meaning of the Lotus Sūtra).

Next, there is the Fubua yu which basically consists of Fayun’s lectures on the Fubua jing or Lotus Sūtra, as recorded by one of his disciples. Although this scribe was a disciple of Fayun and, therefore, within his scholastic lineage, his exact identity remains unknown. This person did not record Fayun’s lecture word for word, but in the interest of realizing the work’s full completion as the commentarial text of the Fubua yu, he made a special point of introducing and critiquing alternative interpretations. As such, it is possible to identify traces of his personal contribution to the text.

As for the structure of the Fubua yu, at the very beginning we find a section that might properly be called a general preface. It contains remarks on the doctrinal classification of the sutra, explanation of the sutra’s title, Miian yulanhua jing, and a basic division or breakdown of the sutra’s contents. The opening sections of Jingying Huiyuan’s commentaries are similar in their treatment of the three elemental themes of doctrinal classification, explanation of the sutra’s title, and analytic division of the sutra’s contents. However, Fayun’s Fubua yu possesses content that fulfills what must also be called the model pattern of a sutra preface.

After this opening section there follows the portion of the commentary in which the meaning of the sutra’s content is explained, passage by passage, beginning with the opening line, “Thus have I heard . . .” and ending with the sutra’s conclusion. This kind of structure is identical with that found in Jingying Huiyuan’s commentaries and Jizang’s Fubua tongde (法華通綱). The most distinctive feature of Fayun’s Fubua yu is his detailed analytic parsing of the entire text of the Fubua jing, and it would appear that this was something to which the commentator exerted utmost effort. The analytic parsing witnessed in the Fubua yu exerted a great influence on Zhiyi’s and Jizang’s commentaries to the Fubua jing.

35 See Hiroshi Kanno, Chūgoku Hakusho to no kenkyū, pp. 141-244; also, Hiroshi Kanno, Hokeki chishikasho shi (Tokyo: Daian shuppan, 1996).
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4. The Commentaries of Jingying Huiyuan

Commentaries by Jingying Huiyuan that survive today include the Wenm zhi jing yi (canon of the buddhist canon), the bodhisattva canon, (2) explanation of the sutra's title, which begins with the heading "explaining its name" (sheng ming 順名), and (3) analytic parsing of the sutra's contents. The degree of explanation varies from one to the next, but when it comes to topical rubrics, the Guanwuliangzhu jing yi (Expository Commentary on the Sutra of the Contemplation of the Buddha of Measureless Life) divides the first section on classification according to the two canons and the second sections on explanation of the sutra's title into the so-called "five esoteric (wu men five doors), while the Wenm zhi jing yi divides them into "six essentials" (the first section on classification of the Guanwuliangzhu jing yi is regarded as the first essential of six essentials). The explanations of the Wenm zhi jing yi are quite brief, but let us at this point introduce the six essentials.

The first essential discusses the ōnmyōhō canon and the classificatory rubric of the twofold canon, noting that the sutra at hand belongs to the bodhisattva canon. The second essential explains "the difference between sudden and gradual (shūyuan 速原) presentations of the teaching, and clarifies the fact that this sutra uses the gradual strategy of teaching." The third introduces the ōnmyōhō, ōnmyōhō, and ōnmyōhō, and situates this sutra in the ōnmyōhō canon or pitaka. The fourth essential deals with "the thematic thrust (tōkyō 主題), indicating that this sutra takes merit making and generosity (that is to say, the practice of charity as the foundational cause for merit and blessing) as its central theme. The fifth essential explains the context and rationale behind the devoting of titles for sutras, and in so doing notes that the sutra at hand derives its title from both the person [who preached] and the Dharma [that is preached]. The term "Buddha" (buddha) indicates the person [who preached], and the words "Preaches the Bathing Monk Sutra" (shō xíng jīng 洗淨法門) refer to the Dharma [that is preached]. The sixth essential brings up the relative differences between the five sorts of person who might preach the Dharma (i.e., a Buddha, a saintly disciple, a deva or god, a divine immortal or rishi, an apparitional person produced by

A fragment of Huiyuan's Renshō zō shu (357-256), included in R85, also survives, and much like Huiyuan's other commentaries, sections on classification according to the twofold canon and explanation of the sutra's title appear therein.

In other yì, this particular jing is variously classified as belonging to the Dharma-wheel or Dharma-rotating of the sudden teaching.
magical transformation) and reveals that this sutra is preached by the Buddha.

Next comes explanation of the sutra's title, which is indicated by the words "next we will explain its name or title" (ci shi qi ming 次釋其名). In the yin for the other sutras, some of the 'six essentials' are treated in the explanation of the sutra title. Finally, at the end, it discusses the three basic divisions [of the sutra's contents] into preface, main discourse, and dissemination.

On the whole, Huiyuan adopts this threefold division of the sutra into preface, main discourse, and dissemination [in all of his commentaries]. However, in the case of the Nāgārjuna jīng yǐ (Notes or Notices on the Meaning of the Nirvāṇa Sūtra) he divides the sutra into five divisions of 'preface' (yuān 分, 'revealing the merits' (xiàn le 分 賦德), 'merits completed or acquired through cultivation' (xiùchēng fèn 修成所分), 'refuting the heretical and conforming to the correct' (yìn tou tōng chōng fèn 破邪正分), and the 'extinction of the Thun Come One and the rite of his cremation' (rupu mião zhēng guì fèng 如來滅度施佛供養分). However, he points out that the fifth section was never transmitted to China. In the Weimo jīng yǐ (Notes on the Meaning of the Vimalakīrti Sūtra), Huiyuan uses the basic threefold scheme for dividing the sutra's contents, but he also displays a very complex analytic parsing.52

That said, one major feature found exclusively in commentaries of Huiyuan and not seen in those of other commentators is his linguistic investigation of sutra passages. Having already examined this subject in a study of Huiyuan's Weimo jīng yǐ,53 I will touch but briefly in its essential points. First of all, Huiyuan points out the fact that certain differences exist between the word order or syntax used in a given Chinese/Than translation of a Buddhist sutra and the word order used in the general run of literatures composed in Chinese. Secondly, he singles out a particular word or character from the sutra text (in this case, notional words and grammatical or functional particles are both included) and, through recourse to various formulas, clarifies its meaning. For example, one finds such patterns as "A constitutes or means to say B" (A 為 B 也), "A is like or analogous to B" (A 類 B 也), "A has the significance of B" (A 是 B 的), "A is equivalent to or functions as the word B" (A 有 B 的; this is used chiefly in explanations of grammatical particles) and "A constitutes or means to say AB" (A 為 AB; where he uses a format of setting the target character in a more familiar two-character compound). Thirdly, through attention to the particular context, he explains why certain auxiliary particles appear in a given passage of the sutra. This sort of feature is particularly valuable, and is something that is almost never seen in Zhiyi and Jianzang.


53 See Hiroshi Kamene, "Jiuyi jin Yinmeciayi bao heshi," Tōyō gakujutsu kenkyū, cited above. For a research report that extends the particular investigation of Huiyuan's linguistic senses to other commentaries of Jiuying Huiyuan, see Koyota Kimura, "Koyota kimura no kokushi baidakai no jutsuitsu kenkyū: Jiuyi jin kō jishu bunshū ni okonochi hōsetsu," The Research of the Research results of a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research of the Japanese Ministry of Education,Science,Sports, and Culture, 1963; also included in Koyota Kimura, Higebikai Finba kokushi shi no kiso kenkyū (Tokyo: Shosha, 2001), which I provided with the result of my prior research on the Weimo jīng yǐ and Nāgārjuna jīng yǐ.
5. The Commentaries of Zhixi and Jiuzang

The foremost feature of the commentaries of Zhixi and Jiuzang such as Fohua xumyi (法華玄義), Wensong jing xuanbu (文盛經玄補), Fohua xumyang (法華玄議), Jiumeng xuanbu (九門玄補), and Fohua yanyi (法華演義) is that they do not include passage by passage explanation of the sutra text, but strive synthetically to clarify the overall meaning of the sutra. They can be said to represent a new form of sutra commentary that sought to unpack and develop the thematic contents of the sutra precise typical of earlier periods. Zhixi in his Fohua xumyi (法華玄義), (Profound Meaning of the Lotus Sutra), for example, sought to provide a synthetic exposition of the Fohua jing (法華經) from the vantage of the "five modes of profound meaning" (wuxing xumyi 五玄玄義): (1) explaining the title (shengming 釋名), (2) distinguishing the substance or foundation (of the sutra) (jianshi 竅釋) (3) illuminating the thematic thrust or core (mingsheng 聲命), (4) determining the function (fuzheng 職正), and (5) classifying the doctrine (jiulian 七籤)." (Explication of the title refers to exposition of the meaning of the sutra's title, Miaofa tianshu jing. Distinguishing the substance refers to determining the substance or foundational essence of the Fohua jing as being none other than the ultimate reality of all phenomena. (In Zhixi's case, ultimate reality is actually identified as the substance of all Mahāyāna sutras, not just the Fohua jing); Illuminating the thematic thrust or thread refers to clarifying the cause and effect [path] of the Buddha's own self-cultivation as the central theme of the Fohua jing; determining the function, to discussion of the two videsions of provisional reality and ultimate reality in their threafold aspect (of self-cultivation, training of others, and simultaneous self-practice and conversion of others) as the functional power of the Fohua jing's ability to sever doubts and arouse faith. Classifying the doctrine refers to the question of where to place the Fohua jing in relation to the manifold teachings delivered over the entire span of the Buddha's preaching career. In the case of Zhixi's Wensong jing xuanbu (文盛經玄補) the structural organization of the commentary proceeds in sequence, through examination of the four nikāya (四分), the three contemplations (that is to say, contemplation of emptiness, contemplation of the provisional, and contemplation of the middle way), and the fourfold teachings (the tripitaka teaching, the pervasive or partial teaching, the separate teaching, and the perfect teaching). Taking as our example Jiuzang's Fohua yanyi (法華演義), we find that Jiuzang sets up 'ten topical points' (shimesi 十門) of discussion. The first chapter deals with the 'topic of the reason for the [sutra's] origin' (laijiao 前定). 'Reason of origin' (laijiao) refers to the intention implicit to the preaching of the sutra and its constituent chapters, in other words, the reason for the very existence of the sutra and its chapters. The second chapter

