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Again on the Donation Made by the Vinayadhara Dhammasena
and on Other Inscriptions from Phanigiri

Oskar von HINÜBER (Freiburg)

While the article on Dhammasena’s donation published in the previous issue of this journal was in print¹, Prof. Dr. Ingo Strauch, Université de Lausanne, visited the site of Phanigiri and procured excellent photos of the inscription together with a booklet published locally and containing also photos of some new inscriptions from Phanigiri.²

This precious gift, first of all the excellent photos of the Dhammasena inscription, for which I am most grateful, helped to remove most doubts and to correct some mistakes caused by reading the occasionally deceptive rubbing, which was the only basis of the previous article. The progress in understanding the inscription is considerable. This, at the same time, aptly demonstrates the dangers of working with inadequate material of inferior quality, which, however, cannot always be recognized as such, if there is no immediate access to the original inscription.

In line 1 the second akṣara is completely destroyed without any trace left. There are some scratches below line 2, which, however, do not seem to be to script, but a damage of the stone rather. The reconstruction [pait]ṭhāpitā remains valid. The first akṣara in line 5 is almost lost with a very minor trace of the lower right part of what might have been a na just visible. It is not even impossible that this akṣara was deleted on purpose. If so, a segmentation bhāṭāputenā budhinā would be possible with a wrong long -ā in the ending of ṳ-putenā which could be explained by the preceding and the following instrumentals correctly ending in -nā. Although this remains a rather uncertain assumption, it would remove the strange personal name Nābuddhi and lead to perfect set of names for the brother and his sisters: Buddhī, Bodhā and Buddhā.

At the end of line 5 the last word is to be corrected to pāvajitikāya followed by dhammasiriya: ca was a misreading for the missing case ending -ya now clearly visible

² R. Chenna Reddy, Phanigiri. A Buddhist Site in Andhra Pradesh (An interim report 2001-2007), Department of Archaeology and Museums, Archaeological Series No. 76, Hyderabad 2008. This useful report contains besides some general information on the site also attempts to read some inscriptions including the Dhammasena inscription, which, however, is published only repeating the fairly faulty transcript (cf. ARIRIAB XV. 2012, p. 3) and without accompanying translation or image. The errors in lines 8 and 9 persist: ekato is read as “charka[to]” (sic) and interpreted as “the installation of a chakra (Dharmachakra) at Sadi Vihara” in the summary of the content.
on the photo. This is not without consequences for the interpretation. First, grammar and structure of the sentence are improved. Second, there is no name Pāvajitikā as assumed earlier: “and with the sister Dhammāsiri, who has left home.”

At the end of line 6 both vowels in bodhā are not very distinct, but likely. The same is true for the last aksara of line 8. The long vowels in hātūna, line 9, are not clearly visible. However, there is no longer any doubt about the long first vowel of thāpitam.

In line 10 the problematic bha(sa)khula disappears. Instead, an only slightly less problematic bhamdaphula emerges now with an anusvāra placed above the line between bha and the following da, which was hidden on the rubbing. Moreover, reading the rubbing only, it seemed as if the da and the first half of phu formed one aksara, a not very distinct sa, and the second half was, consequently, mistakenly taken as khu. However, bhamda, though certain, is also difficult to explain, perhaps as a crossing of khanḍa as in khanḍa-phulla,3 which is common in Theravāda texts, and bhagga < bhagna as in bhagna-sphuṭita.4 The meaning however does not change: “to make repairs of what is broken.” At any rate it remains an expression not found elsewhere so far.

Another improvement is pavāraṇāmahe in line 11 with the locative ending not recognized earlier “on (the occasion of the) Pavāraṇā festival.” The last aksara in this line is, though legible only with some difficulties, without doubt pha. The dot visible immediately above pha is a damage of the stone.

The first aksara of line 14 is damaged but the reading is certain. The text at the end of this line is better comprehensible now: bhikhusanghena dātavā puhamolam, although the meaning is surprising and puzzling: “by the community of monks must be given as the price for flowers …….” There is hardly any possibility to avoid the conclusion that the monks themselves have to contribute, however modestly, it seems, to the celebration of the Pavāraṇā festival. The word ०-mola corresponds to Prakrit molla derived from Sanskrit maulya or mūlya “price.” The plural form dātavā is justified because it refers to the six Kāhāpaṇas.

The enigmatic kāhāpaṇava in line 15 disappears, because instead of va the aksara cha emerges now, “six” in words and figures: kāhāpaṇa cha 6. The word kāhāpaṇa ends in a short vowel. The last word in this line is sānikāyo with a long first vowel, which is hardly visible. However, the right stroke of the aksara sa does not reach the top of the line as it would, if a short vowel is intended. This difference can be easily verified in the word sāka in line 19.

In the previous article, the meaning of word sānikā was misunderstood5. Now, there is a parallel in the inscription “Phanigiri Interim Report, p. 25, fragment b” discussed below. If this is compared, there are two options for interpretation. The meaning should either be “pot” of unknown derivation or “a measure,” derived from Sanskrit śāna “a weight of four māṣas.”

---

3 It is perhaps even conceivable that bhanḍa also means “defective” given the meaning chinnamūrdhā listed in the much later Desināmāmālā by Hemacandra (6.109).
4 On the use of both these expressions cf. O. v. Hinüber, Behind the Scene: The Struggle of Political Groups for Influence as Reflected in Inscriptions (in press).
5 ARIRIAB XV. 2012, p. 9.
The reading of line 16 can be greatly improved by using the photograph. First, below the line the numerical sign “4,” which is completely hidden in the rubbing, appears below the akṣara dā. This number obviously refers to sāṅkāyo “4 sāṅkās, i.e. weights or pots”.

Moreover, all doubtful readings in line 16 disappear, and the lines 14 to 17 can be translated now as follows: “then, as the price for flowers six kāhāpanas must be given annually by the community of monks and for oil for lamps 4 sāṅkās are to be given.”

Here, the verbal root √dā is used as a simplex and with two different prefixes to describe the act of giving. First, Dhammasena uses sampadattam when he “hands over” his 150 cows (and?) 150 tariñelas.6 Then, six kāhāpanas are given by the monks which is expressed by dātava, and finally the verb paridātava occurs in combination with the four sāṅkās.

By using the available lexicographical resources it seems impossible to precisely define the semantic nuances, by which dātava, sampadatta and paridātava are distinguished. At least sam-pra-dā can be understood better by comparing the technical use of this word as found in the Arthaśāstra. Here, sam-pra-dā seems to mean “to hand over” as in sampradānakālikena arghenā, Kauṭalya 3.12.26 “according to the rate at the time of giving (the goods for them for sale)” (R. P. Kangle). It is remarkable that the same verb is used also in one of the rare inscriptions from the time of Rudrapuruṣadatta: khetam sampadattam, Tsukamoto II Gurz 1.2, and that this is the only epigraphical reference listed by K. Tsukamoto.7 This verb seems to have been used to express a legal transfer of property by the Ikṣvākū administration and in the Arthaśāstra.

Incidentally, paridānā also occurs twice in the Arthaśāstra, e.g., in prajñāpana-ājñā-paridānā-lekhāḥ, Kauṭalya 2.10.38 “documents of communication, command and gift” (K. P. Kangle), which, however, does not allow drawing any definite conclusion on the precise meaning of pari-dā.

The verb pari-dā usually means “to hand over” or “to deposit.” Therefore, the difference between dātava and paridātava is perhaps that the monks are asked to actually pay the 6 Kāhāpanas for flowers, but keep the oil ready for use.

Consequently, Dhammasena first states that he transfers the property 150 cows to the Buddhist monastery at Phanigiri. Then, however, he continues by demanding something in return from the monks, when he uses the participium necessitatis twice in dātava and paridātava.

The demand is underlined, as can be seen now from an improved reading, by a second demand: “this must be respected without breaking the agreement.” This is expressed by the negated instrumental case a-va-sam-vadamtena, a syntactical device also found in Vinaya texts.8

---

6 There is no doubt now that the figure is “150,” and a reading “?” instead of 50 can safely be ruled out.
Not much changes in the last two lines. At the end of line 18 the akṣara rā is clearly readable now and a reconstruction as purā[n]a is perhaps not unlikely. Following a name the word purāṇa might indicate a former occupation of the ācārya Buddhisiri such as purā[ṇāmātya]. This, however, is not more than a guess. As the instrumental case of the name Buddhisiri is used, the missing verb must be a participium necessitatis, meaning something like “this must be executed by …”

The reading sakā in bhagavato sakāni bandhanā[nī] in line 19 is a simple error for sāka of unknown meaning. The word sāka could be connected to Sanskrit sākya or śāka, what does not help.

The segmentation of sākanibandhani poses difficulties, because, most unfortunately, nothing at all is left of the last line 20, where no more than 10 akṣaras could have been lost, because the space below the word bhagavato in line 19 remained empty. It is, moreover, unlikely, but not at all impossible, that the inscription ends exactly at the end of line 19. Therefore, it cannot be decided, whether or not the last word of line 19 is nibandhani “band, fetter” or nibandha meaning perhaps “endowment” with the last akṣara ni[ being the beginning of the next word. The expression bhagavato sākanibandhani “band, fetter to, of the sāka of the Buddha” remains incomprehensible, and it is uncertain that nibandhanī is intended at all. Only a parallel might help to understand the end of the inscription.

Once all corrected readings are inserted the following text of the inscription can be established now. Corrections of the first reading are printed in normal boldfaced type (Fig. 1a-e):

1: p.//h + k./r.+++ + + + + + + +
2: vinayadharenah dammasenena [pati]
3: thāpita saha aparo jethabhātūhi
4: budhisirinā dhāmasirinā bhūtupute
5: na (n)ā (bu)dhinā bhagimīya ca pāvajitikā
tā 6: ya dha(m)masiriya bhūtuputihi bodhā
tā 7: ya budhāya ca evam savehi nātimita
8: bandhavehi sadhivhārinisavihārī(bh)i
9: ekato h(ā)r(ū)na thāpitam sasatakālikam
10: imam devadhammaṃ bhāṃdaphularasamthapasa
11: ca anuvasikam ca pavāraṇāmahe pupha
12: chatanasa kāraṇāya gāvīnām diyaḥhasa
13: tam tariḍelaham 100 50 sampadattam tato anu
14: (va)ssikaṃ bhikhu sanghhe(na) dātavā pūphantam
15: kāhāpanā cha 6 dīpateśa ca sānī(kā)
16: yo paridātava etam avisamvadantena anu
(4 inserted between the lines)

17: vaṭetavam etam ca mahānavakāṃmikena mahā
18: + + + kena acariya budhisirin(a) purā
19: + + + + + + + bhagavato sākanibāṃdhani
20: [+ + + + + + + + + ]

With the exception of the very beginning and the end the improved text can be understood and translated as follows:

“... are erected by the Vīnayadhara Dhammasena together with his elder brothers Budhisiri (and) Dhammasiri, the son of the brother, Budhi (Nābudhi?). and with the sister Dhammasiri, who has left home, and with the brother's daughters Bodhā and Budhā, as well as (evam) with all blood relations, friends, relatives, living together or separately, (all) united. This pious donation is established as everlasting. To make repairs of what is broken and (to make) every year a canopy of flowers on the occasion of the Pavāraṇa festival, one and a half hundred of cows, 150 Taridelas are handed over. Moreover, every year the community of monks must give as the price for flowers six Kāhāpanas, and 4 śānikās (measures or pots) of oil for lamps must be provided (or: kept ready for use). This must be respected without breaking the agreement. And this (i.e. the donation?) by the Great Builder, the Great ... Master Budhisiri, the former .... attached to the sāka of the Buddha (???) ...

The structure of the inscription can be described as follows: The monk Dhammasena and his relatives established (patiṭhāpitā) more than one object, probably buildings and columns (thambha), because repairs and a builder (navakāmmikā) are mentioned later in the text. Probably more than one line is missing at the beginning.

Dhammasena, a Vinaya specialist and the initiator of the donation, is the youngest of three brothers. The relation of the other persons mentioned by name cannot be established with certainty, although the structure of the inscription allows the following tentative conclusions. One of the two brothers of Dhammasena, probably Dhammasiri, has a son Buddhi (or, less likely, Nābuddhi). These altogether four male members of the family are mentioned first. Next comes the sister of the three brothers, strangely also named Dhammasiri as one of her brothers. She is called pavajītīkā and consequently has become a novice or nun. Lastly, two daughters of presumably the male Dhammasiri, the sisters Bodhā and Buddhā are enumerated. It can be assumed that the brother's son Buddhi, if this really is his name, could be the brother of Bodhā and Buddhā and all three, he and his two sisters, could be the children of the male Dhammasiri rather. For Budhisirin being named first as the eldest brother, might also have been a monk, if he is identical with the Ācārya Budhisiri mentioned at the end as the executioner of the donation and the agreement. This, of course, does not rule out that he had children before he entered the Sāṃgha. Consequently, in the first generation of Dhammasena's family there were four children, three brothers and one sister. The only (?) brother, who did not become a monk, had three children, one son and two daughters, the second generation. It is remarkable that the parents, perhaps deceased at the time of the donation, are not mentioned at all in contradistinction to many other Buddhist donations. Nor do we learn about other deceased members of the family. Therefore, at the time of the donation the
family of Dhammasena was not particularly large, but it was extremely Buddhist given the names of all its members. This must have applied already to the previous generation of Dhammasena’s devout parents, who gave the Buddhist names to all their children, whom we know of.

The first part of the inscription concludes with: “This pious donation is established as everlasting.” The wording deyyadhamma sasatakālika seems to correspond to the expression akṣayaniśi also used in Ikṣvāku inscriptions and particularly by the Kṣatrapas.

In the second part cattle are handed over as property to the monks (?) to provide the means for future repairs and for a flower-canopy during the yearly Pavāraṇā festival. The meaning of tariḍela remains obscure. It is, however, interesting that the number of both, cattle and tariḍela is 150, first expressed in words, then by a numeral. Therefore, it seems possible that tariḍela is a (Dravidian?) word for a specific kind of cattle: “one and a half hundred of cows, 150 (cows of the Tariḍela-variety?).”

Most interesting is the third part, because here money is demanded by the donor from the Sāṅgha which seems to be unique. The text is straightforward, because the instrumental case bhikkhusaṃghena leaves no room for a different interpretation: The monks have to provide six Kāhāpanas yearly to buy flowers probably those needed to prepare the canopy mentioned earlier. If so, Dhammasena perhaps donated means only for some sort of trestle, to which the flowers were to be fastened by strings such as those

---

9 It would be worth while to collect evidence on families from these donations, which might help to get at least a very rough idea of the number of children and would thus provide some shadowy information on the population, about which almost nothing is known from written sources.


12 The family of Dhammasena was obliged to keep the buildings, which were constructed by using their donation, in good repair according to the Samantapāśādikā 1246,19-1247,9, cf. O. v. Hinüber, “Everyday life in an Ancient Indian Buddhist Monastery,” ARIRIAB IX. 2006, pp. 3-31, particularly p. 20 foll. = Kleine Schriften. Wiesbaden 2009, p. 886.

mentioned in the inscription “Phanigiri Interim Report, p. 25, fragment b” discussed below.

The fourth part is just one sentence to underline that the agreement must be kept by using the negative present participle of the verb vi-sama-vad meaning explicitly “to break one’s word or promise.” This again points to a donation combined with contract agreeing that the donee, here the Samgha, has to share the costs and to contribute some money as well. Consequently, the donor, who is a monk himself and from an apparently quite wealthy family, makes an agreement with his brethren. Whether or not Dhammasena owned the money, from which the donation was made, himself as a monk remains an open question.\textsuperscript{14} He may have only given some spiritual guidance to his brother Dhammasiri, who most likely was a layman. Moreover, in his capacity as a vinayadhara he might have been responsible for formulating the document, and, if this assumption is correct, this would also explain the phrasing of the sentence etan avisamvadaṃtena anuvatetavam, which sounds like legal vinaya-language. His brethren, who were expected to contribute, very obviously had immediate access to the necessary financial means belonging to the Samgha.

In spite of the loss of a major part of the fifth and last part of the document, the general meaning can be inferred. The Ācārya Buddhīśrī is entrusted with the execution of the donation and the supervision of the agreement. His qualification as navakammika again points to buildings mentioned as the central part of the donation in the lost beginning of the inscription.

---

The inscription of Dhammasena is not the only one found at Phanigiri. In the Interim Report mentioned above there is a fragment which runs to a certain extent parallel to Dhammasena’s text, and which thus helps to elucidate certain points otherwise difficult to understand:

Phanigiri Interim Report, p. 25, fragment b (Fig. 2):
1. + (ma)titatho bhikkhu(saṃ)[ghena]
2. aṇuvasikaṃ dātavaṃ pavāraṇāma
3. he puphamaulam kāhāpaṇa cha 6
4. gamthanasutasa palāni paṃca
5. [5] divatelasa ca kuḍo e(ko)
6. [1] + + + + (dh.rā/e) + + +

The beginning of the inscription (ma)titatho (or ॐ-tha?) does not immediately yield any

meaningful interpretation. A segmentation \textit{mati tatha seems possible, and if tathā “and” is meant, this could correspond to tato, line 13 of the Dhammasena inscription.}

The the wording of the sentence \textit{bhikhu(sam)ghena [2] avivasikam dātavām pavāraṇāmahe/3]he pūphamaulam kāhāpaṇa cha 6} is very similar to the corresponding part in the Dhammasena inscription, but the syntax differs. Here, the \textit{participium necessitatis dātavām} refers to \textit{ṃaulaṃ}, unlike \textit{dātavā} referring to the Kāhāpaṇas in the Dhammasena inscription. The word \textit{pavāraṇāmahe}, which runs from line 2 into line 3, shows that lines 3 and 4 are complete. This allows a safe reconstruction of lines 1 and 2 on the basis of the Dhammasena inscription.

The word \textit{ganthana-sūta} in line 4 corresponds to Sanskrit \textit{granthana-sūtra “a string for tying (a wreath of flowers).” There is no parallel to this gift in the Dhammasena inscription. In line 5 \textit{kūḍa} corresponds to Sanskrit \textit{kūṭa “a vessel, a pot.” The expression “one pot of oil for lamps” helps to understand \textit{sānikāyo} 4 in the Dhammasena inscription as an either otherwise unattested word for a vessel or as a derivation from Sanskrit \textit{sāna “a weight of four māsas.” This measure might correspond to one \textit{kūḍa}, because the sum of money mentioned in both inscriptions is also the same. The exact amount of oil cannot be ascertained.

The missing \textit{aṅśara} at the beginning of the line 5 should be the numerical sign for “5,” because \textit{paṃcā} 5 would correspond to \textit{cha 6} and later to \textit{eko [1].}

The traces of the upper part of the last \textit{aṅśara} in line 5 point to a vowel -o and thus allow for a reconstruction \textit{eko}, which makes much sense. Consequently, the first character in line 6 should have been the numeral “1.”

Only the heads of three \textit{aṅśaras} are recognizable in line 6. The first is almost certainly \textit{dha} (or, of course, \textit{dhā} or \textit{dhā} being equally possible) followed by what could be interpreted as \textit{rā} or \textit{re} and by the head of an \textit{aṅśara} allowing for \textit{ka, ta, na} with all vowels except for -ī.

The fragment can be translated in the following way: “… and by the community of monks must be given yearly on the occasion of the Pavāraṇā festival as the price for flowers six 6 Kāhāpaṇas, for strings to tie (wreaths) five 5 Palas, and one 1 pot of oil for lamps.”

It is difficult to understand the relation between the Dhammasena inscription and this fragment. The Dhammasena inscription was excavated “from the courtyard” while it is not clear, where this fragment was found. The obligations of the Saṅgha are almost identical but wording and syntax are different in both inscriptions, which are most likely written by two different persons, if, e.g., the \textit{aṅśaras mo} in \textit{pūphamolaṃ} or the \textit{la} in \textit{diṃvatela} written \textit{divatela} in the fragment are compared. Perhaps the lamps and the flowers were to be used to decorate two different buildings,\textsuperscript{15} which were donated by different families, in a very similar, if not identical way for the Pavāraṇā festival. If this is correct the inscriptions should have been attached to those two buildings originally. Furthermore, it is not unlikely that both inscriptions commemorate donations made during comprehensive renovations of the monastery as described in the Interim Report, p. 29.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{15} The Interim Report mentions two apsidal Caitya halls, two assembly halls, and six vihāras of various seize with altogether 40 cells.}
Moreover, two fragments have been joined in the Phanigiri Interim Report mentioned above:

Phanigiri Interim Report, p. 25, fragment c (1) (Fig. 3a):
1. ]mata[  
2. [s]i[v]ālmi śrī cāntamula  
3. śayasya ripuyuvi  
4. (go)sanasya svāmi

This fragmentary Sanskrit inscription is important, because the Ikṣvāku king Cāntamula is mentioned. It is, however, impossible to guess if the inscription dates from the reign of Cāntamula, or whether his name is mentioned in the genealogy of a later Ikṣvāku ruler. The word ripu-yuvati “young women of the enemies” points to a context speaking of victory in battle.

Phanigiri Interim Report, p. 25, fragment c (2) (Fig. 3b):
1. ḥ vāsa.ṭha + + (s)ya  
   1a. rañe  
2. .i.i ghatādhiṃśaṃ  
3. varṣaṇaṭatā[ni]

The image of the second small fragment of a Sanskrit inscription, which might contain some lines continuing fragment c (1), is published upside down in the Interim Report. The very fragmentary text cannot be interpreted. Only single words can be recognized: adhivāsasya, varṣa-śatā[ni]. The traces read as rañe seem to have been inserted between lines 1 and 2.

According to the Interim Report altogether 42 Brāhmī inscriptions were recovered during the excavations at Phanigiri (pp. 32-38), of which two inscribed Buddhapādas\(^\text{16}\) and one inscribed panel are shown on p. 25 in addition to the Rudrapuruṣadatta inscription.\(^\text{17}\) Unfortunately, the small seize of the images does not allow any certain reading, and the suggestions offered in the Interim Report mostly do not make much sense, which is a strong indication of errors in the laudable efforts to decipher these inscriptions. Hopefully, a full report with good photos of all inscriptions will be available.

\(^{16}\) An image of the Buddhapāda “Interim Report p. 25 fragment c” is also available in the internet under “Important Discoveries in the Recent Past from Andhra Pradesh” (asi.nic.in/asi_epiographical_sans_andhra.asp). Comparing both images, the reading suggested in the Interim Report p. 33 seems to be correct: **sidham bhaya[ṇ]ṭa + + + sa (nātu)kasa bodhiṣṭa devadhamā pādasaghāda** “Success! The pair of feet is the pious gift of Bodhika, the grandson of the venerable ++ +.” The last word is confirmed by the inscription on a Buddhapāda from Nāgārjunakonda, no. 51 in Srinivasan and Sankaranarayanan, as note 10 above, = EJ XXXIII. 1960/61, p. 250: pādasamghāḍā.

not too far in future granting access to the evidently quite interesting and important epigraphs of this Ikṣvāku site.
Two Buddhist Inscriptions from Deorkothar
(Dist. Rewa, Madhya Pradesh)

Oskar von HINÜBER (Freiburg) and Peter SKILLING (Bangkok)∗

INTRODUCTION

Deorkothar lies in Tehsil Deonath, District Rewa, Madhya Pradesh (MP), roughly halfway between Allahabad on the Gangetic plain to the north and Rewa on the Vindhya plateau to the south. It is not far west of National Highway 27 (81°40′E, 24°56′N). Perched on the northern escarpment of the eastern Vindhyas, the site commands a breathtaking view of receding mesas that drop hundreds of feet to the valley of the River Tons below (fig. 1). Deorkothar, discovered in 1982, was excavated by the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) under Phani Kanta Mishra (then Superintending Archaeologist, Bhopal Circle) beginning in 1999/2000. Soon after the first campaign, the excavator published an article in the journal Marg for the year 2000 and, in addition, summarized the results in two booklets.1 On February 15 and 16, 2011, Peter Skilling visited Deorkothar and took photos of the site and of fragments of an inscribed pillar kept in the ASI office, Rewa. The present article is based mainly on this material.

Deorkothar is important because of the age of the Buddhist remains excavated there. This is particularly true for the inscriptions, which are dated by the excavator to

∗ We are grateful to Gautam Sengupta (then Director General of ASI) for his unstinting support and enthusiasm; to the ASI Bhopal Circle – especially to N. Taher (Superintending Archaeologist), J. Manuel, K.K. Verma, and S.K. Singh (Rewa Sub-circle) – for sharing expertise, supplying materials, and providing pleasant companionship in the field; to A.K. Singh (APS University, Rewa) for materials and information; and to the American Institute of Indian Studies (Gurgaon) for facilitating arrangements.

the third century BCE, that is to say almost to the time of Aśoka, which is perhaps slightly too early. One inscription (our ‘Inscription I’) was made known almost immediately by colour photographs published in Marg and in Indian Archaeology – A Review 1999–2000 (plate 90). A second inscription (our ‘Inscription II’), with two further fragments, was illustrated in the booklet Discovering the Past. The booklets gave provisional, but not entirely successful, readings of the two main inscriptions.

Deorkothar was clearly a large and important Buddhist establishment. The centre of cult would have been the huge brick stūpa designated Stūpa no. 1; set on a flat area (fig. 2), it is about 9.5 m in height. It was surrounded by a railing with crossbars bearing motifs like lotus roundels; some bear dedicatory inscriptions. There are three smaller ruined brick stūpas, and about thirty stone masonry stūpas, most with a drum or a raised circumambulatory (fig. 3), and there are brick remains of monastic residences. Not far from Stūpa no. 1 is a massive stone platform, perched on the edge of the plateau (fig. 4); this relates Deorkothar to the stūpa complexes of the western Vindhyas, such as Sanchi, Murel Khurd, and Sātdhara, where such platforms are a regular component of the ritual or residential complexes. Like other Buddhist sites in the Vindhyas, the Deorkothar complex is adjacent to rock-shelters; 63 have been counted in the area, some decorated with rock-art (fig. 5), which is generally hard to date, or with painted Brāhmi inscriptions. Rock shelter no. 22, roughly below the platform, has a painting of a stūpa and a tree-shrine (fig. 6). Fragments of NBPW were recovered from the site, along with beads and other artefacts. We await the excavation report in order to get a fuller understanding.

The inscriptions studied here are engraved in early Brāhmi letters on fragments of a massive sandstone pillar. The fragments of the pillar were recovered from the vicinity of the large brick stūpa; the base stood near the circumabulatory, and the fragments suggest that the pillar was once many metres in height (fig. 7). It is evident that the column was deliberately toppled and smashed. A broken abacus (fig. 8), with the remains of an elephant (?), a wheel (cakra), and a bull, each with a standing human figure in between, was also recovered. This may have capped the column itself.

Inscription I

Reading the inscription (fig. 9) does not pose any serious problems. Our readings of the inscriptions employ the following conventions:

---

2 The image published in Marg is more complete than that published in Indian Archaeology, because the former includes a broken chip with the upper part of the last two available aksaras of line 1, while in the latter the chip is missing. The image on the front cover of the booklet Deorkothar (Bharhat), Rewa, is the same as that in Marg.

Reconstructed passages are placed within square brackets. Within the brackets, reconstructions that are based on the extant fragments are placed in roman type, while hypothetical reconstructions are placed in italics. The name ‘Dhamamitra’ is used as a filler for a lost longer name, and ‘Bhāṇḍu’ for a shorter name. These are simply conventions and are not meant to imply that these were the actual names.

1. bhagavato budha(sa) [sakamunisa ātevāsi dhhamamitra dhamamitrasa ātevāsi]
2. utaramitro utaramitrasa (ā) [tevāsi dhhamamitra dhamamitrasa ātevāsi]
3. bhaḍu bhaḍusa ātevāsi nā(m)di(nu)[tara nāṃdinutarasa ātevāsi upasako]
4. upasakasa ātevāsi savajayo (sa)val[jayasa ātevāsinā]
5. dhamadevena kokuḍikena bahusutiyen(a) [thabho kārāpito + + + + + +]
6. usapito thabho ācariyena kasi[

A substantial part of the inscription is broken off, but, by good fortune, at least the beginning of all the lines is preserved. This is clear from the wide left margin and the regular vertical alignment of the lines. Consequently, it is possible to estimate, if only approximately, that the individual lines measured at least about 28 aksaras when complete, if they were of equal length. This can be inferred from line 3, where, the name Nandina[tara] is only a tentative suggestion in an attempt to calculate the approximate length of the line. This assumption seems to be confirmed in line 2, where a name of four aksaras would fit perfectly into the gap, which opens after the reconstruction of line 3. It cannot of course be ruled out that there might have been one more name in both of the lines. If this was a short name like Bhāṇḍu, then both lines 2 and 3, and line 4, would have been longer by 9 aksaras; if it was a longer name like Dhamamitra, it would have been longer by 13 aksaras. These calculations suggest that at least lines 1 to 3 contained about 28, or, alternatively, about 37 or 41 characters, allowing for one, or more probably when the second inscription discussed below is compared, two names lost in lines 1 to 3. In this case, the length of a line might rather have been 41 aksaras. Line 4 was most likely shorter, if Inscription II discussed below is compared, and should have ended in (sa)val[jayasa ātevāsinā] /5/ dhama devena. This, at the same time, provides a syntactical link between the string of nominatives and the last part of the inscription.

It is unlikely that there was one more name between Savajayo and Dhamadeva, because that would result in a line much longer than the preceding ones.

At the end of the fragment, the inscription breaks off in line 6 after the word kasi[, which should be the beginning of the ācārya’s name. That the text is lost after kasi[ can be seen clearly only in the picture published in Indian Archaeology 1999–2000. It is clear that line 6 is the last line of the record, and therefore the length cannot be estimated.

It is difficult to understand all the details of the inscription, because of textual gaps that cannot be closed. This is largely due to the fact that this inscription, in part certainly because of its high antiquity, does not follow any of the common patterns or formulas used in later Buddhist donations. Firstly, the genitive bhagavato budhasa at the
beginning is quite unusual. Later evidence leads one to expect an opening word like \textit{namo} or \textit{sidham} to precede a name or title in the genitive case, or the two together as at Kanaganahalli on the pedestal of a Buddha image: \textit{sidha namo bhagavato samasabudho sakamoni sidhatha}. In the Deorkothar inscription, it is not easy to imagine what might be the referent of the genitive, because, again due to the age of the inscription, a term like \textit{patimā}, ‘image’, can be safely ruled out. As we shall see below, a solution presents itself only when the whole text, as far as it is preserved, is taken into consideration.

The persons enumerated in lines 2–4 are related to each other as \textit{antevāsins}, a term which appears here in the form \textit{ātevāsin}, which occurs occasionally in other inscriptions.\footnote{Keisoh Tsukamoto, \textit{A Comprehensive Study of the Indian Buddhist Inscriptions}, Part I, \textit{Texts, Notes and Japanese Translation}, Kyoto 1996; Part II, \textit{Indices, Maps and Illustrations}, Kyoto 1998 [rev.: G. Fussman, BEFE0 88, 2001, pp. 383–385], index s.v. \textit{ātevāsin} etc. attested at Kanheri, Mathurā, and Kuḍā, cf. also O. v. Hintüber: \textit{Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick}, Vienna, 2001, § 12. The same lengthening of a short -\textit{a}- before a nasal is found in nāḥ\textit{mdinuṭara}; it is impossible to decide whether or not an \textit{anuvāra} is visible above the \textit{aṅgarā nā.} Note that \textit{habo}, \textit{dhamadina} and probably \textit{bhaḍu} are written without \textit{anuvāra}.} In a Buddhist inscription, one expects \textit{antevāsin} to have the sense of the well-known technical term of Vinaya law, denoting a novice who lives together with his teacher (\textit{ācārya} or \textit{ācariya}, Vin I 60,26–29): that is to say, as a ‘pupil’. Therefore, this sequence of names of \textit{antevāsins} is most likely a line of teachers and pupils, in which Savajaya would have been the teacher of Dhammadeva, who had the column erected.

To go back to the beginning of the inscription, the initially surprising genitive \textit{bhagavato budhasa} now makes good sense as the name, or title, of the first teacher – that is, of the Buddha himself. The length of the assumed gap suggests that one name of four \textit{aṅkaras} is missing (or two names, if the longer variant is considered). This, however, still leaves a gap of about four \textit{aṅkaras}: following the example of the opening of the inscription quoted from Kanaganahalli, perhaps \textit{sakamunisa} can be inserted here, giving a hypothetical text of line 1:

\textbf{bhagavato budhasa [sakamunisa ātevāsi (+ + + +) (+ + + +)sa ātevāsi].}

If this reconstruction is accepted, the total number of teachers and pupils can be calculated as follows: The Buddha himself is the first teacher, and Dhammadeva is the last pupil named. Besides the Buddha, six names are preserved: Uttaramitra, Bhādu, Nandimuttara, Upasaka, Sarvajaya and Dhammadeva. In lines 1–3, one or two names are
lost. Consequently, altogether at least nine or at most twelve persons were mentioned in this record, connected to each other as teacher and pupil (see table below). Depending on the number of akṣaras assumed to be lost, either eight or eleven teachers precede Dhammadeva as the ninth or twelfth teacher at the end of the lineage.

It seems that this teacher-disciple lineage is traced back to the Buddha himself, which is unique in inscriptions known to date. If this supposition is correct, then Dhammadeva would have belonged to the ninth or twelfth generation after the Buddha. If a 200 BCE date for the inscription is approximately correct (but the date is estimated on palaeographic evidence alone, and is therefore precarious), and if about fifteen to twenty years are allowed between each teacher and pupil, then Dhammadeva would have lived either about 120–160 or 165–220 years after the Buddha’s time. If a succession of eight predecessors of Dhammadeva is assumed, the Buddha was alive between about 360–320 BCE; but this is definitely too late. Or, if Dhammadeva had twelve predecessors including the Buddha, the latter was alive about 420–365. Such a date is possible, and would favour the assumption that two names have been lost in lines 1–3.

If we have correctly understood the significance of this succession of teachers and pupils, it is a genuine disaster that the name of the direct antevāsin of the Buddha is lost, because this would have been the teacher to whom the Bahuśrutīya school would have traced its lineage. This reconstruction is, assuredly, highly hypothetical, but nonetheless it helps us understand the structure of the text. And it is not at all impossible that this is really a lineage going back to the Buddha.

In line 5, near the end of the inscription, part of the gap may be reasonably filled in by thabho kārāpito – ‘a column was made’, when one compares line 5 of Inscription II (see below). This, however, is also conjectural.

Despite the fragmentary state of preservation, a tentative translation is possible:

Lord Buddha’s [pupil] … Uttaramitra, Uttaramitra’s pupil … Bha(m)dū, Bha(m)dū’s pupil Nāṃdinuttara. Nāṃdinuttara’s pupil … Upasaka, Upasaka’s pupil Sarvajaya, [by] Sarval[jaya’s pupil] Dhammadeva from Kokudi, a member of the Bahuṣutiya school, [a column was made]… erected was the column by the ācariya Kasi[ …

Three of the six names that are preserved call for comment:

(1) the second member of utara-mitra, is read here as o-mitra, on account of the lengthened right downward stroke of the akṣara ta being clearly visible in both instances;
(2) the name bhaḍu may perhaps be understood as bhaṇḍu, written without anusvāra (cf. note 4), which may be compared as a personal name with that of the monk Bhaṇḍu who is mentioned once in the Theravāda Tipiṭaka at Samyuttanikāya II

---

6 For the Bahuṣrutīyas, see further below.
204,5 in the Sinhalese manuscripts only, which usually preserve old and better readings.8

(3) Upasaka: the first -a- in this name is short. Consequently, this is not the word upāsaka ‘lay follower or practitioner’, but a name of unknown derivation.

The central person of the donation is obviously Dhammadeva, who came from the town of Kokudi, of which the location is unknown, and who was a member of the Bahuṣrutiya school. Most interesting is the word bahuṣrutiya, which can be read with confidence. We can therefore state that this pillar fragment from Deorkothar gives us an important new reference to the Bahuṣrutiya school, a point to which we will return in the conclusion.

To sum up: Inscription I is interesting and even important in four respects: It firmly puts the Bahuṣrutiyas on the map in Madhya Pradesh, it proves that the school is very old, it shows that the Bahuṣrutiyas at an early date used Middle Indic (as a school language?), and, finally, it apparently gives a lineage of teachers and pupils traced back to the Buddha.

Inscription II

A picture of a second pillar fragment bearing six lines of inscription (figs. 10, 11), broken into two fragments (here called Fragments 1 and 2), has, as far as we know, been published only in the booklet Discovering the Past. Also visible in the picture is a detached fragment (our Fragment 3: fig. 12) with a few stray characters, which cannot be satisfactorily connected to either Inscription I or Inscription II.9 Moreover, another photograph taken during the excavations, apparently unpublished to date, shows the larger fragment without fragments 2 and 3, but together with a different fourth fragment (Fragment 4) placed in the same position as the detached Fragment 3, which it replaces (fig 13).

Although the reading of the extant portions does not pose any serious difficulty, the text cannot be understood completely because of its fragmentary character. We give here a tentative reconstruction, using the same conventions as above.

---

7 In post-canonical literature, the Upāsaka Bhaṇḍu(ka) is a companion of Mahinda, whom he accompanies to Ceylon: Sp 70,1 or Mhv XIII 18, XIV 31.
8 A person named Bhaṇḍu made a donation at Sanchi, as did his wife (bhaduno dāṇa[m], IV Sanc 397; bhaduno pājāvatiya dānam IV Sanc 398); a monk named Bhaṇḍuka also made a donation (IV Sanc 293 gotiputasa bhadukasa bhīchun[a] dānam) (refs. to Tsukamoto, as in note 4 above). Tsukamoto interprets these names, most probably correctly, as Bhaṇḍu(ka).
9 The surviving characters, pasako at the end of one line, and then raja, at the end of another line below, would seem to come from a different inscription than those studied here because the lines are spaced further apart. It is, however, possible that there is another, shorter, line between the two. It is impossible to say at present whether the fragment is from the same or a different column, but it is likely that all of the fragments are from one and the same pillar. Note that the pasako of the first line may refer to the same Upasako mentioned in Inscription I, lines 3–4.
INSCRIPTION II, FRAGMENT 1
1. [bha]ga[vato buda]sa sakamu[nisa] (ā)tevāsi anurudhō anurudhasa ātevāsi savanām[do]
   sa[vanām]dasa ātevāsi bha[du bha]
2. [dus[a ātevāsi bha]du bha[dusa ātevāsi dī(sā)giri disāgirisa ātevāsi bhara[no
   bha[ranasa ātevāsi dhama[mtra dhama[m]
3. trasa ātevāsi dhama[mtra dhama[mtra](sa) ātevāsi nāatakadhaguto
   nāatakadhama[gu]tasa ātevāsi dhama[mtra dhama[m]
4. tasa ātevāsi dhama[mtra dhama[mtra]sa ātevāsi dhaṃmadino dhaṃmadinasa
   (ā)[tevāsi dhama]mita dhama[m][a sa]mata ātevāsi
5. nā dhama[m]tēna ++++++++]+(ch.)dakena thabo kārāpito giṃjaki(ya)[ +++++
   ++++++++ ++++++++++++]

INSCRIPTION II, FRAGMENT 2
6. +++ t(ora)n[]o (kato) thabh[o] us[ā]p(i)t[o] ca

INSCRIPTION II, FRAGMENT 3
a. pasako
b. raja

INSCRIPTION II, FRAGMENT 4
1. (lost)
2. [ka(ta][
3. ātev[āsi
4. [vāsinā[  
5. (nā) (varuṇa[  

It is clear that our Fragment 1, line 1 is indeed the beginning of the record, because it is
preceded by a large empty space. Line 6, now broken off on a separate fragment
(Fragment 2: fig. 11), ought to be a continuation of the first five lines, because the
superscript -i- seen at the bottom of the larger Fragment 1 should be the vowel of the
us[ā]p(i)t[o] found on the fragment in line 6.

The structure of Inscription II is the same as that of Inscription I. Here too, a
lineage of teachers and pupils is preserved – but it is more difficult to reconstruct,
because the beginning and end of all lines are lost. The text begins with ātevāsi, which
should follow a name in the genitive case. Compared to the opening of Inscription I, and
taking into account the fact that here the first name to be preserved is Anuruddha, it is
tempting to reconstruct bhagavato budhasa sakamunisa followed by the name of one of
his foremost direct disciples, Anuruddha. For, if Dhammadeva's lineage as given in
Inscription I starts with the Buddha, which is likely, it is unlikely that other monastic
donors at Deorkothar would present a less impressive lineage. However that may be, one
name is missing at the beginning, and probably not more, because the lines are fairly
long, probably almost of the same length as the longer alternative reconstructed for the
Dhammadeva inscription. Assuming that the missing name is bhagavato budhasa
sakamunisa, twelve aksaras are lost. If it was some other name such as Disāgiri (4 aksaras) or Bharana (3 aksaras), only five or four aksaras stood at the beginning of line 1.

While the number of aksaras missing in lines 1–6 is determined by the assumed beginning of line 1, the end of line 1 has to be reconstructed in such a way that the gap of 12 aksaras at the beginning of line 2 and the missing ones at the end of line 1 can be connected to the preserved beginning of line 2. This can be done successfully by inserting 17 aksaras at the end of line 1, which results in 45 aksaras per line, here and in the subsequent lines 2 and 3, which, most likely, were of equal length. It is not probable that the lines were 3 or 9 aksaras longer and contained one more name each. All subsequent lines are filled in according to the same principle.

At the beginning of line 5 the aksaras [(ch.)]dakena are preserved. The connection to the previous line 4 can be found in the detached Fragment 4, which needs a brief discussion. Four lines are visible, and there does not seem to have been another line below line 5. If this is correct, Fragment 4 continues lines 2 to 5 of the large Fragment 1, and are numbered accordingly. Line 2 of Fragment 4 should contain part of a personal name. Line 4 is crucial for the connection of Fragments 1 and 4, because this line clearly ends in [āte]vāsinā. The empty space following ātevāsinā indicates the end of the text written in this line. This is important in two respects. Firstly, line 3 is certainly longer than line 4, and so are most likely also lines 1 and 2, although they are broken off at the end. This has obvious consequences for the number of names that were originally mentioned in the inscription, even though it remains unclear how many aksaras are missing at the end of lines 1 to 3. Secondly, the instrumental ātevāsinā gives a decisive clue for the structure of the text. For, when we compare Inscription I, the following name must be that of the donor. In this way, the two inscriptions elucidate each other, and, because of this, Fragment 4 of Inscription II can be reconstructed as indicated above.

Moreover, in both inscriptions the fourth line was shorter than the preceding ones, probably by one name. The difference of course depends on whether or not one or two names are to be inserted into the gaps and on the number of aksaras in each of the names. Here, the very short fragment with its not entirely clear connection to the main Fragment 1 does not allow any conclusive argument.

These considerations on the structure are highly hypothetical, because they assume that the length of lines and names should be regular. The purpose of the reconstruction given here, however, is primarily to attempt to find out how many names may be lost and how the number of names relates to Dhammadeva’s inscription (Inscription I):

1. The Buddha
2. Lost [3, Lost]
3. Uttaramitra [4.]
4. Lost [5, 6, Lost]
5. Bhaṇḍu [7.]
6. Nandinuttara [8, 9, Lost]

The Buddha
Anuruddha
Sarvānanda
Lost
Lost
Disāgiri
Starting the teacher-disciple lineage in both inscriptions from the time of the Buddha, the donor Dhammadeva belongs either to the ninth or, perhaps more probably, to the twelfth generation after the Buddha, and his anonymous colleague to the fourteenth. Calculating again 15 to 20 years between pupil and teacher, Inscription II in its presumed longer version was written 160/220 years and the second one 195/260 years after the Buddha. Assuming that the inscription was engraved in about 200 BCE, the Buddha was alive somewhere between 360/420 or 395/460, and according to the different calculations based on 15 or 20 year intervals. The dates are plausible, and 15 years may be nearer to the truth than 20 when estimating the varying distance in time between teacher and pupil. Therefore, the possibility that both lineages indeed begin with the Buddha cannot be ruled out.

Even if the donations were contemporaneous, that Dhammadeva of Inscription I belonged to the twelfth generation of the lineage of teachers, while the anonymous donor of Inscription II belonged to the fourteenth generation, does not pose a problem, because there could have been considerable variation in the time elapsed between teacher and pupil. Luckily, the formulas commemorating the act of the donation are similar in both inscriptions and thus help to elucidate each other. The preparation of the column is mentioned in the second inscription as thabho kārāpito. This phrase can be supplied in Inscription I at the end of line 5. Both inscriptions mention the erection of the column. In addition to the erection a column, it is possible that a torana was also constructed (kato), although the reading torana is uncertain. In Inscription I, the Ācārya Kasi[ seems to have been involved in the act of erecting the column. A corresponding phrase might have stood at the end of line 5 in inscription II. The inscription ends in line 6, because no traces of script are visible after usāpito ca and there is a wide space.

An exceptionally interesting word in inscription II is barely, but safely, readable: this is ginjakā[ at the very end of line 5. The rare word ginjakā occurs in the Theravāda canon in one single formula mentioning a particular type of a building, the

---

10 This recalls the end of the inscription by the chief physician of Rudrapuruṣadatta, year 18, where the activities of a monk are referred to, which, however, is not fully understood due to the bad state of preservation of the last line: bhadanta (be [or: dhe])masenena amṇuṅhitan 'supported by the venerably Dhemasena (?). Cf. ARIRIAB 14 (2011), p. 11.
11 On the far right end of the broken column there are, separated from ca by a long gap, some traces of what might have been script or a mason’s mark (?).
giṇjakāvasatha at Nādika/Nātika, a place in Magadha, e.g., in the Mahāparinibbānasutta: tatra sudaṃ bhagavā Nādike viharati giṇjakāvasathe (DN II 91,21 = II 94,15), 'at that time the Lord was staying at Nādika in the giṇjaka house'. The commentaries explain the word giṇjakā as īṭṭhakāmeyā āvasathe (Sv 543,11 = Ps II 235,6 = Spk III 281,8 = Mp III 351,23 = Spk II 753 ‘in a house made of bricks’. As Jules Bloch (1880–1953) noticed far back in 1951, the word giṇjakā survives in new Indo-Aryan languages only in the language of the peasants of Bihar, meaning a kind of brick. This shows that the Theravāda commentaries preserve the correct meaning of the word.

The reference to a brick structure – unfortunately again the text breaks off and the type of building remains obscure – makes good sense, because the inscribed column stood beside a massive brick stūpa, and other brick stūpas and structures were excavated in the Deokothar complex.

Beyond the simple fact that a very rare word is attested here for the first time in an inscription, two points are remarkable. Firstly, this is obviously an ancient Eastern word and technical building term, as the Pāli evidence, together with that of present-day Indo-Aryan languages, shows. As such it can be added to the ancient Eastern technical vocabulary for terms connected with buildings, such as agga ‘bolt (to close a door)’ or tāla-chiggala ‘keyhole’ (which was soon replaced by tāla-chidda even in canonical Pāli). This technical vocabulary does not belong to any Indo-Aryan language. It is remarkable that the knowledge of the meaning of this ancient Eastern word is preserved in the Theravāda commentaries composed centuries later in far away Ceylon. This confirms the substance of the Theravādin tradition that Mahinda brought both canon and commentaries with him to Ceylon: that is, in historical terms, that the canonical texts were transmitted to Ceylon along with explanations. This seems to be very likely, since in South Asian didactic tradition texts are generally accompanied by commentaries.

That the correct meaning survived in Ceylon is all the more significant, insofar as the northern Indian Sanskrit tradition had evidently forgotten the signification of giṇjakā by the time the Sanskrit Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, usually ascribed to the (Mūla)Sārvāstivādin school, was composed. Here by then incomprehensible word giṇjaka is replaced by *kunjikā, as the Tibetan transcript kun-dzi-ka shows. In the same way, the

---

12 This wording occurs once in the Vinaya and in the Majjhimanikāya, five times each in DN and SN, and three times in AN.
14 According to George Abraham Grierson, Bihar Peasant Life, Calcutta 1885, Patna 21926 § 1263 pangiṭā.
16 Ernst Waldschmidt, Das Mahāparinirvānasūtra. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der
Chinese translations of this paragraph point to other misunderstandings. A perhaps slightly earlier form of this misunderstanding is preserved in a text from the *Nidānasamṛikta* in the *Samyuktāgama: bhagavān nadikāyāṃ viharati guṇjakāvasate*. It is difficult to imagine what exactly the (Mula)Sarvāstivāda redactors and others had in mind: *guṇjaka* and *kuṇjiṇa* are plant names, and they do not make much sense here. This evidence again confirms and adds to the many traces of a very old tradition preserved in Theravāda canonical literature.

Taking these considerations into account, Inscription II can be translated, as far as it is understood at present, as follows:

[Lord Buddhā’s] pupil Anuruddha, Anuruddha’s pupil Savvananda, Sa[vvananda’s pupil (two names lost)] pupil Disāgiri, Disāgiri’s pupil Bharaṇa, Bha[raṇa’s pupil (two names lost)] [pupil] ṇātaka-Dhammagutta, ṇātaka-Dhamma[guṭṭa’s pupil (two names lost)] pupil Dhammadinā, by Dhammadinnā’s [pupil … (name lost)] ch.daka the column was ordered to be made (together with/ set up beside) a brick … A *torapā* was made (?) and a column was erected.

Even if much of what has been said above concerning the teacher-disciple lineage and chronology is hypothetical and highly conjectural, both of these brief and challenging new inscriptions certainly contribute interesting details to the knowledge of the dogmatic and linguistic history of early Buddhism, and, if the lineage of teachers is interpreted correctly, connect the monks active at Deorkothar in about 200 BCE directly to the Buddha. The number of generations that separate the donors of the columns from the Buddha rules out any date for his Nirvāṇa earlier than about 400–380 BCE.

**Reflections on the Bahuṣrutiyas**

The Bahuṣrutiya school has been known previously from only four, or possibly five, records: three on pillars from Nāgarjunakonda and one from Kesānapalli, both in present-day Andhra Pradesh, as well as from one extremely doubtful, and indeed probably non-existent, record from Pālāti Ḍherī near Peshawar in the north:

---


19 The following abbreviations are used in this table: I: Étienne Lamotte, *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien I*, Louvain 1958 = *History of Indian Buddhism, from the Origins to the Šaka Era*, Louvain 1988; CII:
L 39. (1.) Jar, Pālātu Dherī; CII.1, no. LVb, p. 122; Tsukamoto V PaDh 3
sāṃgha cādudīśe sāmanana bahuṣuṭīja[ka]na kaśyāvijyanā [parigrahe].
L 40. (2.) Pillar, Nāgārjunakonda (Maṭhaṇiṇiputra Vṛapuruṣadatta, 3rd cent.); EI XX 1929/30, p.
24; Tsukamoto II Naga 44
... imam vihāro savajātaniyuto acarīyānaṃ bahusutīyānaṃ patīṭhāpito ...
L 41. (3.) Pillar, Nāgārjunakonda (Ehavala Cāntāmula, year 2); EI XX 1929/30, p. 62;
Tsukamoto II Naga 42
... vihārā acarīyānaṃ bahusutīyānaṃ patīṭhāpito ...
L - (4.) Pillar, Nāgārjunakonda; (Ehavala Cāntāmula, year 2); EI XXI 1931/32, pp. 62f.,
Tsukamoto II Naga 43
... ayam Devāvihāro savajātaniyuto ajariyānaṃ bahusutīyānaṃ patīṭhāpito ...
L - (5.) Kesānapalli (Vāsethiputa Sīri-Cāntāmula, year 13), EI XXXVIII 1964/65, p. 313–
318; Tsukamoto II Kesa 16
... nīgājasa bahusutīyānaṃ ...

The Deorkothar inscription fills a lacuna, by showing that the Bahūṣrutīya school spread
over a larger area than has been assumed, and adding to the map of schools a Vindhyayan
foothold for the Bahūṣrutīyas in Central India (that is, in modern Madhya Pradesh). Our
inscription is not engraved on a portable object like a seal, which an itinerant monk
might have carried with him and left behind anywhere: it is engraved on a massive stone
column. That the column was erected on the initiative of a member of the Bahūṣrutīyas
points to an influential presence of the school at Deorkothar for some time.

The Deorkothar complex commands a strategic position at the entry to the
Vindhyas from the plains below. On one of the many feeders of the Dakṣināpatha, it can
be approached from Bodh Gaya, Pataliputra, Varanasi/Sarnath, Prayag, or Kausambi,
and it links up with routes across the plateau to Vidisha and Ujjain, connecting it to the
'Buddhist networks' of the Betwa valley and leading on to the Narmada River and
beyond. In the vicinity is the large ruined stūpa at Dundhi Gadhi (Dist. Rewa, MP: fig.

---

Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum: Vol. II.1: Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions with the exception of those of Aśoka by
Sten Konow, Calcutta 1929; EI: Epigraphia Indica; Tsukamoto, see note 4 above.

20 The origins and history of the Bahūṣrutīya school are obscure. According to 'the traditions of the
Northwest', the Bahūṣrutīyas arose in the second century post-Nirvāṇa, directly from the Mahāsāṃghikas,
or, according to the Theravādins and Sāṃghīyas, from the Gokulikas. According to Paramārtha (499–569
CE) and Kuiji (演基: K’ouei-Ki, 632–682 CE), an arhat or aśāikṣa named Yājñavalkya, a contemporary of the
Buddha, formed the Bahūṣrutīya school after he had spent two centuries in meditation in the Himalayas.
See André Bareau, Les sectes bouddhiques du petit véhicule (Publications de l’École française d’Extrême-
Orient, Volume XXXVIII), Paris 1955, pp. 81–83. If Paramārtha’s origin myth is taken at face value, then
Dhammadeva would be quite an early member of this school, almost of the first generation. Bhāviveka
cites a Mahāpratīkhāya-sūtra of the Prajñāpātimāda-Bāmāsūryas, implying a direct affiliation with the
Prajñāpātivādins, one of the earliest Mahāsāṃghikas: see P. Skillings, 'Citations from the Scriptures of
the “Eighteen Schools” in the Tarkajāvāla', in Petra Kiiffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann (eds.).
Buddhavādyāsdhākarakah: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday,

21 For these routes, see especially Dilip K. Chakrabarti, The Archaeology of the Deccan Routes: The
14), about 20 km away, set like a landmark on the towering cliffs, as well as other sites which await further study. About 100 km to the south along the Tons or Tamas River valley lies the famous Bharhut stūpa (Dist. Satna, MP: fig. 15), and still further is the Aśokan edict at Rupnath (Dist. Katni, MP). Although the area surrounding Bharhut remains to be properly excavated, it would seem that Deorkothar is a bigger complex than that at Bharhut. This suggests that the monastic lineages who participated in the construction activity and the erection of the pillar at Deorkothar, including the Bahuśrutiya lineage, established a significant centre here at the edge of the Vindhayas. From here, their ideas and practices could have been carried southward to the Andhra country, including, perhaps, to Nagarjunakonda and Kesana Palli, where, as we have seen, among others the Bahuśrutiya school was also active.

At the same time, this amply demonstrates how our picture of the distribution of Buddhist schools in ancient India is fragmentary and fragile – a picture which can change dramatically with the discovery of a single new inscription, like this one from Deorkothar. Moreover, the date of the Deorkothar inscriptions – perhaps about 200 BCE – is at least two centuries earlier than that of almost all other inscriptions that mention Buddhist schools. Consequently, it provides one of the oldest epigraphical references to a Buddhist school. If this Deorkothar inscription is more or less contemporaneous to the three inscriptions mentioning the Hemavatas, the evidence from Sanchi and the adjacent Sonari now no longer stands as an isolated early, and sometimes even disputed, reference to a Buddhist school.

The Deorkothar and Sanchi inscriptions expose the gap between the early epigraphic records and the later literary records. In the region of Vidisha, inscribed reliquaries record a lineage of Hemavata teachers, whose memory is preserved in the verses of Dipavamsa. We have geographical traces of a Hemavata lineage in India – but we know almost nothing about the school, of which only a single text, a *Vinayamātrkā, survives. From the eastern Vindhayas we now have two teacher–disciple lineages, one certainly of the Bahuśrutiya school, the other by association presumably the same. But here too we know little about the school, unless the *Śyāya– or *Tattva-siddhiśāstra indeed belongs to it. In a broader perspective, these instances show how the memory


24. Tsukamoto, as note 4, IV Sanc 679, IV Sona 3 and 5; Willis, op. cit.

25. Barea, Sectes, as note 20, pp. 111–113, devotes three pages to the school.

26. Barea, Sectes, as note 20, pp. 81–83, devotes three pages to the school, but one page is based entirely
and construction of spiritual descent was important to the monastics, and how the spread of Buddhism involved individuals, human beings, who, through relics and claimed lineages, established a presence in relation to the Buddha. The principles embedded in these epigraphic lineages may be fruitfully compared with teachers' lineages recorded in Vinaya and Vaṃsa literatures.
Two Inscriptions in Brāhmi and Kharoṣṭʰī

Seishi Karashima

Recently, Isao Kurita has kindly sent me photographs of two inscriptions written in Brāhmi and Kharoṣṭʰī. I have decided to publish their transliterations here without further ado, because of their importance to the understanding of the history of Indian Buddhism.

Brahmi Inscription (Plate 12)


The inscription reads as follows:

Ọ siddham* ayaṃ ghaṭa saṅghilavihāre saṅghasya caturdiś[a]syat sarvāṣṭhipādikānā dharmajñānā śāstrajñānā deśakālavi ..[ī]. nā jayatu buddhaḥ

It can be reconstruted as follows:

Ọ siddham* ayaṃ ghaṭa saṅghilavihāre saṅghasya caturdiś[a]syat sarvāṣṭhipādikānā dharmajñānā śāstrajñānā deśakālavi(dhij)[ī](ā)ñā jayatu buddhaḥ

“Success! This pot at Saṅghila monastery belongs to the Community of the four directions (and) Sarvāṣṭivādins who know the Dharma, know Śāstra and know place, time and manner. Glory to the Buddha!”

Sarvāṣṭhipādika~ is a hyper-form of *Sarvāṣṭivādika; cf. BHS Sarvāṣṭivādin; Pāli Sabbatthavādin.

Kharoṣṭʰī Inscription (Plate 13)

This inscription is written on the pedestal of a Bodhisatva statue in stucco from allegedly from Landi Kotal (a small town at the top of the Khyber Pass) in Pakistan. According to Mr. Kurita, the statue in stucco may date back to the fourth century C.E. The inscription reads as follows:

* I should like to express my gratitude to Tatsushi Tamai, Klaus Wille and another friend for their kindness in correcting my readings of these inscriptions.
saghana\(^1\) danamukhe madapidara[n]ja adhvadi<da>na kalagadana puyae bhava(tu)
ualjyasa sagharamasa adhvadida[sa] puya[e] bhavatu

It can be translated in Buddhist Sanskrit translation as follows:
saṃghāṇāṃ\(^2\) dānamukhe mātāpiṭḥāṃ adhvātītānāṃ kālagatānāṃ pūjāyai bhavatu!
upādhyāyasya saṃghārāmasya adhvātītasya pūjāyai bhavatu!

“A donation from the communities (of the four directions?). May it be a pūjā for (their) deceased, dead parents! May it be a pūjā for the deceased master Saṃghārāma!”

This content resembles another well-known Kharoṣṭhī inscription on a relief:
sa[m] 4 1 Phagunasa masasa di paṃcami Budhanadasa tepidakasa danamukhe madapidaranasa adhvadidanasa puyaya bhavatu\(^3\)

“Year 5, on the fifth day of the month Phalguna. A donation from Buddhānanda who knows the Tripitaka. May it be a pūjā for his deceased parents!”

---

1. Only the so-called dental nasal is used in this inscription.
Buddhist Nuns in South India
as Reflected in the Andhakaṭṭhakathā and in Vajirabuddhi’s Anuganṝhipada

Petra KIEFFER-PULZ (Mainz)

The Pāli scriptures preserved belong to the Mahāvihāra tradition of the Theravādin located in Sri Lanka. Some texts, however, originated in other regions and perhaps traditions as for instance the Milindapañha or the Apadāna.¹ This to my opinion holds true also for a number of Vinaya sources, most of which are only preserved as quotations in the Pāli literature, namely for the Andhakaṭṭhakathā, Vajirabuddhi’s Anuganṝhipada, the apare quoted therein, the Vajirabuddhītikā and, perhaps, the Kaṅkhāvitaranipurāṇaṇītikā. There is to my opinion strong evidence that these texts originated in a tradition connected with South India, if not in South India itself.

That Buddhism flourished in South-India (Andhra Pradesh,² Tamilnadu³) and that Sri Lankan monks in general were on friendly terms with the monks there at least up to the tenth century AD is a well-known fact; also that many of the outstanding authors of Pāli scriptures came from South India (Buddhaghosa, Buddhadatta, Dhammapāla, etc.). Nevertheless little is known about the South Indian Sthavira/Theriya schools and their relation to the Mahāvihāra of Sri Lanka.

If my suggestion that the Vinaya texts mentioned above originated in some South Indian environment were true, these texts might provide an insight into customs and habits prevalent in South India, they might show us seemingly typical mainstream Mahāvihāra customs which had their roots in some South Indian tradition. When younger texts of the mainstream Mahāvihāra take position on those opinions, deviations or agreements might become visible. Therefore the examination of these texts certainly will lead to a more differentiated picture of the schools of the Theravādins.

Before we can turn to the question what the texts can tell us about Buddhist nuns in South India, we, however, have to present the arguments for the assumption that the sources mentioned originated in South India or at least in a tradition related to South India.

---
¹  Von Hinüber 1996: § 173ff., § 123.
²  Golzio 2010: 30ff.
³  Kāncipuram, Kāveripatnam, Nāgappattinam, etc.
The earliest of our sources, the Andhakāṭṭṭhakathā, a commentary on the Vinaya dating from between the first century BC⁴ and the 4th or 5th century AD⁵ is lost except for forty-one first hand quotations in commentaries to the Pāli Vinaya:⁶ nineteen are in the Samantapāśādikā attributed to Buddhaghosa by tradition (4th/5th century AD), seventeen in the Vajirabuddhiṭākā, the oldest Vinaya subcommentary (second half of the tenth century AD⁷), and one in the anonymous and undated Kaṅkhāvitaranippurāṇaṭṭākā, the oldest subcommentary on the Pātimokkha, which is younger than the Vajirabuddhiṭākā, but probably older than Sāriputta’s Sāratthadipani (after 10th, and before 12th century AD).⁸ The distribution of these quotations proves that the Andhakāṭṭṭhakathā was in use up to the 10th or 11th centuries AD.

The quotations preserved in the Samantapāśādikā are directly quoted from the Andhakāṭṭṭhakathā. They illuminate that this text belongs to a Vinaya tradition different from the mainstream Mahāvihāra, because it uses a different terminology,⁹ has a different wording of the formula for the ordination of novices and monks by triple refuge,¹⁰ and classifies offenses in other categories than the Mahāvihāra.¹¹ Furthermore, the Samantapāśādikā takes a critical stand on the Andhakāṭṭṭhakathā, indicating that the tradition represented by the Andhakāṭṭṭhakathā was some minority for the author of the Samantapāśādikā.¹² One of the quotations renders it probable that the Andhakāṭṭṭhakathā originated in Andhakaraṇṭha, identified with Andhra Pradesh,¹³ since the specific

---

⁴ Life time of Mahāsūmata Thera, an authority quoted in the Andhakāṭṭṭhakathā.
⁵ Date of the completion of the Samantapāśādikā.
⁶ Kieffer-Püll 1993; Kieffer-Püll 2010.
⁷ See Kieffer-Püll 2013: A II 2.
⁸ Four seemingly first hand quotations in Vajirabuddhiṭākā, Kaṅkhāvitaranippurāṇaṭṭākā and Sāratthadīpani have in effect literal parallels in the Samantapāśādikā. They are partly marked as quotations, but without a source being named. Although the Andhakāṭṭṭhakathā is quoted and mentioned in still younger Vinaya commentaries, none of those references are first hand quotations, and therefore they can be left aside, see Kieffer-Püll 2010: Vjb [5], [18], Kkh-ṭṭ [4], Sp-ṭ [5].
⁹ simīmandalam sambandhati for simam bandhati (Kieffer-Püll 1993: [10]); jāgati for vatthu (Kieffer-Püll 1993: [5]; Kieffer-Püll 1994).
¹⁰ Kieffer-Püll 1993: [7], [8].
¹¹ Kieffer-Püll 1993: [2], [4], [6], [9], [15].
¹² It rejects eleven statements, declares twice that what is said in the Andhakāṭṭṭhakathā is unnecessary, but not wrong, does not take a position in five cases, and values only one as being well said (suvuttan), see Kieffer-Püll 1993.
¹³ According to that quotation the statement that a monk who shares a sleeping place with someone not ordained [Pāc 5 M] on a terrace (pamukha) not closed round (aparikkhita), does not commit an offence—a statement which according to the Vajirabuddhiṭākā is quoted from the Siḥalathakathā—, has been said with respect to a terrace (pamukha) on the earth (bhūmiya) without a base (jāgati). The author of the Samantapāśādikā relates this explanation to the specific monastic architecture in Andhakaraṇṭha where rows of cells (gabhapāliya) join separate domiciles (pāṭekkasannivesa) under one roof (ekachadanā). Coliya Kassaṅpa’s Vinayavivodanīṭṭākā, a South Indian Vinaya subcommentary of the 13th century, complements that the terrace lay in front of the cells and was fully covered by one joined roof, but not closed round on three sides (Kieffer-Püll 1993: 191ff.) The architecture described here in fact is not the most prevalent in Andhra Pradesh where the foursided vihāra is most common, but there are vihāras with one, two, and three wings. There are, for example, two rows of monks’ cells in Rāmatirtha (1st/2nd to 9th centuries AD), Golzio 2010: 32.
monastic architecture described there is detected in South-India.14 This information together with the deviating Vinaya tradition presented in the Andhakaṭṭhakathā renders probable an origination in South India, a suggestion corroborated by the fact that this text was also used by the apare-tradition localized in Kāṇcī and Kāveripatțanam (to which more below).

The Andhakaṭṭhakathā quotations in the Vajirabuddhiṭkā stem from four different sources. Fourteen are penned by the author of the Vajirabuddhiṭkā. Five or six are transmitted in Vajirabuddhi's Anuganṭhipada,15 two in quotations of some "others" (apare), and one probably can be assigned to Upatissa Thera (ca. 5/6th century).

(1) From among these sources the apare16 which are quoted thirty-four times in Vajirabuddhi's Anuganṭhipada are probably the oldest. They can be located in Kāveripatțanam and Kāṇcī,17 are at variance with the Pāli Vinaya and Diṭhānikāya,18 reject an opinion of the Mahāsāṃghikas as not acceptable for thāvaris (probably Sṭhaviras),19 and once or twice quote the Andhakaṭṭhakathā.20 Twice their statements are not completely intelligible,21 because their language seems not to be standard Pāli. Apare-statements paralleled in the Sārathadīpanī are marked there by keci, apare, vadanti, and where Sāriputta takes a position, he and his Sinhalese Gaṇṭhipadas differ from them, indicating that the apare-tradition was considered a minority by the mainstream Mahāvihāra.22 Since Kāveripatțanam flourished till the 4th century and again from the 6th century onwards, and since the apare comment on the Samantapāsādikā they are probably to be dated to the later period.

(2) Upatissa Thera was a pupil of Buddhaghosa, a fellow pupil of and the antagonist to Dhammasiri Thera, and head of an own group or school (gana). Since Dhammasiri Thera

---

14 Such a monastery has been excavated in Kāveripatțanam, the so called Buddha Vihāra, a monastery dated to the 3rd/4th century by the excavators. It consists in a total of nine cells in a row, provided with a common verandah in front of the cells, Soundara Rajan 1994, p. 27.

15 After the lifetime of Dhammasiri Thera (ca. 5th/6th century) and before the lifetime of the probably Sinhalese no takko ti ācariyo (ca. 10th century).

16 To my opinion all apare references belong to one and the same group, because of the exclusiveness with which the author of the Anuganṭhipada quotes them (but no keci, eke, etc.) and the uniform manner in which he does so, and because two quotations of the apare refer directly to Kāveripatțanam and Kāṇcī.

17 Vjb 3597–14 (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 256]). The quotation, in which the apare refer to the custom in the town Kāveripatțanam to leave the rains residence for clothes on the ninth day of the Pavaraṇṇa month (Vjb 468,19–21), is quoted in some other text, possibly the Anuganṭhipada.

18 Vjb 280,7–9 (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 177]); the rule that one may keep an object which one had not formally taken possession of for eleven days (contradiction to Niss 10 allowing ten days at most). For deviations from Vin and DN,Vjb 477,16–17; Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 345].

19 Vjb 1574–6 (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 87]).

20 Vjb 300,19–22 (Kieffer-Pülz 2010: Vjb [7]). According to the apare the Andhakaṭṭhakathā quotation proves that it is allowed to use requisites given to the Sangha with the proviso that they are to be used in the open air according to one's liking. This habit is not shared by the younger mainstream Mahāvihāra to the same degree.

21 Vjb 468,10–21 (Kieffer-Pülz 2010: Vjb [15]); Vjb 3597–14 (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 256]).

22 Vjb 1574–6 (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 87]) rejection by the apare of the Mahāsāṃghika who declare that one might kill an embryo with magical strength developed by meditation. The apare are, furthermore, well aware of Nikāya differences as is indicated by their describing a monk who refused some offered donation because of a different Nikāya affiliation of the donor (Vjb 317,23–24; Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 220]).
is a representative of the mainstream Mahāvihāra, his antagonist Upatissa obviously is not. This accords to the fact that his quotations are preserved only in the Vajirabuddhiṭkā (twenty-eight times), the Anuṅghinipada (eight times), the Kāṅkhāvitaraṇipurāṇaṭikā (three times), and, probably once in the Sāraththadipani.23 He is considered the leading authority by the Anuṅghinipada once,24 probably also used the Andhakaṭṭhakathā,25 and definitely is no Abhayagirivināśin.26

(3) The Anuṅghinipada by Vajirabuddhi27 is a commentary on the Vināya lost, except for 281 quotations in the Vajirabuddhiṭkā, and more than fifty quotations in the Kāṅkhāvitaraṇipurāṇaṭikā. It often critically refers to Dhammasiri Thera, mostly because Dhammasiri’s insufficient consideration of the Vināya led to contradictions with it. In distinction to Dhammasiri’s Gaṅṭhipada, the Anuṅghinipada has no parallels to the Sinhalese Gaṅṭhipadas used by Sāriputta, and where its opinions are found in the Sāraththadipani they are given without a source or are characterized as the statements of some minority with the words vaddanti or keci vaddanti.

Regarding its localization the author of the Anuṅghinipada shows some – but not necessarily first hand – knowledge of Sri Lankan customs.28 On the other hand he reports on the fabrication of clothes from small woven patches, comparing them to Chinese clothes (cīnasāṭakam), a reference presumably hinting at South-India as a commercial partner of China.29 He uses the word garukula (skt. gurukula), rarely employed in Pāli (and then mostly in works of South Indians), instead of the more usual ācariyakula. He uses as an authoritative source the Andhakaṭṭhakathā, and quotes the apare located in

---

23 All other references to Upatissa Thera in other Vinaya texts refer to the Upatissa Thera of the 1st century BC quoted in the Samantapāsādikā. For these Upatissa Theras, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 176-186.

24 Regarding the classification of the rule which makes drinking alcohol an offence [Pāc 51 M]. Here Upatissa Thera, the Anuṅghinipada, the Vajirabuddhiṭkā and the Kāṅkhāvitaraṇipurāṇaṭikā form one group which is clearly distinguished from the Sāraththadipani and its Gaṅṭhipadas representing the Sri Lankan gāṇavaśins on the one hand, and from the Vimatinivodanaṭikā representing the South Indian araṇivāśins on the other (Kieffer-Pülz 2005). Although Anuṅghinipada and Vajirabuddhiṭkā criticize Upatissa Thera on and off, and even though there exists one Upatissa statement which accords to the three Sinhalese Gaṅṭhipadas of Sāriputta (in another case his opinion is mentioned in the Sāraththadipani as from the keci) Upatissa Thera does not belong to the mainstream Mahāvihāra tradition as represented by the Sāraththadipani and its sources.

25 One quotation from the Anganṭhipada containing an Andhakaṭṭhakathā quotation, according to the Vajirabuddhiṭkā reflects the doctrine of Upatissa Thera, giving the impression that Upatissa Thera had access to the Andhakaṭṭhakathā too.

Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 241].

26 This Vajirabuddhi is not the author of the Vajirabuddhiṭkā, because the latter critizises the former with such statements as tap sabbha ayuttam, taṁ na sundaram, na taṁ sārato paccetabbam, etc. (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 157]), ayuttam [Z 171], duvuttam [Z 174] apare quotation [Z 215], or he declares that something had been papaṁcitam, ativa or bahudhābhum papaṁcitam or that something has not to be accepted as the best (na taṁ sārato paccetabbam) or simply is not good (na sundaram). For details, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 43ff., 213ff.

27 He mentions the “small pavāram” (cūlapavāram) in Sri Lanka, but characterizes this notice by the word kira, which shows that this has been common knowledge.

28 Given that in the 7th to 10th centuries there existed lively commercial relations between the Cola area and China such a reference would be easily comprehensible for a South Indian reader of the Anuṅghinipada, but perhaps less for one in Sri Lanka. The Sāraththadipani and Vimatinivodanaṭikā also refer to this type of cloth, but omit the comparison with the Chinese cloth, Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 176].
Kāverīpāṭṭanam and Kañci thirty-four times which amounts to around twelve percent of the Anuṅgantipāda quotations preserved. Even though the designation apare shows that the author of the Anuṅgantipāda considered them a tradition distinct from his own, the fact that he quotes them often and casually with local information only meaningful to monks of that region, make it probable that the apare tradition was geographically close and of sufficient importance for the author of the Anuṅgantipāda to give attention to it, and thus that the Anuṅgantipāda was written for South Indian readers.

(4) Regarding the author of the Vajirabuddhiṭīkā, the identification with a Vajirabuddhi is relatively late. The examination of the quotations from Vajirabuddhiś Anuṅgantipāda clearly has proven that this Vajirabuddhi and the author of the Vajirabuddhiṭīkā cannot be identical. It may be that the identification of the author of the Vajirabuddhiṭīkā with one Vajirabuddhi may have resulted from the title of the text which was in usage already in the 12th century AD. Without going into detail here I want to state that the author of the Vajirabuddhiṭīkā most likely lived in the second half of the tenth century, that he used sources which originated in Sri Lanka, namely, Dhammasiriś Khuddasikkhā (5th/6th century AD), Dhammasiriś Gāṇṭīpāda, and Upasena’s commentary on the Niddesa (after the 9th century AD). He shows knowledge of the Sinhalese language, has first hand knowledge of habits and customs in Sri Lanka, is the only author of a Pāli text who names dipavāsino, tambapanṇīvāsino, or jambudipavāsino as sources of variant

---

30 This is corroborated by his critizism towards them. In three cases he rejects the opinions of the apare with the words that the Ācariyas or Vinayadharas do not speak in that way (Vjb 445,24–25; 468,21,25).
31 The Anuṅgantipāda did neither belong to the Abhayagirivāsin nor to the mainstream Mahāvīhāra tradition, as represented by the Sārathadīpanī. This is indicated by the position the Anuṅgantipāda takes with respect to the rule which prohibits the consumption of alcohol, Kiever-Püls 2005.
32 With about 340 quotations it is one of the main sources of the Vajirabuddhiṭīkā. Identification as a Sri Lankan product results from the roughly eighty quotations for which there are parallels in the Sinhalese Gāṇṭīpādas used by Sāriputta in his Sārathadīpanī. See Kiever-Püls 2013: I 202-205.
33 The Vajirabuddhiṭīkā shares a large portion of its introduction with this text, see Kiever-Püls 2009.
34 He explains the Pāli word vasa to mean “poison” via the Sinhalese forms vasa and visa, deduced from Skt. visa. The regular Pāli form is visa. He possibly also is the source of the single verse from a work by Mātraḍa (Vjb 151,16 = VAW 2.10 + 2.13) handed down in medieval Sinhalese literature from the 12th century onwards. See Kiever-Püls 2013: I 100f.
35 This is shown when he states that even at his time monks in Sri Lanka advance the mahāpāvāranā to the 14th (instead of the regular 15th), or when he mentions details of the cīlapāvāranā.
36 “Inhabitants of the island (i.e. Sri Lanka);” Vjb 106,1–2 (uppalagandhā uppalabhāvā); Vjb 116,24 (reading vedivā vā where the Vajirabuddhiṭīkā has vediyi vā); Vjb 466,3–4: Mahā-āṭṭhakathāyam pi “sankāsavyassant” ti pāṭha, dipavāsino “sankāpayissant” ti paṭhanti kira.

Furthermore, Vajirabuddhi twice quotes the content of some of the dipavāsin’s sayings, Vjb 496,21–4971 (Kiever-Püls 2013: Z 365): “evam sante cōrikāya katasadissam hoti tasmā na vaṭṭari” ti dipavāsino vadanti kira. Vjb 530,24–25: “cōrikāya gahittāna paṇṇuṇāti” ti vacanato “kuṭisodhanam vaṭṭari” ti ca dipavāsino vadanti kira. In all these cases, however, Vajirabuddhi uses the word kira (skt. kila) after the verb, indicating that he tells this from hearsay or that this is well known at his time. So it is possible that some of his information on Sri Lanka or the Sri Lankan readings were common knowledge at his time, and that he adopted this intelligence without having checked it personally. For kira, see Kiever-Püls 2012: I 105f.
37 “Inhabitants of Tambapanṭi (i.e. Sri Lanka);” Vjb 186,20–21: Tambapanṇīvāsino ithirūpaṃ likhitam, katikapataṇ ca na chupanti kira. ākarato muttamat.
readings, and who compares an *andhakapotthaka* with various *sīhalapotthakas* with respect to the reading of a *kammavācā*.

On the other hand he uses the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*, on which he takes a positive stand. Furthermore, the *Anuśaṅhipada* is his second most important source after *Dhammasiriśa Gaṇṭhipada*, and, unlike the author of the *Samantapāsādikā*, the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* takes the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* to be an authoritative text, trying to show its conformity with the likewise authoritative *Samantapāsādikā*, and thus allaying the distance between both texts. In addition he shows knowledge of features special for South India when he states that a certain perfumed powder was favored in *ariyadesa*, here probably referring to South India, or quotes Tamils, or refers to the park in the town Kānci or a custom of the *bhikkhus* in Kāveriṇīṭānam. He is aware of other Buddhist schools, especially the Mahāsāṃghikas prevalent in South India, and besides Sinhalese knew Tamil. He thus betrays knowledge of Sri Lankan and South Indian cultures, and therefore could well have been a native of Andhra Pradesh who lived for some time in Sri Lanka (Anurādhapura) and for some time in Kānci and/or

---

38 “Inhabitants of India”; Vjb 384–7–8: “sikkhamānān” ti pātham dipavāsino rocenti kiriyākiriyaṭṭā, jambudipavāsino “sikkhamānā” ti tassattho sikkhādhammamānānato sikkhamānā ti.
39 These might have been *kammavācā* manuscripts.
40 The reading mentioned corresponds to that handed down in the *Vinaya* as we have it today. Vjb 457,26–30: “vassāyasmato khamati etissā simyā simānāsambāsāya ekāposathāya sanugghāto, so tūnḥassā” ti *Andhakapotthake, Sīhalapotthakesu* ca kusucī pātho athi. kusucī “samugghāto etissā simyā” ti pāthamānī ikhanti, kusucī “etissā simyā sanugghāno” ti ca.
41 In addition he sometimes presupposes the knowledge of what was written in the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* in that he discusses something written there without quoting it, thus writing for readers who knew this text, see Kieffer-Püll 2010: Vjb [13, [14].
42 Characterized by *kira* which makes it possible that it was a generally known fact.
43 *Ariyadesa* is a rare term in Pāli found only in commentaries ascribed to the South Indian Dhammapāla (Sv-pṭ, Ud-a) and once in the Sārathadhimapāṇi where Sāriputta (who often borrows from Dhammapāla) relates it to the monks of Jambudīpa. It is, furthermore, used in the *Mahāvamsa* (61.3; 63.4) where it refers to people from South India. *Ariyadesa* in a narrower sense refers to Andhra Pradesh (Ramachandran 1996, 120). *Ariyadesa* refers to Andhra Pradesh (the region beginning with the Southern limit of Dandaka) also in Tamil Sangam literature (Proceedings 1923: 357).
44 Vjb 298: ekarasena nāthakaranā (v.l. ekaraṇasneharanā) iti damilā.
45 Vjb 380,17; Sāriputta (Sp-ṭ III 126,20–21) later on defines it simply as a park within a town, omitting the reference to Kānci.
46 Vjb 468,11–15: *nimantito yeva nāma hoṭi* ti (Sp 1070,1) ettha upāsakehi “imasmim nāma divase dāndāṇi karoma, sabbe sannipatantī” ti katāya pi katikāya gantum vattati. pāvāṇāya navamito pāthāya pamsukalakīcāram pariyesitum Kāviraṇāṭṭane viya sabbesam gantum vaṭṭati anusaṃvaccaram niyamato upāsakehi sajīvita thapanato. This quotation is part of a longer quotation not marked unambiguously.
47 Vjb 157,1; 335,17–18; 576,12.
48 One reproach Sāriputta makes against the author of *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* is that he mixes up languages in his commentary (bhāṣāntarehi sammiṃsaṃ likhitam, Sp-ṭ 1,2,10). The *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* in fact shows that its author had also access to Sanskrit texts, and it contains Sanskrit words not or not properly transferred into Pāli, pratīyājñānam (Vjb 14,7) instead of an expected *paccavajjānam*; formation gri for gri (Vjb 5,15) on metrical reasons in analogy to siri (skt. śrī) (Bollée 1985: 179, Anm. 2); vyākhyā (Vjb 3,22; 14,7) otherwise rarely used, and then in younger texts; vivākṣā (Vjb 9,17) (for avivākṣā?), etc. See Kieffer-Püll 2013: I 129ff.
49 This presupposes that the Mahāvihāra still lived there, and thus leads to a date before the 11th century.
Käverīpatṭanam, or a native of Sri Lanka who spent some time in South India.\textsuperscript{50}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vinaya</th>
<th>Pātimokkha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st cent. BC–4th/5th cent. AD</td>
<td><em>Early Sīhalatṭhakathā:</em></td>
<td>Pātimokkha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kurundī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahāpaccarī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahā-Āṭṭhakathā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st cent. BC–4th/5th cent. AD</td>
<td>Andhakaṭṭhakathā</td>
<td>Pātimokkha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th/5th cent. AD</td>
<td>Samantapāśādikā</td>
<td>Kañkhāvitaranī (after the Samantapāśādikā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th/6th cent. AD</td>
<td>Upatissa Thera</td>
<td>Pātimokkha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dhammasiri Thera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dhammasiriś Gaṇḍhipada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 6th cent. AD</td>
<td>apare in <em>Vajirabuddhiś Anugāṇṭhipada</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after 6th before 2nd half of the 10th cent.</td>
<td>Vajirabuddhiś Anugāṇṭhipada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before 2nd half of 10th cent. AD</td>
<td><em>no takko ti ācariyo</em> (after the Anugāṇṭhipada)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd half of the 10th cent. AD</td>
<td>Vajirabuddhītkā</td>
<td>Kañkhāvitaranīpurāṇātikā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after 2nd half of the 10th cent. AD before 12th century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd half of the 12th cent. AD</td>
<td>Sāriputtaś Sāratthadīpanī</td>
<td>Pātimokkha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st half of the 13th cent. AD</td>
<td>Coliyā Kassapaś Vimatisvinodanti-ṭikā</td>
<td>Pātimokkha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the Sources (*italics* = texts preserved in form of quotations only)

Important in the present context is the question whether these texts were written at a time when a nuns’ community still existed. The fact that a commentator comments on the nuns’ portions of Vinaya and Āṭṭhakathā is no proof in that respect, because even younger sub-commentaries written at a time when the nuns’ tradition was extinct in Sri Lanka commented on the bhikkunīs’ sections, albeit sometimes a little less detailed. The author of the *Anugāṇṭhipada*, however, tells us that at his time (*etaraḥi*) it was usual practice that a monk, not agreed upon as an adviser of nuns (*asammata ovādaka*) instructed nuns (*Vjb* 307,5–308,15, Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 209]), and the author of the *Vajirabuddhītkā* informs us that at his time (*etaraḥi*) the nuns exclusively went to the monks’ community on the

\textsuperscript{50} For a more detailed discussion of the authorship of the *Vajirabuddhītkā*, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I A II 1.
fourteenth and asked when the uposatha should take place (kadā ayya uposatho).\textsuperscript{51} We do, however, not know whether this refers to Sri Lanka or South India.

\textbf{What the texts can tell us about bhikkhunīs}

With respect to the question what the texts can tell us about bhikkhunīs one has to be aware that the commentaries on Vinaya and Pātimokkha comment on a word at its first place of appearance, and therefore become gradually thinner to the end. Accordingly the Samantapāsādikā's section on the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga (49 pages = Sp 900–949) is much shorter than that on the Bhikkhuvibhaṅga (899 pages = Sp 1–899) corresponding to 3.3 percent of the whole text, compared to that on the Bhikkhuvibhaṅga which equates to 63.5 percent. In case of the Vinaya sources reckoned as being affiliated to South India we merely have quotations, that is to say chips from these texts. Among them only few refer to bhikkhunīs.

In the subcommentarial literature the portion on bhikkhunīs equates to 5.7 percent in the Vajirabuddhiṭṭhā, but only to 1.5 percent in the younger commentaries by Sāriputta (2nd half 12th cent. AD) and Coliya Kassapa (1st half 13th cent. AD) which both originated after the extinction of the nuns' community.

From the forty-one Andhakaṭṭhakathā quotations only four refer to rules of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga, namely three to Sgh 3 N\textsuperscript{52} and one to Pāc 7 N.\textsuperscript{53} From the 281 Anugaṇṭhipada quotations only fourteen (Pār 1, Sgh 3, Pāc 7, 9, 10, 71–73, 81, Nigamana) refer to the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga, and from the thirty-four apare quotations only three (Pār 1, Sgh 3 N). None of the texts comments on the bhikkhunī chapter of the Cullavagga which is dealt with only in the Vajirabuddhiṭṭhā to some extent. Hence the number of quotations referring to nuns is limited. The following are the topics touched on:

- the classification system of the Pātimokkha rules\textsuperscript{54}
- reordination of a nun after sex change in the light of the prohibition for nuns to formally leave the nuns' community
- strict separation of monks' and nuns' communities with respect to the usage of a community's property\textsuperscript{55}
- proof that a rule against accepting raw grain did not exist for nuns only (Pācittiya 9 for nuns), but also for monks\textsuperscript{56}
- sikkhamānā training starts with twelve, ordination with fourteen at the earliest

\textsuperscript{51} The Samantapāsādikā (794,13–17) transmits two statements. According to the first, nuns go and ask for uposatha on the fourteenth, if uposatha takes place on the fifteenth, and on the thirteenth, if it takes place on the fourteenth. According to the second opinion which is that of the Mahāpaccāri the nuns go exclusively on the thirteenth and ask whether uposatha takes place on the fourteenth or fifteenth. Vjb 305,13–15: ayam uposatho cātuddasiko ti pucchiṭṭhakī  ti vuttaṃ (* Sp 794,16–17) tam pi terasiyaṃ yeva, etarahi pana bhikkhuniyo cātuddasiriyāṃ yeva gantvā “kadā ayya uposatho” ti pucchiṭṭhī. Sāriputta also presents the question the nuns ask, but omits any reference as to the date which is coherent regarding the fact that nuns were no longer present in Sri Lanka at this time.

\textsuperscript{52} Kieffer-Pültz 2010: Vjb [9]–[10], Kkh-pt [3].


\textsuperscript{54} Kieffer-Pültz 2013: [Z 15].

\textsuperscript{55} Kieffer-Pültz 2013: [Z 266].

\textsuperscript{56} Kieffer-Pültz 2013: B [Z 265].
(Pācittiya 71–73 for nuns)
- subrules of Saṅghādisesa 3 for nuns

In the following we will deal with the subject of the installation of a nuns’ adviser, with the definitions of gāma and gāmāpacāra in the frame of Sgh 3 N, and with the subrule of Sgh 3 N making it an offence to stay behind a group alone.