---

8 Jiuzang, in his Jiumeng xuanbu jing shu (九門玄補解), shows the influence of Zhixi in adopting the fivefold profound meaning as the method for explaining the content of the sutra. (See T. 33, 144b). However, when it comes to similarities and differences in the concept of 'substance' and 'thread,' he distinguishes two perspectives whereby they can be seen as identical and can be seen as different. See Haruo Kameo, Chigoku Hakusho ni tekikyô (p. 496–528).
treats the 'topic of thematic meaning or import' *(songshi men 學習門).* 'Thematic import' refers to the basic thrust in meaning, or explanation of just what constitutes the basic import of the *Lotus Sūtra.* Compared to the emphasis on clarifying the concrete thought and pedagogy set forth in the *Fabuajíng,* this topic of 'thematic thrust' involves examination of the basic import of the *Fabuajíng* from the vantage of its theory of cause and effect, or religious practice and its results. The third chapter discusses the 'topic of explaining the title' *(shéngmìng men 釋名門)* of the fourth chapter, the 'topic of classifying its doctrinal orientation' *(bòxíngjiàoshi men 佛事應門)*. Classifying doctrinal orientation refers to explaining the orientation of the doctrinal teaching or content of the *Fabuajíng* and involves the concrete effort to establish the status of the *Fabuajíng* in relation to classification of the entire spectrum of teachings delivered over the course of the Buddha's career. The fifth chapter deals with the 'topic of the exoteric and esoteric, or manifest and hidden' *(ziôi men 显密門).* The two pedagogical approaches to teaching *Hinayana*-oriented śrāvakas and Mahāyāna bodhisattvas are divided into exoteric (that is, manifest meaning, in the sense of the meaning being explicitly and clearly stated) and esoteric (or secret meaning, in which the true import or meaning remains hidden). Thus the entirety of the Buddha's preaching career is organized into a total of four aspects. These four permutations of the exoteric and esoteric are one of the core concepts of doctrinal classification that Jizang brought to completion in his *Fabuayì.* It is especially applied to comparisons of the *Fabuajíng* and *Boréjíng.* Although, in the *Fabuayì,* this 'aspect of exoteric and esoteric' becomes a discrete chapter unto itself, when it comes to its generic implications for classifying the teaching of the *Fabuajíng,* it can also be said to figure substantially into the content of the fourth chapter on the 'aspect of classifying doctrinal orientation'.

The sixth chapter treats the 'topic of the three and the one' *(sànyí men 三一門)*, or the relationship between the three vehicles and one vehicle, a concept central to the *Expedient Means* Chapter of the *Fabuajíng.* The seventh chapter concerns the 'topic of efficacious function' *(gōngyìng men 作用門).* It illuminates the idea that the enormous salvific power possessed by the *Fabuajíng* arises from the fact that the sutra is intrinsically endowed with ten sorts of inconceivability. The eighth chapter deals with the 'aspect of disseminating the sutra' *(bìngiàoshì men 經施門).* It discusses the methods for disseminating the sutra, as well as the type of person who disseminates the sutra. The ninth chapter discusses the 'topic of reduction of the sutra text' *(búkàngmen 無常門).* It sorts out the relationship between different translations of the *Fabuajíng* and the various sutras that belong to the extended *Fabuajíng* or 'Lotus' cycle *(fabuajíng hu 述論部).* As such, it represents historical research into the sutra's translation and formation. The tenth chapter concerns the 'topic of history' *(yíshì men 經史門).* It sorts out the history of exegesis on the *Fabuajíng,* and involves historical investigation into the practice of lecturing on the sutra.

The second distinctive feature of Zhiyi's and Jizang's commentaries is their establishment of a unique interpretive method. Zhiyi, in the *Fabuajíng* 法華文句 (Words and Phrases of the *Lotus Sūtra*), adopts a fourfold interpretive scheme consisting
of (1) '[determining] the causal circumstances [for genesis of the passage or text]' (jinyuan 因緣), (2) 'determining its doctrinal orientation' (yinjiao 道教), (3) 'distinguishing' 'root meaning and manifest trace' (benji 本迹), and (4) 'examining the passage from the perspective of contemplating the mind' (guanyun 観心). Jizang adopts a fourfold scheme of interpretation comprising (1) 'exposition of the meaning based on names' (yinming shihi 依名釋義), (2) 'exposition of the meaning based on the teaching of highest principle' (zijiao shihi 國教釋義), (3) 'exposition of the meaning based on mutual inheritance [of dualistic opposites] ' (buxiang shihi 反相釋義), and (4) 'exposition of the meaning that does not resort to any particular method' (yuanyang shihi 無方釋義).

In the case of both Zhiyi and Jizang, it cannot be said that these methods of exposition are actually applied in full to the task of explaining the sutras. Nevertheless, they can be numbered among the greatest attributes of their commentaries.

6. Conclusion

We have sought, in the pages above, to provide an overview of the variety of sutra commentaries that circulated in Chinese Buddhist circles during the early period. We have seen concrete evidence in Buddhist sutra commentaries of a shift from the interlinear to the explanatory form, a development that appears to be grounded in an existing distinction between interlinear and 'exposition of the meaning' forms of commentary, as well as a shift from the interlinear to the expository style in scholarship on the Confucian classics. Even in Chinese Buddhist circles, interlinear commentaries were compiled first, and only later did the exposition of the meaning style of commentary become popular. It was Daosheng's era that marked this point of transformation. Daosheng's Mingsue lianhua jing shu being one of the earliest extant commentary in the 'exegesis of the meaning' style, we have thus gone down scrutiny to its characteristic features. Basically, many of the attributes of Daosheng's commentary went on to be incorporated into later commentaries.

Because extant commentaries from the Liang Dynasty are so few, we focused on the Dapen ninpan jing jiye and Fayun's Fapua jiye. For the 'Three Great Dharma masters of the Sui', — Jingying Huiyuan, Zhiyi, and Jizang — we looked at the opening section of Huiyuan's commentaries and aspects of Huiyuan's exegetical style evinced in his Weima jing jiye. In the case of Zhiyi and Jizang, we have confined ourselves to their creation of commentaries on 'profound meaning' (shenmu), 'profound treatise' (shuanshu), and 'survey of the meaning' (shuoshi) that do not involve passage by passage explanation of 48 This is based on Jizang's Samxin shuyi 三論玄義, T. 45. 14c. In Jizang's Enshi 二述義 (T. 45. 95a), they are given as Sunxing shihi 普名釋義, Yinyuan shihi 因緣釋義, Xindao shihi 眞道釋義, Wuang shihi 無方釋義. On Jizang's fourfold scheme of exegesis, see Sunuo Hira, "Korihit Korygasa no kiso huchu — innobeshou no kiyooka," in his Shosho shiki no kajitsu (Tokyo: Shunjusha, 1973), also his "Shosho shiki no shusoku" in Hira, Chigoku bunka chiri no kenkyu (Tokyo: Shunjusha, 1976), pp. 429-440, and his "Shosho shiki no shusoku no kajitsu shuhishakugai," in Sunuo Hira, Hoko metsu to waseki ni koresu kenkyu (Tokyo: Shunjusha, 1983), pp. 229-250. Also see Hiroshi Kanno, "Ekin Denji shoryogen" su sambu shoagsu ni Kechin no shusoku shusoku to Hyouji Aji shukkou (Tokyo: Shunjusha, 2002).
the sutra text and touched only on the more salient points of their unique interpretive methods. In depth discussion of these two individuals will have to wait for another occasion.

Throughout this paper I have taxonomically divided sutra commentaries into the two categories of ‘interlinear’ and ‘exegesis of meaning’. However, we should mention the fact that other forms of commentary do exist, the *Fahua jingwen yuwo* 法華經文外義 being one such example. In this commentary, a series of topics are elicited relating to the thought of the *Fahua jing*, such as ‘the two wisdoms’, ‘clarification of causal circumstances [that led to the preaching of the sutra], [the meanings of the passage] “whether there are two or whether three [vehicles]”’, ‘the burning home’, ‘the pure land’, and ‘the precipitous path that is five hundred yojanas long’. Investigations are added using a question and answer format, a format that, in fact, can be said to resemble Huin’s 華嚴 *Fahua jing anling yi* 法華經安樂行義 and the section of Jiuzang’s *Fahua suansu* that follows after the fourth fascicle.

---

*The manuscript copy of the text bears the copy date of datong 11 (541 CE). It is available in Fang Guangchao, *Zanwen fei shiwen*, vol. 2 (Beijing: Zhongguo wenhua chubanshe, 1994).*

Note: I would like to offer my appreciation to Prof. Daniel Bruce Stevenson for the translation of my Japanese paper to English and to Prof. A. Charles Muller for his kind cooperation in proofreading this paper.
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Groundwork Layers for Buddhist Sanskrit Philology in America

Akira YUYAMA

I have tried to study the background to the beginnings of Buddhist Sanskrit philology in the earliest stage in North America. The original plan to write this paper was to give a selective overview of the background history of the related fields of study transmitted by the personalities in parampara, who played important roles in the formation of Buddhist studies, particularly of Indic Buddhist literature. My focus will thus be on the central figures in the Yale lineage or the Indological nectar-bearing BEE, i.e., Maurice Bloomfield (1855-1928), Franklin Edgerton (1885-1963)1 and Murray Barson Emeneau (1904). Owing to limited space, however, I have decided to write a short introduction to this wide topic. This paper has therefore become an interim report on the "Nectar-Bearing BEE" as a brief introductory essay to its prehistory. From this viewpoint, I would herewith set down some key words as a guide to my future work in this direction. I have thus switched to simply offering bio-bibliographical data of key persons as a very minimum. It is to be hoped that small but important materials will be published on another occasion. Many of the words listed below may tell a vivid story by themselves.