The installation of a bhikkhunovādaka

The position of an adviser of nuns (bhikkhunovādaka) who every fortnight had to advise nuns ranked high as is demonstrated by the skills the Vinaya demands of a monk qualified for this office and by the fact that a natticatutthakamma instead of the usual nattidutiya-kamma is required. An adviser of nuns regularly agreed upon is described as sammata. In the Word Analysis to Pāc 24 M which makes it an offence for monks to claim that theras teach nuns for the sake of gain, one who teaches is described as one “fully ordained [and] agreed upon [as a bhikkhunovādaka]” (upasampanna sammata, Vin IV 58,16–17). In the casuistry the other three pairs are listed out of conformity (Vin IV 58,23ff.).

upasampanna asammatā “one fully ordained, [but] not agreed upon”
anupasampanna sammatā “one unordained, [but] agreed upon”
anupasampanna asammatā “one unordained [and] not agreed upon”

Even though all three are seemingly incapable to act as bhikkhunovādakas, if one follows the rules in the Vinaya, the commentators had to offer reasonable explanations for them. This at the same time established the possibility of some innovation. Regarding the first, i.e. the upasampanna asammatā, the Samantapāsādikā explains this to mean “one fully ordained, but not agreed upon [as a bhikkhunovādaka]” and to refer to a monk installed (thapita) as a bhikkhunovādaka. A “bhikkhunovādaka agreed upon” or the monks’ community are named as the ones who may perform such an installation. Thus the Samantapāsādika describes some formal course of action instead of the legal procedure requested in the Vinaya. A passage from the Andhakaṭṭhakathā quoted in the Anugāṇṭhipada in this context tells us that upasampanna asammatā refers to a monk installed (thapita) as a bhikkhunovādaka by the community with the following words: “Support the nuns’ community. Teach the nuns and cause comfort for the monks’ community.” Thus the installation described in the Samantapāsādikā was accepted already at the time and in the tradition of the Andhakaṭṭhakathā, with the only difference that in the Andhakaṭṭhakathā a bhikkhunovādaka as the one who installs is not mentioned. Whether or not this reflects some further development, we do not know.\(^{58}\)

---

\(^{57}\) Nevertheless, already the Cullavagga hints at the fact, that such highly qualified monks were rare, because it contains the allowance that all others except an ignorant monk may instruct the bhikkunīs (Vin II 265,4–5).

\(^{58}\) Kieffer-Pütz 2013: [Z 209].
Andhakatṭhakathā quotation, however, shows that the procedure for becoming a bhikkhunovādaka was facilitated at an early date, that the simplified method replaces the legal procedure requested in the Vinaya, that this method was accepted in the Andhakathakathā tradition, and that it found its way into the mainstream Mahāvihāra.

The hurdle of finding a monk qualified enough for becoming a bhikkhunovādaka was already overcome in the Vinaya to some degree, in that the allowance to advise nuns was given to every one except an ignorant, an ill or a travelling monk. The hurdle of agreeing upon a bhikkhunovādaka established in the Vinaya obviously was overcome at the time of the Andhakathakathā at the latest. The fact that the procedure was simplified makes one assume that the number of nuns was not marginal and the procedure prescribed in the Vinaya too complicated for daily usage. Since each nun had to receive instruction every fortnight, each monks’ monastery with nunneries in its periphery had to provide a bhikkhunovādaka which means that it had to have an able monk. Given that communities were distributed over wide regions, this certainly was no easy task. Already the Vinaya tells us that in case neither a bhikkhunovādaka is there nor an able monk, nuns should be told: “There is no monk agreed upon as exhorter of the nuns. Let the Order of nuns strive on with friendliness” (pāsādikena sampādetu)” (BD V 366). As a dispute in the Vajirabuddhiṭkā shows some (perhaps fictitious) opponents were of the opinion that saying even that much made the monk who spoke a bhikkhunovādaka.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vinaya</th>
<th>Andhakatṭhakathā</th>
<th>Samantapāsādikā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sammata bhikkhunovādaka</td>
<td>thapita bhikkhunovādaka</td>
<td>thapita bhikkhunovādaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a nun’s adviser is agreed upon</td>
<td>a nun’s adviser is installed</td>
<td>a nun’s adviser is installed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>method:</td>
<td>method:</td>
<td>method:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iṭṭicatutthakamma</td>
<td>installation by a monks’ community</td>
<td>installation by a monks’ community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>installation by a nuns’ adviser agreed upon</td>
<td>installation by a nuns’ adviser agreed upon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agreeing upon or installing a bhikkhunovādaka

The upasampanna asammata is relevant for another rule too, namely for Pāc 21 M which makes it an offence for monks, if an asammata bhikkhu teaches nuns. The Vajirabuddhiṭkā states that in this context asammata has to be understood as athapita, and that this is also the opinion of the Abhayagirivāsin. Thus these groups applied Pāc 21 M also to the bhikkhunovādakas who were installed, not only to those agreed upon. As the Vajirabuddhiṭkā tells us the Anuṭṭhapada rejects the maxime of the Abhayagirivāsin and accepts only the opinion of the Andhakathakathā which equates

---

59 To be (1) virtuous and to keep to the Pātimokkha, (2) to be very learned (bahuussuta), (3) to know both Pātimokkhas by heart and in detail, (4) to own an agreeable speech and language, (5) to be agreeable to the nuns, (6) to be able to teach nuns, (7) to never have transgressed one of the weighty rules (i.e. Pārañjika, Sgh), (8) to be ordained at least 20 years. These were the qualities originally requested.

60 It, by the way, also is the opinion later followed by Sāriputta in his Sāraṭṭhadipani who nevertheless dropped the reference to the Abhayagirivāsin.
asammata with ṭhapita,⁶¹ arguing that nowadays (etaraḥī), i.e. at the time of the Anugantaripada, an adviser not agreed upon (ovādaka asammata) regularly functions as a bhikkhuṇovādaka. For this tradition Pāc 21 M therefore must have become obsolete with the introduction of the new method to make someone a bhikkhuṇovādaka.⁶²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vajirabuddhistkā, Abhayagiriśin Sāratthadīpānī</th>
<th>Andhakatṭhakathā, Anugantaripada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>asammata = athapīta</td>
<td>asammata = ṭhapita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pācitiya 21 for monks is applied to asammata and athapīta</td>
<td>Pācitiya 21 for monks is obsolete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation of Pācitiya 21

Saṃghādisesa 3 for Nuns

Sgh 3 N makes it an offence for nuns to go to another village alone (ekā gāmantaram gaccheśya), to go to the other side of a river alone (ekā nadipāram gaccheśya), to stay separated for one night alone (ekā rattiṃ vippavaseśya), and to stay behind the group of nuns alone (ekā ganaṃhā ohīyeśya). Most of the references to nuns in our texts are connected with Sgh 3 N: three quotations from the Andhakatṭhakathā, five from the Anugantaripada, and two of the apare are handed down in this context. Relevant for all these rules is the definition of a “village” (gāma) and “the precincts of a village” (gāmūpacāra), since nuns had to live within settlements and, if they left, thereby entering the wilderness, they had to walk with at least a second nun as a compaginion. We therefore will deal with the definitions of gāma and gāmūpacāra, before we discuss the last subrule of Sgh 3 N, i.e. staying behind the group of nuns alone.

Ground in the Vinaya is divided into settlements and non-settlements. The generic term for settlements is “village” (gāma), for non-settlements “wilderness” (araṇṇa) or, more precisely, “wilderness without settlements” (agāmakā araṇṇa). In addition to the extension of a gāma, that of the precincts of a gāma (gāmūpacāra) have to be taken into account. Gāmas are differentiated in enclosed (parikkhitta) and unenclosed (aparikkhitta) gāmas. The boundary of an enclosed gāma is its enclosure (parikkhepa) that of an unenclosed gāma had to be defined. Both types of gāmas, in addition, had precincts (gāmūpacāra) which also had to be determined. According to a definition of the gāmūpacāra of an unenclosed gāma in the Samantapāśādikā in the context of Sgh 3 N “the space appropriate for the enclosure of a village” (parikkhepārahaṭṭhāna, Sp 911,3–4) or, in connection with the rules for the monastic boundary, “a space for the enclosure” (parikkhepokāsa, Sp 1050,17–18) is its boundary. According to this definition the

---

⁶¹ As a further quotation from some Porāṇantaripada, valued by the author of the Vajirabuddhistkā as conforming to the Andhakatṭhakathā, shows the installation by the community is understood as some formal act resulting from the consent of the community (saṅghānumati).

⁶² This, by the way, shows that the Abhayagiriśin too accepted the new method of making bhikkhuṇovādakas, and that they applied Pāc 21 M to all but the sammata and ṭhapīta bhikkhuṇovādakas. Kieffer-Pülz 2010: Vjb [8]; Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 209].
gāmūpacāra of an unenclosed gāma would run at exactly the same spot where in case of an enclosed village the enclosure is situated. Thus gāma and gāmūpacāra would be identical. They, therefore, could be transgressed with one step which is expressed by forms of the verb atikkamati. This in fact is the verb chosen in the context of Sgh 3 N in connection with the word gāmūpacāra.63

Gāma and gāmūpacāra are defined a second time, this time in the Vinaya (III 46,27–30) in the context of Pār 2 M. Here the gāmūpacāra of an enclosed village is defined by one stone throw from the village gate, that of an unenclosed village by one stone throw from the “precincts of a house” (gharūpacāra) (certainly at the border of that village). Neither is the gharūpacāra defined nor is the method to determine the village boundary described there for an unenclosed village. The Mahā-Atṭhakathā quoted by the Samantapāśādikā as authoritative in this respect explains that one stone throw from the gharūpacāra defines the village boundary, another one (this time probably from the village boundary) determines the gāmūpacāra (Sp 299,25–300,7).64 This definition is also valid for Pāc 85 M according to the Samantapāśādikā.65 Thus the gāmūpacāra in that case consists in a circumference of the gāma with a radius of one stone throw. The verb used in contexts where this definition is applied is okkamati, “to enter”, because the extension of the upacāra does not allow to transgress it with one step.

In the context of Sgh 3 N the Vajirabuddhiṭkā quotes several sources with respect to these definitions. An anonymous source critically remarks that the Andhakaṭṭhakathā mentions as gāmūpacāra only the spot appropriate for an enclosure, thus ignoring the differentiation of the Vinaya. An Andhakaṭṭhakathā quotation subsequently presented by the anonymous source66 confirms that the Andhakaṭṭhakathā here applied the gāmūpacāra definition given in the context of Sgh 3 N. In the same context the Anuγaṇṭhipada quotes the apare who report that there exist manuscripts which have okkamati instead of atikkamati in the context of Sgh 3 N, an indication that there the gāmūpacāra definition of Pār 2 M was applied to Sgh 3 N. This opinion is rejected by the apare.67 Finally the Vajirabuddhiṭkā quotes the probably Sinhalese no tacco ti ācariyo. He rejects the statement of the anonymous source that the Andhakaṭṭhakathā ignored

---

63 For the definition of araṇīṇa the Samantapāśādikā in this context resorts to the Vibhaṅga (251) where araṇīṇa is defined as each ground outside of the village gate (araṇīṣan ti nikkhamitvā bahi indakhilā sabbam etam araṇīṃ). This definition of araṇīṇa tallies with the definition equating gāmūpacāra with gāma.

64 The Samantapāśādikā quotes the Kūrundī and the Mahāpaccariṇī with definitions of the precincts of a house (gharūpacāra), and an explanation how to determine the precincts of a village (gāmūpacāra), namely by a stone throw from the gharūpacāra. Like the Vinaya both texts thus omit the determination of the village boundary.

65 Sp 883,16–17: aparikkhittassā gāmassa upacāro adinnādāne vuttanaveva’ eva veditabbo. “The precincts of an unenclosed village are to be known exactly according to the method stated in the [rule] ‘seizing the ungiven’ [Pār 2 M].”

66 According to it a monk who breaks Pāc 85 M commits an offence, if he sets his foot over the gāmūpacāra (atikkamati). Interestingly the Andhakaṭṭhakathā states tam upacāram pathamam pādam atikkamantassa, whereas in all other instances the causative of atikkamati namely atikkāmeti is used in those cases.

67 Vjb 358,20–21: “aparikkhittassā gāmassa upacāram okkamantiyā ti pi ekaccesu dissati, tam na gahetabban’ ti apare” ti vuttam. “[In Vajirabuddhi’s Anuγaṇṭhipada] it is said, that others [state], ‘Even [the reading], ‘If [a nun] enters the precincts of an unenclosed village‘, appears in some [manuscripts], this is not to be accepted.’” See Kieffer-Püls 2013: [Z 255].
the differentiation (between the readings okkamatī and atikkamatī) of the Vinaya with the argument that in some Vinaya manuscripts the reading atikkamatī (instead of okkamatī) is found in Pāc 85 M, and that this is accepted as the reading of the Andhakaṭṭṭhakathā.68 Thus the Andhakaṭṭṭhakathā had the reading atikkamatī in Pāc 85 M69 and Sgh 3 N, and, as we will see below, even in Pār 2 M. It thus applied the definition equating gāmūpacāra with gāma everywhere. Contrary to that, the mainstream Mahāvihāra differentiates between atikkamatī (Sgh 3 N) and okkamatī (Pār 2 M, Pāc 85 M), accepting the definition which equates gāma with gāmūpacāra only for Sgh 3 N.70 The Kankhāviṭarāṇīpuraṇāṭikā in the commentary to Pār 2 M preserves an Andhakaṭṭṭhakathā quotation71 which consists in the definition of a gāmūpacāra, equating it with the gāma and corresponding nearly literally to the definition handed down in the Samantapāsādikā in the section on monastic boundaries (Sp 1050,17–18: gāmaparikkheponkāsā). The Andhakaṭṭṭhakathā, therefore, is a possible source for the Samantapāsādikā’s gāmūpacāra-definition in this context.

The two contradictory definitions of gāmūpacāra preserved in the Samantapāsādikā72 may therefore go back to a South Indian (Andhakaṭṭṭhakathā) and a Sri Lankan (Mahā-Atthakathā) tradition.73 It would be interesting to find out whether the deviating gāmūpacāra definitions are only caused by the incomplete gāma and gāmūpacāra definitions of the Vinaya and the special rules for nuns, or whether an actual difference of village types in South India and Sri Lanka was at the bottom of this divergence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>source</th>
<th>parikkhitta gāma</th>
<th>aparikkhitta gāma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gāma</td>
<td>gāmūpacāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinaya (Pārājika 2 M)</td>
<td>boundary = one stone throw from the village gate</td>
<td>boundary = one stone throw from the precincts of a house (gharūpacāra)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68 Interestingly the confusion of the readings okkamatī and atikkamatī in the various rules in the Vinaya left traces even in manuscripts of the 19th century and even in the first Kkh edition of the PTS by D. Maskell.
69 The author of the Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā with respect to Pāc 85 M suggests to apply the definition which equates gāmūpacāra with gāma, and thus proposes to follow the Andhakaṭṭṭhakathā tradition, see Kieffer-Püll 2013: [Z 37].
70 Kieffer-Püll 2010: Vjb [9].
71 Here the Kankhāviṭarāṇīpuraṇāṭikā has a very interesting section, in which it deals with the various definitions of gāma and gāmūpacāra in the Vinaya (Kkh-pṭ 29,24–40,29)
72 They certainly were motivated by the incomplete definitions in the Word Analysis to Pār 2 M.
73 The position of the Kurundi and the Mahāpaccari according to the statement of the Kankhāviṭarāṇīpuraṇāṭikā, accorded to that of the Andhakaṭṭṭhakathā. No such quotations are handed down. It cannot be excluded that the author of the Kkh-pṭ bases this opinion on the quotations from Kurundi and Mahāpaccari handed down in the Samantapāsādikā in this context. To analyze the coincidence of these two Sri Lankan commentaries with the South Indian Andhakaṭṭṭhakathā will eventually be possible, if one examines the quotations from these early commentaries and their mutual relation. We, however, do not know whether they had one definition for all rules or whether they differentiated. Kkh-pṭ 33,3–5: tasmā “gāmūpacāro ti parikkhiṭṭassā gāmassa parikkhepo, aparikkhiṭṭassā gāmassa parikkhepako” ti (= Sp 1050,17–18) Andhakaṭṭṭhakathāyaṃ vuttaṃ ti veditabbāṃ. taṃhā Kurundiyāṃ, Mahāpaccariyāṃ ca. See Kieffer-Püll 2010: Kkh-pṭ [4].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samantapāsādikā:</th>
<th>boundary = one stone throw from the precincts of a house (gharāpacāra)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kurudi (Pārājika 2 M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantapāsādikā:</td>
<td>boundary = one stone throw from the precincts of a house (gharāpacāra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāpaccatti (Pārājika 2 M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantapāsādikā:</td>
<td>boundary = another stone throw from there (i.e. from the village)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahā-Āṭṭhakathā (Pārājika 2 M, Pācittiya 85 M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andhakaṭṭhakathā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pārājika 2 M, Pācittiya 85 M, Saṅghādisesa 3 N)</td>
<td>boundary = space for an enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantapāsādikā:</td>
<td>boundary = space for an enclosure (parikkhepokāsa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sīma rules)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantapāsādikā:</td>
<td>boundary = space appropriate for an enclosure (parikkhepārahaṭṭhāna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Saṅghādisesa 3 N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions of gāma and gāmūpacāra

The offence of staying behind a group

One apare-quotitation in the Anugāṇṭhipada refers to the offence of staying behind a group alone. As already mentioned, nuns had to live within settlements. For monks it was recommended to live neither too close nor too far away from a village, and this was taken into consideration when places for monasteries were selected. Thus monks’ monasteries should be situated outside of villages which in fact is what Geiger tells us with respect to Sri Lanka, and what can be learned from an information of the Mahā-Āṭṭhakathā handed down in the Samantapāsādikā. There we are told that a nun who remains outside the court of the Mahābodhi tree etc. when the group of nuns enters it, commits the offence of staying behind a group.

Vin I 399: gāmato n’ eva avidūre na accāsanne.

Sp 912.29–913.7: agāmake araṇṇe ti (Vin IV 230.18) ettha nikkhamivā bahi indakhilā sabbam etam araṇṇan ti (Vibh 251.17–18) evam vuttalakkhān eva araṇṇaṁ. tāṁ pan’ etam kevalam gāmabhāvena ‘agāmako’ ti vuttaṁ, na Viññāṇavisadisātaya. tāḍise araṇṇe okkante dassanūpacārī vijahite sace pi savanūpacāro atti, āpatti. ten’ eva vuttaṁ Āṭṭhakathāyaṁ: sace bhikkhunissu Mahābodhi-aṅgaṇaṁ pavisantsu ekā bahi tiṭṭhāti, tassāpi āpatti; Lohapāsādaṁ pavisantsu pi parivenṇaṁ pavisantsu pi es’ eva nayo. Mahācetiyaṁ vandamāṇāsa ekā uttaradvēreṇa nikkhambivā gacchati, tassāpi āpatti. Thāpārāmaṁ pavisantsu ekā bahi tiṭṭhāti, tassāpi āpatti ti. “In the wilderness without settlements: Here wilderness is only that which has the characteristic described in the [following] way: having left [the village], outside of the door post [of the village door] all that is wilderness (definition of the Ābhidhammikas). This, however, is described as ‘without settlements’, because of the absence of settlements, not because of its similarity with the Viññāṇa-wood. If [a nun] has entered such a wilderness and has left the sighting distance [of a second nun], an offence [arises for her] even if hearing distance still is given. Only therefore [it is said] in the [Mahā-]Āṭṭhakathā: If nuns enter the court of the Mahābodhi [tree, and] one remains...
of staying behind the group alone. This offence can only be committed in the wilderness (Vin IV 230,18–29), i.e. outside the village gate of the village from which the nun sets off. The Mahāvihāra of Anurādhapura is—as is well-known—a monks’ monastery and in fact lay outside the town of Anurādhapura.76 Therefore it is wilderness for nuns according to the definition.77 This probably is the reason why monks’ monasteries are defined as being “unallowable ground” (akappiyaabhūmi) for nuns, as we learn implicitly from the Andhakaṭṭhakathā (see above), and explicitly from the Vinayavinicchaya written by the South Indian Buddhaddatta (5th/6th century),78 and from the apane quoted in the Anuagaṇṭhipada. The latter refer to the Khandhadhammavihāra in Kāṇcī and the Sārīdhammavihāra in Kāvīrapāṭhana as such unallowable places.79 Thus South India and Sri Lanka accord with respect to the inadmissibility of monks’ monasteries for nuns which probably resulted from their being situated outside of villages. It should, however, not be concealed that there exist traces of monasteries localised within a city,80 namely the antarārāma, “a monastery [lying] within [a settlement]”81. If these were monks’ monasteries we would have to assume that at some time and in some region monks’ monasteries were built within small settlements too. In that case, however, the space of the monks’ monastery, if it had an own determined monastic boundary, was excluded from the village, and thus the space within the monks’ monastery too would have been akappiya for nuns.

An aggravation of the subrule not to stay behind a group alone is to be observed in the

outside, for her too an offence [arises]. The same is valid in case [nuns] enter the Lohapāśāda or a Parivena. If [nuns] venerate the Mahācetiya [and] one [nun] goes away leaving through the northern door, for her too an offence [arises]. If [nuns] enter the Thūpārāma, [and] one remains outside, for her too an offence arises.”

Cf. Geiger 1986: pp. 58–59. See also the remark in Dhammasiri’s Gānṭhipada (Vjb 360,14–15), according to which the example given in the Mahā-Aṭṭhakathā shows that the offence to stay behind a group alone is also committed in close distance to towns which refers to the localization of the Mahāvihāra close to the town of Anurādhapura.

In a different context also the no takko ti ācariyo tells us that only a nunnery is an allowable ground (kappiyabhūmi). Vjb 346,11–15: bhikkhuniyo ce vissappagā honti, bhikkhunupassayo va kappiyabhūmi. yattha bhikkhuniyo ekaratam pi vasantī, ayam bhikkhunupassayo ti (≠ Vin IV 576–7) vacanato tāsam samipam vā tāhi gahitvāsāgāram vā “gacchāmi” ti gacchato yahāsukham gantum vattati. na hi tātāta taṃ gharan antarāgarhasanakkhyam gacchatti no takko ti ācariyo. “If nuns entered a habitation, only the nunnery is an allowable space. On account of the statement that wherever a bhikkhuni spends even one night, that is a nunnery, [a monk] who goes [with the words]: ‘I go into their vicinity or to the house accepted by them for living’, is allowed to go according to his liking. For, on that account a house is not counted as >between the houses<, [this] is our reasoning’, [says] the Ācariya.”

Vin-vn, Vs. 2040: bhikkhuninām vihārassa bhūmi tāsam tu kappiyā. hoti bhikkhuvihārassa bhūmi tāsam akappiyā. “The floor of a nuns’ monastery for them, however, is allowable. The floor of a monks’ monastery is unallowable for them.”

Vjb 3597–14, Kieffer-Pühl 2013: [Z 256].

From the anāpattī formula to Pāc 46 M (Vin IV 101,5–7) which is a rule also valid for nuns (Pāc 127 N) we learn that four places are kappiyabhūmi for monks, and thus also should be for nuns, namely the antarārāma (E’ wrongly antarāgama), i.e. a monastery within [a settlement], a bhikkhunupassaya, a tiṭṭhīvaseyya, “space for adherents of others”, and a paṭikkamana (i.e. corresponds to āsanasālā in other rules), i.e. a hall for gathering and functioning as a refectory.

That antarārāma is to be understood as an “ārāma within [a settlement]”, not as “into the park” (CPD s.v.) in this connection is shown by the explanation given in the Samantapāsādikā (857,18–19: antarārāman ti anto gāme vihāro hoti taṃ gacchati), and confirmed by at least two Tikās (Vin-vn-ṭ, Kkh-ṭ).
Anugāṇṭhipada which applies that rule not only to the “wilderness”, but even to the gāma. According to the Anugāṇṭhipada’s opinion a nun commits this offence within a village, if she stays there while the other nuns leave. She becomes guilty the very moment the group of nuns transgresses the boundary of the village given that she is out of sighting or hearing distance. The contradictions to the statements in the Vinaya caused by this interpretation are solved by the Anugāṇṭhipada in stating that the Vinaya speaks of agāmaka araṇīna in order to indicate that the offence of staying behind a group is committed in the very moment, in which one leaves the village, and since the decision to leave the village is reached within the village, agāmaka araṇīna refers to the moment the decision is made. Since none of the other commentaries discusses this case, we, unfortunately, do not know how widespread this interpretation was. If the rule were applied in that way, it would be a further restriction of the free moving space for nuns, because no single nun could stay in her village alone when the others left.

Conclusion

The references to nuns in our “South Indian Sources” are limited. This partly is due to the general state of transmission partly due to the fact that passages commenting on bhikkhunīs are only few. They document, however, that nuns’ communities of some Theravāda tradition existed in South India—our “South Indian Sources” did neither belong to the Abhayagiri-vāsins nor to the Mahāsāṃghikas—in the time before and after the Samantapāsādikā, because our sources deal with nuns’ rules and in part slightly deviate from mainstream Mahāvihāras. It is to be supposed that the relations between the South Indian Theravādins and those from Sri Lanka can be defined more clearly if the comparison is made on a grander scale, and if similar texts with a clear regional localization in South India or Sri Lanka are compared as for example the Vinayavinicchaya and the Khuddasikkhā.

ABBREVIATIONS:
M = Monks
N = Nuns
Niss = Nissaggiya offence

---

82 If two nuns remain within the village, each of them commits this offence only, if she is outside of sighting and hearing distance of the other nun (Vjb 360,1–15; Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 259]). The Anugāṇṭhipada furthermore states that this offence is not restricted to the space of time when a nun walks on a road in the wilderness.

83 The Anugāṇṭhipada draws on a passage dealing with the suspension of the rules subsumed under Sgh 3 N for a nun who awoke as a nun after sex change.

84 The author of the Vajirabuddhiṭikā rejects the justification of the Anugāṇṭhipada, but does not take a further opinion on the statement.

85 In the same context the Anugāṇṭhipada teaches in addition that the offence of staying behind the group alone is committed only once, whereas offences against the other three subrules are committed with each other village, each crossing of the river, etc. This is stated in a similar way in the Kkh-pṭ (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 259]).
Pâc = Pâcittiya offence
Pâr = Pârâjika offence
Sgh = Sânghâdisesa offence
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Manuscript Fragments of the *Prātimokṣasūtra*

of the Mahāsāṃghika(-Lokottaravādin) (2)'

Seishi KARASHIMA

In 2008, I published an article, dealing with 25 folios of a Sanskrit manuscript of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the Mahāsāṃghika(-Lokottaravādin), allegedly from Bamiyan, whose photographs had been entrusted to me by Isao Kurita (栗田功), a famous art collector and author of an internationally-renowned work, *Gandhāran Art I & II*. Soon after its publication, Mr. Kurita kindly sent me photographs of other folios of the same manuscript after he himself had carefully peeled off by hand the folios, which were stuck together. Nearly five years have passed since then and I am finally able to publish the results of my investigation into the remaining folios of this very important text.

In the previous article, I referred only to the readings in the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins, edited by Tatia, for comparison. In this article, I have referred constantly to the readings in the *Prātimokṣasūtras* of other schools as well. Throughout this investigation, I have found that it is important to compare, word-for-word, various versions of the *Prātimokṣasūtra*, belonging to different schools, in order to clarify how this text, which dates back to the earliest times of Buddhist history and was and is still recited on every new and full moon days by Theravādin monks, changed during its oral transmission, resulting in various greatly differing versions. I assume that such variations were brought about mainly through the diverse interpretations of archaic and obsolete Middle Indic forms.

---

* The previous article was published under the title, “Fragments of a Manuscript of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the Mahāsāṃghika-(Lokottara)vādins (1)”, in: ARIRIAB XI (2008): 71–90 + 25 plates. Following Dr. Vincent Tournier's suggestion, I have changed the title slightly. I am greatly indebted to Yōhei Furukawa, Jirō Hirabayashi, Jundō Nagashima, Ryūken Nawa, Masanori Shōno, Tatsushi Tamai, Vincent Tournier, Klaus Wille and Zhang Xueshan for their looking through the manuscript and making numerous valuable suggestions and corrections. I should also like to thank Dr. Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber, who kindly allowed me to quote her unpublished edition of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the Mulasarvāstivādins.
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(57)? : Plate 14

recto

missing

verso

1 /// ++ + + .. .. + + +
2 /// ++$[i]ka : 30 /// + +
3 /// .. .. [sairgik]āh pā + +
4 /// [yusman]tānām [prchā]mi 'kaś cātra pa
5 /// + 1 .. .. .. [nām] paripṛchāmī


ime kho punar āyusmanto dvāvavati sūryendrāḥ / dharmā na vaddhamānaṃ sūrey prātimokṣa uddesam āgacchati — (Pāc 1) sāṃprajānāmsvāde pācattikam / (Pāc 2) orṃṣyavāde pācattikam / (Pāc 3) bhikṣupaśiṣyam ye pācattikam /

(59) : Plate 15

recto

1 /// ++ + + [+ r bhikṣur jān. + + +
2 /// ++ + + + + .. i «[t]āni [bh]. ///» ti vyupaś. + +
3 /// ++ + + .. [d]i daṃ punah karma .. +
4 /// [t]ād eva pratyayam kṛtvā ananyam i7 +
5 /// .. ūṇāye[ti] p(ā)yattika • 4 || yah pu.

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 19.11–14. (Pāc 4) yo puna bhikṣur jānan samghasyādhikaranāṇī dharmena vinayena vihitāṃ vyupasāṃtāṃ punah karmāya utkhoṭey — idam punah karma kartavyam bhavisyatiti — etad eva pratyayam kṛtvā ananyam imam tasya bhikṣusya utkhoṭeyam pācattikam / (Pāc 5) yo pu.

1 [yusman]tānām ... paripṛchāmī : Cf. 93v5–94r2. āyusmāntānām prechāmi kaś cātra pariśuddhāḥ ... āyusmāntānām prechāmi (= 97v2–3, 104r1–3, 105r5–v2). Cf. also note 362.
2 kaś cātra : A hyper-Sanskritism of *kaccātra < *kacca atra < kaccid atra; cf. Ma-L, Pātim kacci (')ttha; Sa, Mū(HvH) kacca sāhātra. Cf. also notes 363, 369, 449, 454, 528.
3 .. .. .. [nām] : Probably (āyusmāntānām) : Cf. Ma-L āyusmanto; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.
4 PrMoSū(Ma-L) 18.21–24. || uddōnām || (21) pātra (22) bandhanām (23) bhaisgyām (24) āchēdō (25) varṣāśātikāh / (26-27) tantuvaṃya dve (28) daśāhānagatam (29) upavāraṃ (30) pariṇāmanena || triyam vṛ̣ghāḥ ||
5 .. i etāni [bh]. ///» ti : Cf. Ma-L. (Pāc 4) vihitāṃ; Pātim (Pāc 63), Sa (Pāt 4), Mū(HvH) (Pāt 4) -.
6 .. [d]i : (ukhoṭey)ed? ; Cf. Ma-L utkhoṭey; Pātim (Pāc 63), Sa (Pāt 4), Mū(HvH) (Pāt 4) -.
7 i : This aksara is visible in the photograph of the verso, as the right edge of this line is folded underneath itself.
8 .. ūṇāye[ti] : S.ē? Cf. Ma-L utkhoṭanam; Pātim ukhoṭeyya; Sa ukhoṭey; Mū(HvH) khoṭayet.
9 yah pu : The visarga and the aksara pu are visible in the photograph of the verso, because the right edge of this line is folded underneath itself.
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verse
2 ḫ paṅcābir vācābh(r) dha(r)(ma)m dēsāye anyatra vijña .. //
3 + + + + + + + + + [y][a][h] punar bhikṣuḥ a .. //
4 + + + + + + + + + + + + + + (r)[m]ā[m] vācēyā [pā] + //
5 + + + + + + + + + + + + [s]ā[m]ā[p]a[n]ā[n] + //
Cf. PrMoSu(Ma-L) 19.14–17. na bhikṣar akalpiyakāro mātrgrāmasya dharmam deśeva uttari cchahi paṅcāhi vācāhi anyatra vijñāpurusapudgalena pācattikām l (Pāc 6) yo puna bhikṣar anupasampannam pudgalaṃ padaśo dharmam vācēyā pācattikām l (Pāc 7) yo puna bhikṣur anupasampannasya
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recto
1 + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
2 + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
3 + + + + O + + [bh]ūt(a)bhāṣānā[y][12] .. +
4 tīkā (+) 7 || yaḥ punar bhikṣur jānāṃ bhikṣuḥ(y).
Cf. PrMoSu(Ma-L) 19.17–20. pudgalasya santike ātmopanāyikam uttaranauṣadzharmam alamāryaṅñadarsanam viśeṣādhitigamam pratiṣṭhāyena — iti jānām iti paśyāmīti bhūtasmin pācattikām l (Pāc 8) yo puna bhikṣur jānāṃ bhikṣusya dusṭhulāṃ āpattim anupasampanna-
verse
2 kāśanā[ṃ]sa<ṃ>muttīye[18] pāyattikā • 8 || yo
3 (pu)nār bhikṣu(k)sur[j]āṃ[19] sāmghikam lābham [bh][a][j] ..
4 + + + + .. [m]anujñā bhūtvā pa + + + + +
5 + + + + .. [s]ā[m]ā[s] (tu)tam e .. + + + + +
Cf. PrMoSu(Ma-L) 19.20–23. sya pudgalasya santike āroceva anyatra kṛtye prakāśana-sammultiye pācattikām l (Pāc 9) yo puna bhikṣur jānāṃ sāmghike lābe bhājīyaṃāne pūrve samanujñē bhūtvā paścāt kṣiyādharman āpadyeṣa — yathāsaṃstutam evaṃvyaṃmanto,

[10] akalpiyakāro: S.e. for kārako?; cf. Ma-L (Pāc 5) akalpiyakāro = MaVin 336a16. (比丘)無活人(為女人); Ma.Ch 552a24 - (比丘為女人); Pātīm (Pāc 7), Sa (Pāt 5), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 5) -.
[11] (dha)(r)(ma)m dēsāye anyatra : ≠ Ma-L. dharmam deśeva uttari cchahi paṅcāhi vācāhi anyatra, ≠ Pātīm dharmam desēvya aññatra; Sa, Mū(HvH) dharmam desēyā aññatra.
[12] bhūt(a)bhāṣānā[y]: = MaVin 337a19f. 説其物(乎)語(者)≠ Ma-L (Pāc 7) bhūtasmin, Pātīm (Pāc 8) bhūtasmin; Sa (Pāt 7) bhātāṃ, Mū(HvH) (Pāy 8) bhātāt.
[13] dausṭhulya: Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 8) dusṭhulāṃ; Pātīm (Pāc 9) dusṭhulāṃ; Sa (Pāt 8) dusṭhulāṃ; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 7) dusṭhulāṃ. For these variant forms, cf. BHSD, s.vv. dausṭhula, dausṭhulya; Wogihara 1928: 29f.
[14] āpānā: No parallels in the other versions.
[16] āroceyā: Ma-L āroceya; Pātīm āroceya; Sa, Mū(HvH) āroceved.
[17] kṛtya: Ma-L kṛtye; Pātīm, Sa, Mū(HvH) -
[18] prakāśana[m]s(a)mutīye: Ma-L prakāśanāsammultiye; Pātīm bhikṣhhasammutīyā (v.l. sammatiyā); Sa, sāmghhasammutā; Mū(HvH) sāmghhasammutī. For the variation sammuti / sammati / sampritī, see Abhis 198.
[19] sāmghikam lābham: Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 9) ıkē bhē; Pātīm (Pāc 81), Sa (Pāt 9), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 9) -
jānāṁ
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recto

1 + + + + + + + .. ta[m] pudgal. + + + + + +
2 + + + + + .. [ṭīkā • 9 ]] yāh puna + + + + + +
3 se ā, 21-prātim[oka[si]e] ō sutre uddhiṣyamā[ne] + + + +
4 kiṁ punar 22-imēbhīḥ āyuṣmānto «bahuḥ-bhīḥ» 23, 24-kśudrānuṃśudrebhi[j]h
5 śīkṣāpadebhi uddhiṣtebhīr yāvad eva bhikṣūnāṁ kaukṛ-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 19.23–27. sāṃghikaṁ lābhaṁ samṛge pariṇatam pugalavo pudgalasya pariṇāmayaiti pācattikam L (Pāc 10) yo pūna bhikṣur anvardhamāsam sūtre prātimokṣa uddhiṣyamāne evam vadeya — kiṁ punar āyuṣmānto imehi kṣudrānuṃśudrehi śīkṣāpadehi uddhiṣṭeṣi vāvad eva bhikṣūnāṁ (+ = uṇāṁ [mispl]) kaukṛ-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 19.23–27. sāṃghikaṁ lābhaṁ samṛge pariṇatam pugalavo pudgalasya pariṇāmayaiti pācattikam L (Pāc 10) yo pūna bhikṣur anvardhamāsam sūtre prātimokṣa uddhiṣyamāne evam vadeya — kiṁ punar āyuṣmānto imehi kṣudrānuṃśudrehi śīkṣāpadehi uddhiṣṭeṣi vāvad eva bhikṣūnāṁ (+ = uṇāṁ [mispl]) kaukṛ-

verse

1 tyāya vighaṭāya vilekhaṁ 25-sāṃvarta<m>pte (’)ti 26-imāṁ ta-
2 sya bhikṣusya śīkṣāvīgarhaṇatāyai[h] 27 pāvyattikā : 10 (|) |
3 bijagṛāmabhūĪtagṛāmapātāpa + + + + + +
4 + + + + .. kā : 11 | 28aṭāvāda[v]jī + + + + + + + + + +
5 + + + + + + + + + 29-jhayaṇa «[ī] // // / e + + + + + + + + +

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 19.27–20.7. tyāya vighaṭāya vilekhaṁ sāṃvartantiī, śīkṣāvīgarhaṇe

20 + + + se : Presumably (anvardhamā)s; cf. Ma-L (Pāc 10) 9māsāṁ; Pātim (Pāc 72) -; Sa (Pāt 10) - (v.l. anvardhamā[)]; M(h)hV (Pāy 10) anvardhamāsām.
21 prātim[oka[si]e] sūtre : Cf. Ma-L sūtre prātimokṣa; MaVin 338c17 = Ma.Ch 552b3. βόλον χωνοιμόν; Pātim pātimokkhe; Sa prātimokṣaṣātriḍ(ā)diṣyamāne); M(h)V prātimokṣaṣātriḍ(ā)dhāte.
22 imēbhīḥ āyuṣmānto : Cf. Ma-L āyuṣmānto imehi; Pātim imehi; Sa ebhiḥ; M(h)V āyuṣmānta ebhiḥ (v.l. ebhiḥ āyuṣa); M ebhiḥ āyuṣmaniḥ.
23 «bahuḥ-bhīḥ : No parallels in the other versions.
24 kṣudrānuṃśudrebhi[j]h śīkṣāpadebhīr uddhiṣṭeḥbhir : Cf. Ma-L 9e[hi 9e[hi 9e[hi; Pātim khuddāmnkhuddadehi śīkṣāpadehi uddhiṣṭeḥ; Sa kṣudrānuṃśudrebhi śīkṣāpadehi uddhiṣṭaṁ śūtra = M(h)V.
25 sāṃvarta<ṃ>pte (’)ti : Cf. Ma-L sāṃvartantiī; Pātim sāṃvartantiī; Sa sāṃvartantiī (v.l. sāṃvartante ... (ii)); M(h)V sāṃvartante ... iti.
26 imāṁ tasya bhikṣusya : No parallels in the other versions. Apparently, imāṁ tasya was "corrected" to imānti sya by a later scribe, which does not make much sense.
27 śīkṣāvīgarhaṇatāyai[h] : Probably a hyper-form of 9tāye (Inst. fem.); cf. BHSG § 9.34; cf. Ma-L śīkṣā-vīgarhaṇe; Pātim sikkhaṇḍavivaṇṇake (v.l. 9manake); Sa śīkṣāvivaṇṇanā; M(h)V śīkṣāvivaṇṇanāt (M śīkṣā-vīgarhaṇanā[;][e]; cf. also Mvy 8429. viśeṣaṇaṁ.
28 aṭāvāda[v]jī + + + : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 12) anyavādāvihīmanasake = MaVin 340b27 = Ma.Ch 552b. τάρταρος πηγῆς; Pātim (Pāc 12) aṇiḥvādadehi vihāsake; Sa (Pāt 13) anyavādāvihīmanat; M(h)V (Pāy 13) aṇiḥvādāvihīmanat = Mvy 8433; cf. also BhīVina(Ma-L) § 183, 6A4.4. anyavādam. Probably, aṭāhā and aṭāhā are hyper-Sanskrits, based on Ml. aṭāhā < anya; cf. BHSD, s.v. anyavāda-
29 .. jhayaṇa «[ī] // // / e : Presumably (o)jīhayaṇa(kṣ)jīhayaṇake. As the margin at the bottom of the folio, upon which the inserted aṣkaras must have been written, fell off through time, we have no means of knowing, with certainty, how many were supplemented there. Probably (o)jīhayaṇa- is a scribal error for (o)jīhayaṇa-; cf. Ma-L (Pāc 13) oḍhiyāyanakṣjīhayaṇake; Pātim (Pāc 13) oḍhiyāpanake kṣiyanake; Sa (Pāt 12) avadhīyāma-kṣiyanāt = M; M(h)V (Pāy 12) kṣe[pi]kanār; cf. also BhīVina(Ma-L) § 183, 6A4.4. oḍhiyāpana. The verbal form o-jīhaya- (Pā. oḍhiyāvati, BHS. avadhīyāvati) occurs several times in the Abhis., cf. Abhis I 2, n. 3, III 171, s.v.
pācattikam / ...\(^{30}\) (Pāc 11) bījagrāmabhūtāgraṁapatāpanake pācattikam / (Pāc 12) anyavādaviḥimsanake pācattikam / (Pāc 13) odhyāyanaksīyanake pāca-

(62) : Plate 18
recto
1 + + + + + + .. bhikṣur jāna[m]\(^{31}\) s[ām] + + + + + +
2 + + + + s. maṃcāṃ & pīthaṃ & bhimb. [dh].\(^{32}\) + + + + + +
3 & kurcāṃ & bīj[m]Obopadhānaṃ\(^{33}\) & pra[j]ī. + + + + +
4 & pṛajñāpāyitvā & & tato p<\rangle>akkrameyā\(^{34}\) \(^{35}\) noddhare noddha-
5 rāpaye & anāmaṃṭritanā\(^{36}\) & prakrameyā\(^{37}\) pāya-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 20.7–11. titkam / (Pāc 14) yo puna bhikṣuh sāṃghike bhikṣuvihāre abhyavakāše maṃcāṃ vā pīthāṃ vā viśīkāṃ & caturāraṇaṃ & kurcāṃ & bhimbohanam vā pṛajñāpētvā vā pṛajñāpāyitvā vā tato prakramanto na uddhāreya vā na uddhāreya vā. anāmaṃṭrāvyātvā vā prakrameya pāca-

verso
1 titkā : 14 || yo punar bhikṣuh sāṃghike bhikṣuvihāre aṃ-
2 toṣāyyām \(^{38}\) pṛajñāpāyitvā & pṛajñāpāyitvā & tato
3 prakramen\(^{39}\) [n]ōj[dh]āreC[ō]n\(^{40}\) noddhar[ā]
4 + + + nāmaṃṭritanā\(^{41}\) & prakrame .. + + + + + +
5 + + + + + + .. r (bh)i(k)ṣ[uḥ] bhikṣusya .. + + + + + +

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 20.11–15. titkam / (Pāc 15) yo punar bhikṣuh sāṅgike bhikṣuvihāre antoṣāyāṃ pṛajñāpētvā vā pṛajñāpāyitvā vā tato prakramanto na uddhāreya vā na uddhāreya vā anāmaṃṭrāvyātvā vā prakrameya pācattikam / (Pāc 16) yo punar bhikṣu bhikṣusya duṣṭo doṣāt kupto anāttama-

\(^{30}\) PrMoSū(Ma-L) 20.1–4. ll uddānam l / (1) mṛṣā (2) omṛṣya (3) paśuṃnya (4) utkhoṣanaṃ (5) dharmadeśanā l (6) padāsā (7) viśeṣanā (8) dūcariṇā (9) yathāsāṃstuta (10) vīgarhaṇena ca ll prathamo vargaḥ ll.
\(^{31}\) jāna[m] : This word, lacking in the other versions, is superfluous.
\(^{32}\) bimb. [dh] : Probably bimb(o)dh(ā)nam. As the word bimbopadhānaṃ is found in the next line, bīṣm, or its like is expected here. Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 14) viṣīkām; Pātim (Pāc 14) bhīsama; Sa(Pāt 14) brīṣama; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 14) vṛṣikām; Mū vṛṣīko (s.e.?). For bīṣī (< Skt. bṛṣī; cf. Pā. bhiṣī, Pkt. bīṣī, bhiṣī “bolster, cushion”), cf. Abhis I 120, § 14.14, n. 3; III 404.
\(^{33}\) bījopadhānaṃ : Cf. Ma-L bimbohanam; Pātim, Sa -: Mū(HvH) bimbopadhiṇa-. Cf. BHSD, s.v. bimbopadhāna (“pillow, cushion”); Abhis I 132, § 17.10, n. 4; III 403, s.vv. bimbhāna-, bimbhohakā.
\(^{34}\) p<\rangle>akrmeyā : Cf. Ma-L prakramanto; Pātim pakramanto; Sa, Mū(HvH) -. Cf. also 62v3. prakramen.
\(^{35}\) noddhare noddharāpaye & : Cf. Ma-L. na uddhāreya vā, na uddhāreya vā; Pātim n’eva uddhāreya na uddhāreya vā; Sa, Mū(HvH) anuddhṛtyaṃuddhārya vā (s.v. anuddhṛtyā). anāmaṃṭritanā : Cf. Ma-L anāmaṃṭrāvyātvā; Pātim anāpuccham; Sa -: Mū(HvH) saṃtāṃ bhikṣum anavaloṣya.
\(^{36}\) prakrameyā : Cf. Ma-L “eya; Pātim gaccheyya; Sa, prakramen; Mū(HvH) viprakramet.
\(^{37}\) pṛajñāpāyitvā vā pṛajñāpāyitvā : S.e.? Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 15) pṛajñāpētvā vā pṛajñāpāyitvā (Ms. “pāyetvā; Pātim (Pāc 15) santhārītvā vā saunthārā报业vā; Sa (Pāt 15) saṃṣṭrya vā saṃsṭrayed; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 15) saṃṣṭrya saṃṣṭraya vā; Sa saṃṣṭraya vā saṃṣṭraya. Cf. also 70r3. viṇḥapītavā vā pṛajñāpāyitvā vā.
\(^{38}\) prakramen : = Sa; cf. Ma-L prakramanto; Pātim pakramanto; Mū(HvH) -. Cf. also 62r4. p<\rangle>akrmeyā.
\(^{39}\) [n]ōj[dh]āren : Cf. Ma-L na uddhāreya vā; Pātim n’eva uddhāreya; Sa, Mū(HvH) anuddhṛtya.
\(^{40}\) nāmaṃṭritanā : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 16) anāmaṃṭrāvyātvā; Pātim anāpuccham; Sa -: Mū(HvH) saṃtāṃ bhikṣum anavaloṣya.
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recto

1 + + + + + (k)ṣu[v](i)[h]āre\textsuperscript{42} nikaḍ[ḍh]e + + + + + + +
2 + + + + + [n]. hi bhiṣuṣ titi\textsuperscript{43} va vad[e]yā\textsuperscript{44} + + + + +
3 y[o] punar bhi[k]ṣuḥ ○ sāṃghike bhikṣuṇi[h]. + + + + +
4 Praṇaḍaptāya śavyāya pascād āgatv[ā] madhy. +
5 yyāmm Praṇānapaye + + + + syodvādho bhavisyā..


verso

1 so (’)nyena\textsuperscript{48} prakramasyati\textsuperscript{49} • etad eva pratyayaṃ .. + +
2 nāmyām\textsuperscript{50} imām taṣṭ[a]ya bhikṣusya udvādātye\textsuperscript{51} layā. + +
3 17 || yaḥ [p](u)Ornām bhikṣuḥ sām[gh]. + + + + +
4 + + + 5[v]hīlayasā sapādikāye + + + + + +
5 + + + .[e] .[m].\textsuperscript{54} vā pīṭhe vā abhi .. + + + + +

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 20.19-23. so prakramasyaiti / etad eva pratyayaṃ krtvā, anyanyam imām tasya bhikṣusya udvāhana pācattikām / (Pāc 18) yo puna bhikṣuḥ sāṃghike bhikṣuṇīhāre uparivāhyāvasakātye aḥataya pādake maṇice vā pīṭhe vā abhinisīdeya vā abhinipadyeva

---

\textsuperscript{42} (bhiṣuṣ [v,i][h]āre : Cf. Ma-L. bhiṣuṇīhārād bhikṣum; Pātīm (Pāc 17) bhikṣum ... vihārā; Sa (Pāt 16), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 16) vihārād bhikṣum; MaVīn 343b8 (Pāy 16) vihārād bhikṣum; MaCh 552b13 (Pāy 16) vihārād bhikṣum.)