From the very beginning of Oriental studies in North America, Indic and Indo-European linguistics and philology have occupied a steady position within the framework of humanities. Once upon a time Philadelphia played a central role on the East Coast in every aspect. A number of eminent scholars in the related fields had entered the Oriental Club of Philadelphia in its early days. They were, for example, Hermann Collitz (Professor of Germanic at Johns Hopkins, Baltimore), E. Washburn Hopkins (Professor of Sanskrit at Yale), Eugene W. Burlingame (Fellow at Yale), Franklin Edgerton (then Assistant Professor of Sanskrit at Penn), W. Norman Brown (then in the Intelligence Office, Wash-

---

1 In some works Edgerton’s death is mistakenly dated 1967. He died on 7 December 1963 at Laramie in the American State of Wyoming.
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identified Thoreau’s relevant articles in *The Dial* with Burnouf’s originals (Christy 1932, p. 286f. & p. 295).

Needless to say, I should not overlook the disputes over the authenticity of Thoreau’s authorship. Quite a few specialists in Thoreau’s writings now attribute the introduction of Burnouf’s work to Elizabeth Peabody (cf. e.g. Bore 1982, p. 191; D32). The important thing is, however, as mentioned above, that Thoreau was the initiator to this genre of Asian thought and literature. Very little attention to this point seems to have been paid by his critics (for further details see Glick 1969).

It is gratifying to see how Edward Elbridge Salisbury (1814-1901) began Indian and Buddhist studies on a firm scientific basis from the outset at almost the same time. Needless to say, there have appeared a number of evangelistic Buddhists in North America, who played significant roles in promoting Buddhist thoughts. A number of leading scholars have shown keen interests in the history of Buddhist studies in America. I must however confine myself in philological studies of Indic Buddhist literature.

On his second visit to Europe in 1842 Salisbury saw Burnouf finalizing the philological notes and remarks on his French translation of the *Lotus Sutra* to the press (published after his death in 1852). The printing of his text was completed in October 1841, and the appendices to it were ever growing. Furthermore, Burnouf must have been polishing the final manuscript of his *Introduction* (Paris 1844), to which the foreword being dated 10 November 1844 (cf. Yayama, Burnouf, 2000, p. 451: §5.3.3).

It is worth noting that the American Oriental Society (AOS) was founded in 1842, thus symbolically integrating Orientalists in North America (cf. e.g. Andersen 1995, p. 120-130). In the following year Salisbury returned to Yale from Europe as Professor of Arabic and Sanskrit and became a driving force in the founding of the Society. Many important figures in contemporary Europe were also invited to be on the list of members. It is further noteworthy that, before founding AOS, there were already established learned so-


2 Cf. also *American Buddhism: Methods and Findings in Recent Scholarship*, ed. Duncan Ryskind Williams and Christopher S. Queen (*Ceylon Critical Studies in Buddhism*) (Richmond: Carstow, 1996), xxvii, 329 p. — passed in this book (e.g. see also Gómez & Prelčik in the next footnote).


cieties, e.g. the American Philosophical Society (founded 1743), American Academy of Arts and Sciences (1780), and the American Antiquarian Society (1812). In building up the symbol of the unity of the Orientalists America lags only a tiny bit behind the European colonists (cf. Yuyama 2000a, p. 26-34: §§1.1-2).

In the meanwhile Burnouf in Paris published a part of his Lotus Sūtra in a somewhat strange manner (cf. supra n. 3-4). In this article Burnouf may have wanted to demonstrate a certain idea with regard to the importance of the formation of this chapter in the central philosophical concepts of the Lotus Sūtra, for Chapter V "Herb" contains a very difficult philosophical question.9 It is interesting, therefore, that Burnouf's work had thus attracted Thoreau into this genre among others. How much it has influenced the then intelleutals is to be questioned and answered.

Salisbury showed a keen interest in Buddhist studies. His mercurial article, read before the annual meeting of the American Oriental Society in May 1844, graced the inaugural issues of the JASOS.10 Immediately after the appearance of Burnouf's Introduction (1844) Salisbury introduced it fully to his compatriot scholars in America11, just as Theodor Benfey (1802-1881) did in Germany in 1846.12

Initiated by Franz Bopp (1791-1867), William Dwight Whitney (1827-1894) had an unusual chance to start Sanskrit studies in 1849 and went the next year to Yale to study for a year under Salisbury, the then pioneering figure in this discipline. This is the beginning of his great highway to study language, Sanskrit and Indo-European comparative grammar. Whitney must have learned a great deal during his three-year stay from 1850, in Germany in particular. Old Indic dialectal problems never escaped Whitney's careful attention in the course of his research career.

---


It is widely known that his grammatical works have always had the serious attention of German scholars (cf. e.g. Wundisch, Geschichte, II, 1920, Chap. III, p. 355-361). Thanks to his efforts, Yale gained a reputation for Indology. Whitney attracted a youthful German student, Hazen Oertel by name (1868-1952), to work under him. Oertel continued the work of Whitney and expanded its sphere. In 1901 he attained a professorship at Yale and later in his motherland, finally at Munich 1925-1935 (cf. e.g. Yuyama, Berlin, 2000, p. 35; §4.3.2). It is to be carefully noted that the idea to study dialectal elements in Indic had thus started first from the German connection. In this way Middle Indicins have attracted the close and unmitting attention of American scholars. With this trend on the background it was a logical outcome that Buddhist Sanskrit had begun to occupy the interest of Edgerton among others.15

Furthermore, it is significant to see how Whitney established close friendship with German teachers and colleagues (see e.g. Whitney 1852/1853). To mention only a few among others, Whitney’s work on the āthavarudha-samaññatā in collaboration with Walter Rudolf von Roth (1821-1895) may not be missed (see e.g. Renou’s Maîtres, 1928, p. 68).14 They published a critical edition for the first time in 1855-1856.15 “Unseres Ausgabe des Atharva Veda”, says Rudolf von Roth about it.16

Charles Rockwell Lammam (1850-1941), one of his leading disciples at Yale, brought out his posthumous translation from Harvard in its revised form in 1905 (cf. Renou’s Bibliographie vedique, 1931, Nos. 461 & 471; Emeneau’s Union List, 1935, Nos. 116-117, 121; also Renou’s Maîtres, p. 54).17

In the meantime Whitney translated Roth’s work in manuscript and introduced it to the

circle of American scholars (Whitney 1852/1853a). In 1897, the Austrian-born Maurice Bloomfield contributed his English translation with extracts from the ritual books and the commentaries to Friedrich Max Müller's great enterprise Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XLII (cf. Renou's Bibl. ind., No. 48.1; Emeneau's Union List, No. 136).18 Max Müller (1821-1900) had decided to seriously study Vedic literature upon meeting Eugène Burnouf in 1843 (cf. Yuyama 2000, p. 22-26: §3.4.0-4). Taking this context of international collaboration, it is a pity to see a fatal controversy between the supposedly pro-German American Whitney of Yale and the German-born Englishman Max Müller of Oxford (cf. e.g. Silverstein 1971, Whitney 1873). In a detailed necrology of Whitney published in 1894 Thomas Day Seymour described this prolonged incident in plain language (Seebel 1996, p. 420f.; for more details see e.g. Andersen 1995, p. 135-168).19 In short, Ernst Leumann writes simply about it: "... von Weber, Monier-Williams, Rost, Böhltingk, Whitney und anderen Fachgenossen nicht genug gewürdigt".20 It may be added here that Whitney set a pattern for serious lexicographical interest with his painstaking "Index Verborum to the Published Text of the Arthaka-veda", JASOS, XII, 1881, p. 1-381. Rudolf Roth says again about it: "Zum Zweck der Bearbeitung des Sanskritwörterbuchs ist von mir und von Herrn W. D. Whitney, dem Mitherausgeber des Arthaka Veda, das Sprachgepräge stärkster Gehör sanskrit vollständig gesammelt worden..." (Roth, TJS, 1876, 5, p. 22 = Kühne Schriften, p. 562). Whitney is thus often quoted by Roth in his writings on the Arthavaveda. In this way he had awakened the nectar-bearing BEE of America further in the relevant linguistic and philological fields. Incidentally, the Patapalá Recension attracted the scholarly attention of yet another promising pupil, Bloomfield, who, in 1901, published the Kathmrion Arthavaveda in three volumes from Baltimore, in collaboration with Richard Karl von Garbe (09-III.1857-19.10.1917), successor to 1897 to the chair held by Roth of Tübingen.11 This work was 18 Cf. further e.g. Noshirvani TEJRI, "Vedic Studies Past and Present", Bulletin Kosho, III, 5 (Tokyo 1939), p. 129-165 (in Jap.). This article was then photographically reprinted as an appendix to his Veda and Upanishad (Tokyo: Sogen-sha, 1953), p. 301-341. And it is somewhat resuscit in his Collected Works, edited by Udaya TANAKA, Yuno ISAMOTO and Minoru ISO, Vol. I: "Vedic Studies", I (Kyoto: Iwanami, 1982), p. 275-313, esp. p. 290 (with Han's introductory essay on p. 513). 19 This is also found in a variety of his correspondence (with brief but interesting comments). The Life and Letters of the Right Honourable Friedrich Max Müller, edited by his wife in two volumes with portraits and other illustrations (London, etc.: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1902), 1p. 495, II p. 20-22, 284f. 20 E. Leumann, Unvorgezogene, genroten in den Jahren 1891-1908: Lebenskran, Bildet und Stadtskrip (Strassburg i.E.: Jul. Mandus & Co., 1909), p. 25 (with a portrait); o. übl., p. 13 (on Whitney). 21 Cf. Richard Garbe, Verzeichnis der indischen Handschriften der königlichen Universitäts-Bibliothek (Zu- sammens des Jahres 1845-1899) (= Systematischer alphabetischer Hauptkatalog der königlichen Universitätsbibliothek zu Tübingen, M: Handschriften, c. Orientalische, I. Indische Handschriften) (Tübingen 1899) (= Jans- en's Bibliography of Catalogues (Wiesbaden 1963), No. 325 p. 11-13; Now. 12-17. 326

Further in passing, it may not be out of place to mention that Michael Witzel (*1943), who has shown a keen interest in the Paippalada recension, occupies the Wies Chair of Sanskrit at Harvard (see e.g. Witzel in ZDMG, Supplement VI, 1985). Further in this connection, in his doctoral dissertation submitted to The Australian National University of Canberra an American, Kenneth G. Zysk by name, could make good use of the Paippalada textual source materials offered by Witzel then in Leiden.22

Through the good offices of Salisbury a new chair was created at Yale for “Sanskrit and its Relations to Kindred Languages, and Sanskrit Literature”. Whitney was elected to this professorship in 1854. Ultimately, in 1869, in spite of invitation from Harvard, Whitney occupied the newly endowed Salisbury Chair of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology at Yale, succeeded in guru-dāya-parampara by Maurice Bloomfield and then by Franklin Edgerton. The wide range of Whitney’s interest and knowledge planted fertile seeds among his gifted students such as Lanman and Bloomfield. Shoots from this original plant have thus appeared in the form of pupils like Edgerton from Iowa, and further the Hali-fax-born Canadian Emeneau.