\textsuperscript{43} ti : Cf. Ma-L. ti. For the form iti, see Abhis I 278, s.v.

\textsuperscript{44} vadē[ya] : Cf. Ma-L. vadēya; Pātīm, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

\textsuperscript{45} prajhātāpya śavyāya : Ma-L. (Pāc 17) prajhātāpya śavyāhi; Pātīm (Pāc 16) pābhoaṃgatam (bhikkhum); Sa (Pāt 17) pābhogatam (bhikṣum); Mū(HvH) (Pāy 17) pūravogatānām (bhikṣuṇān).

\textsuperscript{46} prajhānapaye + : Probably ṣpayēya; cf. Ma-L. prajhāpeya; Pātīm kappeya; Sa, Mū(HvH) kalpayed.

\textsuperscript{47} + syodvādho bhavisyā .. : Probably, (vyāsyodvādho bhavisyatī). Udvādho is s.e. for *udbhāduh < Skt ud + ṛvbhāḥ); cf. Pāy udbhāhati (“harassed, troubles, vexes, pains” [DP, s.v.]), udbhāha (“harassed” etc.). Cf. Ma-L udvāhastī; Pātīm yassa sambhādo bhavissati; Sa yasya sambhādo bhavissati; Mū(HvH) yasasya sambhādo bhavissati.

\textsuperscript{48} (’)nyena : Cf. Ma-L, Pātīm, Sa, Mū(HvH), MaVīn 344b13 (Pāy 17), MaCh 552b16 (Pāy 17) -.

\textsuperscript{49} prakramasyati : Probably s.e. for śavyāti = Ma-L, Sa; Pātīm pakkamissati; Mū(HvH) viprakramisyatī.

\textsuperscript{50} + nāmyām : S.e. for (ajnāmyām? = Ma-L; cf. Pātīm anaṇṇam; Sa nānyathā; Mū(HvH) -.

\textsuperscript{51} udvādātye : A hyper-form of *udbhādatāh- (< Skt ud + ṛvbhāḥ; see note 47)?; cf. Ma-L udvāhana; Pātīm, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

\textsuperscript{52} pāy + + : Probably pāy(atikā).}
recto

1 + .. ++ t. kā55 • 18 || yah + + + + +
2 saprī[na] .. [n]odakena trṣam vā mṛ[ti] + + +
3 [v]ā56[simce]d vā [s]. o cāpayed vā pāy[a] .. + +
4 mahallake57 bhījksunā vihāraṃ cchādā«pa»yamāṇ. +
5 yāva58 dvārakośārāgadāṃ pratiṣthāpayamāṇena

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 20.23–27. vā pācattikam / (Pāc 19) ya puna bhikṣur jānan
sapr(ā)m/ānakonēdanaṃ trṣam vā mṛtiṃkām vā sīheya vā sīhcāpeya vā pācattikam / (Pāc 20)
mahallakam bhikṣunā vihāram cchādāpayamāṇena yāvad dvārakośārgalapratīṣṭhānam

verso

1 ālokasaṃjñīparikārakam59 upādāya 60dva ye traye
2 cchādanaparyāyena61 adhiśthitiḥitayāhī62 alpāna[rj]-
3 te63 sthitena taōduttaram64 adhiśthihīhe .. + + +
4 rite sthi te66 pāyattikā «» 20 || yo pu .. + + + +
5 san[ma]t(o) bhikṣ[ū]nī ovadeya67 pā .. + + + +

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 20.27–21.5. ālokasaṃdhiparikārakam upādāya dve vā trayo vā
cchādanaparyāyā dhaśthitiḥitayāh alpaharite sthitena / taduttaram adhiśthiḥihya alpaharite
sthito / pi pācattikam / ...68 (Pāc 21) yo puna bhikṣu asammatto bhikṣunīm ovadeya pācattikam /

---

55. t. kā : Probably (pāyati)ni(kā).
56. [simce]d vā [s]. cāpayed : Probably simced vā s(e)cāpayed; cf. Ma-L (Pāc 19) sīheya vā sīhcāpeya; Pātim (Pāc 20) sīheeya vā sīhcāpeya; Sa (Pāt 19) simet secaved; Mū(Hv) (Pāy 19) sīceta (v.l. siće) secaved (v.l.l. secaved, simcaved, simče[c]oved).
57. mahallake : S.e. for 2lakām = Ma-L (Pāc 20), Pātim (Pāc 19), Sa (Pāt 20); cf. Mū(Hv) (Pāy 20) mahāntam.
58. dvārakośārāgadāṃ pratiṣthāpayamāṇena : Cf. Ma-L. dvārakośārgalapratīṣṭhānam; Pātim dvārakośā aggala- tīṣṭhapanā; Sa dvārakośārgadasthāpanā; Mū(Hv) dvārakośārgadasthānād.
59. ālokasaṃjñīparikārakam : Cf. Ma-L. ālokasaṃdhipā; Pātim ālokasaṃdhiparikāmāya; Sa ālokasaṃdhībhuṃpari(kārm) // (v.l.l. ālokasaṃ) ++ mpāri //; ālokasaṃabhūti/ml //; Mū(Hv) ālokasaṃjñinā bhūmi- parikārmpādāya; MaVin 345c2, Ma.Ch 552h20. 施(戸)施.
60. dva ye traye : Cf. Ma-L dve vā trayo vā; Pātim dvatti (v.l. dvitti); Sa dvau trayo; Mū(Hv) dvau trayo vā.
61. cchādanaparyāyena : Cf. Ma-L. paryāya; Pātim (dvatti)cchādanassa paryāyam; Sa ācchāda(na)pathāḥ; Mū(Hv) cchādanaparyāyāḥ; Mū chedanaparyāyāḥ (a misprint; Ms. cchandana).
62. adhiśthitiḥitayāhī : S.e. for adhiṃ.
63. alpāhārīte : S.e. for alpa".
64. taduttaram : Cf. Ma-L. "arim; Pātim tato ce uttari (v.l. uttarim); Sa tata uttara(m); Mū(Hv) tata uttary.
65. adhiśthihe .. + + + rite : Probably adhiśthiheya alpahārīte = Ma-L.
66. sthi te : Cf. Ma-L. sthito / pi; Pātim (Pāc 19) pi sthito; Sa, Mū(Hv) -.
67. ovadeya : Cf. Ma-L. (Pāc 21) ṣdeya; Pātim (Pāc 21) ṣdeyə; Sa (Pāt 21), Mū(Hv) (Pāt 21) avaraved.
68. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 21.1–4. ॥uddānam ॥ (11) bhijam (12) anvāvadām (13) odhīyanām (14) maha (15) śarya (16) nikāḍham (17) pūrvopagatām (18) vaihāyasam (19) udaka (20) cchādanena ॥ dvītyo vargaḥ ॥
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recto
1 + + .. [bh(i)kšuḥ bhikṣunī oavad. + + + + + +
2 gate sūrye anohate\(^{49}\) aruṇe pā + + + +
3 yo punar bhīṃkšuḥ ovāḍā{[na]p}rekaṣṭ\(^{70}\) .. (k)suṇ[ṇ]. ..
4 upāśrayaṃ upasamkrame\(^{71,72}\) saṃtīṃ bhikṣuḥ anāman-
5 trayītvā anyatra samaye pāyattikā : 23 ||
   Cf. PrMoSī(Ma-L) 21.6–9. (Pāc 22) saṃmato vápi bhikṣuḥ bhikṣunīṃ ovadeya vikāle
   astamgate sūrye anūhate aruṇe pācattikām / (Pāc 23) yo puna bhikṣu ovāḍapreko
   bhikṣunī–upāśrayaṃ upasamkrameya saṃtāṃ bhikṣuṃ anāmantrayītvā, anyatra samaye
   pācattikām /

verso
1 tatrāyaṃ samayo gilān{[o]}ā\(^{73}\) bhikṣunī ovaditavyāḥ[ḥ]
2 bhavati anuśāsītavyā̐m\(^{74}\) ayam atrā samayo
3 yo punar bhīṃkšuḥ bhikṣusaya\(^{75}\) evaṃ > vade\(^{76}\) āmīṣa-
4 heto āyusmanṭo\(^{77}\) bhikṣuḥ bhikṣunī ovadyā\(^{78}\) pā-
5 yat[t]ikā • 24 || yo punar bhikṣuḥ (bhi)ks(u)ṇyā\(^{79}\) sārdham
   Cf. PrMoSī(Ma-L) 21.9–13. tatrāyaṃ samayo — gilānā bhikṣunī ovaditavyā anuśaśītavyā
   bhavati / ayam atrā samaya / (Pāc 24) yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣum evam vadeya — āmīśahetor
   āyusman bhikṣu bhikṣunīm ovadatit\(^{80}\) pācattikām / (Pāc 25) yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣunīya
   sārdham
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recto
1 \(^{81}\)ek(o) ekā<ya> raho niṣadayaṃ kalpaye\(^{82}\) pāyattikā •
2 25 || \(^{83}\)yo punar bhikṣuḥ bhikṣunīye sārdham saha-
3 gāraśayāṃ ○ kalpaye pāyattikā • 26 ||
4 yo punar bhikṣuḥ bhikṣunīye sārdham saṃvidhāyādhva-

---

\(^{49}\) anohate : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 22) anūhate; Pātim (Pāc 22), Sa (Pāt 22), Mū(HV) (Pāy 22) -.
\(^{70}\) ovāḍā{[na]p}reko : Or eśka\(^{70}\) S.e.; cf. Ma-L ovāḍapreko (Pāc 23); Pātim (Pāc 23) -; Sa, Mū(HV) -.
\(^{71}\) upasamkrame : Cf. Ma-L ०krameya; Pātim (Pāc 23) upasankamitra; Sa, Mū(HV) -.
\(^{72}\) saṃtīṃ bhikṣuḥ : S.e. for saṃtāṃ bhikṣuṃ = Ma-L; Pātim (Pāc 23) -; Sa, Mū(HV) -.
\(^{73}\) gilān{[o]}ā : The sign for o was erased and that for å was added by the scribe.
\(^{74}\) {m\(^{*}\)} : Presumably s.e. for "+" or "−".
\(^{75}\) bhikṣusaya : Cf. Ma-L ०kṣum; Pātim (Pāc 24) -; Sa (Pāt 23) -; Mū(HV) (Pāy 23) ०kṣun; Mū ०kṣum.
\(^{76}\) vade : Cf. Ma-L vadeya; Pātim vadeya; Sa (vaded); Mū(HV) vaded.
\(^{77}\) āyusmanṭo : Cf. Ma-L ०man\(^{*}\); Pātim therā (v.l. -); Sa, Mū; Mū(HV) āyusmanṭo.
\(^{78}\) ovadeyā : Cf. Ma-L ovadatitī; Pātim ovadantitī; Sa (avavadantitī); Mū(HV) avavadantī.
\(^{79}\) bhikṣuṇyā : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 25) ०nīya; Pātim (Pāc 30) bhikkhunīya; Sa (Pāt 28), Mū(HV) (Pāy 29)
   bhikṣunīya.
\(^{80}\) ovadatitī : The manuscript reads thus, while Titia transcribed te ovadatitī by mistake.
\(^{81}\) ek(o) ekā<ya> : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim eko ekāya; Sa ekākī (v.l. ekaikāya); Mū(HV) eka ekkāya.
\(^{82}\) kalpaye : Cf. Ma-L kalpeya; Pātim kappeya; Sa kalpayet; Mū(HV) -.
\(^{83}\) yo puna bhikṣuḥ bhikṣunīye sārdham saha-gāraśāyaṃ kalpaye pāyattikā • 26 || : The other versions, incl. Ma-
   L, MaVin (348a–b) and Ma.Ch (552c1), lack this rule.
5 mārgaṃ⁶⁴ pratipadye yā anvātanāsas grāmā<ṃ> taraṃ pi •

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 21.13–16. eko ekāva raho nisadvām kalpeva pācattikam / (Pāc 26) yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣunīya sārdham samvīdhāya adhvānamārgaṃ pratipadye yā anvātanāsas grāmāntaraṃ pi

verso
1 anyatra samaye pāyattikā • 27 || tatrāyaṃ sa-
2 mayo mārgo bhavati sabbhayat sapatibhyay sā-
3 [vaj]aṃksasammatacito⁶⁵ «sāsrtaḥgamanīyo⁶⁶» ayam atra samayo • yaḥ
4 punar bhikṣuḥ bhikṣunīya⁶⁷ sārdham samvīdhāya ekaṇāvaṃ⁶⁸
5 abhiruheyat⁶⁹ ṛūdhvagāminat⁷⁰ va adhogāminat⁷¹ va anaya-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 21.16–19. anyatra samaye, pācattikam / tatrāyaṃ samayo — mārgo bhavati sabbhayat sapatibhyay sāsaṃksasammatat / ayam atra samayo / (Pāc 27) yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣunīya sārdham samvīdhāya ekaṇāvaṃ abhiruheyat ṛūdhvagāminat va adhogāminat va anaya-
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recto
1 tra tiryut[ā]raṇāye⁷² pāyattikā : 28 ||⁷³ yo punar bhi-
2 kṣuḥ anvāti kāye bhikṣunīye cīvarān m dadyā anaya-
3 trā parivartake[ṇ][na]⁷⁴ pāyattikā : 29 || yo punar bhikṣu
4 anvāti kāye bhikṣunīye cīvarān sīved⁷⁵ va sīvā-
5 payed va pāyattikā 30 || yo punar bhikṣuḥ

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 21.19–24. trā tiryottaranāya pācattikam / (Pāc 28) yo puna bhikṣu anvāti kāye bhikṣunīye cīvarān dadyā anvātra pālattakena pācattikam / (Pāc 29) yo puna bhikṣur anvāti kāye bhikṣunīye cīvaram sīveva va sīvāpeva va pācattikam / (Pāc 30) yo puna bhikṣur

---

⁶⁴ adhvānamārga : Cf. BHSD, s.v. adhvānamārga; Ma-L (Pāc 26) adhvānamārga; Pātīm (Pāc 27) adhānāmaggam; Sa (Pāt 24) samānāmaggam; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 26) adhvānamārga; Mū (Pāy 26) adhvānamārga.
⁶⁵ sā[va]ṃksasammatattat : S.e. for sāsaṃksaṃma. = Ma-L, Sa, Mū(HvH); cf. Pātīm sāsankat.
⁶⁶ sāsrtaḥgamanīyo : Cf. Ma-L.; Pātīm satthagamanīyo; Sa sārthaḥgamanīyo; Mū(HvH) sārthaḥgamanīyo.
⁶⁷ bhikṣunīya : Cf. Ma-L. (Pāc 27) ‘niyya; Pātīm (Pāc 28) bhikṣuṇīyat; Sa (Pāt 25) bhikṣuṇīyat; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 27) bhikṣuṇīsārthaṃ.
⁶⁸ ekaṇāvaṃ = Sa, Mū; cf. Ma-L ‘nāvam; Pātīm ‘ekaṇ nāvam; Mū(HvH) ek‘aṃ nāvam.
⁶⁹ abhiruheyat : Cf. Ma-L ‘ruheyat; Pātīm ‘ruheyyat; Sa ‘ruhed; Mū(HvH) adhirohed.
⁷⁰ ṛūdhvagāminat : Cf. Ma-L, Mū(HvH) ‘gāminat; Sa ‘gāminat; Pātīm uddhaṅgāminat (v.l. uddhagat).
⁷¹ adhogāminat : Cf. Ma-L, Mū(HvH) ‘gāminat; Pātīm ‘gāminat; Sa ‘gāminat.
⁷² tiryut[ā]raṇāye : Cf. Ma-L tiryottaranāya; Pātīm tiryuyantaraṇāya; Sa tiryukpārasamantarāt (v.l. tiryak); Mū(HvH) tiryakpāra.
⁷³ // : This sign is visible in the photograph of the verso, as the upper margin of this side is folded underneath itself.
⁷⁴ parivartakeṇnas : Cf. Ma-L pālattakena (= Ms; +pālatttha) (Pāc 28); Pātīm (Pāc 25) pārivattakā (v.l. ‘vaṭṭa); Sa (Pāt 27) ‘Mū(HvH) (Pāy 25) parivartakāt.
⁷⁵ sīved : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 29) sīveva; Pātīm (Pāc 26) sībeyya; Sa (Pāt 26), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 24) kuryat.
verse
1 jāñam bhikṣunīya96 paripācitām piṇḍapātāṁ paribhunyijyā97
2 anyatra pūrvav98 grhasamāraṁbhe99 pāyattikā 31 ||
3 ekāhapaṁ Omam100 agilānena bhikṣunā āvā-
4 satha[m]piṇḍapātāṁ101 paribhunyjitavyam102 <tad>uttari(m)103 paribhun-
5 jeyā pāyattikā 32 || paramparabhojanaṁ104 anya-

anyatra pūrve grhīsamāraṁbhe pācattikam / ...105 (Pāc 31) ekāhapaṁ Omam bhikṣunā
agilānena āvāsathapipātāto paribhunyjitavyo taduttari(m) paribhunyijeyā pācattikām / (Pāc
32) paramparabhojanaṁ anya-
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recto
1 tra samay[e] pāyattikā : 33 || tatrāyaṁ samayo
2 glānasamayo106 cīvarakālasamayo107 ayaṁ atara
3 samayo • yo O punar108 bhikṣu{h}[i]{k}[r] jāna<ś> <m> {bhikṣur} bhuktivā«vi» pravāri-
4 to utthito āsanāto109 anātiriktaṁ kṛtaṁ khādanīyam
5 bhjoṇiyan110khādeś vā bhunjed vā bhukte pāyattikā • 34

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 22.3–6. tra samaye pācattikām / tatrāyaṁ samayo glānasamaya
cīvarakālasamaya / ayaṁ atara samayo / (Pāc 33) yo puna bhikṣur bhunjivā (s.e. for

96 bhikṣunīya : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 30), Sa (Pāt 30), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 30) bhikṣunī; Pātīm (Pāc 29) bhikhunī.-
97 paribhunyijyā : Cf. Ma-L bhikhunjya; Pātīm bhikunjya; Sa, Mū(HvH) paribhunīta.
98 pūrva : S.e. for “rīmaḥ or “rīvaḥ; cf. Ma-L “rīvaḥ; Pātīm pubbe; Sa prāg; Mū(HvH) pūrve.
99 grhasamāraṁbhe : S.e. for grhīsamā or grhīsamāḥ; cf. Ma-L grhīsamāḥ; Pātīm grhīsamāḥ; Sa, Mū(HvH)
grhīsamāraṁbhit.
100 agilānena bhikṣunā : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 31) bhī ṣo agi; Pātīm (Pāc 31) agī bhikṣunī; Sa (Pāt 32), Mū(HvH)
(Pāy 32) bhikṣunā agilānena.
101 āvasathā{m}piṇḍapātām : Cf. Ma-L āvasathapipātāś; Pātīm āvasathapipadāḥ; Sa ekāvasaṁsthitaṁ ...
piṇḍapātaḥ(h); Mū(HvH) ekā ... pīṇḍapātaḥ.
102 paribhunyjitavyam : Cf. Ma-L “tayoj; Pātīm bhukti-tahobbo; Sa, Mū(HvH) paribhuktvayo.
103 <tad>uttari(m) : Cf. Ma-L taduttari(m); Pātīm tate ca uttari (u.l. “rīṣṭ); Sa sata uttaram; Mū(HvH) tata uttari.
104 paramparabhojanaṁ : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 32), Pātīm (Pāc 33) “jane; Sa (Pāc 31) “janne; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 31)
“jānād
105 PrMoSū(Ma-L) 26.21f. ll uddānam ll (21) asammato (22) sammato cāpi (23) ovādo (24) āmiṣam (25) niṣāyā
ca (26) adhvānamārgo (27) nāvā ca (28) deti (29) sēvī (30) paripācanaṇa ll tīrīya vargaḥ ll.
106 glānasamayo : Cf. Ma-L, Pātīm glīnaḥ; Sa, Mū(HvH) glīṇaḥ.
107 cīvarakālasamayo : =? Ma Vin 353c6 (Pāy 32) ca (u.l. “rīṣṭ); Ma.Ch.552c10 (Pāy 32) ca (u.l. “rīṣṭ); cf. Ma-L,
Sa cīvarakālasamayo; Pātīm cīvarakālasamayo cīvarakārasamayo; Mū(HvH) karmasamayo “dhva-
samayaś cīvarakālasamayo. Cf. 88r4. cīvarakālasamayo (= 70v1–2); note 263.
108 bhikṣu{h}[i]{k}[r] jāna<m>n <m> {bhikṣur} bhuktivā«vi» : Probably, “rīna” was inserted mistakenly by the scribe,
after he had come across the expression bhikṣur jānaṁ bhikṣu bhuktivā in the following folio. Bhuktvā“vi” is a
scirbal error for bhuktivā. Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 33) bhikṣur bhunjavā (s.e. for bhuktivā?); Pātīm (Pāc 35) bhikkhu
bhunjavā; Sa (Pāt 34) bhikṣur bhuktavā; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 34) bhikṣur bhuktavā; Ma Vin 354c26 (Pāy 33),
Ma.Ch.552c11 (Pāy 33) bhuktvā “a Monk, having eaten”.) For the forms bhuktivā, Pā. bhutavā and
references).
109 anātiriktaṁ kṛtaṁ : S.e. for anatīḥ kṛ (Ma-L)?; Pātīm anatirittam; Sa akṛtaṁ(jiriktaṁ; Sa(hy) // tirikta;
Mū(HvH) akṛtaniriktaṁ (s.e.); Mū(HvH) akṛtaniriktaṁ (s.e.).
110 khādeś vā bhunjed vā bhukte : Ma-L khādeya vā bhunjeya vā; Pātīm khādeya vā bhunjeya vā; Sa khāde-
vā bhunjita vā; Mū(HvH) khādeya bhunjita vā.
bhuktāvi?) pravārito utthito āsanāto, anādirīkatam kṛtaṁ khādanīyam, vā bhogānyam, vā khādeya vā bhunjeya vā pācāttikaṁ/

vṛṣṇa:
1 y[o] punar bhikṣuḥ jānan 111 bhikṣuḥ bhuktāvi pravārito utth(i)(o) ā-
2 sanāto. 112 anādirīkatam kṛtaṁ khādanīyabhojanīyaṁ
3 āśvādanāprekṣyō113 (*panin曼traye114 * 115ehy āvusa (;) khā-
4 dehi bhunjighi [bhuk]tē116 pāyattika : 3(5) || yo pu-
5 nar bhiksū 117adinnam aparigṛhitam m(u) ... r[a]m118 āhāra-

Cf. PrMoSū (Ma-L) 22.7–10. (Pāc 34) yo pūna bhikṣu jānam bhikṣu bhuktāvi (< - āvī [= Ms.]) pravāritam utthitam āsanāto āśvādanāprekṣa anādirīkatena khādanīyena vā bhogānyena vā upanimantraya “ehi bhikṣu khādāhi bhunjāhi” ti vā vadeya bhuktasmīm pācāttikaṁ / (Pāc 35) yo pūna bhikṣu adinnam apratigrīhitam mukhādāryikam āhāra-
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recto
1 m āhar(e)d[119] (a)nyatra udakadañcākāṣṭha120 pāyattika 36 ||

111 bhikṣuḥ bhuktāvi pravārito utthi(ji)to āsanāto : S.e. for bhikṣu (acc. sg.) bhuktāvi (acc. sg.) pravāritam utthitam āsanāto = Ma-L (Pāc 34). The scribe seems to have confused a similar expression in this rule with that in the preceding one (68 recto 3–4). Cf. Pātīm (Pāc 36) bhikṣuḥ bhūtāviṁ pravāritam; Sa (Pāt 35) bhikṣuṁ bhuktavatam pravāritam; Sa(hy) /// bhākrvīya pravadṛjī ///; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 35) bhikṣuṁ bhuktavat-

112 anādirīkatam kṛtaṁ khādanīyabhojanīyaṁ : Probably s.e. for anādirīkatamṭkṛtena khādanīyena bhogānyena. The scribe seems to have confused a similar expression in this rule with that in the preceding one (68 recto 4–5). The hyper-form anādirīkatam (< anādirīkatam [68 recto 4, see note 109] < anādirīka) is not attested anywhere else. Cf. Ma-L anādirīkatena khādanīyena vā bhogānyena vā; Pātīm anādirītena khādanīyena vā bhogānyena vā; Sa akṛ(ṭa)śīktena khādanīyabhojanīyaṁ; Mū(HvH) akṛtīrīktena (Mū akṛtāśīkta) khādanīyabhojanīyaṁ.

113 āśvādanāprekṣyō : Cf. Ma-L āśvādanāprekṣo; Pātīm āśvādanāpekko; Sa, Mū(HvH) āśvādanapreṣṭi; Mū āśvādanā. For prekṣa-, meaning “intending”, see BHSD, SWTF, s.v.; the word āśvādanaprekṣyō is found also in KP(V-D) 4v4. Cf. also note 154 on vitāpanā-prekṣya.

114 (*panin曼traye ; Pātīm ābhīhaṭṭhum (absolutive of abhi-ṛhaḥ; cf. CPD I 1383b, DP I 225b) pāvāreya; Sa yāvadarathm pravāreyed; Mū(HvH) ātyarathm (Mū ity' [s.e.]) pravāreyed. Ayartham is probably hyper-Sanskritisms of Pā. abhihaṭṭhum: ay-artham *=ati-artham < *ati-haṭṭhum < *ati-haṭṭhum < abhi-haṭṭhum (for the confusion between ati- and abhi-, see EV I [2nd ed.], 221 [ad Th 447; with further references]; Abhi III 261, i/bh). Cf. note 126.

115 ehy āvusa (;) khādehi bhunjighi : =? Ma.Ch.552c14 (Pāy 34) 長者食此食(“Eat, O elder monk, this food!”); MaVin 356c21 (Pāy 34) ; cf. Ma-L, ehi bhikṣu khādāhi bhunjāhi; Pātīm handa bhikṣu khāda vā bhuja vā; Sa idam āvāsam khaḍāti bhumsēvy; Mū(HvH) idam āvāsanā khaḍā idam bhumsēvy.

116 [bhuk]tē : Cf. Ma-L bhuktasmīm; Pātīm bhūtasmīm; Sa kaccid esa bhikṣuḥ mūhartam apy āsādītah syād idam eva pratyaṇyaṃ kṛtvā nānyāthā (pāyantākāś); Mū(HvH) kaccid esa bhikṣār asādī bhaviṣyati etad eva pratyaṇyaṃ kṛtvā (pāyantākāś).

117 adinnam aparigṛhitam : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 35) adinnam apratigṛhitam; Pātīm (Pāc 40) adinnam; Sa (Pāt 39) aparigṛhitam; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 39) adattam (Śāṅkīraśāsana of Mī. adina); MaVin 357b15. Bārīk; Ma.Ch. 552c15. Bārīk; Sa, Mū(HvH) 197c2. Not found; DhgVṇ 663c19 (Pāy 39), PrMoSū (Dh) 1027a3. Bārīk. For the Middle Indic form dinma, Abhis III 292, 256.

118 m(u) ... r[a]m : Probabley mukhādāryikam; cf. Ma-L mukhādāryikam; Pātīm mukhādāvaram; Sa mukhādāvēna; Mū mukhādāvāra; Mū(HvH) mukhābhivyāhāryam.

119 āhar[e]d[ ] : Cf. Ma-L āhaṛaya (s.e. for āhareya?); Pātīm āhareyya; Sa, Mū(HvH) āhared.

120 udakadañcākāṣṭha : Cf. Ma-L udakadañcāpōne; Pātīm udakadañcāpōṇa (v.l. ”pōṇa”; Sa udakādantañcāśṭha-bhyām; Mū(HvH) udakādantañcāśṭha.
2. vikālabhojane pāyattikā : 37 || sannidhiṅkāraṇa\textsuperscript{121} \\
3. bhhojane pāyaṅtikā : 38 || bhikṣuṅ\textsuperscript{122} kho punah kule- \\
4. sūpasamkramitvā\textsuperscript{123} pravārenti\textsuperscript{124} puṇpair vā manthi r vā tataḥ\textsuperscript{126} pra- \\
5. vāritena bhikṣuṅā triptārūpārāparam pratiṅghṛṇi-tavyā\textsuperscript{<tavyam pratiṅghṛṇi>tvā}\textsuperscript{127} \\
   Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 22.10–15. m ahāreya anyatraśodakantapone pācattikam / (Pāc 36) \\
vikālabhojane pācattikam / (Pāc 37) sannidhiṅkārābhhojane pācattikam / (Pāc 38) bhikṣuṅ \\
   kho punah kalehi upasamkranti pravāreṇa puṇepi vā manthi vā / tathāpravāritena \\
bhikṣuṅā yāvat triptārūpārāparam tato pratiṅghṛṇitavyam / pratiṅghṛṇitvā \\

\textit{verso}

1. bahirdhām\textsuperscript{128} vābhinirh<ar>itvā\textsuperscript{29} agilāneṇa bhikṣuṅā sārdha(m) sa(m)- \\
2. vibhajitvā khaḍātīayam bhunṣiṣṭayam taduttāraṇa\textsuperscript{130} pratiṅghṛṇeyā\textsuperscript{131} \\
3. bahirdhām\textsuperscript{132} vā nirhāCītvā\textsuperscript{133} agilāneṇa bhikṣuṅā\textsuperscript{135} asām- \\
4. vibhajitvā\textsuperscript{136} khaḍ(j)e]d vā bhunṣed vā bhukte\textsuperscript{137} pāyattikā • 39 [(]) \\
5. yañi kho puṇjar imāni\textsuperscript{138} pratiṇasammatiṃ bhoj-a- \\
   Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 22.16–19. bahirdhā niharītavyam / bahirdhā niharītvā agilānakehi \\
bhikṣuṅi sārdham samvibhajitvā khaḍātīvam bhunṣiṣṭayam. / taduttarim pratiṅghṛṇitvā \\
bahirdhā niharītvā agilānakehi bhikṣuṅi sārdham samvibhajitvā vā asamvibhajitvā vā \\
khaḍeya vā bhunṣedya vā pācattikam / (Pāc 39) yañi kho punah imāni pratiṇasammatiṃ \\
bhoj-a-

\textsuperscript{121} sān[label{mandhikāra : Read "Tkāraka<mr>"?; a nāmūl absolute (cf. EV II [2nd ed.] 76); for "n-i-kṛ", cf. Whitney § 1094; cf. also Ma-L (Pāc 37) sānmiṅkāra<mr>; Pātim (Pāc 38) sānmiṅkārakā; Sa (Pāt 38), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 38) sānmiṅhat. Cf. also BHSD, s.v. sānmiṅdi; PTSD, s.v. sānmiṅdi.}
\textsuperscript{122} bhikṣuṅ : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 38) bhikṣuṅ; Pātim (Pāc 34) bhikṣhup; Sa (Pāt 33) (bhikṣ<ya>vaḥ punah sambhahālaḥ, Mū(HvH) (Pāy 33) bhikṣavaḥ khalu sambhahālaḥ.}
\textsuperscript{123} kuleṣpasamkrāmiva : Cf. Ma-L kulehi (Loc. pl.) upasamkrāntam; Pātim kulaṃ upagataṃ; Sa kulaṃ upasamkrāmyeyus. 
\textsuperscript{124} pravārenti : Cf. Ma-L pravāresu; Pātim pāvareyyaḥ; Sa pravāreyeyuḥ; Mū(HvH) pravārayeyur. 
\textsuperscript{125} puṇpair vā manthi r vā : Cf. Ma-L pāpehi vā manthi vā; Pātim pāvehi vā manthi vā; Sa pāpair vā manthi vā \\
   Mū(HvH) manthaiś (Mū maṇḍaiś [s.e.] cāpyaiś cākānksadhīs. 
\textsuperscript{126} tataḥ : Cf. Ma-L tathā; Pātim abhiṇaṭṭhaṃ (absolute of abhi-ṛḥ); Sa (yāva)ddarhaṃ; Mū(HvH) ydraghaṃ \\
   (Mū tv arthaṃ [s.e.]). Cf. note 114. 
\textsuperscript{127} pratiṅghṛṇi-tavyā\textsuperscript{<tavyam pratiṅghṛṇi>tvā} : Cf. Ma-L pratiṅghṛṇitavyam pratiṅghṛṇitvā; Pātim patīgghaṭabbaḥ; Sa prati-ṛghaṭ(va)yaḥ; Mū(HvH) pratiṅghṛṇitvā. 
\textsuperscript{128} bahirdham : Cf. Ma-L bahirdhā; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.
\textsuperscript{129} abhinhir<ar>tvā : Cf. Ma-L nirhārīvaḥ; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.
\textsuperscript{130} taduttaram : Cf. Ma-L taduttarī; Pātim tato cē uttari (v.l. "ritim"); Sa tato uttaram; Mū(HvH) tata uttari. 
\textsuperscript{131} pratiṅghṛṇeyā : Cf. Ma-L pratiṅghṛṇivā; Pātim patiṅghṛṇeyya (v.l. patiṅga); Sa, Mū(HvH) pratiṅghṛṇiyuḥ. 
\textsuperscript{132} bahirdham : Cf. Ma-L bahirdhā; Pātim tato; Sa bahir(; Mū(HvH) bahir. 
\textsuperscript{133} nirharītvā : Cf. Ma-L niharītvā; Pātim niharītvā; Sa (āra)maṃ (ni)ṣk(ī)ramya(v) (v.l. gaṭṭivaḥ); Mū(HvH) āra)maṃ gatvā. 
\textsuperscript{134} agilāneṇa bhikṣuṅā : Cf. Ma-L agilānakehi bhikṣuṅi; cf. also Pātim bhikkhuhā; Sa, Mū(HvH) bhikṣavaḥ. 
\textsuperscript{135} asamvibhajitvā : = MaVīn 361b5. अस्माच (not in the text), Ma.Ch 552e20. अस्माच (not in the text); = Ma-L sārdham samvibhajitvā vā asamvibhajitvā vā; cf. Pātim sadābhim samvibhajitabbaṃ; Sa sanvedayitavyā (v.l. sa[mvib]bhajyāḥ); Mū(HvH) samvibhaktavyā. 
\textsuperscript{136} khaḍed vā bhunṣed vā : Cf. Ma-L khaḍeṣya vā bhunṣedya vā; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.
\textsuperscript{137} bhukte : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.
\textsuperscript{138} imāni : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 39) imāni; Pātim (Pāc 39), Sa (Pāt 40), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 40) tāni.
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recto

1 +139 samyāyathīḍā[ṃ] sarpis tailaṃ madhu phāṅ(i)ta(m) dugdhaṃ dadhi
2 matsamā[ṃ] māmsamā[ṃ] tānì ca bhīṣu ātmānārthe[ṃ] āgitāno ku-
3 leṣāpasamākkramitvā[143] vijñāpitvā vijñāpayitvā
4 vā[143] khaḍe vā bhūmje vā bhukte[146] pāyattikā : 40 || gaṅabho-
5 janaṃ[147] anyatra samayena[148] pāyattikā : 41 ||

Cf. PrMoŚū(Ma-L) 22.19–23. nāṇī bhavanti samyāyathīḍam sarpis tailam madhu phāṇītam
dugdham dagdhi matsyaṃ māṃsamā māṃsataṃ yo puna bhīṣur evanrapāṇi pranītasammatāni
bhajanāni ātmārthaḥ agitāno kulehi vijñāpetvā vā vijñāpayetvā vā khādya vā bhūmjeva
vā pācattikām / (Pāc 40) gaṅabhojane anyatra samaye pācattikām /

verso

1 tatrāyam samayo gilānasamay[o] cīvarākālasa-
2 mayo[150] «adhvānagamanasamayo» nāvabhirohāgasamayo mahāsāmayo[150] śra-
3 maṇabhaṅktaṃ[151] aṁya atra samayo • 42 || yo pu-
5 j(y)otis(m)iṁ[155] kāṣṭhaṃ vā ṭṛṣṇaṃ vā ṭṛṣṇaṃ vā
gomaṇaṃ vā śakalikaṃ[156] vā

139 bhoga + : Cf. Ma-L. bhajanāni bhavanti; Pāṭim (paṅga-ḥ)bhajanāni; Sa, Mū(HvH) (paṅga-ḥ)bhajanāny.
140 matsamā : Cf. Ma-L. matsyam; Pāṭim maccho; Sa, Mū matsyo; Mū(HvH) matsya-
141 tānì ca bhīṣu : ≠ Ma-L. yo puna bhīṣur evanrapāṇi pranītasammatāni bhajanāni = MaVin 361c28. 如是美, Ma.Ch 552c22. 如是美, Po; Pāṭim yo puna bhīṣur evanrapāṇi paṁaṭṭhabhajanāni; Sa yah punar bhīṣur evanrapāṇi praṇītaḥ bhajanānāy = Mū; Sa(hy) / /tu/ ṭat bhajanāni / /; Mū(HvH) yo punar bhīṣur imany evanrapāṇi praṇītaḥ bhajanānāy
142 ātmānārthe : It seems that nā was crossed out by a later hand. S.e. either for ātmārthe or for āṭmamo (ʿrthe; cf. Ma-L. āṭmārthāya; Pāṭim atano atihāya; Sa, Mū(HvH) atmarthāṃ. Cf. also note 152.
143 kuleṣāpasamākkramitvā : Cf. Ma-L. kulehī = MaVin 361c27. 諸家中; Ma.Ch 552c21 ; -; Pāṭim - ; Sa - ; Mū(HvH) parakulebhyo.
144 vijñāpitvā vijñāpayitvā vā : Cf. Ma-L. vijñāpetvā vā vijñāpayetvā vā; Pāṭim viṇāpetvā; Sa viṇāpetvā; Mū(HvH) viṇāpya.
145 khāde vā bhūmje vā : Cf. Ma-L khādeya vā bhūmjeva vā; Pāṭim bhūlījeva; Sa -; Mū(HvH) khāde bhūmija vā.
146 bhukte : Cf. Ma-L. Pāṭim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.
147 gaṅabhojanaṃ : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 40) ʿjane; Pāṭim (Pāc 32) ʿjane; Sa (Pāt 36) ʿjanam; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 36) ʿjanād.
148 samayena : Cf. Ma-L ʿmaye; Pāṭim ʿmayā; Sa, Mū(HvH) ʿmayāt.
149 cīvarākālasamayo : Cf. Ma-L cīvaradānākālasamaya; Pāṭim cīvaradānāsamaya cīvarakārasamaya; Sa cīvaradānākālasamaya (v.l. cīvarakāla), Mū(HvH) -; MaVin 362b23 (Pāy 40; missing; cf. Abhis III 568–569); Ma.Ch 552c25 (Pāy 40) 衣時. Cf. note 107.
150 mahāsāmayo : Cf. Ma-L, Pāṭim ʿsamayo; Sa ʿsamāja-; Mū(HvH) ʿsamajā.
151 śramanabhaṅktaṃ : Cf. Ma-L. ʿstavāṇaḥ; Pāṭim samanabhastasamayo; Sa śramanabhastasamayo (v.ll. śramanabhakhth, ṭhaktoḥ), Mū(HvH) śramanabhastasamayo.
152 ātmānārthena : S.e. for āṭmamo (ʿrthena?; cf. Ma-L (Pāc 41) āṭmārthāya; Pāṭim (Pāc 56), Sa (Pāt 52) -; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 52) āṭmārthāṃ. Cf. also note 142.
153 viṭāpanopreṣko ṣ(y)otis(m)iṁ : Cf. Ma-L ʿyotismiṃ viṭāpanapreṣko; Pāṭim visibbanaṇekkho (v.l. visibbanāṇ) jotim; Sa visibpanapreṣko ... jotih; Mū(HvH) viṭapanapreṣko jotih. The word-order of Ma-L is strange.
154 viṭāpanopreṣko : Probably s.e. for viṭāpanapreṣko; cf. Ma-L. viṭāpanapreṣko; Pāṭim visibbanaṇekkho visibpanapreṣko (v.l. viṭapanāp); Mū(HvH) viṭapanapreṣko. For prekṣya, meaning "intending," see note 113.
155 kāṣṭhaṃ vā ṭṛṣṇaṃ vā : Cf. Ma-L ʿṭṛṇaṃ vā kāṣṭhaṃ vā = MaVin 365a8. 草木 (the commentary also comments first ㄔ[“grass”] then ㄊ[“wood”], 365a11f.; Ma.Ch 552c25. 草木; Pāṭim, Mū(HvH) -; Sa - (v.l. ʿṭṛṇaṃ vā kāṣṭhaṃ vā; ṭṛṇaṇi)./)
156 śakalikā : Cf. Ma-L sakaliṃ; Pāṭim, Mū(HvH) -; Sa - (v.l. śakaliṃ); cf. also BHSD, s.vv. śakalika,
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recto

1 (t)u(ṣam) vā [ṣ(ə)m]k[a]ra[m]158 vā 159uddahed vā uddahāpayed vā160 pāyatikā : 2 43 || yo punar bhikṣuḥ anupasampannena pudgalena
3 sārdham uttaraṃ161 ○ dvītraṃ trītrātparamāṃ162 sahagā-
4 raśayyāṃ kalpeyā163 pāyatikā  • 44 || yo puna-
5 r bhikṣuḥ pūrvakarmāṇāṃ164 cchandaṃ datvā pāscā165 doṣā166 kupito

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 23.2~7. tussam vā samkāram vā ādaheya vā ādaheypa vā anyatra samaye pācattikam | (Pāc 42) yo puna bhiksura anupasampannena pudgalena sārdham uttari dvītraṃ trītraṇ vā sahagāraśayāṃ kalpeyā pācattikam | (Pāc 43) yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣūnām karmanā cchandaṃ datvā pāscād duṣṭo doṣāt kupito

verso

1 [a]nāṭt(a)m(a)nā167 evaṃ va[de]168 a[d]linno me es[o]169 c[ha]n[dl]. . . . . .
2 me eso chando akṛtāṇi etāni karmāṇi du . . . . . .
3 karmāṇi • nāḥāOm etesā karmāṇāṃ ccha + + + +
4 . . . i pāyatikā  • 45 || yo punar bhi + + + +
5 + + + e170 ehi āvusā171 sahitakā172 [gr]. + + + +

śakalika, Pa; sakalika.

159 PrMoSū(Ma-L) 21.26–29. īl uddānam 1[1] āvasatho (32) parampara (33) pravāraṇy (34) āśādanā (35) adinnam (36) vikālam (37) samādhiḥ (38) manthā (39) vijñaptih (40) ganaḥbhohanena īl caturtho vargha īl.
158 [ṣ(ə)m]k[a]ra[m] : Cf. Ma-L. saṃkāraṃ; Pātim, Mū(HvH) - ; Sa (v.l. saṃkāram).
159 uddahed vā uddahāpayed vā : Cf. MaVin 365a8, Ma.Ch 552c25f. 若自然若使人然；Ma-L ādaheya vā ādaheypa vā; Pātim sāmādaheyya vā sāmādaheypa vā; Sa saṃātthāya sāmādheyad vā (v.l. ut(samātha)red upasamḥ(ə)r(ə)f(ə)yed) vā; Mū(HvH) samaya-dadhyat samavādihpayad vā.
160 vā : = Mū(HvH); = MaVin 365a8 ; ≠ Ma-L vā anyatra samaye; Pātim vā aṅñatra tathārūpa paccayā ; Sa vānyatra pratayaya; Ma.Ch 552c26. 除因緣.
161 uttaraṃ : = Sa (Pāt 53); cf. Ma-L (Pāc 42), Pātim (Pāc 5) uttari; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 54) (dvītraṇ) ārdham.
162 trītrātparamāṃ : Cf. MaVin 365e19, Ma.Ch 552c27. 過三宿；Ma-L trītraṇ vā; Pātim tirattam ; Sa, Mū(HvH) - .
157 kalpeyā : Ma-L kalyāṇa; Pātim kappayya; Sa, Mū(HvH) kalpayet.
164 pūrvakarmāṇāṃ : = Ma-Ch 552c28. (與)渴慕(欲) 已; cf. MaVin 366h8. (與欲) 已; ≠ Ma-L (Pāc 43) bhikṣūnāṃ karmanā (probably s.e.); cf. Pātim (Pāc 79) dharmikānaṃ karmanāṃ; Sa (Pāt 54) dhārmike sanghakaranyey; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 53) dhārmike sanghakaranīye.
166 paścād : Ma-L paścād; Pātim pacchāt; Sa tathā paścād; Mū(HvH) tathā paścād; Mū paścād.
167 doṣā : Ma-L duṣṭo doṣā; Pātim, Sa - ; Mū(HvH) abhiṣakāt.
168 [a]nāṭt(a)m(a)nā : Ma-L 2'manā; Pātim, Sa - ; Mū(HvH) nāṭtamānaḥ; Mū (nāṭtamānā).
169 va[de] : Ma-L vadeya; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) vadey (v.l.).
170 e[ṣ]e[j] : Ma-L, Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) - .
171 āvusā : Cf. Ma-L iver āvyasman; Pātim āvusā; Sa āvyasman; Mū(HvH) āvyasman. Cf. also notes 222, 347, 384, 400, 428, 440.
172 sahitakā : “together” = Ma.Ch 553a2. 共(叡), MaVin 366c12. 共. No parallels in the other versions. The word sahitaka-- is probably a characteristic of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottavadin’s literature, cf. BHSD, s.v.
Cf. PrMoSü(Ma-L) 23.7–11. *na-tamama evam vadeyā — adinmo me chando durdinno me chando akṛtī ny etāni karmāṇi dukṛtī ny etāni karmāṇi nāham etesām karmāṇam
cchandaṃ demiti vadeyā pācaṭikam/ (Pāc 44) yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣum evam vadeyā — ehi
tvam āvusman-grāman pindāya praviśiyāmah

Folios 72–81 are published in Karashima 2008: 72–77
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_recto_
1 sancintya tiryagyoni-gataṃ prājīmaṃ⁷³⁸ jīvitād vyaparop[e]-
2 yāy⁷³⁴ pāyaṭikā 64 || yo punar bhikṣuḥ bhikṣusya
3 <sancintya>⁷³⁵ kaukṛtyam upaśamharet⁷³⁶ kim ṭasya⁷³⁷ muḥurtam api
4 aphaśo⁷³⁸ bhavati⁷³⁹ {=} pāyaṭikā • 65 || yo puna-
5 r bhikṣuḥ bhikṣusya v bhikṣunyā⁷⁴⁰ v śrāmanerasyā vā
cf. PrMoSü(Ma-L) 25.26–26.3 (Pāc 61) yo puna bhikṣuḥ sancintya tiryagyoni-gataṃ
drāminam jīvitād vyaparopave pācaṭikam | (Pāc 62) yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣusya sancintya
dvakṛtyam upasamhāreya kim (Ms. kin) ti se muḥurtam pi aphāśu bhavatā ti pācaṭikam /
(Pāc 63) yo puna bhikṣuḥ bhikṣusya v bhikṣunyā v śrāmanerasyā vā

_verso_
1 śrāmanerīyā vā «śākamāṇgāye vā» cīvaraṃ datvā apratuyuddharītvā⁷⁴¹ pari-
2 bhūṃjaṃ⁷⁴² 183 imaṃ «ta»syā bhikṣusya apratuyuddhārāpārībhog[gi]⁷⁴⁴ «see the
3 supplementary folio below»⁷⁴⁵
4 panidhe vā apiṇḍaḥpaye vā antamasato⁷⁴⁶

(only Mvu) and Abhis III 528.

⁷³³ prājīmaṃ : Acc. sg.; cf. BHSG § 10.43, Abhis III 29, § 10.2; cf. also Ma-L (Pāc 61), Sa (Pāt 61), Mū(HvH)
(Pāy 61) prāminam; Pātim (Pāc 61) pānam.

⁷³⁴ vyaparopave : Cf. Ma-L. "eya; Pātim vyoporeyya; Sa, Mū(HvH) vyaparopayet.

⁷³⁵ sancintya (Pāc 62), Sa (Pāt 62), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 62) sancintya; MaVin 378b14, MaCh
535b14. अ् (“deliberately”); Pātim (Pāc 77) saheccia.

⁷³⁶ upasamharet : Cf. Ma-L upasamhāreya; Pātim upadaha-yya; Sa upasamha-re (v.l. "haret); Mū(HvH) "haret.

⁷³⁷ ṭasya : Cf. Ma-L. ti se (Gen. sg. masc.; cf. Abhis III 539); Pātim " sax; Sa, Mū(HvH) asya bhikṣor.

⁷³⁸ aphaśo : Ma-L, Pātim aphaśu; Sa aphaśam (v.l. "asparśam”; Mū(HvH) asparśo.

⁷³⁹ bhavati : Ma-L bhavatā (ti); Pātim bhavisatā (ti); Sa bhaved; Mū(HvH) bhavisati.

⁷⁴⁰ bhikṣunyā : Ma-L (Pāc 63) "neye; Pātim (Pāc 59) bhikkhumiyā; Sa (Pāt 68) - (v.l. bhikṣunyā); Mū(HvH) (Pāy
68) - (cf. Pāy 67 bhikṣunyā).

⁷⁴¹ apratuyuddharītvā : Cf. Ma-L. 5dha-yyā; Pātim appacuddhārānam (v.l. "ārakam); Sa, Mū(HvH) apratuy-
dhāraya.

⁷⁴² paribhuṃjaṃ : Cf. Ma-L. paribhuṃjeyya; Pātim paribhuṭiyeyya; Sa, Mū(HvH) paribhuṃjyta.

⁷⁴³ imaṃ "tasyā bhikṣusya : The other versions, incl. MaVin 379a9 and Ma.Ch 553b16, lack these words.

⁷⁴⁴ apratuyuddhārāpārībhog[gi] : S.s for "ārībhoge. It seems that the scribe had written first as "bhoni then
corrected to "bhogī. Cf. Ma-L. "bhogī.

⁷⁴⁵ Supplementary words are written on a folio, made of leather.

⁷⁴⁶ anyataraṇyataṃ vā punaḥ śrāmanakṣaṃ [jīva]sasparīṣkaṃ : ≠ Ma-L (Pāc 64), MaVin 379b27 (Pāy
64), Ma.Ch 553b18 (Pāy 64), Pātim (Pāt 60) -; ≥ Sa (Pāt 67) anyatamāntyataṃ vā śrāmanakṣaṃ pariṣkāram (v.l. "jitapaśi’’); Mū(HvH) (Pāy 67) anyatamāntyataṃ vā śrāmanakṣaṃ "jīṭāparīṣkāram.

⁷⁴⁷ apanidhe vā apiṇḍaḥpaye vā : Ma-L apaniheyā vā apiṇḍaḥpayā vā; Pātim apanidheyyā vā apiṇḍaḥpayā
evā; Sa, Mū(HvH) upaṇiṣadḥyād upaṇiṣadḥayed vā.

⁷⁴⁸ antamasato : Ma-L. "śato; Pātim antamaso; Sa antato; Mū(HvH) -.
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recto
1 (pāya)tiṭṭiṅa || yo punar bhikṣur bhi
2 (k)ṣu + + + sya 199 pātraṇaṃ vā cīṭvaram vā ni-
3 šīdanaṃ vā sūcīgharaṇaṃ 191 vā 192 kāya-ba-
4 ndhanam vā ||

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 26.3–8. ērāmanerīye vā śikṣamānāye vā cītvaram datvā apratyudhāreṇa paribhunjeyya apratyudhārapeṇa pāccattikam | (Pāc 64) yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣusya, pātraṇ vā cītvaram vā niśīdanam vā sūcīgharaṇaṃ vā apamihāpeva vā apamihāpevaṇaṃ saṁvīdhiṇa adhivānamārgam pratipadeva antamaśa-
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 verso

1 bhikṣur bhikṣusya 199 bhiṣ[e] vā bhīṣāpaya vā pāya-
2 tiṅkā : 68 || udakahāśyasammanatake104 pāyatti-
3 kā : 69 || amCūgulipratodanake pāyatiṅka : 4 70 || yo punar bhikṣur māṭgrāmeṇa sārdham 195 a-
5 dhvānāmārgam pratipadeyeyā196 antamas[a]-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 26.8–12. bhikṣur bhikṣusya bhīṣeṇa pāccattikam | (Pāc 66) udakahasta-
6 sammardanat pāccattikam | (Pāc 67) aṅgulipratodanake pāccattikam | (Pāc 68) yo puna bhikṣu māṭgrāmeṇa sārdham saṁvīdhiṇa adhivānamārgam pratipadeyeyā antamaśa-

verso

1 to197 grāmāṃtaraṇaṃ pī pāyatiṅkā • 71 || yo punar bhi-
2 kṣur māṭgrāmeṇa sārdhaṃ sahagāraśavyāṃ kalpa-
3 ye198 pāyattiOkā 72 || yo punar bhikṣu<r> māṭ-
4 grāmeṇa sārdhaṃ eko ekāya və rhāo niśadyāṃ kalpa-

199 hāsyārthāyāmi : S.e. for śrīhāyāpi; cf. Ma-L hāsyārtham pi; Pātim hasāpekkho (vll. ĥāśā, hassā) pi; Sa hāsyapekṣayam api; Mū(HvH) -.
200 bhīkJ/su + + + sya : Probably nothing was written between bhikṣu and sya; cf. Ma-L (Pāc 64) bhikṣusya; Pātim (Pāc 60) bhikṣhussa; Sa (Pāt 67) bhikṣol; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 67) bhikṣor.
201 sūcīgharaṇaṃ : Cf. Ma-L sūcīghraṇaṃ; Pātim sūcīgharaṇaṃ; Sa sūcīgharaṇaṃ; Mū(HvH) sariatam.
202 kāya-bhandhanam vā : = Pātim, Mū(HvH); = Ma-L, Sa, MaVin 379b27 (Pāy 64), Ma.Ch 553b18 (Pāy 64) -.
203 bhiṣ[e] vā bhīṣāpaya vā : = Ma-L (Pāc 65) bhīṣeṇa = MaVin 379e24 (Pāy 65) = Ma.Ch 553b20 (Pāy 65) ||
204 bhīṣ[e] vā bhīṣāpaya vā : = Sa (Pāt 66) bhīṣed bhīṣapayed vā (vll. bhīṣed bhīṣapayed); Mū(HvH) (Pāy 66) bhīṣapayed bhīṣapayed vā.
205 udakahāśyasammanatake : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 66) udakahastasarmanāt; MaVin 380b26 (Pāy 66), Ma.Ch 553b21 (Pāy 66) udakhaṃ; Pātim (Pāc 53) udake hasadhamme (vll. hasā, hassā); Sa (Pāt 64), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 64) udakaharyānan; Mūv 4889 udakahahāram.
206 sārdham vā = Ma-L (Pāc 68) sārdham saṁvīdhiṇa = MaVin 381c18 (Pāy 68) = Mūv 4889 udakaharyānan; Ma.Ch 553b23 (Pāy 68) saṁvīdhiṇa; Pātim (Pāc 67) sārdham saṁvīdhiṇa; Sa (Pāt 70) sārdham saṁvīdhiṇa (vll. -); Mū(HvH) (Pāy 70) sārdham.
207 pratipadeyeyā : Cf. Ma-L śeṣa; Pātim pratipajjeyya; Sa, Mū(HvH) pratipadyeta.
208 antamas[a]jotu : Cf. Ma-L śatato; Pātim antamaso; Sa antato; Mū(HvH) -.
209 kalpaye : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 69) kalpaye; Pātim (Pāc 6) kappeyya; Sa (Pāt 65), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 65) kalpayet.
5 ye²⁰⁹ pāyattikā • 73 || yo punar bhikṣur jānaṁ
Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 26.12–20. to grāmāṇtaram pi pācattikam l (Pāc 69) yo puna bhikṣu mātrgrāmena sārtham sahāgārāśayāṁ kalpeva pācattikam l (Pāc 70) yo puna bhikṣu mātrgrāmena sārtham eko ekāya raho nisadyāṁ kalpeva pācattikam l ...²⁰⁹ (Pāc 71) yo puna bhikṣur jānaṁ
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**recto**
1 ūnavimśatívarṣa(m)²⁰² pudgalo²⁰² bhikṣubhāvena²⁰² upasaṁ-
2 pādaye²⁰⁴ so ca pudgalo anupasampanno te ca
3 bhikṣeṣūnāṁ²⁰⁵ gārhyāṁ²⁰⁶ o imāṁ teṣāṁ bhikṣuṇāṁ garhaṇa-
4 tāye²⁰⁷ pāyattikā • 74 || yo punar bhi-

**verso**
5 kṣuḥ svahastam prthiśvin²⁰⁸ khane vā khanāpaye
Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 26.20–25. ūnavimśatívarṣa<m> pudgalam bhikṣubhāvāya upasampādyeva so ca pudgalo anupasampanno te ca bhikṣu gārhyā imāṁ teṣāṁ bhikṣuṇāṁ garhaṇapācattikam l
(Pāc 72; see verso)
(Pāc 73) yo puna bhikṣuś svahastam prthiśvin khaneṣu vā khanāpaye

**verso**
1 vā añtamasato iham²⁰⁹ khane[m]ti²¹⁰ vā vade[y]. pāya-
2 ttikā • 75 || yo {vā}²¹¹ punar bhikṣu<ś jānaṁ> stainyasāṛthena
3 sārdham²¹² adhvānāMārganā pratipadyeyā²¹³ añtama-
4 sato grāmāṇtaram api vā pāyattikā 76 ||

---
²⁰⁹ kalpeva : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 70) kalpeva; Pātim (Pāc 44) kappēya; Sa (Pāt 43) kalpeya; Mū(HvH) -. ²⁰² PrMoSū(Ma-L) 26.16–19. // uddānam // (61) saṃcintya (63) kaukṛtyam (63) apratyuddharitvā (64) apaniheya l (65) bhīṣeya (66) udaka (67) anaguli (+ angolī) (68) saṃvidhāya (69) sahagāra (70) nisadyāya l/ ṣaptamo vargaḥ l.
²⁰³ ūnavimśatīvarṣa(m) : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 71) ūnavimśatīvarṣa<m> ; Pātim (Pāc 65) ūnavīsatīvassam ; Sa (Pāt 72), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 72) ūnavimśatīvarṣam.
²⁰⁴ pudgala : S.e. for "galam = Ma-L; Pātim puggalam; Sa, Mū(HvH) pudgalam.
²⁰⁵ bhikṣubhāvena : = Sa; Ma-L, Mū(HvH) "bhāvāya; Pātim -. ²⁰⁶ upasampādyeva : Cf. Ma-L "pādyeva; Pātim "pādyeva; Sa "pādyev; Mū(HvH) "pādyept.
²⁰⁷ bhikṣeṣūnās : Originally, bhikṣur had been written here, which was then changed to bhikṣeṣūnāsr by a later hand. S.e. for bhikṣu (= Ma-L); Pātim bhikṣhū; Sa, Mū(HvH) bhikṣavo.
²⁰⁸ gārhyā : Cf. Ma-L gārhyā; Pātim gārhyā; Sa gārhyā; Mū(HvH) garhyāh.
²⁰⁹ garhaṇatatyā : Cf. Ma-L garhaṇa; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -. ²¹⁰ khane vā khanāpaye vā : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 73) khaneṣu vā khanāpaye vā; Pātim (Pāc 10) khaneyya vā khanāpayya vā; Sa (Pāt 73) khanayat (v.l. khanet) khanayed vā; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 73) khanet khanayed vā; MaVin 384c20f. (Pāy 73), Ma.Ch 553c2 (Pāy 73) 自手掘之，若使人掘。 The order of this and the following rule is reversed in Ma-L as well as in the two Chinese translations.
²¹¹ vā : = Pkt < Skt. iha; this form is found also in BLSF II.1.1, p. 428, Or.15010/58 recto 4; cf. Ma-L iha = Ma.Ch 553c2. 是地; Pātim, Mū(HvH) -; Sa - (v.l. imām).
²¹² khanē[ṃ]tī : Cf. Ma-L khanēhitī; Pātim, Mū(HvH) -; Sa - (v.l. khanāvan). ²¹³ tāye : No parallels in the other versions.
²¹⁴ sārdham : ≠ Ma-L (Pāc 72) sārdham saṃvidhāya = MaVin 384b22 (Pāy 72), Ma.Ch 553b29 (Pāy 72) 期共; Pātim (Pāc 66) sādṛṣṭham samvidhāya; Sa (Pāt 71) sārdham samvidhāya; = Mū(HvH) (Pāy 71) sārdham.
²¹⁵ pratipadyeyā : Cf. Ma-L śeṣya; Pātim pratipajeyya; Sa= Mū(HvH) pratipadyeta.
5 caturmāsikena\textsuperscript{214} bhikṣunā prayakecraprāvanam\textsuperscript{215} 
ib. 26.23–24. (Pāc 72) yo puna bhikṣur jānan sthānyasārthanā sārdham samvidhāya
adhvānamārgam pratipadyeyya antamaśato grāmāntaram pi pācattikam l
ib. 26.27. (Pāc 74) cāturmāsikā bhikṣunā prayakecraprāvanā
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recto
1 sātayitavyā\textsuperscript{216} taduttaram\textsuperscript{217} sādayeyā\textsuperscript{218} anyatra
2 punahpravāraṇe anyatra yāvajjivakāye
3 pāyattikā : O 78\textsuperscript{219} || yo punar bhikṣur bhikṣu-
4 bhīr\textsuperscript{220} evam bucāmāno\textsuperscript{221} imehi te āvusā\textsuperscript{222} paṁca-
5 hi āpattikhehi\textsuperscript{223} anadhyācāraḥ\textsuperscript{224} śiṣkā kara-

\textsuperscript{214} caturmāsikena : S.e. for "sikā?; cf. Ma-L (Pāc 74) cāturmāsikā; Pātim (Pāc 47) caturmāsā-(ppaccaya-
pravāraṇā) (v.l. cātuṃmasā); Sa (Pāt 74) caturmāsikā (v.l. caturmāsām etc.); Mū(HvH) (Pāy 74) caturmāsikī.

\textsuperscript{215} prayakecraprāvanam : Cf. Ma-L "rānā; Ma-Vin 385c22f. (Pāy 74) बेदातिण्यः भक्षु:; Ma.CH 553c4 (Pāy 74) बेदातिण्यः; 
Pātim ppaccaya-pravāraṇā ("an invitation [to accept] requisites"); Sa, Mū(HvH) pravāraṇā.

\textsuperscript{216} sātayitavyā : S.e. for sādaya\textsuperscript{22}; cf. Ma-L sādayayā; Pātim sāditabba; Sa sādhatīrāvya (v.l. sīkārtīrāvya);
Mū(HvH) sīkārtīrāvya. Cf. SWTF s.vv. sādayitavya, sādhatīrāva.

\textsuperscript{217} taduttaram : Ma-L taduttarim; Pātim tato ce uttari (v.l. "rām"); Sa tta uttaram; Mū(HvH) tām atikramato.

\textsuperscript{218} sādayeyā : Ma-L sādhyeya; Pātim sādhyeya; Sa sādhyet; Mū(HvH) -.

\textsuperscript{219} 78 : This should be number 77. This wrong numbering caused errors in the consequent numerals up to 89
which occurs twice.

\textsuperscript{220} bhikṣubhir : = Sa (Pāt 75), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 75); cf. Ma-L (Pāc 75) bhikṣuḥ; Pātim (Pāc 71) bhikṣuḥ.

\textsuperscript{221} bucāmāno : S.e. for vucca\textsuperscript{4}; cf. Ma-L uccā; Pātim uccā; Sa, Mū(HvH) ucyā.

\textsuperscript{222} āvusā : Cf. Ma-L āyuṣam; Pātim āvusā; Sa - (v.l. āyuṣam); Mū(HvH) āyuṣman. Cf. also note 171, 384.

\textsuperscript{223} āpattikhehi : Cf. Ma-L āpattikhehi; Pātim sīkāppade; Sa, Mū(HvH) sīkṣāyāṃ.

\textsuperscript{224} anadhyācāraḥ : Cf. Ma-L anadhyāvācāya; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

\textsuperscript{225} karanīyam* : Cf. Ma-L karanīyā; Pātim -; Sa, Mū(HvH) (sīkṣāyām) sīkṣātyayam.

\textsuperscript{226} tāṃ bhikṣur : Probably s.e. for tāṃ bhikṣu (= Ma-L); Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

\textsuperscript{227} vade : Ma-L vadeya; Pātim vadeya; Sa vade; Mū(HvH) <vadena>.

\textsuperscript{228} sīkṣātyayam : It seems that the scribe had written first as sīkṣāsyaṁ then corrected to "sīvam. Read either
("sīvam(m)" or "sīvam(m)"; cf. Ma-L sīkṣāsyam; Pātim sīkṣāssāmi; Sa sīkṣāyām; Mū(HvH) sīkṣāsyam.

\textsuperscript{229} draksāyām : = Ma-L = Ma-Vin 386b9 (Pāy 75), Ma.CH 553c7 (Pāy 75) द्राक्षविन्। Probably, originally s.e.
for praksāyām (= Sa, Mū(HvH)); Pātim paripucchāmi (iī).

\textsuperscript{230} sthavirā bhikṣuh : Probably s.e. for sthavirā<ṃ> bhikṣuḥ; cf. Ma-L sthavirān bhikṣuṇ; Pātim aṅkhaṃ
bhikkhum; Sa anyaḥ ... bhikṣuṃ; Mū(HvH) anyāḥ bhikṣuṃ.

\textsuperscript{231} madhyamam bhikṣuṃ ... vinayadharāṃ mātrkādhāram : Acc. sg.; cf. Ma-L "mān bhikṣuṃ ... vinayadharāṃ
mātrkādhāram (pl.); Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.
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recto

1 [bhi]kṣu([n]) sūtradharāṃ vinayadharāṃ mātrkādharāṃ te\textsuperscript{232} 
2 ahaṃ upasamkramitvā\textsuperscript{233} pariṇipchisyām pari-
3 praṇiṣyāmī\textsuperscript{234} tē\textsuperscript{235} ca «tē» pāyattikā • 79 || \textsuperscript{236}a-
4 pī tu khulu śiksākāmena bhikṣuñājñātavyam*
5 \textsuperscript{237} upadḥārayitavyam* upalakṣayitavyam*

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 27.5–7. bhikṣuṃ sūtradharāṃ vinayadharāṃ mātrkādharāṃ / tāṃs tāvad
ahaṃ upasamkramya pariṇipchisyam pariṇipraṇiṣākariṣam ti, pācattikam / śiksākāmena
bhikṣunā ajñātavyam upalakṣayitavyam upadḥārayitavyam /

verso

1 surāmaireyamadya<pāne>\textsuperscript{238} pāyattikā • 80 || «bhikṣu» anāda-
2 ryake\textsuperscript{239} pāyattikā • 81 || yo punar bhikṣu bhikṣu-
3 bhī\textsuperscript{240} kalahaOjātehi\textsuperscript{241} bhāndanajātehi
4 \textsuperscript{242} vigrahaviśvādam āpānehi upapviharantehi śrōṇa-
5 sthātam\textsuperscript{243} tiṣṭhe\textsuperscript{244} vam cete\textsuperscript{245} vakṣyantī\textsuperscript{246} tām śrutvā\textsuperscript{247} paścā-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 27.8–11. (Pāc 76) surāmaireyamadya<pāne> (<−<pānām>) pācattikam /
(Pāc 77) bhikṣu(‘)nādārve pācattikam /
(Pāc 77) yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣuhi kalahaājatehi
bhāndanajātehi vigrahaviśvādapānnehi viharantehi upaśrotrasthāne tiṣṭhaya — vam ete
vadisyanti tām paścā-

\textsuperscript{232} te : Acc. pl. masc. (cf. BHSG § 21.30–31; Abhīs III 38, § 18.27); cf. Ma-L tāṃs; Pātīm, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.
\textsuperscript{233} upasamkramitvā : Cf. Ma-L tāvad "kramya; Pātīm, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.\textsuperscript{234}
\textsuperscript{234} pariṇipchisyām : Cf. Ma-L pariṇipraṇiṣākariṣam ti; Pātīm, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.\textsuperscript{235}
\textsuperscript{235} ca «tē» : No parallels in the other versions.
\textsuperscript{236} api tu khulu : No parallels in the other versions.
\textsuperscript{237} upadhaśrayitavyam* upalakṣayitavyam* : Cf. Ma-L upalakṣayitavyam upadhaśrayitavyam; Pātīm, Sa, Mū(HvH) -; MaVin 386b11, MaCh 553c10. 應學亦應問．
\textsuperscript{238} surāmaireyamadya<pāne> : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 76) surāmaireyamadya<pāne>; Pātīm (Pāc 51) surāmerayapāne; Sa (Pāt 79), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 79) surāmerayamadypadapāt.
\textsuperscript{239} bhikṣu(‘)nādārve : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 77) bhikṣu(‘)nādārve; MaCh 553c12 (Pāc 77) 輕他比丘; MaVin 387c15 (Pāc 77) 輕他; Pātīm (Pāc 54) anādarīve; Sa (Pāt 78) anādarīvekahā; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 78) anādarāt.\textsuperscript{240}
\textsuperscript{240} bhāndanajātehi : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 78) bhikṣuhi; Pātīm (Pāc 78) bhikṣhunām; Sa (Pāt 76), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 76) bhikṣunām.\textsuperscript{241}
\textsuperscript{241} kalahaājatehi : Cf. Ma-L jātehi; Pātīm ‘jātanaḥ; Sa, Mū(HvH) ‘jātanaṃ.
\textsuperscript{242} vigrahaviśvādam āpānehi : Cf. Ma-L ‘vivādāpānnehi; Pātīm vivādāpānnaṇaḥ; Sa vivādham (v.l. vīghṛtavī) āpānānaḥ; Mū(HvH) vivādām āpānānaṃ.
\textsuperscript{243} upapviharantehi śrōṇa-thātāhā : S.e. for viharantehi upaśrotrasthāne (or ‘śrotātthi’ [Nom. sg. of upaśrotṛ] + sīhaṇe?; cf. below 871r2); cf. Ma-L viharantehi upaśrotrasthāne; Pātīm upassutum; Sa tāṣṭum upaśrotikas; Mū(HvH) tāṣṭum upaśrotikāya.
\textsuperscript{244} tiṣṭhe : Cf. Ma-L tiṣṭhaya; Pātīm tiṣṭhey; Sa, Mū(HvH) tiṣṭhed.
\textsuperscript{245} cete : Cf. Ma-L ēte; Pātīm ime; Sa, Mū(HvH) etc.
\textsuperscript{246} vakṣyantī : Cf. Ma-L vadisyanti; Pātīm bhanissantī; Sa, Mū(HvH) vakṣyanti.
\textsuperscript{247} śrutvā : Cf. Ma-L (s.e.); Pātīm sosṣāmī (ti); Sa, Mū(HvH) ahaṃ śrutvā.
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recto
1 d upavāsaṃpharisyāmi tī • etad eva pratyaśam
2 kṛtvā «anānyam» iman tasya bhikṣusya upaśrotasthāne
3 pāyattikā O 82 || yo punar bhikṣur ja-
4 nam'258 saṃghike vinīscaye kathāyāṃ varta-
5 mānāyaṃ samantam bhikṣum
   Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 27.11~15. d upasampharisyāmī tī • etad eva pratyaśam kṛtvā, anānyam.
   iman tasya bhikṣusya upaśrotasthāne pācattikam l (Pāc 79) yo puna bhikṣuḥ samgha
   vinīscayakathāhi vartamānāḥ uttāhyāsanāt prakrameya santam bhikṣum

verso
1 anāmantrayātva uttāhyāsanā prakrameya255 pāyattikā : 83 []]
2 yo punar bhikṣur āraṇyake śāyāsane viharanto vikā-
3 lam'256 grāmaṃ praviṇīseyā255 samantam bhikṣum anāmantrayi-
4 tvā anyatā tathārūpe atavyikakarana'rē256 pā-
5 yatikā 84 || yo punar bhikṣuḥ sabhaktaḥ samā-
   Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 27.15~24. anāmantrayātva, anyatra tathārūpe atavyike karana'rē
   pācattikam l (Pāc 80) yo puna bhikṣu āraṇyake śāyāsane viharanto vikāle grāmaṃ
   praviṇīsya santam bhikṣum anāmantrayātva, anyatra tathārūpe atavyike karana'rē
   pācattikam l ...257 (Pāc 81) yo puna bhikṣuḥ sabhakto samā-

\[258\] anānyam : S.e. for ananyam; cf. Ma-L ananyam; Pāṭim ananōham; Sa, Mū(HvH) -; IOL San 1014vy (ed.
   Wille, “Buddhist Sanskrit Sources from Khotan”, BLSF II 61) ///. tvā anānyam. ///.

\[259\] upaśrotasthāne : upaśrotā (Nom. sg. of upaśrotṛ) + sthāne?; cf. Ma-L upaśrotasthāne (However, in uddānam
   [Ma-L 27.22], the manuscript reads upaśrotṛa).

\[256\] jānam : Superfluous. No parallels in the other versions.

\[257\] saṃghike vinīscaye kathāyāṃ vartamānāyām : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 79) samgha vinīscayakathāhi vartamānāhī;
Pāṭim (Pāc 80) saṃgha vinicchayakathāya vattamānāhī; Sa (Pāt 77) saṃghasa(a) niṣcittiyāṃ kathāyāṃ
   vartamānāyām; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 77) saṃghasa dharmāyāṃ vinīscayakathāyāṃ kathāmānāyām.

\[258\] (uttāhyāsanāto) samantam bhikṣum anāmantrayātva uttāhyāsanā prakrameya : Ma-L, uttāhyāsanēt
   prakrameya santam bhikṣum anāmantrayātva; Pāṭim chandaṃ adatvā uttāhyā' āsanā pakkameya; Sa āta
   uttāhyā pakramet santam bhikṣum anavalo(ya); Mū(HvH) ātaṃ vippakramet santam bhikṣum anavalo(ya);
   MaVin 388c11 (Pāy 79) śāyāsante, not do bhikṣuḥ; Ma.Ch. 553c11 (Pāy 79) go'ta, not do bhikṣuḥ.

\[259\] prakrameya : Cf. Ma-L prakrameya; Pāṭim pakkameya; Sa prakramer, Mū(HvH) vippakramet.

\[260\] vikālaṃ : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 80), Pāṭim (Pāc 85) vikāle; Sa (Pāt 80), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 80) akāle.

\[261\] praviṇīsya : Cf. Ma-L eva, Pāṭim praviṇīsya; Sa, Mū(HvH) praviṇet.

\[262\] atavyikakarana'rē : Cf. Ma-L atavyike karwiększ; Pāṭim accādikā karana'rē; Sa (tathārpa)-pratya bravery;
   Mū(HvH) (tadṛṣṭa)pār) pratya savvy.

\[263\] PrMoSū(Ma-L) 27.20~23. II. uddānam II (71) ūnavinśati (72) stainyasartho (73) prthivi (74) pravāraṇa (75)
   na śīksīṣyam (76) madayaṇām (77) anādaryam (78) upaśroṯra (79) vinīscaya (80) āranyakah II aṣṭamo
   vargaḥ II.
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recto
1 no purabhaka[m]²⁵⁸ paścābhaktam²⁵⁹ kuleṣu cāritram āpadyeyā²⁶⁰
2 satmaṃ bhikṣur²⁶¹ anāmaṃtryayitvā anyatra samaye pā-
3 yattikā : 805 || tatrāyaṃ samayo «glānasamayo»²⁶² cīvara-
4 kālasamayo²⁶³ ayam atra samayo « || » yo puna-
5 r bhikṣuḥ rājñā kṣatriyasā mūrdhnābhīṣiktasya²⁶⁴

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 27.24–27. no purebhaktaṃ paścābhaktam vā kuleṣu cāritram
āpadyeyā satmaṃ bhikṣur anāmaṃtryayitvā, anyatra samaye pācattikam l tatrāyaṃ samayo
— cīvaradānakālaśamayo l ayam atra samayah l (Pāc 82) yo puna bhikṣu rājñā
kṣatriyasā mūrdhnābhīṣiktasya

verso
1 janapadasthāvareyaṣprāptasya²⁶⁵ antaḥpuram pravi-
2 sēya²⁶⁶ anisīkramante rājāne anisīkramante stryāgare²⁶⁷
3 anirhriteΩhi ratanehi antamasato i-
4 ndrakilam-m a>lpli lāṃgheyā²⁶⁸ ānākkātyā : 86 || yo
5 punar bhikṣur daṃtavyam vā asthiṃmayaṃ vā²⁷⁰«śrīṃgamayaṃ vā» ratanā-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 27.27–28.2. janapadasthāmahāvyapraṃprātasya antaḥpuram praviṣeyānīs-
krante rājāne, anisīkramante antahpure, anirgatiehi ratanehi antamasato indrakilam pi
atikrameya pācattikam l (Pāc 83) yo puna bhikṣu daṃtavyam vā asthiṃmayaṃ
vā śrīṃgamayaṃ vā suvarṇamaṇyaṃ vā rūpyamayaṃ vā ratana-

²⁵⁸ purabhakta[m] : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 81) purebhaktaḥ; Pātim (Pāc 46) purebhaktaṃ vā; Sa (Pāt 81), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 81) pārvavabhaktaḥ.
²⁵⁹ paścābhaktam : Cf. Ma-L paścābhaktam vā; Pātim pacchābhaktam vā; Sa, Mū(HvH) paścābhaktam.
²⁶⁰ āpadyeyā : Cf. Ma-L “eṇa; Pātim āpadyeyā; Sa, Mū(HvH) āpadyeyā.
²⁶¹ bhikṣur : S.e. for bhikṣum; or read bhikṣau(Acc.)-r(ānāmaṃtryayitvā); Ma-L bhikṣum; Pātim, Sa :-; Mū(HvH) ghrītam.
²⁶² “glānasamayo” : This word, lacking in the other versions, is superfluous.
²⁶³ cīvaradānakālasamayo : Cf. Ma-L cīvaradānakālasamayo; Pātim cīvaradānakālasamayo; Sa, Mū(HvH) ;-; MaVin 390a5 (Pāy 81), Ma.Ch 553c19 (Pāy 81) 表時. Cf. note 107.
²⁶⁴ mūrdhnābhīṣiktasya : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 82) mūrdhnābhī; Pātim (Pāc 83) muddhābhīṣitassā; Sa (Pāt 82) mūrdha-
abhīṣiktasya (v.l. mūrdhnāḥ); Mū(HvH) (Pāy 82) mūrdhnābhīḥ.
²⁶⁵ janapadasthāvareyaṣprāptasya : Probably s.e. for “sthāmahāvyapṛṣṭa = Ma-L ; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) ;-; MaVin 390c15 (Pāy 82), Ma.Ch 553c19 (Pāy 82) -. The expression janapadasthāmahāvyapṛṣṭa occurs also in the Mahāvastu, Āstasāhasrīkā Prājñāparāmitā, Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra etc.
²⁶⁶ praviṣeyā : Cf. Ma-L praviṣeyā; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) ;-.
²⁶⁷ stryāgare : Cf. Ma-L antahpure; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) ;-; MaVin 390c15. 王夫人; Ma.Ch 553c20. 夫人.
²⁶⁸ anirhriṭehi ratanehi : < anirhriṭe hi r⁵; a locative absolute; for Loc. pl. -e hi, see Abhīs III 15f., § 5.9 (with references); cf. Ma-L anirgatiehi ratanehi; Pātim anirgata ratanake; Sa anirgrhiṣeṣu ratneṣu; Mū(HvH) anirhriṣeṣu ratneṣu vā ratnasamamateṣu vā.
²⁶⁹ lāṃgheyā : Cf. Ma-L atikrameya; Pātim atikkāmeya; Sa, Mū(HvH) samatikrameya; MaVin 390c16, Ma.Ch 553c20. 過(門限).
²⁷⁰ “śrīṃgamayaṃ vā” ratanāyam vā : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 83) śrīṃgamayaṃ vā suvarṇamaṇyaṃ vā rūpyamayaṃ vā ratanāyam vā; the fragments of the Prātimokṣa-Vibhaṅga of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins in the Scheyen Collection, written in early Western Gupta script, read śrīṃgamayaṃ vā suvarṇamaṇyaṃ vā rūpyamaya(ṃ) // (Karshim 2006: 161); Pātim (Pāc 86) visāngamayaṃ vā; Sa (Pāt 84), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 84) visāngamayaṃ vā; MaVin 391b7 (Pāy 83), Ma.Ch 553c22 (Pāy 83) 角; cf. also MaVin 391b15. 不聰金銀寶等作針筒.
recto

1 mayaṁ\textsuperscript{271} vā sucīgharaṁ\textsuperscript{272} kāṟāpaye\textsuperscript{273} bhedāt\textsuperscript{274} pāya-

2 tikā : 87 || mançaṁ pītham vā bhikṣuṇā kārayamā-

3 nena\textsuperscript{275} sugataṅgulipramāṇam pādakaṁ kārā-

4 payitavyam anyatra adānye\textsuperscript{276} taduttaraṁ\textsuperscript{277} kārā-

5 paye\textsuperscript{278} chedanāye\textsuperscript{279} pāyatikā : 88 || yo pu-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 28.2–6. mayam vā sucīvighram kārāpeya bhedanapācattikam / (Pāc 84) maṇcām vā pītham vā bhikṣuṇā kāṟāpayamāṇena sugataṅgulipramāṇāḥ pādakāḥ kāṟāpayavitavyāḥ anyatratattaniye, taduttaraṁ kārāpeya cchedanapācattikam / (Pāc 85) yo pu-

verso

1 nar bhikṣuṁ tūlasaṁśtārāmayam\textsuperscript{280} mançaṁ vā pītham vā abhi-

2 niśde\textsuperscript{282} vā abhinīṣade vā uddharaṇayā\textsuperscript{283} pāyat-

3 kā : 89 || niśīdānam bhikṣuṇā kāṟāpayamāṇe-

4 na prāmāṇikam kārāpayitavyam tattreṇa pramāṇam-

5 dirghaṁ dvai\textsuperscript{284} vístatayo\textsuperscript{285} sugatavístatinā tiryō\textsuperscript{286}

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 28.6–9. na bhikṣuṁ tūlasaṁśtārāmayam maṁce vā pitham vā abhinīṣade vā abhīṁśaṁ padayey vā uddharaṇacattikam / (Pāc 86) niśīdānam bhikṣuṇā kāṟāpayamāṇena prāmāṇikam kārāpayitavyam / tattreṇa pramāṇam — dirghaṁ dvæ vístatayo sugata vístatinā tiryō

\textsuperscript{271} rataṇāmayam : Cf. Ma-L rataṇamayaṁ; BHSD, p. 452, s.v. rata(n)āmayā (Mvu), BHSG 8.16; Pkt. rataṇā-

\textsuperscript{272} sucīgharaṁ : Cf. Ma-L sucīvighram; Pātim sucīharaṁ; Sa sucīgharaṁ; Mū(HvH) sucīghrham; Mvy 8511. sucīghrakā.-

\textsuperscript{273} kāṟāpay : Cf. Ma-L kārāpeya; Pātim kārāpeya; Sa kāryaṁ; Mū(HvH) kāraye<\textit{d}>

\textsuperscript{274} bhedāt : S.e. for bhedaṁt; cf. Ma-L bhedaṁtara; Pātim bhedaṁtaram; Sa - (v.l. bhe(da)mañña); Mū(HvH) bhedaṁtara

\textsuperscript{275} sugataṅgulipramāṇam pādakaṁ kāṟāpayitavyam : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 84) 2 gulaṁpramāṇāḥ pādakāḥ kāṟāpayi-

tavyāḥ; the fragments in the Schoyen Collection read 2 gulaṁpramāṇāḥ pādakāḥ kāṟāpayitavyā (Karashima 2006: 161); Pātim (Pāc 87) atthangulapādakāṁ kāretabbaṁ; Sa (Pāt 85) sugataṅgulipramāṇāḥ pādāḥ kāṟāpayitavyā; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 85) gulaṁpramāṇāḥ pādakāḥ kāṟāpayitavyā

\textsuperscript{276} adānye : Probably s.e. for adānye < Skt. atāṇi (“the notched end [of the leg of a couch or chair]”); cf. Ma-L āṭṭāṇi; the fragment in the Schoyen Collection reads adānīye (Karashima 2006: 161); Pātim āṭṭhīmāya āṭṭaniya; Sa āranyās (s.e. for *ādanyās?); Mū(HvH) āṭṭikāyās

\textsuperscript{277} taduttaraṁ : Ma-L taduttaraṁ; Pātim tam atikāmayato; Sa tata uttaram; Mū(HvH) tata uttari

\textsuperscript{278} kāṟāpaye : Or “paye (chedanāya); Cf. Ma-L kārāpeya; Pātim - ; Sa kāryaṁ; Mū(HvH) kāreyec

\textsuperscript{279} chedanāye : Or (kāṟāpaye) cē. Cf. Ma-L cchedanā; Pātim chedanakām; Sa - ; Mū(HvH) cchedanāt

\textsuperscript{280} tūlasaṁśtārāmayam : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 85) tūlasaṁstrte; Pātim (Pāc 88) tūlonaddham; Sa (Pāt 86) tūlasaṁstrtam; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 86) tūlenāpanahāyād

\textsuperscript{281} maṇcām vā pītham vā : Cf. Ma-L maṇce vā pīthe vā; Pātim maṇcām vā pītham vā (tūlonaddham kārāpeya); Sa (sāyaṁ) avanahaṛaḥ; Mū(HvH) maṇcām vā pītham vā (tūlenāpanahāyād

\textsuperscript{282} abhinīṣade vā abhinīṣade vā : Abhinīṣade is s.e. for abhinipadeye (“may lie down on”); cf. Ma-L abhinīṣadeye vā abhi<śa> ṁpadyey vā; MaVin 392a28 (Pāy 85); Ma,Ch 553c25 (Pāy 85) 若坐若臥。 Cf. also Pātim (tūlonaddham) kārāpeya; Sa (sāyaṁ) avanahṛaḥ avanahaṛaḥ vā; Mū(HvH) (tūlenā)panahahāyād upanahahāyād vā

\textsuperscript{283} uddaṁrālaye : Cf. Ma-L uddālana; Pātim uddālanakām; Sa - ; Mū(HvH) uddālanār; MaVin 392a28. 挽出已 (“having pulled out”); Ma,Ch 553c25. 出已 (“having brought out”).