The most significant of all their many works is their book on Vedic Variants: A Study of the Variant Readings in the Repeated Mantras of the Veda, which was published in three volumes by the Linguistic Society of America (Philadelphia 1930-32-34).23 In it Edgerton declares eloquently (Vedic Variants, II, p. 20, §20): “...We refer to shifts which suggest possible dialectic influence from popular speech, by their resemblance to the phonetics of the later Middle-Indic dialects. (Cf. especially Wackernagel, I, p. XVIII, with references there quoted; and...) The large mass of this kind, clearly pointing to extensive influence of Middle-Indic phonetics in the earliest periods of the language, seems to us one of the most important results of this volume of the Vedic VARIANTS. The principle, to be sure, is not new. But it has never before been illustrated so extensively; and the special character of the illustrations, ..., we believe, now presented for the first time in Vedic phonology. We find, all in all, the most definite proof of phonetic changes not only in the direction of Praekritism, but also (no less interesting) in the reverse direction, ‘hyper-Sanskritism’,


which latter indicates a rather delusive consciousness, on the part of the handlers of the
texts, of the antithesis between the phonetics of the high speech and of the popular dia-

This is the very basic starting point of their linguistic research into Indian languages,
whether Indo-Aryan or non-Indo-Aryan. This must be the proper function of linguistic
research at Yite. Its key approach is "dialects, dialectal phenomena, other diachronic or
 synchronic, characteristics either common to all or localities as regionalism or provincial-
ism, etc.".

It seems to me that Emeneau looked for these clues with boundless energy and enthusi-
asm.24 In the meanwhile the keyword "linguistic area" had occupied his attention as his
greatest concern.25 His dynamic ideas are ever growing with his wide range of linguistic
knowledge, wearing his five score years lightly. Emeneau has thus planted his bulbs to the
West Coast of America at the University of California, Berkeley. This idea is indeed sug-
gestive to those who are engaged in the languages and cultures of India and beyond. I do
not intend here, however, to go on further to his works.26

Out of their wide interest comes a deep insight into the narrative literature of India, which

---

24 Cf. e.g. M. B. Emeneau, "The Dialects of Old Indo-Aryan", Ancient Indo-European Dialects: Proceed-
ing of the Conference on Indo-European Linguistics held at the University of California, Los Angeles,
April 25-27, 1943, edited by Henrik Birnbaum and Jouse Polved (Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of

Paper Series, XII) (Berkeley: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of California,

26 Cf. e.g. M. B. Emeneau, "India as a Linguistic Area", Language, XXXII (1956), p. 3-16.

27 Reproduced in Language in Culture and Society, A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology, edited by

---

Also Language and Linguistic Area: Essay by Murray B. Emeneau, selected and introduced by Arvad S.
Dil (A Language Science and National Development: A Series Sponsored by the Linguistic Research Group

28 In this connection, I recall my teacher at Leiden, F. B. J. Kuiper, who delivered a lecture on the rele-
vant topic in Ann Arbor in 1965: "Genesis of a Linguistic Area", IJL, 2, 2 (1965), p. 81-112; reprinted in
his Selected Writings on Indian Linguistics and Philology, ed. A. Lahotsky, M. S. Oert and M Wild (A
Kern Institute Mevrouw, 1) (A Leiden Studies in Indo-European, VII) (Amsterdam-Atlanta: Editions

29 Cf. A. Toynbee, "Bibliography of Publications by P. B. J. Kuiper (Upto and including the Year
1967)", Proceedings: Indian, Persian and Indo-European Studies presented to Frenzein Bernardus Janeth
Kuiper on his sixtieth birthday, ed. J. C. Heeseman, G. H. Scholiker and V. J. Shrothramou (A Janua
Linguarum: Studia Memoriarum Nikola van Wijk dedicata, Series Maior, XXIII) (The Hague-Paris-
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has continued until today.\(^{27}\) One cannot forget the works done by the three BEE at Yale. In addition, William Norman Brown (1892-1975), who had spent some five years in India after the age of eight, expanded the sphere in the relevant fields of study both diachronic and synchronic. Strictly speaking, the self-taught Edward Weibehorn Hopkins (1857-1912) is not a part of this lineage, but was undoubtedly a promoter of this same academic tradition. His scholarly influence at Yale as well as other centres along the East Coast can never be neglected. The work of his that has been rather overlooked is, I believe, his meticulous studies on Indic narrative literature and Epic versification.

Incidentally, it is a coincidence that both Whitney and Hopkins were from the same township of Northampton in Massachusetts. After all, Hopkins succeeded to the chair after Whitney at Yale in 1895. It is significant that Edward W. Hopkins studied in Berlin with Albrecht Friedrich Weber (1825-1901) and in Leipzig with Ernst Windisch (1844-1918).\(^ {28}\) After his return from Germany in 1881 Hopkins instructed students in Indo-Iranian research at Columbia for some five years and at Bryn Mawr for some ten years. In 1926 Edgerton succeeded to the famed chair held by Hopkins. For decades Bryn Mawr was then one of the principal centres to hire eminent scholars in Indic, Indo-Iranian and comparative linguistics and philology.

Among the scholars in the early period the name of Eugene Watson Burlingame (1876-1932) should not go unheeded. All of his works are indispensable for those who are interested in Buddhist narrative literature. It is amazing to see him having worked in close centres of Indological studies of the East Coast such as Harvard University at Cambridge, Johns Hopkins University at Baltimore, University of Pennsylvania at Philadelphia in addition to his alma mater at New Haven. Particular mention must be made to his Buddhist Legends published in three parts from Harvard in 1921 (repeatedly reprinted by PTS)\(^ {29}\).

---


28 Regrettably, despite his emphatic conclusion, the kind of international relation in science is not touched by Klaus Milian, "Die Geschichte der Sanskrit-Philologie an der Universitat Leipzig von den Anfängen bis zur Einerzierung von Friedrich Weber", Bulletin of the Oceon College Post-Graduate and Research Institute, LV-LV (a Sir William Jones Number) (June 1994-95), p. 133-141.


---

* - 1. Introduction; Synopses: Translation of Books 1 and 2 (with a photograph of a palm-leaf MS, Evviii, 128 p, 1 folded folio. II. Translation of Books 3 to 12 (v), 366 p. III. Translation of Books 13 to 16 (vi), 374 p.
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Henry Clarke Warren (1854-1899) did not occupy any university chair, being physically handicapped and disabled after an accident. However, his energetic contribution to Buddhist studies, based on firm philological training and backed up with fieldwork, cannot be forgotten (cf. Lamann on Warren 1889, 1890a, & 1921). His famous work *Buddhism in Translation* (1896) has repeatedly been reprinted to supply a demand of the reading public. A reprint with a preface by Daniel Henry Holmes Ingalls (1916-1999), successor to Walter Eugene Clark at Harvard, offered a popular edition with a very brief biographical sketch on Warren at the end of the book (New York 1963).

Warren was not only a man of science but also a financier to the academic world (for further details see Lamann 1921, paying a tribute with a nice dedicatory poem). Incidentally, it may be noted that Lamann himself showed a deep interest in Buddhist literature. In 1909 he published an article on the Pali book-titles and their designations. It is unfortunate that his bio-bibliographical data have not appeared in a proper manner.

In 1929 Lamann received a commemorative volume, which contains a garland of papers dedicated by eminent scholars from all over the world including such leading Japanese scholars as Jyan (a Junijiro) Takakusu (1866-1945), Taiken Kimura (1881-1930) Gennyo Ono (1883-1919), all on Vasubandhu, and Hakuju Uji (1882-1963) on historical Maitreya. These prominent figures have thus been easily visible in the centres where they left their footprints. In addition to those mentioned above, one may observe their influence at work in Cambridge (Harvard), Philadelphia (Penn), and elsewhere.

In this connection one cannot overlook the further importance of Lamann's keen interest in bringing out the fruits of Buddhist philological research, in addition to a wide range of purely Indological topics. A fine example is the launching of the *Harvard Oriental Series*, which was founded by Lamann and Warren in 1891, beginning with Hendrik Kern's edition of the *Satka-Malaki of Arya-Sura*. The editorial work was then continued by the Wales Professor of Sanskrit at Harvard, W. E. Clark (from Volume XLI). "... It aims to make available for us people of the West the incomparable lessons which (if we be wise


enough to maintain the teachable habit of mind) the Wise Men of the East can teach us. ... / Buddha (563-483 B.C.) was the greatest teacher of pre-Christian Asia. His precepts and example have been or are an untaught blessing to India and Ceylon and the Far East. ... "

("Preliminary Note" to the Descriptive List of the HDS, 1932, p. 1).