\textsuperscript{284} dvau : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 86); Pātim (Pāc 89); Sa (Pāt 89), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 89) dve. Cf. notes 298, 526.

\textsuperscript{285} vístatayo : Cf. Ma-L vístayaḥ; Pātim vidatthīyā; Sv vístataḥ; Mū(HvH) vístatayo

\textsuperscript{286} tiryō : Cf. Ma-L tiryag; Pātim tiriyaṁ; Sa tiryak; Mū(HvH) tiryag. Cf. also BHSD, s.v. tiriya.
recto

1 ca²⁸⁷ ḏ[o]-v-aḍḍhaṃ²⁸⁸ taduttaram²⁸⁹ kārāpaye²⁹⁰ cchedanāt²⁹¹ pāyattikā :
2 kāṇḍūpracchādānam²⁹² bhikṣunā kārāpayamāṇena prā-
3 māṇikam kāra ○ yitavyam²⁹¹ tatra idaṃ pramāṇaṃ di-
4 rghaśo catvāra²⁹⁵ vitastayo²⁹⁶ sugatavitastinā tī-
5 ryo²⁹⁶ ca²⁹⁷ dvau²⁹⁸ taduttaram²⁹⁹ kārāpaye³⁰⁰ cchedanāya³⁰¹ pā-

 Cf. PrMoŚū(Ma-L) 28.9–13. ḍyvārdham ananyatra daśavīttastikam / taduttarim kārāpeya
cchedanapāccattikam / (Pāc 87) kāṇḍūpracchādānam bhikṣunā kārāpayamāṇena
prāmāṇikam kārāpayitavayam / tatrēdaṃ pramāṇam dirghaśo catvāri vitastayo
sugatavitastinā tīryag dve / taduttarim kārāpeya cchedanapā-

verso

1 yattikā : varṣakaśāṭakam³⁰² bhikṣunā kārāpayamāṇe-
2 na³⁰³ prāmāṇikam kārāpayitavayam* tatredaṃ pramāṇaṃ[y]yam
3 dirghaśo saḍ vi otastayo³⁰⁴ sugatavitastinā tī-
4 rya³⁰⁵ ca aḍḍhātikam³⁰⁶ taduttaram³⁰⁷ kārāpaye³⁰⁸ cche<da>nāye³⁰⁹
5 pāyattikā : yo punar bhikṣuḥ sugatasya³¹⁰ suga-

 Cf. PrMoŚū(Ma-L) 28.13–17. cattikam / (Pāc 88) varṣaśāṭāikā bhikṣunā kārāpayamāṇena
prāmāṇikā kārāpayitavā / tatrēdaṃ pramāṇam — dirghaśo saḍ vi otastayo sugatavitastinā,
tīryag addhātyaṃ / taduttarim kārāpeya cchedanapāccattikam / (Pāc 89) yo puna bhikṣuḥ
suga-

2⁸⁷ ca : No parallels in the other versions.
2⁸⁸ ḍ[o]-v-aḍḍhaṃ : Cf. Ma-L dvyārdham; Pātīṃm dvyāddham; Sa sārdhaōvitastir; Mūḥ(HvH) a<ṛddha>-ṛṭiyās.
2⁸⁹ tadduttaram : Cf. Ma-L ṭtarim; Pātīṃm tam atikkāmmaya; Sa tata uttaram; Mūḥ(HvH) tata uttari.
2⁹⁰ kārāpaye : Cf. Ma-L kārāpeya; Pātīṃm ; Sa kārayet; Mūḥ(HvH) kārayec.
2⁹¹ cchedanāt : Cf. Ma-L cchedana-; Pātīṃm cchedanat; Sa ; Mūḥ(HvH) chedanāt.
2⁹² kāṇḍūpracchādānam : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 87), Mūḥ(HvH) (Pāy 88) ṭpracchādānaṃ; Pātīṃm (Pāc 90) kāṇḍu-
pracchādānam; Sa (Pāt 88) kāṇḍūpracchādānam.
2⁹³ kārāpayitavayam : Cf. Ma-L kārāpayitavayam; Pātīṃm kāretabbā; Sa, Mūḥ(HvH) kārāpayitavayam.
2⁹⁴ catvāra : Cf. Ma-L catvārī; Pātīṃm catassā; Sa, Mūḥ(HvH) catasro.
2⁹⁵ vitastayo : Cf. Ma-L viastayo; Pātīṃm viasthiyo; Sa, Mūḥ(HvH) vitastayah.
2⁹⁶ tīrya : Cf. Ma-L tīryag; Pātīṃm tīryaṃ; Sa tīryag; Mūḥ(HvH) tīryag.
2⁹⁷ ca : No parallels in the other versions.
2⁹⁸ dvau : Cf. Ma-L, Pātīṃm, Sa, Mūḥ(HvH) dve. Cf. notes 284, 526.
2⁹⁹ tadduttaram : Cf. Ma-L ṭtarim; Pātīṃm tam atikkāmmaya; Sa tata uttaram; Mūḥ(HvH) tata uttari.
3⁰⁰ kārāpaye : Cf. Ma-L kārāpeya; Pātīṃm ; Sa kārayet; Mūḥ(HvH) kārayec.
3⁰¹ cchedanāya : The akṣara ya was crossed out apparently by a later hand. Cf. Ma-L cchedana-; Pātīṃm
chedanakam; Sa ; Mūḥ(HvH) chedanāt.
3⁰² varṣakaśāṭakam : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 88) varṣaśāṭikā; Pātīṃm (Pāc 91) vassikasāṭikam; Sa (Pāt 87), Mūḥ(HvH) (Pāy 89)
varṣaśāṭcvaram.
3⁰³ prāmāṇikam kārāpayitavayam* : Cf. Ma-L ćnikā ćtavyā; Pātīṃm pamāṇikā kāretabbā; Sa, Mūḥ(HvH)
prāmāṇikā kārāpayitavayam.
3⁰⁴ vitastayo : Cf. Ma-L viastayo; Pātīṃm viasthiyo; Sa, Mūḥ(HvH) vitastayah.
3⁰⁵ tīrya : Cf. Ma-L tīryag; Pātīṃm tīryaṃ; Sa tīryak; Mūḥ(HvH) tīryag.
3⁰⁶ aḍḍhātikam : A hyper-Sanskritism of Pā = BHS. addha-tya ("two and a half"); cf. Ma-L aḍḍhatikāṃ;
Pātīṃm aḍḍhatikā; Sa sārdhe (v.l. sāṛddhaṃ) dve; Mūḥ(HvH) a<ṛddha>-ṛṭiyās. Cf. also 79ṛ5 ardhaṭākā.
3⁰⁷ tadduttaram : Cf. Ma-L ṭtarim; Pātīṃm tam atikkāmmaya; Sa tata uttaram; Mūḥ(HvH) tata uttari.
3⁰⁸ kārāpaye : Cf. Ma-L kārāpeya; Pātīṃm ; Sa kārayet; Mūḥ(HvH) kārayec.
3⁰⁹ cche<da>nāye : Cf. Ma-L cchedana-; Pātīṃm cchedanakam; Sa ; Mūḥ(HvH) chedanāt.
3¹⁰ sugatasya : This word, lacking in the other versions, is superfluous.
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**recto**

1 tācīvarapramāṇena\(^{311}\) cīvaraṃ kārāpayet\(^{312} 313\) t[ō] vā pu-
2 nar uttaraṃ\(^{314}\) kārāpaye\(^{315}\) cchedanāt\(^{316}\) pāyattiṃ • 89 ||
3 kiṃ ca tasya bhāgavato tathāgatasyārhatah samyaksambuddhasya sugatasya sugataćcāvarapramāṇam?
4 samyaksambuddhasya sugatasya sugataćcāvarapra-
5 māṇḍirghaśo dasā\(^{317}\) vitastaya\(^{318}\) sugatavi-

*Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 28.17–19. tācīvarapramāṇaṃ cīvaraṃ kārāpeya. — kiṃ ca tasya bhāgavato tathāgatasyārhatah samyaksambuddhasya sugatasya sugataćcāvarapramāṇam? dirghaśo nava vitastayo sugatavi-

**verso**

1 stinā\(^{[19]}\) tāryau\(^{319}\) ca śaṭ* idaṃ tasya [bh]agavato tathāgata-
2 sya a[rhato sa]myaksambuddhasya sugatasya «(su)gata»cīvara-
3 pramāṇaṃ || yoJ O punar bhikṣu bhikṣusya 230 duṣto doṣo\(^{321}\)
4 kupto (a)n[ātt]amano amūlakena samghāvaśe-
5 sēna\(^{322}\) dharmeṇa amudhvaṃseyā\(^{323}\) pāyattiṃ : «90 ||»

*Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 28.19–23. stinā tāryak sa t idam tasya bhāgavato tathāgatasyārhatah samyaksambuddhasya sugatasya sugataćcāvarapramāṇam | tato vā punar uttarir kārāpeya cchedanapācattikam l | (Pāc 90) yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣusya duṣto dosat kupto anāttamanato amūlakena samghātiṣesena dharmena amudhvaṃseyā pācattikam l |
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**recto**

1 y(o) punar bhikṣa[ṇ] ... (s)ā[r]m(ī)n(h)īkaṁ lābhāṃ samghe pariṇa-
2 tāṃ pūḍg[n]alo pūdgalasya pariṇāmaya\(^{324}\) pāyatti-

---

311 sugataćcāvarapramāṇena : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 89) 'pramāṇam'; Pātim (Pāc 92) 'ppamānam'; Sa (Pāt 90) 'pramāna'; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 90) 'pra-māmaṃ'.
312 kārāpayet : Cf. Ma-L kārāpeya; Pātim kārāpeya; Sa, Mū(HvH) kāraved.
313 tāfo[...] vā punar uttaram kārāpeya cchedanāt pāyattiṃ • 89 || kimca tasya bhāgavato ... «(su)gata» cīvara-
314 pramāṇaṃ : The word order in our manuscript agrees with that in Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) as well as in the Chinese translations, namely MaVin 394b5f. (Pāy 89) 若过意之者。是慧提。如来衣名長九修伽陀德手，廣六揵手，名名來列衣；Ma.Ch 554a4f. (Pāy 89) 若過意之者。是慧提。如來衣名長九修伽陀德手，廣六揵手，手手ord in Ma-L is reversed, namely: kiṃ ca tasya bhāgavato ... sugataćcāvarapramāṇam | tato vā punar uttarir kārāpeya cchedanapācattikam l |
315 uttaram : Cf. Ma-L uttarir; Pātim atirekaṃ; Sa uttaraṃ; Mū(HvH) uttareṇa.
316 kārāpeya : Cf. Ma-L kārāpeya; Sa, Mū(HvH) .
317 dasa : = Mū(HvH); ≠ Ma-L, Pātim, Sa; MaVin 394b6, Ma.Ch 554a5. 九(“nine”).
318 vitastaya : Cf. Ma-L vitastayo; Pātim vidatitthyo; Sa, Mū(HvH) vitastayah.
319 tāryau : S.e. for tāryo?; cf. 89v5, 90r4–5. tāryo; 90v3–4. tārya; Ma-L tāryak; Pātim tāryām; Sa tāryak; Mū(HvH) tāryak.
320 duṣto doṣo kupto (a)nāṭṭamano : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 90) duṣto doṣat kupto anāttamano; Pātim (Pāc 76) -; Sa (Pāt 69) - (v.l. dviṣo dvesād api)ratītaḥ suṭṭādhajjhaḥ ... anāpannam; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 69) dviṣo dvesād api)ratītāḥ suṭṭādhjaḥ ... anāpannam; MaVin 395a8 (Pāy 90), Ma.Ch 554a6 (Pāy 90) धोषविनयस्या.
321 doṣo : S.e. for doṣā; cf. Ma-L doṣā; Pātim -; Sa - (v.l. dvesād; Mū(HvH) dvesād.
322 samghāvaśeṣena : = Sa, Mū(HvH); cf. Ma-L samghātiṣesena; Pātim samghādhāsesena.
323 amudhvaṃseyā : Cf. Ma-L oya; Pātim amudhvaṃseyā; Sa, Mū(HvH) amudhvaṃsayet.
324 pariṇāmaya : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 91) pariṇāmeya; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.
3 kā : [y]o p[u]nār bhikṣuḥ anvardhamāsāṃ prāti-
4 mokṣāṣūṭre335 uddhasīyamāṇe326 evaṃ vade327 idāniṃ328
5 punaḥ aham jānāmi idāni329 punaḥ aham «paṇṭasyāmi»330.

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 28.24–27. (Pāc 91) yo puna bhikṣur jānan āṃghikam lābbham samghe
parinatam pudgalo pudgalasya parināmyena pācatikam ī (Pāc 92) yo puna bhikṣur
anvardha-māsam sūtre prātimokṣe uddhasīyamāne evam vadeva — adya punar aham jānāmi.
idāntam punar aham jānāmi

verso

1 ayaṃ pi dharmo sūtrāgato sūtraparipāpanno311 sūtre anva-
2 rdhamāsāṃ prātimokṣoddesām āgaccha(ṃ)ti332 jānāṇi<ṃ>ti 333 kho pu-
3 naḥ te bhikṣuḥ saṃ tan O bhikṣu334 335 sakṛdāgum(ṃ)pto sakṛttrigupto
4 āgatapūrvaṃ<ṃ> pī sannisāṇapūrvaṃ pī «saṃjinipatatpurvaṃ pī»336 kah punar vā-
5 do bahuṣo337 338 kho punas tasya bhikṣusya añātakaṃ339 mo-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 28.27–31. — ayaṃ pi dharmo sūtrāgato sūtraparipāpanno
anvardhamāsāṃ sūtre prātimokṣe uddeśam āgacchati /

333 sārtaḥsahasrāmān nāstām bhaṃ mahyam āpattih jānānā ca te bhikṣuṃ tām bhikṣṣaṃ sakṛd dvikkhuto trikkhūto
āgatapūrvaṃ pī sannisāṇapūrvaṃ pī, kah punar vā do bahuṣo /

335 prātimokṣāṣūṭre : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 92) sūtre prātimokṣe; Pātim (Pāc 73) pātimokkhe; Sa (Pāt 83) prātimokṣa-
sūtrō (uddhasīyamāne); Mū(HvH) (Pāy 83) prātimokṣasūtroddēse.
326 uddhasīyamāne : Probably s.e. for uddhasīyamāne (= 93r5); Cf. Ma-L, Sa, Mū(HvH) uddhasīyamāne; Pātim
uddhasīyamāne.
377 vade : Cf. Ma-L vadeya; Pātim vadeya; Sa, Mū(HvH) vadeda.
328 idāniṃ : Cf. Ma-L adya; Pātim idānī (eva); Sa, Mū(HvH) idānīn.
329 idāni : Cf. Ma-L idānī; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.
330 «paṇṭasyāmi» : Cf. Ma-L jānāmī; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.
331 sūtre anvardhamāsāṃ prātimokṣoddesām āgaccha(ṃ)ti : Cf. Ma-L anvardhamāsāṃ sūtre prātimokṣe uddeśam āgacchati;
Pātim anvāḍhamsāṃ uddeśsam āgacchati; Sa, Mū(HvH) -; Cf. MaVin 396aSf. (Pāy 92), Ma.Ch
554a10f. (Pāy 92) 半月波羅提木又中說.
332 jānāṇi<ṃ>ti ... te bhikṣuḥsā : Cf. Ma-L jānena ... te bhikṣuḥ; Pātim aññhe bhikkhā jāneyyaṃ; Sa bhiksavo
jāntyuhuḥ; Mū(HvH) bhikṣavo jāntraṇ; MaVin 396a6, Ma.Ch 554a11. 諸比丘知。For nom. pl. bhikṣu
("monks"), see BHSG § 12.61, Abhis III 30, § 11.9.
333 kho punaḥ : Cf. Ma-L ca ("if"); see BHSD, s.v. ca 2; SWTF, s.v. ca 5; Bollée 2002: 249; DP, s.v. ca 3; Abhis
I 237 ca 3); Pātim ca; Sa ca ("if"); Mū(HvH) ca.
334 bhikṣu : Cf. Ma-L bhikṣuṃ; Pātim bhikkhum; Sa, Mū(HvH) -.
335 sakṛdāgum(ṃ)pto sakṛttrigupto : S.e. for sakṛd <dhv>igupto sakṛt <dhv>igupto? Gupto is a hyper-Sanskritism of MI
kutto < Skt. kvrvas (ĀMg kvrva, Pā khattum, BHs kvrva, kvrva, kvrva, kvrva, kvrva, kvrva, kvrva, kvrva, kvrva, kvrva,
svaktaṃ etc. [see BHSD, s.v. kvrva; Abhis III 279, s.v. tri-ksatto; cf. also BHs gupati which is a hyper-form
of MI kuti < Skt. klpti). Cf. Ma-L sakṛdāgum dvikkhuto trikkhuto; Pātim dvitikkhutto; Sa dvī trihi; Mū(HvH) dve
trīṇi vā.
336 aṣaṃjinipatatpurvaṃ pīv : These words, lacking in the other versions, are superfluous.
337 na ... mokti bhavati : Cf. Ma-L nāsti ... muktiḥ; Pātim na ... mutti attth; Sa nāsti ... mokṣo; Mū(HvH) na ... muktiḥ.
338 kho punas : Cf. Ma-L kho punas; Pātim ca; Sa punar; Mū(HvH) eva.
339 añātakaṃ : S.e. for añātakaṃ ("without knowing"); Cf. Ma-L añānena ("because of ignorance"); Pātim
añānakena; Sa añānān (mokṣo); Mū(HvH) añānān (muktiḥ); MaVin 396a7, Ma.Ch 554a12f. 以不知故.
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recto
1 kṣa. bhavati atha khaluṣaṃ so āpattim āpanno bhavatiṣya
2 tam kṣipram evaṃ yathādharman yathāvinayam kārāpay-
3 tavamṣaṃ taduttaṃCramaṇa sammoham āpādayitavyo
4 tasya te āvusṣaṃ sulābhāṃ durlabdhaṃ (na s(u)labdhijā) ysva tvaṃ anvardhamāṃsāṃ sûre
5 rdhamāṃs prātimokṣasūtre uddiṣyamāne nāṣṭaḥ-

Cf. PrMoSu(Ma-L) 28.31–33. kṣīṭha khaḥ yāṃ pi ca so bhikṣur āpattim āpanno tāṃ
ksipram evaṃ yathādharman yathāvinayam kārāpayitavyo, uttaram ca sammoham
āpādayitavyo. tasya te āyasman labdhā durlabdhaḥ ysva tvaṃ anvardhamāṃsāṃ sûre
prātimokṣa uddiṣyamāne nāṣṭaḥ-

verso
1 kṛtvā na manas[i]kṛtvā na sarvacetāḥ samanvāhara-
2 yītvā nāvahitasroto dharmam śṛṣṇiḥ imam tasya
3 bhikṣusya sammoOhanāye pāyātikā : | uddi-
4 śṭam kṣaṃ kho punar āyuṣmanto dvānavati pāyātikā dharmāḥ
5 tatāhāṃ āyuṣmāṇtānāṃ praccāṃ prāṣṭhāṃ kaś cātra pariṣuddhāḥ

Cf. PrMoSu(Ma-L) 28.33–29.11. kṛtvā na manasikṛtvā na sarvacetasaṃ samanvāhyā
ayaḥitaśroto satkṛtya dharmam śroṣṣiti (śaṅo [mis]) limam tasya bhikṣusya sammo-

---

341 mokṣa : Cf. Ma-L muktih; Pātim mutt; Sa mokṣa; Mūḥ(HV) muktih.
342 khalu : Cf. Ma-L khulu; Pātim ca; Sa, Mūḥ(HV) -.
343 yam ... taṃ : Cf. Ma-L yāṃ ... tāṃ; Pātim yāṃ ... taḥ; Sa yāṃ (v.l. īvaṃ) ... tāṃ; Mūḥ(HV) yāṃ ... taḥ.
344 so : Cf. Ma-L pi ca so bhikṣur; Pātim ca; Sa ca; Mūḥ(HV) sa.
345 bhavati : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim -; Sa syār, Mūḥ(HV) -.
346 kārāpayitavyam : Cf. Ma-L kārāpayitavyo; Pātim kāretabba; Sa kārayitavya ("vyaṃ"; Mūḥ(HV) "vya.
347 taduttaram : Cf. Ma-L uttaram; Pātim uttarī (v.l. "riḥ"); Uttaṃ uttāṃ; Mūḥ(HV) uttarī.
348 āvyasā : Cf. Ma-L āyuṣman; Pātim āvyasa; Sa āyuṣman; Mūḥ(HV) āyuṣman. Cf. also note 171, 384.
349 sulābhah : S.e. for alābhah; Cf. Ma-L labāḥ; Pātim labāḥ; Sa alābhoh; Mūḥ(HV) alābāḥ.
350 durlabdhaṃ : Cf. Ma-L durlābhah; Pātim durlabhah; Sa durlabhah; Mūḥ(HV) durlabhah.
351 ena s(y)labdhijā : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim -; Sa na sulābhadhā; Mūḥ(HV) na sulābhadhā.
352 anvardhamāśe : Cf. Ma-L, Sa, Mūḥ(HV) "māśam; Pātim -.
353 prātimokṣasūtre : Cf. Ma-L sūre prātimokṣe; Pātim pātimokkhe; Sa prātimokṣasūtrydīdiśyamāṇe; Mūḥ(HV) prātimokṣasūtrydīdiśyamāṇe.
354 asīrhiṣh:रvā : Cf. Ma-L avahiḥkṛtvā; Pātim ādīhikaṭāvā (v.l. āṭhīṃ karva); Sa sakṛtyārhiṣh:रvā;
Mūḥ(HV) guṇākṛtya ... asīrhiṣh:रvā. The forms asīrhiṣh:रvā are hyper-Sanskritisms of Ml āṭhīṃ-kṛṣṇa < arthi-kṛṣṇa.
355 sarvacetāḥ : Cf. Ma-L, Sa, Mūḥ(HV) "cetasaḥ; Pātim -.
356 samanvāharyāśvītā : Cf. Ma-L, Sa, Mūḥ(HV) samanvāhityā; Pātim -.
357 nāvahitasroto : Cf. Ma-L ayaḥitaśroto (cf. SWTF, s.v.) satkṛtya; Pātim -; Sa nāvahitasroto; Mūḥ(HV)
358 nāvahitasroto.
359 sammoOhanaye : Cf. Ma-L sammoOhanaye; Pātim mohanake; Sa samavejanāt; Mūḥ(HV) śikṣā samavejanāt.
360 uddiṣṭam : Cf. Ma-L uddiṣṭah; Pātim uddiṣṭhā (p. 82); Sa (p. 235), Mūḥ(HV) (at the end of the Praṇīttaka
Dharmāḥ) uddiṣṭa.
361 dnavātivā : = Ma-L; Pātim dvnavātivā; Sa navātivā; Mūḥ(HV) navātivā.
362 pāyātikā : Cf. Ma-L, sādhūpapacatikā; Pātim pācitrīvā; Sa pācitrīvā; Mūḥ(HV) pāyātikā; Ma.Ch 554a18.
363 ahām : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim -; Sa, Mūḥ(HV) ahām.
364 āyuṣmāṇānām : Cf. Ma-L "smano; Pātim āyuṣmante; Sa āyuṣmātaḥ (v.l. "śmantaḥ"); Mūḥ(HV) "śmataḥ.
365 kaś cātra : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim kac(ī)tha; Sa, Mūḥ(HV) kac(ī)thāra. Cf. also note 2.
pācattikam | ...uddisṭhah ko punar āyuṣmanto dvānavati śuddhapācattikā dharmāḥ |
tātrāyuṣmanto prechāmi kacci (')ttha pariṣuddhāḥ?
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**recto**

1 dveteśyakam[!]的安全性.452 tr(e)jītyakam437 pi āyuṣmanto prechāmi438 yassat tūṣī ēvam etam dhārayāmi ◊ ime kho

2 mi 369 kaś cātra pariṣuddhā pariṣuddhās cāṭrāyusmanto 370

3 yassat tūṣī ēvam etam dhārayāmi ◊ ime kho

4 punar āyuṣmanto cattvāraḥ prādeśanikā439 dharmāh 372 sū-

5 tre anvardhamāse prātimokse udeśasam āgacchānti •

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 29.11~16. dviteṣyakam pi āyuṣmanto prechāmi kacci (')ttha pariṣuddhāḥ?

triteṣyakam pi āyuṣmanto prechāmi kacci (')ttha pariṣuddhāḥ? pariṣuddhā atrāyuṣmanto

yassat tūṣī ēvam etam dhārayāmi ◊ ime kho punar āyuṣmanto cattvāraḥ prādeśanikā dharmā anvardhamāsam sūtre

prātimokse udeśasam āgacchānti —

**verso**

1 yo punar bhikṣuḥ āranyake śayyāsane433 viharanto pū-

2 rve «apravārita»434 apratisamvidito435 aparigrhītato436 bahirdhā ca

3 apratigrhītoto avīcāyasavastusmi437 378 svaḥastam

4 khādanīyaṃ bhōjaṇīyaṃ pratigrahaṇaitevāvā 379 a-
5 ហើយ បំផ្លាញ ព្រះសិប្បសិទ្ធិ នោះ

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 29.17–19. (Prāti 1) yo puna bhikṣu āryanyake sāvanāsane viharanto
pūrve apratisamveditam bahirdhā apratigrhitam antavāsastasminānagalānaya
khādanaṇyam vā bhoojanāṇa vā pratigrhiniyā khādeya vā bhūjyeyā vā bhūktāvina282 tena
bhikṣunā prati-devāviveyam —
2 yitavyaṃ tena bhikṣunā asampreyam⁵⁹ me āvusā⁵⁰ gāra-
3 hyam⁴⁰ prādesanīōkaṃ⁴⁰ dharmam⁴³ āpattim āpanno taṃ dharmam
4 prādesayāmi⁴⁶ ayaṃ pi dharmo prādesaniyo⁴⁵ bhikṣu
5 kho punaḥ anitaraṅghaṛje⁴⁶ nimantritakā paribhūmje⁴⁰ tatra⁴⁸

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 29.23–26. grhitvā, khādeya, (=khādeya [misp]) vā bhunjeyvā vā bhuktavā⁴⁹ tena bhikṣunā pratideśayitvam, — asampreyam me āyusman gāryam prātideśanikam dharmam āpanno / taṃ dharmaṃ pratideśayami / ayaṃ pi dharme pratideśaniko / (Prāt 3) bhikṣu kho punar antaragrhī nimantritakā bhujanti / tatra ca
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recto

1 [bhiks]uṇīḥ vijśvāsamanarūpā⁴¹ sthitā bhavati iha oda-
2 naṃ dehi «iha sūpaṃ dehi» iha vyāṃjanaṃ dehi vade⁴¹ sarvehi tehi bhikṣuhi
3 sā bhikṣunī evaṃ asyād⁴² vacaniyā : āgamehi⁴³ tā-
4 va [stvaṃ bhaginī⁴⁴ ⁴⁵bhikṣu [stva]vad bhokṣyaṇṭī • ⁴⁰āgamehi tāva [stvaṃ
tvaṃ bhaginī bhikṣu [stva]vad bhokṣyaṇṭī • ekabhikṣu pi ca⁴⁷ taṃ⁴⁸ bhikṣuṇ(īm)

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 29.26–30.3. bhikṣunī visvāsamanarūpā sthitā bhavati / sā evam āha⁴⁹
— iha odoanu dehi iha sūpaṃ dehi iha vyāṃjanaṃ dehiti vā vadeva / sarvehi tehi bhikṣuhi sā bhikṣunī evaṃ asya vacaniyā — āgameṣa tāva tvaṃ bhaginī: vāvad bhikṣu bhujanti tī / ekabhikṣu pi ca tāṃ bhikṣuṃ

---

⁵⁹ asampreyam : = Ma-L; Pātim asappāyaṃ (“unbecoming”); Sa asāmpreyam; Mū(Hv) asāmyayā.
⁴⁰ āvusā : Cf. Ma-L āyusman; Pātim āvusā; Sa, Mū(Hv) āyusmantah. Cf. also note 17, 384.
⁴¹ gāryaṃ : Cf. Ma-L gāryaṃ; Pātim gāryaṃ; Sa gārṇayāṃ; Mū(Hv) gāryaṃ. See note 385.
⁴² prātidesanikam : Cf. Ma-L prātidesanikam; Pātim ; Sa, Mū(Hv) prātidesānyāṃ.
⁴³ āpattim āpanno : Ma-L āpanno; Pātim āpajīṃ; Sa āpanno śmi, Mū(Hv) asmy... āpanno.
⁴⁴ prātidesayāmī : Cf. Ma-L prātidesayāmī; Pātim paṭidesemī; Sa, Mū(Hv) prātidesaṇīṃī.
⁴⁵ prātidesaṇīyo : Cf. Ma-L prātidesaṇīko; Pātim pātidesaṇīyē; Sa, Mū(Hv) prāṭidesānyāḥ.
⁴⁶ amitaraṅghaṛje : Cf. Ma-L (Prāt 3) antaragrī; Pātim (Prāt 2) kulesu; Sa (Prāt 2), Mū(Hv)(Prāt 2) kulesu.
⁴⁷ paribhūmje : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim bhujanti; Sa bhunjīros (v.l. paribhūm); Mū(Hv) bhunjate.
⁴⁸ tatra : Cf. Ma-L tatra ca (“if”); Sa, Mū(Hv) tatra ced. Cf. also note 333.
⁴⁹ bhuktiṃvā : No parallels in the other versions.
⁵⁰ visvāsamanarūpā : Cf. Ma-L visvāsamānāḥ; Pātim vasāsamānā; Mū(Hv) vyapadiṣāṃ; MaVīn 398a13, Ma.Ch. 554a29f. 指示 (“gives directions”).
⁵¹ vade : Cf. Ma-L ti vā vadeya; Pātim ti; Sa, Mū(Hv) ti.
⁵² asyād : Opt. sg. 3 of ‘vas (cf. BHSG, p. 205 a, s.v. as; Mvu l 286.13. asyāt); Cf. Ma-L asya (opt. 3. sg); Pātim -; Sa, Mū(Hv) syād.
⁵³ āgamehi : Cf. Ma-L āgamaṃ; Pātim aparasakka (“Go away!”); Sa āgamaṃ; Mū(Hv) 5mayasa (v.l. 5maya).
⁵⁴ bhaginī : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim, Mū(Hv) bhaginī; Sa (bhaginī).
⁵⁵ bhikṣu [s]tvaṃ bhokṣyaṇtī : S.e. for bhikṣu yāvad bhos; cf. Ma-L yāvad bhikṣu bhujnti; Pātim yāva bhikṣkā bhujanti; Sa yāvad ime bhikṣavo bhujanti; Mū(Hv) yāvad ime bhikṣavo bhunjate. Cf. also note 422.
⁵⁶ āgamehi tāva [s]tvaṃ bhaginī bhikṣu [s]tvaṃ bhokṣyaṇtī • : These words, lacking in the other versions, are superfluous. Cf. note 423.
⁵⁷ ca : “if”; cf. Ma-L ca; Pātim ce; Sa, Mū(Hv) cen (na). Cf. also note 333.
⁵⁸ taṃ : S.e. for tāṃ; cf. Ma-L, Mū(Hv) tāṃ; Pātim tāṃ.
⁵⁹ sā evam āha : These words, lacking in the other versions, are superfluous.
**verso** (written by a different scribe)

1. ñaivañ vade\textsuperscript{420} ñagamehi\textsuperscript{421} táva tvam bhagini\textsuperscript{422} bhikṣû tāvad bhokṣyañti

2. ñagamehi táva tvam bhagini bhikṣû tāvad bhokṣyañti sarvehi\textsuperscript{424}

3. tehi bhikṣubhiñ\textsuperscript{425} ○ pratidesayitavyam\textsuperscript{426} asampreyam\textsuperscript{427}

4. me āvusa\textsuperscript{428} gārhyam\textsuperscript{429} pratidesanikan\textsuperscript{430} dharmam\textsuperscript{431} apattam-

5. m āpanno tañ dharmañ pratidesayāmī\textsuperscript{432} ayam api

\textsuperscript{420} vade : Cf. Ma-L vadeya; Pātim paṭibhāsya; Sa paṭibhāyat ... vaktum; Mū(HvH) paṭibhāyat ... vaktum (v.l. vaktayya)

\textsuperscript{421} ñagamehi : Cf. Ma-L ñagamaya; Pātim apasakka ("go away!"); Sa ñagamaya; Mū(HvH) -

\textsuperscript{422} bhikṣû tāvad bhokṣyañti : S.e. for bhikṣû yāvat bho; cf. Ma-L yāvat bhikṣû bhūjanti; Pātim yāva bhikkhu bhūjanti; Sa yāvat ime bhikṣu (avo bhuhjanti); Mū(HvH) - Cf. also note 415.

\textsuperscript{423} ñagamehi táva tvam bhagini bhikṣû tāvad bhokṣyañti : These words, lacking in the other versions, are superfluous (probably a ditto graph). Cf. note 416.

\textsuperscript{424} sarvehi : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim -; Sa, Mū(HvH) sarvaś.

\textsuperscript{425} bhikṣubhiñ : Cf. Ma-L bhikkhuñ; Pātim bhikkhuñ; Sa, Mū(HvH) bhikṣubhir.

\textsuperscript{426} pratidesayitavyam : = Ma-L, Sa, Mū(HvH). Except for here and 97r4, in the other folios of this manuscript, the form prādesayā- is used instead of pratidesayā-. This 96r verso, whose script is different from the rest, was probably written by a different scribe later on. See notes 430, 432.

\textsuperscript{427} asampreyam : = Ma-L; Pātim asappayam ("unbecoming"); Sa asāmpreyam; Mū(HvH) asāmyam.

\textsuperscript{428} āvusa : Cf. Ma-L āvusam; Pātim āvusu; Sa, Mū(HvH) āvusamantah. Cf. also note 171, 384.

\textsuperscript{429} gārhyam : Cf. Ma-L gārhyam; Pātim gārhyam; Sa gārhiṣṇyam; Mū(HvH) garhyam. Cf. also note 385.

\textsuperscript{430} pratidesanikan : = Ma-L; Pātim pāṭidesanikam; Sa, Mū(HvH) pratidesanikam. Except for here and 97r4, 5 and v1, in the other folios of this manuscript, the form prādesanika- is used instead of pratidesanika- / prādesanīya-. See note 426.

\textsuperscript{431} apattam āpanno : Ma-L, āpanno; Pātim āpajimhi; Sa āpajmhi (h) sama; Mū(HvH) vāyam ... āpannā.

\textsuperscript{432} pratidesayāmi : = Ma-L; Pātim paṭidesema; Sa paṭideśayāma (āma); Mū(HvH) pratidesayāmo. In the other folios of this manuscript, the form prādesayā- is used instead of pratidesayā-. See note 426.

\textsuperscript{433} bhūkṣavā : This word, lacking in the other versions, is superfluous.

\textsuperscript{434} prādesanijñāko : Cf. Ma-L, pratidesaniko; Pātim -; Sa, Mū(HvH) pratidesanīyā.

\textsuperscript{435} apravārito : = Ma-L (Prātit 4); Mū(HvH) (Prātit 3) oṭiḥḥ; Pātim (Pātit 3) animantito; Sa (Prātit 3) animantritah.

\textsuperscript{436} pratigrāhāyītvā : Cf. Ma-L pratigrāhītvā; Pātim patiggaheṭvā; Sa pratigrāhīyāḥ; Mū(HvH) pratigrāhyā.

\textsuperscript{437} agilāno : Cf. Ma-L, MaVin 399a1, Ma.Ch 554b5, Sa, Mū(HvH) -; Pātim agilāno.

\textsuperscript{438} śādved vā bhunjed vā : Cf. Ma-L śādveda vā bhunjeyya vā; Pātim śādveda vā bhunjeyya vā; Sa - (pratigrāhyāḥ); Mū(HvH) śādved bhūjeyya vā.

\textsuperscript{439} pratidesayitavyam <tena bhikṣunā> : = 94v5-95r1; cf. Ma-L tena bhikṣunā pratidesayitavyam; Pātim saṭidesetabam tena bhikṣunā; Sa, Mū(HvH) tena bhikṣunā ... pratidesayitavyam.

\textsuperscript{440} āvus[a] : Cf. Ma-L āvusam; Pātim āvusu; Sa, Mū(HvH) āvusamantah. Cf. also note 171, 384.

\textsuperscript{441} gārhyam : Cf. Ma-L gārhyam; Pātim gārhyam; Sa garhaṇyam; Mū(HvH) garhyam. Cf. also note 385.

\textsuperscript{442} pratidesaṃkhiṇi dhar. : Probably s.e. for pratidesaṃkika dharmam; cf. Ma-L pratidesaṃkikan dharmam.
5 taṃ dharma[ṃ] pratideśayāmi • ayaṃ pi dharmo pratideśa-
6 niyo • 4

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 30.5–10. dharmo pratideśaniko / (Pratid 4) yāni kho punar imāni śaiksasammatāni kūlāni bhavanti tatra ca bhikṣuh pūrve apravārito upasamkramitvā svahastam khādanāṃ ābhoojāṇyām vā pratigṛhmītām, khādeva vā bhuvījeya vā bhuktāvinaṃ⁴⁴⁴ tena bhikṣunā pratideśayitvām. — asampreyam me āyusman gārvayam pratideśanikam dharmam āpanno / tam dharmam pratideśayāmi / ayaṃ pi dharmo pratideśaniko / ...

**verso**

1 uddištā kho punar āyusmanḍo catvāri⁴⁴⁶ pratideśanīyāḥ⁴⁴⁷ dharm(ḥ)
2 tatrāyusmanṭāṇaḥ⁴⁴⁸ prṛchāmi⁴⁴⁹ kaś cātra pariśuddhāḥ dvefiya-
3 kaṃ⁴⁵⁰ pi⁴⁵¹ tretīyakāṃ⁴⁵² o pi āyusmanṭāṇaḥ⁴⁵³ prṛchāmi⁴⁴⁴ kaś cātra
4 pariśuddhā pariśuddhā (/)tatrāyusmanṭāṇaḥ⁴⁵⁵ yasmāt tūṣāi eva-
5 m eto⁴⁵⁶ dāhāyāmi • atikkramaṃ idaṃ punah pramādān no
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**recto**

1 [pi]dhāritam* ime kho punar āyusmaṇṭo⁴⁴⁷ sātiṃkapamcheda-
2 śa śaiksakā dharmaḥ⁴⁵⁸ sūtre anvardhamāse prātimokṣe udde-
3 śam āgacchaṁti • o pariṃaṇḍalamivasaṇam⁴⁵⁹ nivā-

---

⁴⁴⁳ āpattim āpanno : Ma-L āpanno; Pāṭim āpajjaṃ; Sa āpanno svm; Mū(HvH) asmy ... āpanno.
⁴⁴⁴ bhuktāvinaḥ : No parallels in the other versions.
⁴⁴⁵ PrMoSū(Ma-L) 30.11–13. ills dānāṃ il / (1) āranyākam (2) antaragṛhe (3) bhikṣu ca nimantritakāḥ (4) śaiksasammatena catuṣṭhāṃ il.
⁴⁴⁶ catvāri : S.e.?, cf. Ma-L, Sa, Mū(HvH) catvāraḥ; Pāṭim cattāro.
⁴⁴⁷ pratideśanīyāḥ : Cf. Ma-L pratideśanikāḥ; Pāṭim pātidesanīyāḥ; Sa, Mū(HvH) pratideśanīyāḥ.
⁴⁴⁸ tatrāyusmaṇṭāṇaḥ : Cf. Ma-L `manto; Pāṭim tathā āyusmantaḥ; Sa, Mū(HvH) tatrāham āyusmataḥ. Cf. also note 362.
⁴⁴⁹ kaś cātra : Cf. Ma-L, Pāṭim kacchi `ṭhā; Sa, Mū(HvH) kacca sthātra. Cf. also note 2.
⁴⁵⁰ dvefiyaṃ : Cf. Ma-L dvīyāṃ; Pāṭim dviyāṃ; Sa, Mū(HvH) dvir.
⁴⁵¹ pi : Cf. Ma-L pi āyusmaṇt preṛchāmi kacchi `ṭhā pariśuddhāḥ; Pāṭim pi pucchiṃ kacchi `ṭhā pariśuddhāḥ; Sa, Mū(HvH) api.
⁴⁵² tretīyakāṃ : Cf. Ma-L trīyāṃ; Pāṭim tatriyāṃ; Sa, Mū(HvH) trir.
⁴⁵³ āyusmaṇṭāṇaḥ : Cf. Ma-L `msmanto; Pāṭim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -. Cf. also note 362.
⁴⁵⁴ kaś cātra : Cf. Ma-L, Pāṭim kacchi `ṭhā; Sa = Mū(HvH) kacca sthātra. Cf. also note 2.
⁴⁵⁵ āyusmaṇṭāṇaḥ : Cf. Ma-L `msmanto; Pāṭim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -. Cf. also note 362.
⁴⁵⁶ eto : S.e. for etam?; cf. Ma-L, Pāṭim etam; Sa, Mū(HvH) etad.
⁴⁵⁷ sātiṃkapamcheda śaiksakā : Cf. Ma-L `pañācāc chaiksā; Pāṭim sekhīyaḥ; Sa, Mū(HvH) sambuhulah saiksā.
⁴⁵⁸ sūtra anvardhamāse prātimokṣe uddeṣam āgacchanti : Cf. Ma-L anvardhamāsāṃ sūtre prātimokṣe uddeṣam āgacchanti; Pāṭim uddesam āgacchanti; Sa, Mū(HvH) anvardhamāsāṃ prātimokṣasārudeśeṣam āgacchanti. Cf. Ma.Ch 554b10f. 半月半月次説破羅提木文.
⁴⁵⁹ pariṃaṇḍalanimivasaṇam : Cf. Ma-L (Śai 1) pariṃaṇḍalam nivasaṇam; Pāṭim (Sekh 1) pariṃaṇḍalam; Sa (Śai A12) pariṃaṇḍalam cīvaraṃ (= Śbh I 196.3); Mū(HvH) (Śai 1) pariṃaṇḍalam nivasaṇaṃ (v.l. nivāsa).
4 sayitavyam śiksā karaṇyam tak> || parimandalam cī-
5 varaṇāprāvarisyāmī śiksā karaṇyam* 2 ||

 Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 30.19–22. ime kho punar āyusmanto sātirekapāncaśac chaikṣā dharmā
yavardhamāsam sūtre prātimokṣe utdesam āgacchanti —
(Śāi 1) parimandalam nivasaṇam nivaśayāṃ tī śiksā karaṇyā ||
(Śāi 2) parimandalam cīvaram prāvarisyāmī śiksā karaṇyā ||

verso

1 susamvrto antaragham upasaṃkkramisyāṃ
tī 2 śiksā karaṇyam* 3 || noksiptacaksur antaragham 4
3 upasaṃkramiśyāmī śiksā karaṇyām 4 ||
4 alpaśabdo antaragham nipaśaṃkkramisyāṃmī •
5 noccaṃghikāye nōḍ[ga]ṭṭhikāyē na kāyaprācāla-

 Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 30.23–31.3.
(Śāi 3) susamvṛto antaragham upasaṃkramisyāṃ tī śiksā karaṇyā ||
(Śāi 4) na utksiptacaksur antaragham upasaṃkramisyāṃ tī śiksā karaṇyā ||
(Śāi 5) alpaśabdo antaragham upasaṃkramisyāṃ tī śiksā karaṇyā ||
(Śāi 6) na uccaggahikāyām antaragham upasaṃkramisyāṃ tī śiksā karaṇyā ||
(Śāi 7) na ogunṭhikāyā ante upaś śī kaś || (Śāi 8) na utksiptikāyā ante upaś śī kaś || (Śāi 9)
na utkuṭukāyā ante upaś śī kaś ||
(Śāi 10) na khambhaṅkrto ante upaś śī kaś || (see 99 recto)
(Śāi 11) na kāyaprācāla-

---

646 nivaśayāṃ tī : S.e.? Cf. Ma-L nivaśayāṃ; Pātim nivaśessāmī tī; Sa, Mū(HvH) nivaśayāmā iti.
647 karaṇyam* : Hereafter, this manuscript reads karaṇyam at every occurrence, while the other versions have
karaṇīyā instead.
648 prāvarisyāṃ : Cf. Ma-L (Śāi 2) prāvarisyāṃ; Pātim (Sekh 2) pārupissāmī; Sa (Śāi A16) prāvarisyāṃ
(v.l. pravāravyāma); Mū(HvH) (Śāi 8) prāvarisyāṃ.
649 antaragham : Cf. Ma-L (Śāi 3) antaragham; Pātim (Sekh 3) antaragham; Sa (Śāi B1), Mū(HvH) (Śāi 11)
antaragham.
650 noksiptacaksur : Cf. Ma-L (Śāi 4) na utksītē; Pātim (Sekh 7) okkhittacakkhu (1); Sa (Śāi B5) nōsītsiptacaksuṣo,
Mū(HvH) (Śāi 14) anukṣītē. For u-k < ut-k, see Abhis III 128, s.v. u-k.
651 antaragham : Cf. Ma-L antaragham; Pātim antaragham; Sa, Mū(HvH) antaragham.
652 antaragharam : Cf. Ma-L (Śāi 5) antaraghram; Pātim (Sekh 13) antaraghram; Sa (Śāi B7), Mū(HvH) (Śāi 13)
antaraghram.
653 uccaggahikaye : “with a loud laugh”; cf. Ma-L (Śāi 6) uccaggahikāyām; Pātim (Sekh 11) ujjaggahikāyā (v.l.
ujjaggahī); Sa (Śāi B10) uccaggahikāyā (= Śb I 194.3); Mū(HvH) (Śāi 23) ujjangahikāyā (v.l. ujjangahikāyā; Mv 8546 ujjangahikāyā; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 297, l. 3. nōcaggahikā, l. 7. uccaggahikā. These are hyper-
forms of Pā. ujjaggahī—< Skt. *u-jjākṣīkā (laughing), derived from ud + vajaks (“laugh”, a
reduplicated form of Vhas); cf. Abhis II 366, note § 42.29, (2); III 130, s.v. uccaggaha-. In 994, another hyper-
form uccaggahikāyē occurs: cf. note 476.
654 uḍḍgajñṭhikaye : “with the head covered”; cf. Ma-L (Śāi 7) ogunṭhikāyā; Pātim (Sekh 23) ogunṭhito; Sa (Śāi
B15) aṭṭgajñṭiṅkākṛtā; Mū(HvH) (Śāi 16) udgumṭhikāyā (= Mv 8540); BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 297, II, 3, 8.
ogunṭhikā; Śb I 196.2. udgumṭhikāyā kṛtena. Cf. also Abhis I 9, note § 1.10, (1); III 170, s.v. ogunṭhikā—,
ogunṭhikā-kṛta—; BHSD, s.vv. avagunṭhikā, udgumṭhikā-kṛta. In 95r, another form ogunṭhikāyē occurs: cf.
note 477.
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recto

1 k[o]649 na śṛṣapracālak[o]650 na khambhakṛto651 na bāhuvikṣepako652
2 amtaraghare653 upasamkramisyāmityī śiksā karaṇīyam*
3 susamvrto ('ntara'ghe448 niśīdasyāmityī śiksā karaṇī-
4 yam* || notksiptakaśu sulpaśabdo675 nocchamghikāye676 n(‘) o-
5 guṇthikāye677 no478 osaktikāye679 na pallasthikāye480

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 31.3–5. *kam antaragṛham upasamkramisyāmityī śiksā karaṇīyā /
(Sāi 12) na śṛṣapracālakam antaragṛham upasamkramisyāmityī śiksā karaṇīyā /
ib. 31.2. (Sāi 10) na khambhakṛto antaragṛham upasamkramisyāmityī śiksā karaṇīyā /
ib. 31.6–20
(Sāi 13) na bāhuvikṣepakaṁ antaragṛham upasamkramisyāmityī śiksā karaṇīyā / ...
(Sāi 14) susamvrto antaragṛhe niśīdasyāmityī śiksā karaṇīyā /
(Sāi 15) na utksiptaś√u antaragṛhe niśīdasyāmityī śiksā karaṇīyā /
(Sāi 16) alpaśabdo antaragṛhe niśīdasyāmityī śiksā karaṇīyā /
(Sāi 17) na uccchamghikāya antaragṛhe niśīdasyāmityī śiksā karaṇīyā /
(Sāi 18) na ogunthikāya antaragṛhe niśīdasyāmityī śiksā karaṇīyā /
(Sāi 19) na utksiptikāya antaragṛhe niśīdasyāmityī śiksā karaṇīyā /
(Sāi 20) na osaktikāya antaragṛhe niśīdasyāmityī śiksā karaṇīyā /
(Sāi 21) na pallasthikāya antaragṛhe niśīdasyāmityī śiksā karaṇīyā /

649 kāyapracālaks[o]: Cf. Ma-L (Sāi 11), Mū(HvH) (Sāi 26) "pracālakam; Pātim (Sekh 15) "ppacālakam; Sa (Sāi B35) "pracālakā; Mvy 8550, Śbh 1 194.2. "pracālakā.
650 śṛṣapracālak[o]: Cf. Ma-L (Sāi 12), Mū(HvH) (Sāi 28), Śbh 1 194.3. "pracālakam; Pātim (Sekh 19) sīsa-
ppacālakam; Sa (Sāi B33) śṛṣapracālakā; Mvy 8552. "pracālakam; MāVin 401b22 (Sāi 12), Ma.Ch 554b23 (Sāi 12) 椁.
651 khambhakṛto = Ma-L (Sāi 10); cf. Pātim (Sekh 21) khambhakato; Sa (Sāi B17) kambhākṛtā; Mū(HvH) (Sāi 25)
skambhākṛtā (v.l. kambhākṛtā); Mvy 8549 skambhākṛtā; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 297, II. 4, 9. khambha;
MāVin 401a22 (Sāi 10), Ma.Ch 554b21 (Sāi 10) 椁.
652 bāhuvikṣepako: Cf. Ma-L (Sāi 13) "pakam; Pātim (Sekh 17) bāhuppacālakam; Sa (Sāi B29) bāhupracālakā (v.l. "lakam); Mū(HvH) (Sāi 27), Mvy 8551, Śbh 1 194.2. "cālakam; MāVin 401c5 (Sāi 13), Ma.Ch 554b24 (Sāi 13) 椁.
653 amtaraghare: Cf. Ma-L. antaragṛham; Pātim antaragṛha; Sa, Mū(HvH) antargrham.
654 ('ntara'ghe: Pātim (Sekh 5) "ghre; Sa (Sāi B1), Mū(HvH) (Sāi 11) antargṛham.
655 sulpaśabdo: S.e. for alpaśabdo. The characters for a and su resemble each other in the Brahmi script.
656 uccchamghikāye: Cf. Ma-L (Sāi 17) uccchamghikāya. See note 467.
657 ogunthikāye: Cf. Ma-L (Sāi 18) "kāya; Pātim (Sekh 24) ogunthīto; Sa (Sāi B16) avagunthikāṛī; Mū(HvH) -. See note 468.
658 no: Presumably s.e. for no<tkṣiptikāya no>; cf. Ma-L (Sāi 19) na utksiptikāya ... (Sāi 20).
659 osaktikāye: Cf. Ma-L (Sāi 20) "kāya; Pātim -; Sa (Sāi B22) avastikāṛī; Mū(HvH) (Sāi 18), Mvy 8542
utsastikāṛī; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 297, l. 8. osaktikā; Śbh 1 196.2. uccastikāṛī; MāVin 403a11 (Sāi 20),
Ma.Ch 554c2 (Sāi 20) 抱膝 ("hugging one’s knees"). Cf. also BHSD, s.v. utsastikā; Pachow 2000: 172; Nolot 1991: 332, n. 8; PrMoSū(Sa) 307, n. 11; MaVin 403a11f. 抱膝者, 手抱者 抱膝者; 抱膝者, 抱膝者 抱膝者.
660 pallasthikāye: A hyper-form of Pa = BHIS pallathikāa- < Skt paryastikā (Pkt. pāllatikā, pāla); cf. Ma-L
(Sāi 21), Pātim (Sekh 26) pallathikāya; Sa (Sāi B28) pallathikāṛī; Mū(HvH) (Sāi 20), Mvy 8544, Śbh 1 196.2 paryastikāṛī; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 297, p. 297, l. 8. pallaṭhikāa.
661 PrMoSū(Ma-L) 31.7–11 // uddānam // (1) nivasanam (2) pravaraanam (3) susamvrto (4) caksuḥ (5) śabda (6)
nocchamghikā (7) na ogunthikā (8) notksiptikā (9) na uktukā (10) na khambha (11) na kāya (12) na śṛṣa (13)
na bāhukena // prathamo vargah //.
verso
1 na khambhakṛto 482 antaraghahe 483 niṣaṇṇaḥ hastakaukṛtyam
2 vā 484 pādakaukṛtyam vā kariṣyāmiti śīkṣā karaṇi-
3 {yā •}yaṃ satriṣṭya paṇḍapātaṃ pratigrhiṣyāmi-
4 ti śīkṣā karaṇīyam * 486 satriṣṭya 487 paṇḍapātaṃ pari-
5 bhumijīṣyāmiti śīkṣā karaṇīyam * || samasūpikam 488

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 31.21–32.1.
(Sāi 22) na khambhakṛto antaraghe niṣiṣyāmiti śi<kṣa> karaṇīyā l
(Sāi 23) na antaraghe niṣaṇṇa hastakaukṛtyam pādakaukṛtyam vā kariṣyāmiti śīkṣā kara-
ṇīyā l... 489
(Sāi 24) satriṣṭya paṇḍapātaṃ pratigrhiṣyāmiti śīkṣā karaṇīyā
(Sāi 25) samasūpikam

100 : Plate 47
recto
1 paṇḍapāta[m] na stūpakāraṃ na jihvāniḥsāraṇaṃ 490 na
2 apakhaṇḍakāraṃ 491 paṇḍapātaṃ paribhumijīṣyāmi-
3 ti śīkṣā karaṇīyam* atimahāṃtehi kava-
4 lehī 492 paṇḍapātaṃ na kabadācchhedakam 493 paṇḍapātaṃ

482 khambhakṛto : = Ma-L (Sāi 22). Cf. note 471.
483 antaraghe : Read antaraghe <niṣiṣyāmiti śīkṣā karaṇīyam na antaraghae>. Cf. Ma-L antaraghe niṣiṣyāmiti śīkṣā karaṇīyam vā pādakaukṛtyam vā kariṣyāmiti śīkṣā karaṇīyam na antaraghe due to haplography.
484 niṣaṇṇaḥ hastakaukṛtyam vā pādakaukṛtyam vā kariṣyāmiti ... : = Ma-L; MaVin 403c9f. (Sāi 23) 不動手足坐家內。應當學. Ma.Ch 554c5 (Sāi 23) 不動手足是家內坐。應當學. No parallels in the other versions.
485 và : = Ma-L lacks this word.
486 satriṣṭya paṇḍapātaṃ paribhumijīṣyāmiti śīkṣā karaṇīyam * : No parallels in the other versions.
487 satriṣṭyam : For the extension of a gerund by -m, see Karashima 2002: § 21.2 (abhīruṣyam); Abhis III 48, § 29.8 (dadiyam, prāvāryaṃ); EV I (2nd ed.)336 (ad Th 1242; pavibhaiṣṭaṃ); Dhp(tr.N) 157 (ad Dhp 392; sakkaccam, upapajjaṃ, peccam). Cf. Ma-L (Sāi 24), Sa (Sāi C1), Mū(HvH) (Sāi 40) satriṣṭya; Pātim (Sekh 27) sakkaccam.
488 samasūpikam : = Sa (Sāi C5) (v.l. sāpam), Mū(HvH) (Sāi 42); cf. Ma-L (Sāi 25) samasūpikam; Pātim (Sekh 29) sama-sūpakaṃ; Sa(hy) samasuṣṭi(paṇḍapavadah).
489 PrMoSū(Ma-L) 31.24–27. Il uddānaṃ li (14) susamvṛto (15) caṁṣa (16) śadā (17) noccaṅghikā (18) na ogunthikā (19) nortṣipikā (20) nosaktikā (21) na pallaṭthikā (22) na khamba (23) na hastapādaudakrtyena ḳī ṭivyọ vargaḥ li.
490 jihvāniḥsāraṇaṃ : Cf. Ma-L (Sāi 29) jihvānicchāraṇaṃ; Pātim (Sekh 49) jihvānicchāraṇaṃ; Sa (Sāi C18), Mū(HvH) (Sāi 60) jihvāniṣācaḥ; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 3 jihvā [30]; MaVin 404c1 (Sāi 28), Ma.Ch 554c10 (Sāi 28) 吐舌.
491 apakhaṇḍakāraṃ : Probaby a hyper-form of avagandha. Cf. Ma-L (Sāi 28), Pātim (Sekh 46) avaganda ("stuffing out [the cheeks]"); Sa, Mū(HvH) ; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 3 avaganda [29]; MaVin 404b16 (Sāi 27) 中嘔食; Ma.Ch 554c9 (Sāi 27) 口中嘔食.
492 kavalehi : Cf. Ma-L (Sāi 30) kavadehi; Pātim (Sekh 39) kabalāṃ; Sa (Sāi C8) álopam; Mū(HvH) (Sāi 49–50) álopam; Sa(hy) (nadiṁhāṇyati) ("lool!"; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 3 (nātāmāhanta) [30]; MaVin 404c15 (Sāi 29), Ma.Ch 554c11 (Sāi 29) (大)團飯食.
493 kabadācchhedakam : Cf. Ma-L (Sāi 33) kavadacchh; Pātim (Sekh 45) kabalavacchh; Sa (Sāi C12) kabadācchhedakam; Mū(HvH) (Sāi 62) kavalidakchh; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 4 kavadacchh [34]; MaVin 405a25 (Sāi 32), Ma.Ch 554c14 (Sāi 32) 腹半食.
5 (na) ⁴⁹⁴ anāgatehi kabaḍhehi mukhadvāram vivari-
  Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 32.1–7. pinḍapātaṁ paribhūmjīsyāmiṣti śikṣā karaṇīyā /
  (Śai 26) na stūpākārakam pinḍapātaṁ paribhūmjīsyāmiṣti śikṣā karaṇīyā /
  (Śai 27) nāvakārakārakam pinḍapātaṁ paribhūmjīsyāmiṣti śikṣā karaṇīyā /
  (Śai 29) na jīvāṇicārakam pinḍapātaṁ paribhūmjīsyāmiṣti śikṣā karaṇīyā /
  (Śai 28) nāvagandakārakam pinḍapātaṁ paribhūmjīsyāmiṣti śikṣā karaṇīyā /
  (Śai 30) nātimahantehi kavaḍehi pinḍapātaṁ paribhūmjīsyāmiṣti śikṣā karaṇīyā /
  ib. 32.10. (Śai 33) na kavadacchedakam pinḍapātaṁ paribhūmjīsyāmiṣti śikṣā karaṇīyā /
  ib. 32.8. (Śai 31) nānāgate kavaḍe mukhadvāram vivari-

verso

1 syāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyam* na kabaḍavikṣepakāḥ
2 na sakabaḍena mukhena vācaṁ bhāṣīsyāmiṣti • na pā-
3 tranirlekhakam⁴⁹⁶ ○ pinḍapātaṁ paribhūmjīsyāmiṣti
4 na hastanirlekhakam⁴⁹⁷ na amgulinirlekhakam na caccu-
5 kārakam⁴⁹⁸ na sussukārakam⁴⁹⁹ pinḍapātaṁ na gulu-
  Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 32.8–9. syāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /
  (Śai 32) na kavadatokṣepakam pinḍapātaṁ paribhūmjīsyāmiṣti śikṣā karaṇīyā /
  ib. 32.11–21
  (Śai 34) na sakavadena mukhena vācaṁ bhāṣīsyāmiṣti śikṣā karaṇīyā / ...
  (Śai 35) na pāṭanirlekhakam <pinḍapāta> paribhūmjīsyāmiṣti śikṣā karaṇīyā /
  (Śai 36) na hastanirlekhakam pinḍapātaṁ paribhūmjīsyāmiṣti śikṣā karaṇīyā /
  (Śai 37) nārāgulinirlekhakam pinḍapātaṁ paribhūmjīsyāmiṣti śikṣā karaṇīyā /
  (Śai 38) na cuccukārakam pinḍapātaṁ paribhūmjīsyāmiṣti śikṣā karaṇīyā /
  (Śai 39) na sursurukārakam pinḍapātaṁ paribhūmjīsyāmiṣti śikṣā karaṇīyā /
  (Śai 40) na gulu-

⁴⁹⁴ anāgatehi kavaḍehi : Cf. Ma-L (Śai 31) anāgate kavade; Pātim (Sekh 41) anāhate kabaļe; Sa (Śai C10), Mū(HvH) (Śai 51), Mvy 8575 nānāgate ālope; Śb Ī 196.5. nānāgate khādanīye; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 3 nānāgata[32]; MaVin 404c28 (Śai 30) 張口待食; MaCh 554c12 (Śai 30) 張口待食.
⁴⁹⁵ kabadavikṣepakāḥ : Cf. Ma-L (Śai 32) kavadatokṣepakam; Pātim (Sekh 44) pinḍukkhepakam; Sa, Mū(HvH) -; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 4 kavadatokṣepaka [33]; MaVin 405a13 (Śai 31) 鄙食; MaCh 554c13 (Śai 31) 牠食.
⁴⁹⁶ -nirlekhakam : A hyper-form of nirlehaṇam; tāmūl absolute of nir-V-lih (“lick”); cf. EV II (2nd ed.) 76. Cf. Ma-L (Śai 35) -nirlehaṇam; Pātim (Sekh 52) -nillehaṇam; Sa (Śai C20), Mū(HvH) (Śai 68), Mvy 8587, Śb Ī 198.5 -avalaḥeṇam; Sa, v.l. // fl. khakam.
⁴⁹⁷ -nirlehaṇam : Cf. Ma-L -nirlehaṇam. See the preceding note.
⁴⁹⁸ -cuccukārakam : Probably s.e. for cuccu’; cf. Ma-L (Śai 38) cuccukārakam; Pātim (Sekh 50) capacapukārakam; Sa (Śai C14) cuccukārakam (v.l. cuccukā’); Mū(HvH) (Śai 54) cuccukkārakam; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 7. cuccu; Mvy 8577 cuccukārakam.
⁴⁹⁹ -sussukārakam : Cf. Ma-L (Śai 39) sursurukārāṃ; Pātim (Sekh 51) sursurukārakam; Sa (Śai C13) śuṣu-kārāṃ; Mū(HvH) (Śai 55), Mvy 8578 śuṣuṁkārakam; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 7. sursuru.
⁵⁰⁰ PrMoSū(Ma-L) 32.12–15. // uddānam // (24) satkṛtya (25) samastāpa (26) na stūpa (27) nāvakāraṇa (28) nāvagandha (29) na jīhvā (30) nātimahantam (31) nānāgatam (32) na kavadatokṣepaka (33) na kavadacchedaka (34) na sakavadena mukhena vācaṁ // trīyō vargaḥ //
1 rukārakaṃ⁵⁰¹ na sitthāpakārakaṃ⁵⁰² na hastanidhūnakam⁵⁰³ na
ditional parasya pātraṇaṃ nidhyāvyisāṃhitā⁵⁰⁴ uddhyā-
yakarmāṇtaCṃ⁵⁰⁵ upādāya⁵⁰⁶ śīkṣā karaṇīyaṃ •
pātrasaṃjitā pindapātaṃ paribhūmjisyāṃhitā na
5 dinnādinnāni⁵⁰⁷ vyājanāṇāi odanena⁵⁰⁸ praccādāyai-

Cf. PrMoŚū(Ma-L) 32.21–33.4.

lukārakaṃ pindapātaṃ paribhūmjisyāṃhitī śīkṣā karaṇīyā /
(Sāi 42) na sitthāpakārakaṃ pindapātaṃ paribhūmjisyāṃhitī śīkṣā karaṇīyā /
(Sāi 41) na hastanirdhūnakam pindapātaṃ paribhūmjisyāṃhitī śīkṣā karaṇīyā /
(Sāi 43) nātivalam parasya pātraṇaṃ nidhyāvyisāṃḥi odhīvyānakarmāṇaṃ upādāyēti śīkṣā
caraṇīyā /
(Sāi 44) pātrasaṃjitā pindapātaṃ pariḥ>bhunjī>svāmīti śīkṣā karaṇīyā /
(Sāi 45) (see 101 verso)
(Sāi 46) na dinnādinnāni vyājanāṇāi odanena praccādāyai-

verso

1 svāmīti bhūyokarmān tam⁵⁰⁹ upādāya • agilāno

---

⁵⁰¹ gulgurukārakaṃ : S.e. for gulgula<; cf. Ma-L (Sāi 40) gulgula<; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 7. gulgula; Pātim ; Sa (Sāi C15) phupphukārakaṃ; Mū(HvH) (Sāi 56–57) ihutthukārakaṃ ... phupphukārakaṃ; Mvg 8579–80 ihutthukārakaṃ ... phupphukārakaṃ.

⁵⁰² sitthāpakārakaṃ : = Ma-L (Sāi 42). A hyper-from for sitthāvākārakaṃ (< Skt. siktha “boiled rice” + namul absolute of ava-vkṣ “scatter around”); cf. EV II [2nd ed.] 76). Cf. BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 8. sittha [43]; Pātim (Sekh 48) sitthāvākārakaṃ; Sa (Sāi C22) sistavikirama (v.l. sikti<); Sa(hy) sistavani + ; Mū(HvH) (Sāi 58) sitthaprhākārakaṃ; Mvy(l/f) 8520 sitthā (Mvy 8582 siktha); MaVin 406b19 (Sāi 40), Ma.Ch 554e22 (Sāi 40) 撲策. The order of this and the following rule is reversed in Ma-L (= BhiVin[Ma-L]), while that in the two Chinese translations agrees with this manuscript.

⁵⁰³ hastanidhūnakam : Cf. Ma-L (Sāi 41) ṇirndhūnakam (s.e. for ṇunakam); BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 8. hasta [42]; Pātim (Sekh 47) hasthāniḍhūnakam (v.l. ṇdhi<); Sa (Sāi C21) hastavādhnakam; Sa(hy) hastavi[f]ṭū[n]ā ṇīḥ; Mū(HvH) (Sāi 65) hastasandhūnakam; Mvy 8589 ṇandhūnakam; MaVin 406c3 (Sāi 41), Ma.Ch 554e23 (Sāi 41) 搕手.

⁵⁰⁴ iti : Cf. Ma-L .-. 

⁵⁰⁵ uddhyāyanakarmāntam upādāya : Cf. Ma-L (Sāi 43) odhīvyānakarmāntam up<. Both -karmāntam and -karmatāṃ are hyper-Sanskritisms of MI kammatā– (< Skt. kāmyatā); cf. note 505. Cf. also BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 8. nōdhīyana; Pātim (Sekh 38) ujjhānasār;</ Sāi (Sāi C26) avadhyānapreksā; Mū(HvH) (Sāi 69), Mvy 8594 īnno; MaVin 406c17 (Sāi 42), Ma.Ch 554e24 (Sāi 42) 鏖心. Uddhyāvana is a hyper-form of Pā ujjhāvana (“complaining”), a derivative of ujjhāyaiti (“complains”); cf. DP, s.v.; Abhis III 171, s.vv. o-jjhāya-, o-ddhyāya-.

⁵⁰⁶ upādāya : Cf. Ma-L upādēyīti.

⁵⁰⁷ dimndinnāni : An ānmedīta-type compound (cf. BHSG §§ 23.12f.; Abhis I 69, n. 4). For the Middle Indic form dimna, cf. Abhis III 292, 560. Cf. Ma-L (Sāi 46) dinnda<; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 9. chādyatī [47]; Pātim (Sekh 36), Sa (Sāi C25), Mū(HvH) (Sāi 46), MaVin 407b13 (Sāi 45), Ma.Ch 554c27 (Sāi 45) . The order of this and the following rule is reversed in Ma-L (= BhiVin[Ma-L]) as well as in the two Chinese translations.

⁵⁰⁸ praccādāyaysāmīni : = Ma-L; cf. Pātim patiċchādēssāmi; Sa pratičchādayaysāmā; Mū(HvH) ṇyāmahi.

⁵⁰⁹ bhūyokarmāntam : Cf. Ma-L bhūya ṇagamanakarmāntam. Both -karmāntam and -karmatāṃ are hyper-Sanskritisms of MI kammatā– (< Skt. kāmyatā); cf. note 505. Cf. Pātim bhūyokarmatāṃ, Sa bhūyakṣammatāṃ; Mū(HvH) bhūyākkā<; MaVin 407b13f., Ma.Ch 554c27. 更正得.
The folios 102–116 are already published in Karashima 2008: 78–87. Amongst them, the following three folios are dealt with afresh here, as new fragments, belonging to them, have been identified since then.
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recto

1 + + + t. rāhulaṃ s[u]gataputram* varcaghaṭesmin i
2 + [eh], nāpi «tio» vācām atibāhu me · tasnā samagṛā 519 sati-
3 tās sagaravā bhūtvānyamanyeṣu paricarathā dharmara-
4 jām 520 adhigaṁśiya .. o acy(u)taṃ padam viśokam · buddho vipa-
5 sīyī upagamaṃ pāṭal[i]: 521 sikhī pu[m]ṇḍarī + .. mūle
6 sāl[as][ya] mūle puna (v)ījśvabhur jīnāh 522 sī + + +
7 [I] ..

519 sūpam cf(‘) odanam ca : Probably s.e. for sīt(‘) od(‘) vā; cf. Ma-L (Śai 45), Sa (Śai C24) odanam vā sūpam vā; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 9. vijñāpatī [46]; Pātīm (Sekh 37) sūpam vā odanam vā; Mū(HvH) -; MaVin 407a27 (Śai 44), Ma.Ch 554c26 (Śai 44) -.

520 vyamjanaṃ ca : Probably s.e. for vyāṃ vā = Ma-L. No parallels in the other versions.

521 vijñāpya vijñāpya : Read <ātāmārthāya> vijñāpya vijñāpya <dyā-ya>; cf. 70r3. vijñāpatīvā vijñāpatīvāvā; Ma-L ātāmārthāya kulehi vijñāpatīvā vā vijñāpatīvāvā; Pātīm attāno attāhā vyāṃ vā; Sa ātāmāḥ ... vijñāpatīsāyā; Sa(hy) [ājī]man (a)rddhāvai vijñāvayā; Mū(HvH) -; MaVin 407a27, Ma.Ch 554c26. 爲己宗 ("asks for [food] for one's self").

522 khādyāṃitā : Cf. Ma-L. paribhūmijāyāmiti; Pātīm bhūhījāśāmi iti; Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

sūṣṭhīte[na] : S.e. for sūṣṭhena (< sa + sīkha--; “with boiled rice attached”). Cf. Ma-L (Śai 48) sūṣṭhena; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 9. sūṣṭhena [49]; Pātīm (Sekh 55) sāmisaṇa ("soiled by food"); Sa (Śai C23), Mū(HvH) (Śai 70) sāmisaṇa; MaVin 407b25 (Śai 46), Ma.Ch 554c28 (Śai 48) sāmisaṇa (v.s. śāṁjñā); Sa(46) . See note 517.

prāṇīḥālakaṃ : S.e. for pāṇīyasthā (= Ma-L); Pātīm pāṇīyālakaṃ; Sa pāṇīyasthā (v.l. pāṇījñāla/); Mū(HvH) udakālakām.

3. sūṣṭhīte[na] : S.e. for sūṣṭhena = Ma-L (Śai 47); Pātīm (Sekh 56) sūṣṭhakāṃ ("with boiled rice attached"); Sa (Śai C29), Mū(HvH) (Śai 72) sāmisaṇa; MaVin 407c14 (Śai 47), Ma.Ch 554c29 (Śai 47) ātaṃ. 

prāṇīḥālakaṃ : S.e. for pāṇīyasthā (= Ma-L); Pātīm pāṇīyālakaṃ; Sa pāṇīyasthā (v.l. pāṇījñāla); Mū(HvH) udakālakām.

4. prāṇīḥālakaṃ : S.e. for sūṣṭhena = Ma-L (Śai 47); Pātīm (Sekh 56) sūṣṭhakāṃ ("with boiled rice attached"); Sa (Śai C29), Mū(HvH) (Śai 72) sāmisaṇa; MaVin 407c14 (Śai 47), Ma.Ch 554c29 (Śai 47) ātaṃ. 

5. sūṣṭhīte[na] : S.e. for sūṣṭhena = Ma-L (Śai 47); Pātīm (Sekh 56) sūṣṭhakāṃ ("with boiled rice attached"); Sa (Śai C29), Mū(HvH) (Śai 72) sāmisaṇa; MaVin 407c14 (Śai 47), Ma.Ch 554c29 (Śai 47) ātaṃ. 

prāṇīḥālakaṃ : S.e. for pāṇīyasthā (= Ma-L); Pātīm pāṇīyālakaṃ; Sa pāṇīyasthā (v.l. pāṇījñāla); Mū(HvH) udakālakām.

5. sūṣṭhīte[na] : S.e. for sūṣṭhena = Ma-L (Śai 47); Pātīm (Sekh 56) sūṣṭhakāṃ ("with boiled rice attached"); Sa (Śai C29), Mū(HvH) (Śai 72) sāmisaṇa; MaVin 407c14 (Śai 47), Ma.Ch 554c29 (Śai 47) ātaṃ. 

prāṇīḥālakaṃ : S.e. for pāṇīyasthā (= Ma-L); Pātīm pāṇīyālakaṃ; Sa pāṇīyasthā (v.l. pāṇījñāla); Mū(HvH) udakālakām.

prāṇīḥālakaṃ : S.e. for sūṣṭhena = Ma-L (Śai 47); Pātīm (Sekh 56) sūṣṭhakāṃ ("with boiled rice attached"); Sa (Śai C29), Mū(HvH) (Śai 72) sāmisaṇa; MaVin 407c14 (Śai 47), Ma.Ch 554c29 (Śai 47) ātaṃ. 

prāṇīḥālakaṃ : S.e. for pāṇīyasthā (= Ma-L); Pātīm pāṇīyālakaṃ; Sa pāṇīyasthā (v.l. pāṇījñāla); Mū(HvH) udakālakām.

tasmāt samagṛhāh sahitāh sagauravāh bhavyā anyamanyam paricaratha

dharmarājāṃ adhibhūcchathā nirvāṇam atandrita acyutam padam aṣokam ||25||


aṣokam āśrīva jino Vipaśyā Śikkhī jinah pandarīkasya mūle
śālasya mūle upagamyā Viśvabhūt śīrṣamūle Kraukucchandabrāhmanāḥ

r4-6: cf. DN II 4.6–12. Vipaśī ... pātālīyā mūle abhisambudho. Śikkhī ... pandarīkassā
mūle abhis. Vessabhī ... sālasse mūle abhis. Kakusandho ... sammāsambudho śīrṣassā
mūle abhisambudho.

verso

1 523[r]. k. su .. + hmaṇo buddho ca kanakamuni(ī) udu .. +
2 nyagrodhamule puna kāśyapo jinaḥ āśvatthamūle .. +
3 saptamo muni[ṛ ma]ōhāmu[ṇ(ī)]ḥ śākyamunǐḥ «sa» gautamo •
4 sukham buddhānām utpādaḥ sukhāṃ dharmasya deśanā sukham
5 (saṃ)ghas(y)a sāmagrī samagṛāṇāṃ tapaḥ sukham [†] etā ..
6 + + + + [ṅ]irdiṣṭaṃ pu[r](u)ṣadamyasārathinā • yatra [s].


śīrṣamūle Kraukucchandabrāhmanāḥ

buddhās ca Kanakamunī udumbare nyagrodhamūle upagamyā Kāśvapah
āśvatthamūle muni Śākyapūngavah upetya bodhiṃ samavāpya Gotamāḥ

Koṇāgamano ... sammāsambudho udumbarassā mūle abhisambudho. Kassapo ... 
sammāsambudho nīgrodhassā mūle abhis. ahaṃ ... sammāsambudho assattathassā mūle
abhīṣa

v4-5: cf. Uv 30.22

sukham buddhasya cātpādaḥ sukham dharmasya deśanā /
sukham samghasya sāmagrī samagṛāṇāṃ tapaḥ sukham // (cf. also Dhp 194, PDhp
68)

v6: cf. PrMoSū(Sa) 262.6. prātimokṣaḥ samuddiṣṭo nirditaṃ ca mahārṣinā

(116) : Plate 50

recto

1 + + + + 524[t]ā śikṣaṃ .. + + + + .. dhāḥ saptānāṃ +
2 + + + + lā mahā + + .ā .. lokāgrādhipaṭi ..
3 + + (r)mākhyaṭānī 525« + + » {†} ni + + sūtra vistareṇa kṛtaṃ sāṃ-
4 gh(e)na po[ś(a)] + O ārabhadhvāṃ niṣkṛjavāṃ yuyadhvam b[u]-
5 ddhaṣasane .. dhunātha mṛ .. + .ai + + + + + + + +
6 ku[ṇ]ja[r]. + [o «hy a»]min dharmavina .. + + + + + + + +

r1-4: cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 37.28–31. ete saptā daśabālā mahāprajñā amitabuddhi saptānāṃ

523[r]. k. su .. + hmaṇo : Probably (K)r(ā)(k)asu(ndbrā)hmano.
524 The aksaras tā śī(ks)am are visible in the photograph of the verso, as the upper margin of this side is folded underneath itself.
525 « + + » {†} ni : Probably (aktivī).
samayaksambuddhānāṁ abhināṁ ... lokākhyādhipatīnaṁ dharmākhyaṁ ... uktāṁ / uddīṣṭam / prātimokṣasūram / kṛtāṁ sanghena posadhām / āryāḥ śikṣāṁ cīram pālayantu / sāsanaṁ ... santu saṃsthātu /

r3–4: cf. PrMoSū(Sa) 263.6. uddīṣṭaṁḥ prātimokṣah kṛtāṁ samagrena sanghena posatha iti //

r4–6: cf. PrMoSū(Sa) 262.10–263.2.

āraḥdhānvam niskramadhvaṁ / vuyvadhvaṁ buddhāsane · dhunadhvaṁ mṛtyunanah sainyanām / nadāgāram iva kuñjaraḥ 13 (cf. Uv 4.37; SHT X 100)

yo ṛṣya asmin dharmaviney
PrMoSū(Mū.HvH) Schlußverse 15–16a ≡ SBV II 162.13f., Divy 68.19f., 138.26f. etc.

āraḥdhānvam niskramata vuyvadhvaṁ buddhāsane // dhunīta mṛtyunanah senyan (SBV, Divy senyanāṁ) / nadāgāram iva kuñjaraḥ //

yo ṛṣya asmin dharmaviney

Th 256–257a = SN I 156.34–157.1 = ib. 157.19–21

āraḥatha nikkamatha / vaujjatha buddhāsane

dhunātha maccuno senaṁ / nadāgāram va kuñjaro //

yo imasmin dharmaviney

verso

1 .. ṛṣya[ṛ]. + + .. jātis. + ///
2 yasyāḥ(r)th. (s)ḥ(ḥ)ḥ(a)m uddīṣṭam ya ..
3 lam anurakṣeth(a) O + [laṃ]vā camāri yathā · ks. m. bhavatu
4 ++ r. .. dev. .. + .. na .. .. jinānāṁ vardhatu pūjā
5 +++++ .. e [ci]ra[m*] + + .. ca [de]sītā dharmā yena ..
6 +++++ + + + + + + + + + .. + + + .. catvāri sutirthe + +

v1–3: cf. PrMoSū(Sa) 263.2–5. apramatto bhavisyati

prahāya jātisamsāraṁ / dukkhasyāntam sa yasyati 14 (cf. Uv 4.38)

yasyārthe śūtram uddīṣṭam / yasyārthe posahah kṛtah

tac chīlam anurakṣadhvaṁ / vālāgraṁ camaṁ yathā 15

PrMoSū(Mū.HvH) Schlußverse 16b–d = SBV II 162.15f., Divy 68.21f., 139.1f. etc.

aprattiṣṭhā carisyati //

prahāya jātisamsāraṁ / dukkhasyāntam karisyati //

PrMoSū(Mū.HvH) Schlußverse 18

yasyārthe śūtram uddīṣṭam / yasyārthe posahah kṛtah
tac chīlam anurakṣadhvham / bāḷāgraṁ camaṁ yathā //

Th 257b–c = SN I 157.1–2 = ib. 157.21–22

apramatto viheṣati

pahāya jātisamsāraṁ / dukkhasantam karissati //
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A folio written by a different scribe (a supplement to Folio 106 recto): Plate 51

A

1 uddiṣṭā kho punar āyuṣmaṇto dvau\textsuperscript{526} dharmaś cānudharma-

2 ś ca ○ tatrāyuṣmaṇṭānāṁ\textsuperscript{527} pṛcchā-

3 mi ○\textsuperscript{528} kaś cātra pariśuddhā dviti-

4 yakaṁ pi ṭṛīyakaṁ pi āyuṣmaṇṭānāṁ pṛcchām.

5 kaś cātra pariśuddhāḥ pariśuddhā (’)trāyuṣma[ṃ] +

B

\begin{verbatim}
PrMoSū(Ma-L) 35.20f.  uddiṣṭāḥ kho punar āyuṣmanto duve dharmāḥ dharmo
anudharmaś ca. tatrāyuṣmanto pṛcchāmi. kacci (’)tthā pariśuddhāh dvītyam pi
āyuṣmanto pṛcchāmi kacci (’)tthā pariśuddhāh tṛīyam pi āyuṣmanto pṛcchāmi kacci
(’)tthā pariśuddhāh pariśuddhā atrāyuṣmanto yasmāt tūṣāṁ evaṁ e[t]a dhārayāmi !
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{526} dvau : Cf. Ma-L duve; Pāṭim, Sa, Mū(HvH) - . Cf. notes 284, 298.

\textsuperscript{527} āyuṣmaṇṭānāṁ : Cf. Ma-L śmaṁto; Pāṭim, Sa, Mū(HvH) - . Cf. also note 362.

\textsuperscript{528} kaś cātra : Cf. Ma-L kacci (’)tthā; Pāṭim, Sa, Mū(HvH) - . Cf. also note 2.
**Symbols used in the Transliteration**

( ) restored aksara(s)  
[ ] aksara(s) whose reading(s) is(are) uncertain  
< > omitted (part of) aksara(s) without gap in the manuscript  
{ } superfluous aksara(s) or a danda  
{|} erased aksara(s) in the manuscript, e.g. {|o|}  
— erased aksara(s) in the manuscript, e.g. viśhe  
« » interlinear insertion  
+ one lost aksara  
.. one illegible aksara  
. illegible part of an aksara  
/// beginning or end of a fragment when broken  
| danda  
|| double danda  
-wise the edge of the manuscript is folded back upon itself, obscuring the lettering  
* virāma  
· punctuation mark  
: visarga used as punctuation  
‘ avagraha; if not written in the manuscript, it is added in brackets in the transliteration  
○ string hole  
ḥ upadhmānīya

**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: α is a scribal error, a corruption, or a hyper-form of β  
α (Chinese) ∈ β (Sanskrit etc.): the Sanskrit word β was misunderstood by the Chinese translator(s) and translated as α  
α ≠ β = β does not agree with α  
α ≈ β = β is almost the same as α  
α ⇐ β = the Sanskrit form β should be changed to α

**Abbreviations and Bibliography**

AMg = Ardhamāgadhī  
ARIRIAB = Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University

BHS = a Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit word, listed in BHSD


Bollée, Willem B.


Geiger, Wilhelm

1916 Pāli, Literatur und Sprache, Straßburg (Grundriss der Indo-arischen Philologie und Altturnskunde 1, 7)

von Hinüber, Oskar


Karashima, Seishi


Ma.Ch = PrMoSūt(Ma.Ch)
Ma-L = PrMoSūt(Ma-L)


MI = Middle Indic
misp = misprint
Ms = manuscript
Nolot, Édith
Oberlies, Thomas
Pā = Pāli
Pāc = Pācattikaṃ (PrMoSū[Ma-L]), Pācittiyaṃ (Pātim)
Pachow, W. 巴宙
Pāṭ = Pātayantikā (PrMoSū[Sa])
Pāṭid = Pāṭidesanīya (Pātim)
Reprinted with corrections 2003: Pali Text Society
Pāy = Pāyantikā (PrMoSū[Mū]); Pāyattikā (PrMoSū[Mū,HvH])
Pkt = Prakrit
Pratid = Pratīdesanīya (PrMoSū[Sa], PrMoSū[Mū,HvH])
Pratid = Pratīdesanika (PrMoSū[Ma-L])
PrMoSū(Dh) = The Chinese translation of the Prātimokṣasūtra of the Dharmaguptakas, T. 22, No. 1430, 四分僧戒本, trans. by Buddhayaśas
PrMoSū(Ms) = The Chinese translation of the Prātimokṣasūtra of the Mahāsāsakas, T. 22, No. 1422, 彌沙塞部和醜五分戒本, trans. by Buddhajīva (佛陀什), 423 C.E.
PrMoSū(Mū) = Mū
PrMoSū[Mū,HvH] = Mū(HvH)
PrMoSū[Sa] = Sa


Śai = Śāikṣadharmā (PrMoSū[Ma-L], PrMoSū[Sa], PrMoSū[Mū], PrMoSū[Mū.HvH])


SBV = The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhādavastu, being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mālasarvāstivādin, ed. Raniero Gnoli, 2 parts, Roma 1978: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente (Serie Orientale Roma 49/1-2).

s.e. = scribal error

Sekh = Sekhiya (Pāṭim)

SHT = Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfundten, ed. Ernst Waldschmidt et al., Wiesbaden/Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1965- (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Bd. 10), T. 1-.

Skt = Sanskrit


Wogihara, Unrai
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The *Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa*:
A Transliteration of the Nepalese Manuscript A (5)

Noriyuki KUDO

**Conventions:**

( ) restored aksara(s)
[ ] damaged aksara(s)
< > omitted (part of) aksara(s)
{ } superfluous aksara(s)
{{ }} erased aksara(s)
« » interlinear insertion
+ one lost aksara
.. one illegible aksara
. illegible part of an aksara
* virāma
' avagraha
; a sign for fulfilling a blank

**Transliteration:**

SL.163.8 na yathānye(71r.4)ṣā² vākyānā³ devadattam ane<na> grññānti |
a<<ka>>smākaṃ⁴ ya;⁵ ○ stūpe dattam apaharati | tasyāparimāṇaṃ pāpariṃ teṣāṃ
c upamāṇaṃ na teṣā⁶ pramāṇaṃ kriyati⁷ | yat(a) ki(71r.5)ñcid asmiṃ prthivīmaṇḍale⁸

---

1. As to proceeding parts of this transliteration see Kudo 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012. For convenient reference to Lévi’s edition, the pagetnumber and line are given in the left margin using the abbreviation “SL.” (= Sylvain Lévi). I would like to express my thanks to Dr. Diwakar Acharya who gave me information about the ‘Notebooks’ transcribing the original manuscripts and supplied the images of them. Needless to say, any errors that remain are of my own.

2. For *yathānyeṣāṁ*.

3. For *vākyānām*.


5. Here is a sign consistently used for fulfilling a blank especially before a binding hole and at the end of line; however, it should be read as visarga.