In regard to the Yale school of linguistics I cannot fail to notice two figures among many others. One is Leonard Bloomfield (1887-1949), who, to no small extent, must have been influenced by his uncle Maurice (cf. also Andersen 1995, p. 220-226). The young Bloomfield studied with the then renowned German linguists-philologists in 1913-1914, at Leipzig with the Slavicist August Leskien (1846-1916) and the Indo-Europeanist Karl Brugmann (1849-1919) and at Göttingen with the Indologist Hermann Oldenberg (1854-1920) as well as Jakob Wackernagel (1853-1938).

The other was the German-born and America-educated Edward Sapir (1884-1939). He had paved the highway of anthropological and sociological linguistics (cf. also Andersen 1991, p. 226-233). Being a linguist and anthropologist, Sapir had in fact sprinkled a beneficent rain of knowledge all over the Continent, e.g. in Berkeley, Philadelphia, Ottawa, Chicago and New Haven. Incidentally, he was always sentimental to California or to the West Coast (cf. Voegelin 1952).

Sapir must have deepened multilateral research into languages and cultures of specific areas inherited from his pioneering predecessors. Indeed, it may be further worth noting that Sapir was one of the frequent contributors to The Dial, begun in 1940 in Boston by Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-1882) with the editorial assistance of Henry D. Thoreau.

Sapir's final years in New Haven fell on Franklin Edgerton's tenure at Yale (1926-1953). It goes without saying that Edgerton as his contemporary colleague thought most highly of Sapir's ability in a wide range of science. That Edgerton seems to have helped Sapir from isolation at Yale (see Edgerton 1940). After all, Edgerton describes Sapir beautifully: "He (= Sapir) was an artist in science, or a scientist in art." (Edgerton, op.cit., p. 463 = Sapir - Appraisals, p. 7). Having been in Berkeley for more than half a century, Emeneau tells for himself how much Sapir at Yale 1931-1939 has affected him.11

To close this paper I wish to add a few words on the German connection with Yale. One cannot overlook the importance of Whitney's friendly relation with his teacher Albrecht Weber in Berlin. Weber was the very scholar, I believe, who for the first time showed the

10 Cf. Eggan 1986, — further Maudslay's "Introduction" to Sapir's Totemism and Taboo, p. v (comm. n. 1).
wisdom and power to see into the dialectal elements in the Vedic literature. This was strongly supported by Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar (1837-1925), who has put it forward by saying: "I am at a loss to see why some scholars should find it so difficult to believe that Sanskrit is a vernacular." If it is well known, however, that the French savants until recently have obstinately rejected this theory.

In a booklet (Leipzig 1884) Adolf Holtzmann (1838-1914) tried to supplement with Epic licenses missing in Whitney's Grammar/Grantskript (Leipzig 1879). The second supplement was his own work on the verb: Roots/Wurzeln (Leipzig 1885), which is still much used by the students of Indic. In 1952 Emeneau brought out a textbook on Sanskrit sandhi rules with reference to Whitney's Grammar (Berkeley-Los Angeles 1958).

Whilst studying in Berlin and Leipzig, Maurice Bloomfield met a number of leading masters like Weber, Oldenberg, Heinrich Friedrich Zimmer (1851-1910), Ernst Wilhelm Oskar Windisch, Georg Curtius (1820-1912), and Karl Brugmann. He met frequently in the same classes with his friends like Hermann Collin (1855-1935), Paul Jacob Deussen (1844-1919), Ernst Leumann (1859-1931), Mark Aurel Stein (from Hungary, 1882-1943), Max Müller, and so on. In pursuit of further Vedic research Bloomfield visited Roth and


It is not my intention to see a historical development of this controversial issue. But I would here with just cite e.g. Joseph Monnier, Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue sanskrit (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1931), p. 133; Louis Renou, Histoire de la langue sanskrit (Geneva: Les Editions de Lyon, 1956), p. 30 n. 1; also Renou's "Introduzione" ad Jakob Wackernagel, Akadimische Grammatik I (Göttingen: Vandenheuck & Ruprecht, 1973), p. 7 (cum p. 54f. n. 80).


In the meantime yet another notable work has appeared in Vienna: Chlodwig H. Werba, Verba hindo-arica: Die primaren und sekundären Wurzeln der Sandhit-Sprache, 1: Radier Primarwurzen (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1997; VIII, 550 p.)

Garbe at Tübingen in 1884 and 1889. Many other promising scholars went to Germany for further studies, as for another good example Abraham Valentine Williams Jackson (1862-1937).

At the same time it is to be noted that some famed scholars have come from Germany. The name of Heinrich Zimmer, Jr. (1890-1943), who taught at Johns Hopkins for a short period of time, may be most familiar to the general public in America. After the retirement of Edgerton in 1953 the Sterling Chair of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology at Yale was occupied temporarily by Louis Rouet (1896-1966) of the Sorbonne in 1953 before coming to Tokyo as Director of the Maison Franco-Japonaise (1954-1956). Thereafter went Paul Thieme (1901-2001) from Tübingen to New Haven for three years.

If one takes other branches of Indic studies like narrative literature and Middle Indicism or Prakritism into account, the American scholarly connection with Europe and India will enhance much more impact to us. And without these points the history of American Indology cannot be fully discussed. In particular, the American tradition of Indic narrative literature has continued to date. It is too a vast topic to include in the present paper. But, in order to see the background history of Buddhist philology in North America I cannot forget the role played by the groundwork layers in the field of Indian narrative and folkloric literature.

With this brief background in mind, I hope to have evoked something of the fertile and progressive history of the predawn period of this discipline. A firm basis of Buddhist Sanskrit philology in North America was thus achieved after a century of foundation work accumulated by the predecessors as well as their contemporaries.

This introductory essay has already taken too much space. I am well aware that I have had to raise a number of eminent scholars even at Yale. It has thus become an interim report in preparation for a future work on the lineage of the three nocturnal-bearing BEE: Mauricio Bloomfield, Franklin Edgerton and Miuay Barnou Emezeu. This is just a gateway to the goal of Buddhist Sanskrit philology. I am now wondering if I shall be able to write more with detailed bio-bibliographical data, which, I trust, will also speak eloquently of the prosperous history of American Indology as a whole.
Bio-Bibliographical Source Materials

Owing to the limited space I herewith give only a few biblio-bibliographical source materials.17

Works in General (with abbreviations)


References to Particular Personalities:

Bloomfield, Leonard (Chicago, 01.7.1887-New Haven, 18.IV.1949).

Bloomfield, Maurice (Bielefeld, Austria, 23.11.1855-Munich, 13.6.1918).
ARN, III, p. 49a-50a: "Maurice Bloomfield (1855-1918)," by Mark K, Connelly.
DAB, I, p. 386a-386b: "Maurice Bloomfield", signed by A.W.J.
"Biographical Sketch," p. xvi-xvii.
"Bibliography of Professor Bloomfield's Writings," p. xiii-xiv (up to the year 1920).

17 For further references see, e.g. A. Vyvyan, Engine Burnout: The Background to his Research into the Loun Suard (= Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Budavari, III) (Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University, 2000), p. 79-118 [hereinafter cited: "Fvvaran 2007"].
“Index List of Whitman’s Writings”, p. xlii-xlvi.
Hann Oertel, “William Dwight Whitney”, Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, XX (1894), p. 308-313 (with a list of Whitney’s works) [reproducibly excluded from Oertel’s Klime Schrift (Stuttgart, 1994)].
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Postscript

To my deep regret and shame, as always, I am too poorly prepared to carry out a work to look into the original materials kept in the famed centres along the East Coast. I had planned to dig out the necessary documents at the time when the annual meetings of the Association for Asian Studies and the American Oriental Society were held in Boston and Baltimore respectively in March 1999. My prime interest had lain in the Johns Hopkins University among others. I found myself hopelessly missing the target. To confess frankly, also, it was my first visit to these university towns. And a heavy snowfall prevented me from visiting Yale at New Haven.

Since then my cherished desire to attempt once more to this expeditionary tour has not been realized for various reasons. Nevertheless, my visit to the George Peabody Library in Baltimore at that time was by no means fruitless. In the meantime since then, thanks to the kind offices of the Librarian, Professor Carolyn Smith, I was able to build up contacts with the Johns Hopkins University Libraries. Herewith I express my sincere gratitude to Mr. James Stimpert, Archivist, Special Collections, and Ms. Jennifer Allain Ralls, Assistant Archivist, The Ferdinand Hamburger Jr. Archives, both at the Milton S. Eisenhower Library. They have spared no pains to meet my burdensome requests. Otherwise, a number of tiny materials, such as newspaper clippings, would never have caught my eyes even when wider open. It is really amazing how carefully they keep their archival documents. As a matter of fact, no independent department of Indic and Buddhist studies exists there any longer. This fact has encouraged me to revisit those academic centres and establish much closer contacts with the staff in charge and further excavate firsthand archival materials with regard to the cradle of Buddhist philosophy in North America. I shall then be able to see the American scenes more deeply.

Unfortunately, I have been unable to see the work by William Norman Brown, Johns Hopkins Half-Century Directory: A Catalogue of Trustees, Faculty, Holders of Honorary Degrees, Students, Graduates, and Non-Graduates, 1876-1926 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, 1926), viii, 542 p. — But, again thanks to their help from Baltimore, I have obtained the photocopy of the portions needed for consultation for the moment.

Introducing Three Recent Japanese Publications on the Dharmapala Literature in Chinese

Akira TUZAMA

During the last few years, there have appeared in Japan three important works on the Dharmapala and its related literature. This is intended to introduce them to the Western friends engaged in relevant subjects. These works, though written in Japanese, will no doubt help us understand the relevance better through their meaningful methodological notes and careful philological remarks with necessary references.
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Introduction: Three Recent Japanese Publicat...


Q: Anton Zigmund-Cerbu's posthumous work on the Kriṣṇamārgaḥ:

In recent years Anton Rope has been offering a number of enlightening articles with regard to the history of Indological studies.

In his paper "De l'histoire des études orientales à Paris: Anton et Liša Zigmund-Cerbu", Bulletin d'études indiennes (Ouvrage publié par l'Association Française pour les Études Indiennes avec le concours de l'Université de Paris-III), No 17-18, 1999-2000 (2000), p. 21-32, Anton Rope has announced that Anton Cerbu left an unpublished work on Kuladatta's Kriṣṇamārgaḥ:

"B. Manuṣānovi, consacrée à New York (Selon la note communiquée par M. Stephen Headley, nprn, n. 10),

1. Ample étude sur le Kriṣṇamārgaḥ 'Recueil de rituels' de Kuladatta, environ 150 fol."

(Rope, sprr, p. 21).

As announced therein (Rope, sprr, p. 21 fn. 4), his article was also published with little revisions: "Anton et Liša Zigmund-Cerbu, orientalistes de talent et en plénitude", Studia Orientales, Revue internationale d'études orientales et internationale Journal for Asian Studies, Périodique publié par le "Centre d'Histoire des Religions", Faculté d'Histoire, Université de Bucharest (Association Rommaine d'Histoire des Religions), Volume L, no. 1-2 (Bucharest 2000), p. 11-23 (incl. an additional plate with two photos after p. 16). On p. 21 he further comments on Skorupski's work (cf. Yuyama, sprr, p. 13: §1.3.1, with a fn. 25):

"... un sujet de ce recueil de rituels, voir en dernier de T. SHOKURPSKI, 'A new analysis of the Kriṣṇamārgaḥ, dans Sansacœurs, ... (Warsaw-UniBot, 1998), p. 181-196 ...

L'auteur, qui cite la contribution de M. Béjaoui, ne pouvait malheureusement pas avoir connaissance d'un manuscrit d'Anton Cerbu..."

It was almost absolutely impossible for Skorupski to see such a work! Rope's remark can be applied to my article. At least, one can admit that he had consulted a better original manuscript. To my regret, Rope's enlightening article has reached me a little too late to incorporate into my paper.

Incidentally, Anton Rope has also given me a shock with his information of Anton Cerbu's posthumous work left in manuscript form:

"Au État-Unis, A. Zigmund-Cerbu menera de front l'enseignement universitaire, les recherches sur le territoire en Extrême-Orient et la préparation de deux ouvrages: l'un intitulé 'An introduction to the history and sociology of Southeast Asia', l'autre intitulé 'Une traduction du texte bouddhique Kṣesāra-vidarmanārājaḥ du cycle mahāyāniste de Pratīyārtha...'' (Rope, sprr, p. 26 et passim).

Cerbu's work on the Rāṣṭra must also have escaped Conze's notice. No one can blame him!

Q: Yuyama, sprr., p. 41, n. 58:


© 2006 ERIAB, Soka University, JAPAN.
A study of Chapter V of the Kriyāsūryaṇaḥ
Professor Gudrun Wühlmann of Madison has kindly informed me that there is an unpublished M.A. thesis by Wilfried Kempe under the guidance of Bernhard Köhler at the University of Kiel: Das Fünfte Kapitel des Kriyāsūryaṇaḥ (1984). I have not yet seen it. Let us hope to see it published before our eyes!


1. After having published this paper I realized that I had placed a little too much stress on the international relations, particularly on the French connection. I should naturally have mentioned that Bagchi had a good academic climate in the related fields of study at the Vīśva-Bharati of Santiniketan itself. See e.g. Prokhor Kamar Mukherje, Indian Literature; Ahmad (China) (= Calcutta Oriental Series, No. 22, E.14) (Calcutta: Calcutta Oriental Press, 1928), (ii), (iii), 98 p.

2. To my regret, I have just noted a recent publication on the Vīśva-Bharati a little too late to incorporate it into my paper: Vīśva-Bharati – Santiniketan, 1901-2000 (Calcutta: Publications Department, Vīśva-Bharati, 2000, 57 p., ill.).

3. At the same time, I have noted a very interesting publication on the history of Ch’ing-hua University, which was published immediately after the appearance of my paper:

Ch’ing-hua University started with international cooperation. My attention was drawn to an early aspect of enviable Sino-German cultural exchange. In connection with Professor Chi Hsien-Lin 李敏林 (1911- ) I see a series of interesting affairs (op. cit., p. 73 & 77). It is to be remembered that it was a difficult time for them under the then domestic and international situation:

1935 1 4 月 4 日: 校評議員會決議: 本校派遣代表赴德參觀考察校務及學生
2 月 13 日: 校評議員會決議: 本校決議接芮該校學生於貴州，每月發給 24 萬合銀。
4 月: 本校與德國商洽訂立交換研究辦法。
6 月 22 日: 舉行 1934 年度畢業典禮，... 7 月 6 日: 校評議員會決議: 通過派遣赴德研究生男女研究者四人，...
1936 10 10 日: 校評議員會決議: 本校派遣赴德研究生男優等生派 5 人，...
德方來電表示接受 3 人，...

It is surprising to find a monthly stipend of 24 per month sterling. Chi arrived in Göttingen in September 1935 to study with Emil Sieg (1866-1951, holding a chair since 1920) and then with Ernst Walschmidt (1897-1983, chaired 1936-1965). He left Germany in October 1945, returning home in the vernal season of 1946 via various ports en route. Since autumn 1946 Chi holds a chair at Peking University (cf. ARIRIAB VI, 2003/2001, p. 140ff.,
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SÜBS = Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur.


Die buddhistische Literatur hat jedoch eine lange und umfangreiche Entwicklung hinterlassen, die in der Literatur des Buddhismus erfasst werden muß. Die buddhistische Literatur hat jedoch eine lange und umfangreiche Entwicklung hinterlassen, die in der Literatur des Buddhismus erfasst werden muß. Die buddhistische Literatur hat jedoch eine lange und umfangreiche Entwicklung hinterlassen, die in der Literatur des Buddhismus erfasst werden muß.
学士募集締め切りの前日まで、大学へ書類を提出することは大切です。提出期限は5月31日までです。
SWTF = Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden: UAI 1−Höfe, 同じく同様な解釈で、いわゆる「トルファン仏教出土仏教梵字辞典」がある。インド学仏教学を専攻する学者にとって、同様に必要な辞書である。この辞書について多くを書き加える必要がある。インドの修羅を含めて、中国語の仏教用語を著し、修羅が存在してから、仏教が存在した、つまりインドにおいて責任をもって仏教を伝えた仏教僧侶の共通の教義で開かれた。ヴェルシュミット（Ernst Waldeischnitz）1897−1895は、特にインド学の研究者に深く影響を与えた。日本国でありなされないにも関係があるが、その特徴はすでに述べた。文字通りインド文化の影響をもって日本へ及ぼした。
Werner Jacobssen's Samling

Forensic anthropology is a young discipline that is still in its formative stages. It is a relatively new field that has developed over the past few decades. Werner Jacobssen's Samling (1914-1971) is one of the pioneers in this field. His work has been influential in the development of forensic anthropology.

Center for Orientalia & Judaica, Dept. Kongelige Bibliotek
Soren Kierkegaards Plads, 1 Frederiksberg, DK-1016 Kopenhagen K, Denmark.
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The application of forensic anthropology in criminal investigations has been a hot topic in recent years. The field of forensic anthropology has contributed significantly to the advancement of criminal justice systems.
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The application of forensic anthropology in criminal investigations has been a hot topic in recent years. The field of forensic anthropology has contributed significantly to the advancement of criminal justice systems.
今昔も近辺の風景を思いつくままに描き続けるが、時々と行数が増え書き手に溢れてきた。


本書の第一巻の刊行時に次第に追及するか発行を期待したが (ARIRAB VI, p. 70), 瞳へと進んで

連れて関連学各を満足させてくれた。有料の発表者に、執筆協力者との努力を並び並んで

ははない。資料の提供者を含めて、本書の関係者に感謝の意を表し、大きな心を添える誠意であ

る。感謝の意を表して、ここに感謝の意の表記を添えて、かつてトゥフマン崇拝の文章

の整理をしたリューゲルス夫人 (Elsie Linders-Petters: 1890-1945) を思い起こす。これらの

病患が、今後もインド学芸術学のありと何か両立を求めるものだが、果たす物件となるに過ぎ

ない。しも若い中が重要な発表が出た (Daniel Bouche, JFR, XIV, 3: Autumn 2002, p. 245-259,

順に慎重な提案が多いより、さらなる調査解釈の新進を念じて、関連学芸の参照

の価値を呼ぶ。願を願うことに内容目数を挙げてみた。

1. Sára, a) Ágama.

b) Mahāpratīṣṭhānacarita

II. Vijnana

III. Abhidharma

IV. Mahābhārata
14. Richard Salomon, "A Fragment of a Collection of Buddhist Legends, with a Reference to King Huvika

15. Eli Frccze, "A Mābhataruka among the Buddhist: Three Fragments on the Relationship between Ward


Poetical Team
23. "Pacsimilias": Plates I-XIX.
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Brief Communication

Two peculiar optative endings in the Central Asian MSS.

While studying the Central Asian MSS. of the Saddharmapundarika sûtra and Sarvastivadanasamudgata sûtra, I have recently come across the following two peculiar third person singular optative endings.

(1) -nyām
A Sanskrit fragment of the Saddharmapundarika sûtra in the Lishun Museum Collection (Lü), A-9, verso 8, reads: upāsakāmī ca varjyām1, whereas the other MSS. read as follows: Gilgit MS. (D2). 76a3. upāsakāmī ca varjyä ( = Bj, C4, N1, T6, B etc.); O (Khādālīq MS. = “Kashghar” MS.). 267a5. upāsakāmī ca varjēta; F (Farhād-Beg). 17a8-17b1. upāsikā ca varjēta.

Lü. A-10-a. recto 1 reads: /// sēkṣyām, whereas the other MSS. read instead as follows: D2.76a7. vāramukhyām na sāvetā; O. 267b5. vāramukhyām na sāvetā (= Petrovsky Collection 324a5); F.17b5. vāramukhyām na sāvetā. 2

Also, whereas Gilgit-Nepalese MSS. of the same text read vāmityā ... anumārtya (KN. 102.11), a Central Asian fragment in the Hoernele Collection, 142.S.B.71, IV recto 3, reads instead: /// nyām ... anumāryām 3.

This peculiar optative ending has been noted already by Prof. Hirofumi Toda1 and Zhongxin Jiang4. We cannot, however, rule out the possibility that the ending -nyām resulted from the erratic usage of anumānya in the Central Asian MSS.5

---


2 Cf. ibid. XIII § 8.

3 Cf. ibid. XIII § 9.


7 For examples of such a “pseudo-anumānya,” see Seishi Karashima "Some features of the language
(²) -cāyā

Whereas the Nepalese MSS. of the Sāvatthaprabhāsottamaśāstra read: nāmaçāyāni

padatayājanam apamānāyati [cāyā], a Sanskrit fragment in the Lishun Museum Collection,¹ No. 20.1554/24 (± No. P.7b14b), verso 1, reads as follows: 

/ dānī padatayājanāni c. + + + + + vāskyāti²

The optative ending -cāyā (here written as cāyā) is also found in one of the Central Asian fragments of the same text in the Lavrov Collection in St. Petersburg;¹ SI L/10. recto 2, 'śantayāti vyaprakāryāti'³ [gkb. 'lyyāti'⁴, recto 3-4, 'prācēryāti, antardhāvyāti'; recto 6, 'antardhāvyāti', prādurbhāvyāti'.

This ending is found also in a Central Asian fragment of the Saddaramapundarikakārtti from the N. F. Petrovsky Collection: Frag II 40a2. saci evam vadeyāti (KN. 105.12. vade); II 40b8-9, niskramyāti pravṛcēyāti (KN. 107.7. niskramamyārit vā; O. niskramatāt caiva(m) pravṛcēti[ti]).⁵

An example of this ending is also found in the Nepalese MSS. of the Śaṃkṛāṇāṭārāātra: Andrew Skilton, "Śaṃkṛāṇāṭārāātra," in: Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection I, Buddhist Manuscripts, vol. 2, ed. Jens Braeug et al., Oslo 2002: Hermes Publishing, p. 164, ll. 18-19. na tasya bodhāya kādati samayā ya uddīśyātiti⁶ inman śaṃkṛā, jānyāti⁷ are justly doubted by Prof. O. von


¹vyākhyāta: some MSS. read vyākhyātā instead. The form vyaprakāryā is a haplography of vyaprakāryātā.


⁴vyaprakāryātā or vyaprakāryātyā?


⁶Tytrenkin (op. cit., p. 35) transcribed this as 'yatī'.

⁷Tytrenkin transcribed this as 'jīhi[ī]kāyāti'.

⁸Tytrenkin transcribed this as 'tabhāṣyāti'.


¹⁰Cf. Skilton, op. cit., p. 162, fn. 516. The relevant Gilgit MS. reads addhīśyāta (Skilton, op. cit., p. 162, l. 12, scribal error for 'yatī').

¹¹ Cf. Wilhelm Geiger, Pali, Literatur und Sprache, Stuttgart 1916 (Grundriß der Indo-Asiatischen
Hinüber²⁰. In the Aśokan Inscription, on the other hand, we have probably an example of this ending: bheyyati²¹.

In the Lavrov fragment of the Saumaprapkūtottaramātra, the optative plural ending -ṛṣṇī is also found: SL 1/10. verso 3. abhiṣapuḍāḥḥyṛṣṇī²²; do. 4. bhāṣṭiṣṭyṛṣṇī.

Seishi Karashima


²⁰ Viṣṇupadāya II 390.22; cf. Geiger, op. cit. § 126.
²¹ Oskar von Hinüber, Das ältere Mitteiniah im Überkāś, 2., erweiterte Auflage, Wien 2001: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (ÖAW) Bd. 467 - Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Stifterkreises, Heft 201, § 436. Prof. von Hinüber kindly suggested to me, in personal communication (December 2002), that jīneyati should be either read as jīneyati or jīneyati with the manuscripts (cf. Viṣṇupadāya II 324).
²² Cf. von Hinüber, op. cit. § 437.
²³ Tyebtun (op. cit., p. 37) transcribed this as ṭṇatū.
One More Extra Folio Included in the Bundle of MS[A] of the *Mabukarmasibhanganga* Preserved in the National Archives of Nepal, Kathmandu

In the bundle of MS[A] of the *Mabukarmasibhanganga*, preserved in the National Archives of Nepal, Kathmandu, we have two extra folios which seem to belong to each different set of manuscripts; rather it is likely that these two are used as a sort of memorandum. One is a folio that has passages parallel to the MPS’s 32 (Gyelwa Lévi, *Mabukarmasibhanganga et Karmasihangapada*, Paris 1932: 63.2-64.9 = MS[A]38r.1-v.2; MS[B]20r.6-21r.6). The other is the one which contains an enumeration of ten evil acts and some verses from the *Vajracchedaka.* In the following, I would like to show its transmigration alone.

On its one side, items of ten evil acts are written separately in four columns (see figure): Column A-B = enumeration of ten evil acts; Column C-D = brief explanations.


© 2003 EIRI, Soka University, JAPAN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. utdhiyata, mīna</td>
<td>1. viśācā, kastā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ihheya, iṣyā</td>
<td>2. pūpa, hri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. dhāṣyaya, krodha</td>
<td>3. kṛṣyana, iṣyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. +y. qāhī, hi</td>
<td>4. nyāpāda, vihimsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. māra, vacanā</td>
<td>5. mūḍāha, ājñā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. kā;kā; ny. jñā[n]ājāḥ</td>
<td>6. sā ... māya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. kākṛtya jñecana :1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column C</th>
<th>Column D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. datā akṣatala hamābā</td>
<td>1. apanidipāta 1 alpāya bhavati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. prānākipā i alpāya bhavati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 adstíðuna 2 Íbogudsóðspanstí
4 kásmatthýriðarena 1 + + + tröð naryti
5 mæsfæðsina 4 Íbðýrýsýn, + + + citattíðare
6 þættnyj 5 mítubhedá vata...þæða vícýar
7 þræuk 6 Ímanúðvarasvbodurandríða

Column D:
1 Ímanúðhápaþa 7 mítubhedýa
2 <avídyta 8 Ímanúðvarasvbodurandríða
3 mæsfæðsýtí 10 tröðvaðírahavanngí

The other side:
1 [Vajjrásetícim uktan 1 kharo dvvdisaivarmanntí íaþaþ þjókkarað svamabhi svapajramanmíj ijatye...ji...rkaibí it rútulo níraðnokalíkaðranjanjí (nú) +
2 + grawtha 1 Íbðýrýsýnþíðarmí tóíranda bráhmaný bidýl[í] 1 þjókkar yari bhuvati paðs jaív iatye...iub[í] tóíranda játu bráhmarcaya bráhmaný...]
3 þa te sa þraðmí títe te ca lokasa bráhmaný 1 fáða(bh)ocayam bráhmu tasmát...aþaþaþ
4 káraþamí 11 Ímanúðhápaþa
5 káraþamí 11 Ímanúðhápaþa
6 vadaþteþaþo samghabhitántí karúnah bráhmarcaya bráhmaný, sí saþ bráhmacarya sa vudhíkhádísarapajígrawatha 1 plánsa na samarthí ca sa bráhmaný kin śa kala
7 Ímanúðhápaþa 11 Ímanúðhápaþa
8 Ímanúðhápaþa 11 Ímanúðhápaþa
9 munaþo sa...tás tasya śrúvakaðíra Ímanúðhápaþa
10 munaþo sa...tás tasya śrúvakaðíra Ímanúðhápaþa
11 munaþo sa...tás tasya śrúvakaðíra Ímanúðhápaþa

Noriyuki KUDO

---

3 v. 6 kharo dvavdisajjanmañi saiyamama jírálahí 1 Ímanúðhápaþa
4 v. 6 kharo dvavdisajjanmañi saiyamama jírálahí 1 Ímanúðhápaþa
5 v. 14 kharo dvavdisajjanmañi saiyamama jírálahí 1 Ímanúðhápaþa
6 v. 14 kharo dvavdisajjanmañi saiyamama jírálahí 1 Ímanúðhápaþa
7 v. 37 káraþamí 1 Ímanúðhápaþa
8 v. 37 káraþamí 1 Ímanúðhápaþa
9 v. 37 káraþamí 1 Ímanúðhápaþa
10 v. 37 káraþamí 1 Ímanúðhápaþa
11 v. 37 káraþamí 1 Ímanúðhápaþa
12 v. 37 káraþamí 1 Ímanúðhápaþa
13 v. 37 káraþamí 1 Ímanúðhápaþa
14 v. 37 káraþamí 1 Ímanúðhápaþa
15 v. 37 káraþamí 1 Ímanúðhápaþa
16 v. 37 káraþamí 1 Ímanúðhápaþa
17 This verse is not included in the present edition of the Vajracanti but it is noted that certain manuscript used for this edition contains it, see Footnote 109, p. 10: akámsa bráhmacarya ca vudhíkhádísarapajígrawatha 1 plánsa na samarthí ca bráhmaný kin śa kala.
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活動報告（平成14年1月以降）

「研究庁運営委員会」を年2回、3回の総会で開催。
「国際仏教学系等研究評価会」を月2回の総会（夏季・冬季休みを除く）で開催。
以下、8月を除く研究室および所属の主要な活動を記述。

平成14年

1月28日(水) 第11回仏教学総会
ミュンヘン大学、イエズス＝ヴェルハルト大学教授（Prof. Dr. Juss-Ute Hartmann, Institut für Indologie und Drukmologie, Universität Münchon）を招務
テーマ「The Structure and the Contents of the Divayu-agama of the Muna-Sarvapani
＝ Remarks on the Sanskrit Manuscript Recently Discovered in Pakistan」
（根本）若
一切自言「長阿含」の服具構成とその内容—パキスタンで最近見られた「長阿含」
の文献年表について—

2月17日(土) 18日(日) 京都大学寺良講堂、コーポラライフ教育講師、工学系講師
国際仏教学研究会 第18回学術大会に出席

3月15日(月) 25日(金) 幸福禅寺学研 中京大学（国文学研究科）
京都大学総合文化研究センターで「仏教美術、仏教美術及び仏教美術本研究の現状
と展望」を講演

3月15日(月) 第19回仏教学総会
ローラ・ブートン教授（Prof. Dr. Michael Hawe, Fachgeher Indologie 與 Tibetologie der Universität Marburg）を招務
テーマ「What cannot be falsified by one who is not s utadhist — On the art of
composing nonteligious and bilingual riddles in Sanskrit」
（根本）若
なぜ一部では難解であるにもかかわらず、サンスクリット語が用いられた音楽と言語の形成に関する

4月12日(土) 工藤講義
東京大学総合研究所「佛学と自然」研究結果発表会に出席（発表：工藤大学総合研究所)

5月9日(木) 8日(水) 研究室発表
「仏教大学・国際仏教学系等研究室・年報」平成15年度(第2期)「(3月31日作)
M. J. VORWEG-DEUTSCHER in collaboration with Senthilkrishna and Nupur
pages + XXXX photos, ISBN 4-9908622-4-7).
Michel ZENNERMAN, A Buddha Within: The Rādhagovinda-bhakti, The Laity Exposition

5月15日(火) 研究サミット
研究室構想5年に関して、「仏教大学・国際仏教学系等研究所」の委員
とする小田真之（3月）を発行し、学内外の関係者に配布
5月29日(木) 第20回仏教学研究会
インドナチア大学・マクナーサー学部教授 Dr. Jan NATHER, Associate Professor, Department of Religious Studies, Indiana Universityを招へい
テーマ A New Look at the Translations of Zhu Quan (支雲) に賛って

5月29日(金) 仏教講座
慶應大学総合研究所「仏教と自然」研究部研究会に出席（於：慶應大学総合研究所）

7月6日(土)-7日(日) 管野所長
日本仏学学術大会第31回学術研究会に参加（於：関西、東北大学）
理事会に出席

7月27日(金) 仏教講座
慶應大学総合研究所「仏教と自然」研究部研究会に出席（於：慶應大学総合研究所）

7月29日(金)-8月1日(日) 平嶋教授 中国出張（仮）
北京大学仏教学院講義、仏学会客員研究者および北京大学仏教学院正規教授
ならびに仏教組織を含む新仏教學系の研究について意見交換

8月22日(火)-9月12日(月) 管野所長 中国出張
中国人民大学「仏教と宗教学理论研究所」の客員教授として出張

9月25日(金) 平嶋教授・仏教講座
慶應大学総合研究所「仏教と自然」研究部研究会に出席（於：慶應大学総合研究所）

10月11日(水)-11月4日(水) 平嶋教授 台湾出張
台湾・国立中央大学「仏典資料研究国際学術研究会」出席
「仏典・仏教資料・仏教研究」と題して発表、司会を務める。台湾・中国などの漢詩
史研究者と仏教研究者との意見交換

11月6日(土) 管野所長
関東大学哲学研究発表会に出席（於：戸田記念講堂）
「『仏教論』の現代的意義」と題して講演

11月8日(火) ザッティ教授
「金剛界一切種の基礎的研究と新仏典の研究」研究会に出席（於：大阪大学）
"The Twenty Section of the Kongyou J Manuscript" と題して発表

11月14日(月) 平嶋教授 中国出張
「仏教文献叢書」新資料の講義。東京与研究国際学術研究会（於：北京大学中国
古代文学研究所）出席し、「般若心経印度文学関係研究（仏典経典）、仏典文献学、仏典文献学」
（仏典学）等発表を含む研究（仏典学）に顧問して講演

11月22日(金) 平嶋教授・仏教講座
慶應大学総合研究所「仏教と自然」研究部研究会に出席（於：慶應大学総合研究所）

11月23日(土) 平嶋教授・仏教講座
慶應大学総合研究所「仏教と自然」シンポジウムに出席
パネリスト：桜井美一大学名誉教授（本研究所顧問）
コンペルト・シュミットハウン教授（ハルブリク大学）
（於：慶應大学・河合セントラル）
12月7日(土)11月30日(月) 萩野所長、辻崎教授、ザケッティ助教授 タイ出張
国際仏教学会(The International Association of Buddhist Studies)第13回国際会議に参加。
以下の講演で発表（著：タイ・チェラロンコン大学）
辻崎教授 "Chinese Buddhist Commentaries of the Early Period"（初期中国仏教の仏教
について）
辻崎教授 "A Triangular Edition of the Lotus Sutra —— New Editions of the Sanskrit,
Tibetan and Chinese versions"（空・真・国際情報『仏経論』投稿本の構想）
同 "Sanskrit Fragments of the Sutra of Golden Light from the Linhān Museum
Collección"（仏教文物館蔵『金光明経』発表写本新物）
ザケッティ助教授 "The Kōgon-kyō Manuscript of the Sh ciò ren jing"（『金剛経写本（十二門経）』）

12月20日(金) 第32回仏教学塾総会
フランス国際仏教学会・仏教学研究のジャン＝ノエル・A・ロベール博士（Prof. Dr. Jean-Noël A. Roze, Section des Sciences Religieuses, École Pratique des Hautes Études）
の講演
テーマ「仏教の学びの問題—仏経の場合」

平成15年
1月19日(日) 萩野所長
「創価大学・国際仏教学会高等研究室のあり」と題して、研究所創設から5年目の活動
と今後の展望を仏教学塾に発表（仏教文化壇）
国際仏教学高等研究所所長・所員の著作
(List of Publications of the IRIAB Director and Fellows)

菅野 博史（Hiroski Kan'nosuke）Director
「仏典—大乗仏教文献叢書の三種叢書と古経の四種叢書—」木村清博士遺稿記念論集，東アジア仏教，東京：春秋社，2002.1)

I. 学会研究機関等・役員
日本佛教学会会議・理事・評議員
Member on the Board of Directors and Councillors of the Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies.

篠山 明（Akira Yutaka）

共同研究報告書：「サンスクリト仏教研究の文献学的考察—日本仏教学会報「仏教文献研究」・学会編集委員会事業」—慶應義塾大学・仏教文化研究所編著, 2003年, (pp. 13-97).
研究報告書：神光上親生・惣谷大学文学部教授／研究指導者／篠山明，創価学園・国際仏教学会高等研究所教授／助手穂積，佛教学会総合研究所／仏教文化研究所／その他の講座大学関係者の朝比奈英男，奈良町田，武田享宏，長谷川恭，徳山弘道，東山光，徳山望文

I. 学会研究機関等・役員／研究者
1. Extraordinary Member, Institute for the Comprehensive Studies of the Lotus Sutra at Ritsuko University (Tokyo).
II. 学術研究編集委員

1. 仏教研究会・編集業務委員会・監査委員 (1992- )
Promotion Member on the Editorial Board of the DDK English Tripitaka (Tokyo-Berkeley: Buddhist Promoting Foundation, 1991)。

2. コネクティック大学アジア研究センター・専門委員 (アジア研究文書叢書・編集委員) (1988-)
Specialist Member on the Editorial Board of the Bibliotheca Codicum Dietmissarium (Tokyo: UNESCO Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies affiliated to The Tokyo Bunko, 1989)。

3. 仏教研究会叢書編集委員会・委員 (1998-)
Member on the Editorial Advisory Board of the Buddhist Bureaum (Editors: Tadashi Kurosaki / Tivy-Louden (1989)).

4. 「インド・イラン学系・協同編集委員 (2000-)

5. 「アジア学」系・研究発表委員会・委員 (2000-)
Member on the Committee of Scientific Publication of the Stidia Asiae (Bucharest: Centre for the History of Religious University of Bucharest).

Member on the Editorial Committee and the Advisory Board of a Catalogue of Pali Dictionary (Copenhagen: Institute of Asian Studies, University of Copenhagen).

7. 「インド・仏教学」系・編集連絡委員会・委員 (2000-)

8. 「仏教発展委員会」(学術委員会・委員 (2001-)
Member on the Scientific Committee of the Corpus Scriptorum under the direction of Oscar Bote (Tiryn).

III. 学会員

1. Academy of Religious Studies (Buddhist Section).


3. Association for Asian Studies (Life Member).

4. 仏教学会・Association of Buddhist Philosophy (Tokyo).

5. Dansk Morgenlænbsk Genosschaf.

7. *International Association of Buddhist Studies* (Life Member).
8. *International Association of Oriental Librarians*.
9. *International Association of Sanskrit Studies*.
10. *International Association of Tibetology Studies*.
11. *Japan Buddhist Association*.
12. *Japan Association for South Asian Studies*.
13. *Japan Studies Association*.
14. *Japan Buddhist Association*.
15. *Japan Society for the Study of Pali and Buddhist Culture*.
19. *Sans Society (Bangkok)*.
22. *Society for Buddhist Studies* (Kyoto).
23. *Society for Buddhist Studies* (Osaka University, Kyoto).

IV. アジア研究関係者機関：

3. *Japan-Swiss Friendship Association*.
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- [Yasuo KAJITARA] Buddhist Deification of Ancestor Worship
- [Sakuma YAMASHITA] Buddha in the History of Chinese Literature
- [Akira YAMAGUCHI] The Earliest Buddhist Texts in Chinese
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(1) An Annotated English Translation: "Two Genres Flying Away with a Transition"
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