6. For *teṣāṃ* [additional anusvāra before class nasal].

7. For *kriyate*.

8. For *prthivī*⁹.
sarvasatvānāṁ hiranyāvasuvrūṇāṁ
dhanadhānyāṁ vastrālaṁkārā捻āṁ
tasya sarvasya yaḥ kaścid apahāraṁ karoti | tasmāt pāpāt prabhūtatarāṁ paḥ(71v.1)paṁ yaḥ
stūpe dattam apaharatī ||

163.3 | ēso śmākam siddhāntah | yaḥ
dūpe dattam tat{a} stūpa eva yo jyam | yaḥ

163.5 | samghe tat samgha evapayo jyam | ēsa svasiddhāntah | pratisthāpitaḥ |

163.7 | yathā(71v.2)śmākam Bhagavān* []
tiṣṭhāti tasmiṁś ca kṛtaḥ adhikāṁraḥ
aprāme yavipākaḥ | kathāṁ punar bāhyā ye devās teśāṁ
datte kiṁ punyam phalata

163.9 | evo vān ca brūmāḥ | yas tiṣṭhāti yed eva bhaktā vā dhūparaṁ vā

163.11 | puspam vā
gandham vā dipam vā bhojanam vā
avstraṁ vā a(71v.4)laṅkāraṁ vā hiranyam vā

163.13 | suvarṇam vā prayacchanti kiṁ ajam hastena hastam na

163.15 | pratigrhanti19 |

163.17 | atha na pratigrhanti ċ< buddhasya teśāṁ ca kaḥ prativiśeṣa(71v.5)h |

163.19 | atha matam ċ< devanāṁ vārcčas vā
teśāṁ pratikṛtayaḥ pujaṁnti21 | asmakam api

163.21 | buddhasya dharmāsārīrama tiṣṭhāti | gunās ca

163.23 | pujuṁnte23 | pratimāstūpāyaś24 ca
dhūparam gandham pra{...}25(72r.1)tiyacchanti26 | evam krtc śmākam eva
datte stūpeṣu prāṇyam27 asti pujuṁte28 yasmaṁ na

163.29 | pratigrhanti29 tasmān nāsti devā30 |

163.31 | athāsti kasmān na pratigrhanti31 |

163.33 | kiṁ karaṇaṁ | u(72r.2)ktam Bhagavatā32 ċ<

---

9. For hiranyaś [additional anusvāra before class nasal].
10. For *ālankārāṇāṁ [additional anusvāra before class nasal].
11. For yaḥ [omission of visarga].
12. Read yat as is emended by Lévi; Notebook A (34.17): yaḥ.
13. Read yat as is emended by Lévi; Notebook A (34.18): yaḥ.
14. For svasiddhāntah [s > ś].
15. For punyam [omission of anusvāra].
16. For parinīṛtyaḥ [n > n].
17. A scribal error for yad.
18. For avam [y > j].
20. For vārcās (vā + arcās).
21. Read pujyante [a > u] as is emended by Lévi; Notebook A (34.26): pujyanti.
22. For gunās. [n > n].
23. Read pujyante [a > u].
24. Lévi emends: pratimāṣu vac ca; and notes (163, fn. 3): Ms. pratimāṣṭūpāyaś ca = Notebook A (34.27).
25. Here is one letter erased.
26. Lévi edits: dhūpaṁ gandham puspam pratiyacchanti = Notebook A (ibid.). However, puspam is not found in the manuscript.
27. For punyam [pu > pra].
28. For pujyante. [a > u].
29. For pratigrhnti [hn > hn].
30. For devah [omission of visarga]. Lévi emends: devah; Notebook A (34.29): devah.
31. For pratigrhnti [hn > hn].
32. Source unknown.
trayāṇāṁ samavāyena dakṣiṇā mahāphaṁbhavati | yadi tāvad dāttāṁ bhavati | yac ca dravyam dātavyam hirāṁ naṁyasuvrāṁ.functional tac ca bhava;(72r.3)ti | ye deksimīyāh | pratigrāhakāh ñ | devā manusyā o vā evan teṣām trayāṇāṁ api samavāyair mna [SL 164] dānanāṁ nāṁ hastena hastam dattam mahāphala (72r.4) bhavati | yady āṣṭi eva kiṁ ca na pratigrhnanti taṁ bhaktāṇāṁ | atha pratigrhnanti tad bhaktāṇāṁ | atha na pratigrhnanti kim kṛtvā : | atha yuktam(72r.5)nāṁ ca bhaktāṇāṁm eva krodhaṁ kāraṇam | atha teṣām sataṁ nāṁmahām devaṁ kruddha iti | ucyate | yadi na kruddhāṁ kimīṁ | athaṁ na pratigrhnanti tasmāṁ nāṁ sa <"> idaṁ trīyaṁ (72v.1) kāraṇam | 164.6 yac ca teṣām devānāṁ devabhaktāḥ suvarṇaṁ hiraṇyam vā pādamūle prayacchanti | eva devasya ko bandhanaṁ iti | taṁ yadi tasya dhūpeṣu puspeṣu gandheṣu vā mālyā(72v.2)kāre vopayuyati | yena tu dattam tasya puṇyaphaṁlam asti | atha taṁ dravyam anyair eva gṛhitam <"> yo dātā tasya puṇyaphalam nāṁ <"> ye ca gṛhnanti vau(72v.3)yaṁ devabhaktā devapādopājīvina devo vayaṁnām ceṁkam iti | teṣāṁm adattādane aiśvaryya deva

33. For dāttā.
34. For dakṣiṇāmīyāḥ [a scribal error for da > de; n > n].
35. For na.
36. For mahāphalam.
37. For pratigrhnanti [hn > hn].
38. For pratigrhnanti [hn > hn].
39. For pratigrhnanti [hn > hn].
40. Additional anusvāra insertion before a class nasal.
41. Additional anusvāra insertion.
42. Read evam as is emended by Lévi; Notebook A (34.36): evam.
43. For krodhaḥ [omission of visarga].
44. Read satyam as is emended by Lévi; Notebook A (34.36): satyam.
45. For devah [omission of visarga].
46. Additional anusvāra insertion.
47. For artham.
48. For pratigrhnanti [hn > hn].
49. For teṣām [class nasal for anusvāra].
50. Read evam as is emended by Lévi: evam; Notebook A (34.39): evam [m is circled by a scribe].
51. Lévi emends: devasya ko bandho va iti (“alors quel rapport entre le dieu et vous” (p. 177.37) [what the relationship between God and you]); Notebook A (34.39): bandhana. Should it be read as devasya ko bando nāḥ iṁ (what the relationship between God and us)?
53. Lévi emends: mālyākare; Notebook A (34.40): mālyā kare.
54. For vopayuyate = Lévi; Notebook A (34.40): vopayuyati.
55. For tad.
56. For gṛhnanti.
57. Additional anusvāra insertion before a class nasal.
58. Additional anusvāra insertion before a class nasal.
ca dravyāpahāre | kiṃ kāraṇaṃ<nn*> devadravyam anyena grā(72v.4)hyam iha
devasya [ ] semō60 vā devadravyam grhyet pra⊙viśiṣṭo va <⟩ ni61 ca devasya
kaścit tulyam62 prāg eva viśiṣṭarataraṃ63 ca <⟩
te pratiViśiṣṭarataraḥ64 ;

(72v.5) kiṃ kāraṇaṃ <> yasmāt te tasya pranipātaṃ65 kurtvanti | devapādaś ca
svapanti <> yadā te viśiṣṭarataraḥ kimnim66 artham deva67 prasādyate |

16417 atha tatra devadravyagrahane68 pāpaṃ69 nāśī <> (73r.1) anyeṣām70 api
staskarāṇaṃ ye cauryena jīvantī | ta71 dravyaparasvāpahāraṇ ca kurtvanti | teṣām api
pāpaṃ72 nāṣī |

16419 atha mata73 pitā putra74 rājā prabhūtya75 ca yathā dravyam yathā caityadravyam76
pu(73r.2)tro grhnāti77 | bhūtyam78 vā rājño dravyam grhnanti79 | tathā vayam
a⊙pi <⟩
evam apy ayuktām | kiṃ kāraṇaṃ <> putrasya tu pitur dravya80 grhnato81 mahān*
pātaḥkāḥ <>

59. This sentence is confused. Lévi emends: teṣām adatādevāsvārve devadravyāpahāre (“Quelle raison
ont-ils donc, sans avoir reçu la souveraineté au-dessus des dieux, de prendre le bien des dieux?” (p. 178,
4-5) [(Why were they so without receiving sovereignty over the gods, to take the property of the gods?)];
Notebook A (35.1): [teṣām adattādeva a⟩⟩ ⟨[ ]⟩ svaryā ⟨[ ]⟩deva ⟨[ ]⟩dravyāpahāre |
60. A scribal error for samo.
61. Read vā | na.
62. Read tulyaṃ as emended by Lévi; Notebook A (35.2): tulyaṃ.
63. For viśiṣṭarataraś [ṣ > s].
64. Read pratīviśiṣṭaratārāḥ.
65. For pranipātaṃ [n > n].
66. Additional anusvāra insertion before class nasal.
67. For devaḥ [omission of visarga].
68. For -grahane [n > n].
69. For pāpaṃ [class nasal for anusvāra].
70. For anyeṣām [ny > ny].
71. On the left side of this letter one straight stroke is found; is it meant for a vowel sign for -e? Notebook
A (35.6): tadadravya-.  
72. For pāpaṃ [class nasal for anusvāra].
73. For mātā. Notebook A (35.7) gives alternative reading in square brackets: ata matam [māṭā] pitā (m is
circled by a scribe).
74. For putro.
75. Read bhṛtyaḥ (‘servant of a king, a minister’) as is emended by Lévi; Notebook A (35.7-8):
pra(⟨[ ]⟩bhṛtya ca [ṣca].
76. Read paitryadravyam (‘property of his father’). Lévi emends: paitryam dravyam; Notebook A (35.8):
caityadravyam. This reading is attested by its parallel expression “bhūtyam (→ bhṛtyo) vā rājño dravyam”.
77. For grhnāti.
78. Read bhṛtyo.
79. Read grhnāti (3rd, sg.). Lévi emends so; Notebook A (35.9): grhnā(→ā)[{n]}ti (adding a long vowel
sign after akṣara hna and canceling n of ligature nti).
80. For dravyam.
81. For grhnato.
a{ta} tham mataam (73r.3) raja\textsuperscript{82} bhutyavad\textsuperscript{83} dravyam iti |
ucyate | raja adattanam\textsuperscript{84} o grhnamana\textsuperscript{85} putra\textsuperscript{86} ca pit\textipa{a} ca dadyat\{a\} pit\textipa{a} prag eva bhutes\textsuperscript{87} | tasmad asmadartha\textsuperscript{88} so (')yad\textsuperscript{89} drst\textipa{a}ntah \textasciitilde{} ya\textsuperscript{90} ca (73r.4) evam sampratipann\textipa{a} vayam devabhakt\textipa{a}h tatpadopaj\textipa{v}ina\textipa{a} ca tasmad grhnama\textsuperscript{91} iti |
tac cayuktam | ki\textipa{n} kara\textipa{m} | na ca devabhakt\textipa{a}h te devadravyam gr(73r.5)hnam\textipat\textipa{t}\textsuperscript{93} | atma grhnam\textipat\textipa{t}\textipa{m} | na te tadbhakt\textipa{a}h bhavam\textipa{t} | na ka\textipa{c}cid bha{kt\textipa{i}j\textipa{t}i\textipa{t}} ktim\textipa{a}m* devadravyam grhnam\textipat\textipa{t}\textipa{m} \textasciitilde{} na te\textipa{a} te\textipa{a}h devabhakt\textipa{a}h bhavati | devadravye te\textipa{a}m bhakt\textipa{a}h na te\textipa{a}h ki(73v.1)\textipa{n} ci\textipa{p}an\textsuperscript{98} | na vidyate |

ye\textsuperscript{99} adattam grhnam\textipat\textipa{t}\textipa{m} | ki\textipa{n} kara\textipa{m} \textasciitilde{} p\textipa{r}var\textipa{sh}ibhih mule chinn te tapau vrksam \textsuperscript{\textipa{sakhya\textipat\textipa{m}}} | yasya luptapitrsneha\textsuperscript{102} tasya itaro jana\textipa{h} |
etad uttam bha(73v.2)vati | yo \textasciitilde{}dattam devadravyam grhn\textipat\textipa{t}\textipa{m} na tasya ki\textipa{O}ncid akara\textipa{n}\textipa{yam} | ki\textipa{n} kara\textipa{m} | na te bhaktimata\textipa{h} | atma te bhakti(SL 165)manta\textipa{h} \textasciitilde{} satrava\textipa{h} kaivam\textsuperscript{105} pit\textipa{a} de(73v.3)vasya |

(To be continued)

---

\textsuperscript{82} L\textipa{e}vi emends: raja.; Notebook A (35.10): raja.
\textsuperscript{83} Read -bhuryavad.
\textsuperscript{84} Read adattanam = Notebook A (35.11).
\textsuperscript{85} For grhnamanam [hn > hn].
\textsuperscript{86} For putram.
\textsuperscript{87} Read bhuryam.
\textsuperscript{88} For -artham = Notebook A (35.12).
\textsuperscript{89} L\textipa{e}vi emends: ya\textipa{m} = Notebook A (35.12).
\textsuperscript{90} L\textipa{e}vi emends: vac caivam; Notebook A (35.12): ya\textipa{h} ca evam.
\textsuperscript{91} For grhnama iti.
\textsuperscript{92} Read -bhakt\textipa{a} = Notebook A (35.14).
\textsuperscript{93} For grhnam\textipat\textipa{t}\textipa{m} [hn > hn].
\textsuperscript{94} For grhn\textipa{m}ant\textipa{m} [hn > hn].
\textsuperscript{95} Read grhn\textipa{m}ant\textipa{m} (3rd, sg.) [hn > hn]; additional anu\textipa{v}a\textipa{ra} before class nasal.
\textsuperscript{96} For te\textipa{\textipa{a}}m.
\textsuperscript{97} For te\textipa{\textipa{a}}m.
\textsuperscript{98} Read ki\textipa{n}cit p\textipa{pan}. A scribal error: the scribe might read a letter t- in the consonant cluster as a vowel sign of which is attached to the left side of p\textipa{a}- [t p\textipa{a} - po-]. Notebook A (35.12): nci po- \textasciitilde{} nci<\textipa{m}> p\textipa{a}-(a vowel sign -o is cancelled).
\textsuperscript{99} Hiatus remains.
\textsuperscript{100} For grhn\textipa{m}ant\textipa{m} [hn > hn].
\textsuperscript{101} L\textipa{e}vi reads: tapovrksasakh\textipat\textipa{va}vam; Notebook A (35.18): tapau vrksam \textsuperscript{\textipa{sakhya\textipat\textipa{vam}}. See L\textipa{e}vi's note [p. 164, fn. 1]: "Evidemment il y a ici une lacune que le ms. ne marque pas." However, there is no gap in the manuscript — either physically or in textual sequence.
\textsuperscript{102} For -snehas; Notebook A (35.18): -sneha(h).
\textsuperscript{103} For grhn\textipa{m}ant\textipa{m} [hn > hn]; tti. a scribal error).
\textsuperscript{104} Read bhaktimant\textipa{h} = Notebook A (35.19).
\textsuperscript{105} L\textipa{e}vi emends: ke khy\textipa{\textipa{p}it\textipa{\textipa{a}}; Notebook A (35.20): ke yam pit\textipa{\textipa{a}} (yam is underlined).
REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS:

KV = Karmavibhanga.
KVU = Karmavibhanga-upadeśa.
Notebook = Notebook transcribing Manuscript A of the Karmavibhanga, No. 5-265 (microfilm B94/3), pages 34 (National Archives of Nepal).
SL = Sylvain Lévi 1932.

SECONDARY SOURCES:

KUDO Noriyuki 工藤 順之

Lévi, Sylvain
1932 Mahākarmavibhanga (La Grande Classification des Actes) et Karmavibhāṅgopadeśa (Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhanga), textes sanscrits rapportés du Nepal, édités et traduits avec les textes parallèles en sanscrit, en pali en tibétan, en chinois et en kutchéen, Paris.

<Key words: Karmavibhanga, Karmavibhangopadeśa, Nepalese manuscript, Sylvain Lévi>
A first-century Prajñāpāramitā manuscript from Gandhāra
- parivarta 5
(Texts from the Split Collection 2)

Harry FALK and Seishi KARASHIMA

1 Introduction
This second part of the manuscript of the Gāndhārī Prajñāpāramitā runs parallel to the later half of the fifth parivarta of the Aśtasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā (henceforth AS). Its mere existence may look surprising as Conze (1960: 54f.; 1978: 49f.) did not list separate chapter titles from Lokakṣema’s translation for what are parivartas 3, 4 and 5 in the AS. Sander (2000a: 93f.) misinterpreted this as if Conze’s list showed that these chapters did not exist in Lokakṣema. A number of manuscript fragments of an AS from the Bamiyan area in Brāhmī script, dating to Kushan times, were edited by Sander (2000b) most carefully, containing parallels to 11 chapters out of the 30, possibly some more. Within the mass of fragments no parallels were found going along with text from the parivartas 3, 4 and 5, seemingly supporting Sander’s interpretation of Conze’s list. However, Conze nowhere refers to missing chapters. Our synoptic view shows clearly that text related to the fifth parivarta is found in Lokakṣema’s translation; Conze must have been aware of it. Our Kharoṣṭhī manuscript therefore does not contain text from a relatively recent chapter 5 but material apparently as old as chapter 1.

The presentation follows in all aspects the edition of the preserved parts of the first parivarta, published in the last issue of this journal (Falk & Karashima 2012). The text is written on the verso of the same sheets of birch-bark which contain the first chapter. In most cases the preserved segments are inscribed on both sides, but at those places where two barks were glued together only one side carries text. The graphical presentation of the succession of segments with their front- and back-sides is given in our first paper and shows that there is an initial series of three segments which do not contain text of the first parivarta on their verso. Without having the first parivarta for comparison, their succession is still perfectly clear both from the running text they contain as well as through adjoining parts where some Kharoṣṭhī letters are preserved partly on one and partly on the other side of the join. Possibly because here we have to do with the edge of the glued section of bark, there is a gap running right through line 5-13 where there is no letter preserved with some parts on both side of the glued section. Nonetheless, the succession of text in lines 5-13 and 14 is such that their continuity can be regarded as established.

2 The interrelation of all three texts
There are lots of examples which again confirm the results achieved before, namely that
Lokakṣema translated a text close to our Gāndhārī version and that the Sanskrit version is considerably expanded. Many examples can be found by just a glance at the synopsis. The development Gāndhārī → Lokakṣema → AS is correct on the whole, but the fifth *parivarta* provides also material to show that such a unilinear picture will not suffice to explain all the differences. There are all sorts of congruences of two versions against the third:

**2a Agreement of the Gāndhārī and Lokakṣema against the AS**

As was already seen in the first *parivarta*, Lokakṣema’s text was very close to the Gāndhārī version, in most cases just slightly enlarged. This fifth *parivarta* again shows agreement in many points as compared to the Sanskrit text and some of the differences are witness of a changed attitude of the author of the AS towards a Bodhisattva.

In 5-61 we read in the Gāndhārī text that an *āryaśrāvaka* wants to provide support (*anugraha*) to a Bodhisattva and strengthens his own efforts to bring the Bodhisattva closer to the Prajñāpāramitā. What is *bosisatvāsa anugraho karoti* in Gāndhārī becomes *sarvasattvānāṁ anugraham kartukāmāḥ* in Sanskrit. Instead of the Sanskrit “help to all beings”, Lokakṣema has: “O venerable disciple (of the Buddha)! Bodhisattva-mahāsattvas who receive (the Prajñāpāramitā?) in this manner, will swiftly become Buddhas” (Karashima 2011: 127 fn. 783), thus also providing help to the Bodhisattva as in the Gāndhārī version. In the Sanskrit version the position of the Bodhisattva has been elevated; he is not in need of *anugraha* any longer, which now needs to be conferred to “all the beings”.

The case continues and presents interesting variants. According to the Gāndhārī text this help (*anugraha*) given to the Bodhisattva produces something: *ado praṇatia bhagavado śavaga ya*, which I (HF) understand as “out of this arise the śrāvakas of the Lord”. After *ado*, the usual *praszavati* is required and since two out of four letters are identical I take *praṇatia* as a clerical blunder based on a distorted exemplar. AS renders the term correctly as *prassūtā*, but what arises is now *bhagavatvānāṁ mahāsattvānāṁ anuttarā samyaksambodhiḥ* instead of *bhagavado śavaga*. Lokakṣema, on the other hand, says the same as the reconstructed Gāndhārī text with his “Disciples of the Buddha originate from it”.

Another case is found in 5-40 where *bhuyasamatrae* is left out in the AS, but found as “in a much greater degree” in Lokakṣema.

The first letters of 5-35 are gone, but the next letters read *(sa)rvaṇudhammaṇa labhi bhaviṣasi,* “you will gain the qualities of a Sarvajña”. In the Sanskrit version, the complete fifth *parivarta* is devoid of the term *sarvajña*, which is used copiously in many other chapters, though. In the fifth chapter, Lokakṣema reads here “(Because) the virtues of *sarvajña(tā)* (omniscience) bring the virtues of the dharmas to completion”, a clear parallel to the Gāndhārī text, not to the Sanskrit, where “Buddha” is used instead of “Sarvajña”.

At the end of 5-16, the Gāndhārī reads *viñana anicam ti*, with no parallel on the Sanskrit side, but which corresponds to “One (should) learn that (consciousness) is impermanent and practise (the idea) that consciousness is impermanent”.

There are sentences and passages only contained in Gāndhārī and Lokakṣema.
One starting with puṇavaro kośiga at the end of 5-46 lasts until another puṇavaro kośiga follows in 5-50, so that we can presuppose a classical case of haplography. Further examples concern the lines 5-03 and 04, 5-15, 5-28 and 29.

2b Agreement of the Gāndhārī and AS against Lokakṣema

In line 5-59 we find a list of belongings civarapeḍava-śayasaṇa-gilaṇa-praceabbeṣa[ja], which has an unmistakable parallel in the AS version: civarapinḍapāta-śayanāsana-gāna-praṭyayabhaṣaiya-pariśkarāṇ, framed by other parts of a sentence with no corresponding part in Gāndhārī. Lokakṣema leaves out the complete paragraph, – or never saw it in his exemplar, so that we would have to regard it as part of an extension.

There is a telling reversal of paragraphs in Lokakṣema. From the start up to and including line 5-29 all versions follow the same sequence of sentences. But then only Gāndhārī and AS continue, while Lokakṣema’s text seems to miss the contents of lines 5-30 to the middle of 5-32, until Śakra answers baha bhāmte bhagava. This part is found in the Chinese version much further down, after 5-36, where the Prajñāpāramitā is said to produce the fruits of all possible stages of enlightenment. In other parts of his work, Lokakṣema also produces transpositions of this sort (Conze 1960: 26).

However this transposition came about,¹ it seems to show that Lokakṣema did not work with a direct predecessor of our manuscript but one of a slightly different tradition.

2c Agreement of Lokakṣema and AS against Gāndhārī

In both sentences immediately following the ones with bhuyasamatrae (5-40, 5-46), the author of the AS does not reproduce puṇavisamkhareṇa, although punyābhisamkhāreṇa is a term quite well-known to him. A look at Lokakṣema shows that he too does not refer to this term and so we can conclude that Lokakṣema’s exemplar also was devoid of it.

The logical conclusion therefore is that our ms follows a tradition which had on its own enlarged the Ur-text to some minimal extent as compared to the mss which Lokakṣema used and which led to the AS.

There are some cases where Lokakṣema has passages which are found only in the AS but not in Gāndhārī. One passage after padisamyutena in 5-34 starts a short insertion in Lokakṣema which became huge in AS. Another clear case follows after ta kisa hedu in 5-60, being two sentences in Lokakṣema, enlarged to three in AS.

The two versions contain a number of short insertions clarifying who is speaking (5-02, 5-08, 5-23), which are missing in Gāndhārī.² Maybe this points at an initial oral presentation of the text, as given in Gāndhārī, which the reciter knew by heart including the persons speaking, indicating different speakers by a different modulation of the voice.

---

¹ The most common reason is the copying of the verso of a palm-leaf manuscript first instead of the recto. As far as we can imagine, the long sheets and sequences of sheets of birch-bark do not lend themselves to this kind of mistake. On the other hand, for the early time where we have to locate the Urtext, the use of palm-leaves is so far not attested.

² Cf. the Brāhmī ms, where the speaker is also not explicitly named (Sander 2000b: 12, 16, 40) and only introduced by āha.
For readers deprived of this help, the change must be expressed verbally. Discussions about the role of writing in shaping non-śrāvaka texts started with a paper by Schopen (1975), whose stand was supported by Gombrich (1988/1990), expanding on observations of Cousins (1983) on Pali texts. Recently, Schopen’s theory of the “book” was refuted by Drewes (2007). The discussions will continue and we hope to have provided one more fact to be taken into account.

3 Pedigree

The three kinds of agreement and disagreement leave no doubt that there is no straight line from Gāndhārī to Lokakṣema or to the Sanskrit Aṣṭasāhasrikā. Instead, a fork model looks more promising, starting from an Urtext, leading in three directions, first to our Gāndhārī ms which is minimally enlarged compared to older versions. Then a text from another tradition still held in Gāndhārī was used by Lokakṣema. The parts unique to his text and the AS show that both are ultimately based on a Gāndhārī tradition which was further enlarged compared to our preserved one. The AS goes back to this further-enlarged text and again enlarged it substantially. But it did not use a ms of the strand leading to Lokakṣema, because the said transposition of contents is not found in it.

This simple model probably would look much more complicated if we had more early manuscripts. Suffice it here to say that even this simple fork-model presupposes so many intermediate stages that locating the Urtext deep in the first century BCE, if not earlier, seems safe. Moreover, such an early date for non-śrāvaka “Mahāyāna” texts is not surprising and has been proposed many times before. The reservations against Lokakṣema’s text as not representing an older stratum compared with the AS tradition, last expressed by Seyfort Ruegg (2004: 23), could be overcautions. His warning against looking for an Urtext for all sorts of variant forms (2004: 22) is certainly justified: a stemma codicum would require more material compared to what we have and what we can expect to find in the future. Nonetheless, what we have now with this fragmentary Gāndhārī text has changed our view on Lokakṣema and it allows us to speak of older and younger strands of the Prajñāpāramitā with more confidence.

4 Nature of the AS

It will take more studies on these three versions to interpret all the differences with regard to text transmission and changes in content. With regard to the translation process which led to the Sanskrit text, we can point at a case of uncertainty on the side of the translator. Gāndhārī 5-40 and 5-45 both read: eva sa praṇaparamida bhuyasamatrae bhāvana parivūri gacheṣati. AS first had difficulties with bhāvana, rendering bhuyasamatrae bhāvana by a simple bhāvyan in the first case, but by bhūyasyā māṇayā bhāvanāṃ in the second. The difference may be traced back either to an illegible exemplar or to a misunderstanding in the first case, while some elucidation through own reasoning or foreign advice led to a correct translation in the second.

Many differences in the AS can be explained seeing that this author inserts a samyaksambodhi where there was none before. In 5-36 pracegabosi was changed to samyaksambuddhatvam; in 5-58 a simple bosae was changed to anuttarāyāḥ
samyaksambodheḥ;
in 5-63 ̆śikṣeṃti is enlarged to anuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhau śikṣeran, to cite only the clear cases.

(Harry Falk)

Conventions

++ = Line 1-21 has lost bark needed for ca. 3 aśkaras up to the standard left-side border. An additional marker for lost bark (as “///”) is not used.

(1-22) ++ = Line 1-22 has lost bark needed for ca. 3 aśkaras counting from a hypothetical right-side border, which can be reconstructed on the basis of several clear cases.

. = one character has left some traces, which are too scanty for a clear definition.

_ or ____ = shorter or longer part of the bark left unwritten, mostly because of its unevenness.

**bold type:** Gāndhārī text as read from the birch-bark.

*normal type:* Sanskrit text of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā.

*italics:* Phrases and passages in the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā not found in the Gāndhārī version.

Abbreviations used for the Chinese parallels


AAA = the commentary on AS called Abhisamayālamkārālokā; cf. Wogihara 1932.

AsP.tr. = Conze 1958.

AsP.tr.II = Conze 1973.


R = AS; ed. Mitra 1887-1888.


KJ = Xiaopin Banreboloumi jing 小品般若波羅蜜經 (T. 8, No. 227), translated by Kumārajīva 鸠摩羅什 in 408 C.E.

Lk = Daoxing Banre jing 道行般若經 (T. 8, No. 224; 179 C.E.), translated by Zhi Loujiachen 支婁迦谶 or Lokakṣema.

ps-ZQ = ps(eudo)-Zhi Qian: the first chapter of the Da Mingdu jing 大明度經, T.8, No.225, 478b~482a, entitled Xingpin 行品, is evidently not the work of Zhi Qian 支謙 but of an anonymous translator.

Sh = Fomuchushengsanfazang Banreboloumido jing 佛母出生三法藏般若波羅蜜多經 (T. 8, No. 228), translated by Shihu 施護 or Dānapāla in 982~(?)

Xz(I) = The fourth assemblage (第四會) of the Da Banreboloumi jing 大般若波羅蜜經 (T. 7, No. 220, pp. 763~865), translated by Xuanzang 玄奘 in 660~663.

Xz(II) = The fifth assemblage (第五會) of the above-mentioned translation by Xuanzang (T. 7, No. 220, pp. 865~920).

Zfn = Mohebanre chao jing 摩訶般若釈經 (T. 8, No. 226), translated by Tannopi 晩摩訶 or Dharmapriya and Zhu Fonian 竹佛念 during the Former Qin Dynasty (351-394).

Pk = The Tibetan translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā is to be found in vol. 21, pp. 57-183, i.e. No.734, Sher phyin, mi 1b1~312a8.

D = the Tibetan translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā in Derge (sDe dge) Kanjur (No. 12, Shes phyin, ka 1b1~286a6); facsimile reproductions:

(1) Bstan ’gyur sde dge’i par ma: Commentaries on the Buddha’s Word by Indian Masters (CD-Rom), New York: The Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center (TBRC).
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punar aparāṃ kauśika yāvanto jambudīpe sattvāḥ tān sarvān kaścid eva kulaṇṭro vā kuladuhitā vā caturṣu apramāṇeṣu

(5-01:) + + hi pradiśhave
pratiśṭhāpayet

evaṃ peyālena kartavyam. yathā caturṣy apramāṇeṣu evaṃ catasṛṣy ārūpyasamāpatisu

[p]āṃcaṣu abhiṅeṣu
pañcask abhijñāsu

yāvat samastāsu dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattyabhijñāsu

pradiśhave
pratiśṭhāpayet
ta ki [ma]jnāsi [k]o[ś]i
/ tat kiṃ Manyase kauśika

avi te sa

(5-02:) + + (pra)savea
api nu sa kulaṇṭro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇyam prasavet.

a[ha] bahu (bhaṇ)[t]e bhagava
śakra āha bahu bhagavan bahu sugata //

bhagavān āha
A Part of Lokakṣema’s translation, paralleling the Gāndhārī fragments (2)
436c17–438a7

(AS.54.16 = R.107.3 = AAA.291.27 [AsP.tr.II 121 = AsP.tr. 40]; Lk.436c17; ZQ.485c25; Zfn.518b29; Kj.546b7; Xz[I].784a1; Xz[II].879a16; Sh.604a10; Tib.Pk.63b3 = D.60a5)

(The Buddha said: “...”) Moreover, O Kauśika, if a good man or a good woman makes the people in Jambūdvīpa
all practise
the four meditations¹, -(AS)²
the four truths³,
the four supernatural powers⁴
and the pañcābhijñā⁵,

what do you think, O Kauśika, is their merit not great?”

Śakra devendra said: “Very much, very much, O Lord! -(AS)⁶”

The Buddha said:

² AS.54.17–55.21 = R.107.5–109.9 = AAA.292.1–294.4. tat kim manyaśe Kauśika! ......... bhūta-kotiprabha-vanadhyām iti = Sh.604a25–b17, Tib.Pk.63b3–65a1 = D.60a6–61b2. Other versions (ZQ.485c26, Zfn.518c1, Kj.546b8, Xz[I].784a2, Xz[II].879a17) as well as Lk lack parallels.
⁶ AS.55.25 = R.109.16 = AAA.294.15. sugata = Xz[I].784a5. 善逝 (= Xz[II].879a22), Tib.Pk.65a4 = D.61b5. bde bar gshegs pa. Other versions (ZQ.485c27, Zfn.518c3, Kj.546b10, Sh.604b22[?]) as well as Lk lack parallels.
ado  kośia so kulaputro [va] (ku)[ladhida v]ji bahudaro pu ..
atah khalu punah sa kausika kulaputro va kuladuhita va bahutaram punyah prasavet

(5-03:) + (pra)[āa]paramiādae  [p][o][sta]o
ya imān prajñāpāramitām antaśah pustakagatām
api krtyā abhisraddadhah abhisraddhate avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimūcann
adhimucyate prasannacittāh prasannacittāyā adhyāsyasampannāya bodhāya cittam utpāda va samutpāditabodhicittāyā bodhisattvāya adhyāsayena dadyāt

paresu likaṣa
antaśo likhanāyāpi

vācanaṇāpi akilāsitayā sampādayisvati udyukto 'muṃ grāhayaṇi

dasati
samārājyisvati
samādāpāyisvati samprahārasayisvati vācā nesvati vinivesvati anunesvati artham asvā asmai samprakāśayisvati evam cāya cittaṃ viśodhayaṇi nirvīcikitsām kariṣayati evam caivaṃ vākṣayati
ehi tvāṃ kulaputra asmin va bodhisattvamārge śiśkasva / ava hi tvāṃ śiṣkṣamāṇaś caran vyāycchamānaḥ kṣipram evānuttarāḥ samyakṣambodhim abhisambhotyasve / abhisambudhya ca aparimitaṃ sattvadhātum anuttare upadhisamkṣaye 'bhivinivesyasi yad uta bhūtakotiḥprabhāvanatāyām iti /

tiṣṭhatu khalu punah kausika jāmbūdvipakān sarvasattvān
dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhijnāsā pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhisaṃskārah anena
paryāyaṃ pī te kausika cāturmahādvipake lokadhātāu sattvāh tān api sarvān kaścida eva kulaputo va kuladuhita vā dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhijnāsā pratiṣṭhapayet /
tiṣṭhatu khalu punah kausika cāturmahādvipake lokadhātāu sarvasattvān
dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhijnāsā pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhisaṃskārah ye pī te kausika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātāu sattvāh tān api sarvān kaścida eva kulaputo va kuladuhitā vā dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhijnāsā pratiṣṭhapayet /
tiṣṭhatu khalu punah kausika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātāu sarvasattvān
dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhijnāsā pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhisaṃskārah ye pī te kausika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātāu sattvāh tān api sarvān kaścida eva kulaputo va kuladuhitā vā dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhijnāsā pratiṣṭhapayet .

viṣṭhatu khalu punah kausika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātāu sarvasattvān
dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhijnāsā pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhisaṃskārah ye pī te kausika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātāu sattvāh tān api sarvān kaścida eva kulaputo va kuladuhitā vā dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhijnāsā pratiṣṭhapayet /
“It is inferior to that of a good man or a good woman, who copies the Prajñāpāramitā,

-(AS)\(^7\) gives its scriptural scrolls to other people,

makes them copy it or

recites it for them. -(AS)\(^8\)

Their merit is much greater.

(The Buddha said: “ ...”) Moreover, O Kauśika, leave aside (the people) in Jambū-
dvīpa; if a good man or a good woman makes (the people)
on the four continents, in the small world, in the medium-sized world, in the thousand
worlds, in the double-thousand worlds, in the triple-thousand great worlds (up to) the
people in the buddha-worlds (innumerable as) the sands on the riversides of the Ganges,
all practise the four meditations, the four truths,
the four supernatural powers and the pañcābhiṣijñā; and makes all (the people) accomplish
(their practices), what do you think, O Kauśika, is their merit not great?”

Śakra devendra said: “Very much, very much, O Lord! -(AS)\(^9\)”

The Buddha said: “It is inferior to that of a good man or a good woman, who copies
the Prajñāpāramitā, -(AS)\(^10\) gives its scriptural scrolls to other people, makes them copy
it or recites it for them. -(AS)\(^11\) Their merit is much greater.

\(^7\) AS.55.27–29 = R.109.19–22 = AAA.294.18–22. abhīśraddhadhābhiśraddhadhate ...
samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāvyāhāryaḥ = Xz(I).784a6–7, Sh.604b23–24, Tib.Pk.65a5–7 =
D.61b6–7. The older versions (Lk.436c21, ZQ.485c28, Zfn.518c4, Kj.546b11, Xz(II).879a24) lack parallels.

\(^8\) AS.55.30–56.4 = R.110.1–8 = AAA.294.23–295.3. udvyutko 'num grāhaviṣayati saṃdārāviṣayati ... yad
uta bhūtakotiprabhāvanatāyām iti = Xz(I).784a8–12, Sh.604b25–c2, Tib.Pk.65a7–b3 = D.61b7–62a3. The
older versions lack parallels.

\(^9\) AS.56.22 = R.111.12 = AAA.296.15. sugata = Xz(I).784b1. 普通 (= Xz(II).879a22), Tib.Pk.66a8 =
D.62b7. Other versions as well as Lk lack parallels.

\(^10\) AS.56.24–26 = R.111.15–18 = AAA.296.18–22. abhīśraddhadhābhiśraddhadhate ...
samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāvyāhāryaḥ = Xz(I).784b2–4, Sh.604c15–16, Tib.Pk.66b1–3 = D.63a1–2. The older
versions (Lk.436c29, ZQ.485c28, Zfn.518c10, Kj.546b17, Xz(II).879a24) lack parallels.

\(^11\) AS.56.27–33 = R.111.19–112.3 = AAA.296.23–297.2. udvyutko 'num grāhaviṣayati saṃdārāviṣayati ...
yad uta bhūtakotiprabhāvanatāyām iti = Xz(I).784b4–9, Sh.604c 18–23, Tib.Pk.66b3–7 = D.63a3–6. The
older versions lack parallels.
tiṣṭhata khalu punāḥ kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātāu sarvasattvān
dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattabhūjīnāsu pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhisamkāraḥ anena
paryāyena ye’pi kecit kauśika gangānadvālukopāmesu trisāhasramahāsāhasreṣu
lokadhātuṣu sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaṅgutro vā kuladuhità vā
dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattabhūjīnāsu pratiṣṭhāpayet /

tat kim maruṣaye kauśika
api nu sa kulaṅguto vā kuladuhità vā tato nidānaṁ bahu punyam prasaveto
sakra āha bahu bhagavan bahu suguta //

bhagavān āha

ataḥ khalu punāḥ sa kauśika kulaṅguto vā kuladuhità vā bahutaram punyam prasaveto
ya imām prajñāpāramitām antasaḥ pustakagatām api kṛtvā
abhisraddhadh abhisraddhadhe avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimucyate
prasanncitah prasanncittāy adhyāśayaṃpanno 'dhyāśayasaṃpannāya bodhāya
cittam utpāda do samutpāditabdhicittāyā bodhisattvāya adhyāśayena dadyāt

antaśo likhaṇāyāpi vācaṇāyāpi akilāsitayā sampādayasyati
udyukto 'muṃ grāhayisyati saṃdarsāisyati
samādāpayisyati samuttejayisyati saṃpraharṣayisyati
vācā nesyati vīnesyati artham asyā asmai saṃprakāsāisyati
evaṃ cāsyā cittaṃ viśodhayisyati / nirvicitikṣāṃ karisyati evaṃ caīnaṃ vakṣyati

ehi tvam kulaṅgutra asminn eva bodhisattvamārge śikṣasva / ara hi tvam śikṣamānas ca ran
vāyacchamānāḥ ksipram evanuttaraṃ samyaksambodhim abhisambhotasyase /
abhisambudhyā ca aparimitam satvadhātum anuttara upadhisamkṣaye 'bhivināyasaḥ yad
uta bhūtakoṭiprabhāvanatāyāṃ iti //

puṇavaro k(ośiga) +++++ [p](u)[u](ro) vi ku[l.]
(5-04:) +++++ ++++++++ ++++++(po)[stao para]ṣ[sa] [l](i)[khaṇa da]sati a[ya]me[va]
tenā bohudaro

(5-05:) +++++ [·]o[k]ośiga
puṇar aparāṃ kauśika

yaṃ ca so kulaṅguto va kuladhita vi ima praṇaparamida
yaḥ kulaṅguto vā kuladuhità vā imām prajñāpāramitām

likhitvā

svaya ca va
svayaṃ ca vācaṇeto
(437a) Moreover, O Kauśika, (if a good man or a good woman) gives the scriptural scrolls of the Prajñāpāramitā to other people, makes them copy or study it, or (they) study it themselves, their merit is much greater (than that of the former).

Moreover, O Kauśika, if a person

studies the Prajñāpāramitā themselves
parebhyaś ca likhitvā pūrvvad dadyāt ayatnataḥ kauśika pūrvvakāt kulaputrāt kuladuhitur
vā sakāśād bahutaram puṇyaṃ prasavet / punar aparām kauśika yah kulaputro vā
kuladuhitā vā

(5-06:) + .. [praṇa] paramidae atho parasa
imāṃ prajñāpāramitām arthakusalo vācayet parebhyaś
c a likhitvā pūrvvad dadyāt sārthāṃ savyaṇjanām

uvadiśe ayameva teṇa
upadiśet paridipayet ayatnataḥ

bahuḍaro puño prasa
kauśika sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet //

(5-07:) + + + .. devaṇa iṃtro bhagavado edadoya
atha khalu śakro devāṇām indro bhagavantam etad avacat

iyam api bhagavan

(5-08:) + + + + [pa]ramida uvadiśitava
prajñāpāramitā upadeśavyāḥ

aha
evam ukte bhagavān śakram devāṇām indram etad avacat

ayāṃ [pi] .. + + + + .. + [p](u)[t](ra)[sa] + + + +
+i yam api kauśika prajñāpāramitā upadeśavyā śabudhyamānasya kulaputrasya vā
kuladuhitur vā /

(5-09:) [paramida]+ + + .. + .. u .. + ..
and expounds the wisdom within it\textsuperscript{12}, their merit is much greater (than that of the former)."

\textit{Śakrā devendra} said to the Buddha:

"How, O Lord, (should) one study the \textit{Prajñāpāramitā} and expound the wisdom within it?"\textsuperscript{13}

The Buddha said:

\textsuperscript{14}A good man or a good woman, who does not know (the \textit{Prajñāpāramitā}, should) study it.

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{12} 解中慧 : = ZQ.485c29; cf. AS.57.4f. = R.112.9 = AAA.297.12. \textit{sārthaṃ savyaṇjanām upadiṣet paridīpayed} ("expound and light it up, both the meaning and the letter" [AsP.tr.II 121 = AsP.tr. 40]). Zfn.518c13f. 解中慧; Kj.546b23. 解説其義; Krsh(2010),643f., s.v. 中(1).

\textsuperscript{13} 云何學般若波羅蜜，{學}，解中慧，{，其福甚多}？：Both 學 and 其福甚多 are superfluous; cf. AS.57.7f. = R.112.11f. = AAA.297.18. \textit{iyam api ... prajñāpāramitā upadeśtavyā?} ("Can one then expound this perfection of wisdom?" [AsP.tr.II 121 = AsP.tr. 40]); ZQ.485c29f. 云何學明度解中慧？; Zfn.518c14f. 云何學般若波羅蜜，解中慧者？; Kj.546b24f. 應為何等人解説般若波羅蜜義？ In the Taishō, Koryō, Zifu Editions etc., another sentence 釋提桓因白佛言："天中天！云何學般若波羅蜜，解中慧？" is mistakenly added after this one (dittoography).

\textsuperscript{14} 善男子、善女人不曉，學： Cf. AS.57.8f. = R.112.13f. = AAA.297.24f. \textit{iyam api Kauśikān prajñāpāramitā upadeśtavyā abudhyamānasya kulauparasya vā kuladuhitvā vā} ("Yes, one should expound it to someone who does not understand it." [AsP.tr.II 121 = AsP.tr. 40]); ZQ.486a1.; Zfn.518c15f. 其不曉者，為解説之; Kj.546b25f. 若有善男子、善女人不知般若波羅蜜義故，應為解説其義.
\end{footnotes}
[ta kisa hed]u
tat kasya hetoḥ

[upa .. .. 15 koṣiga anaga] + (5-10:) ++ ++ [praṇāparamidae pāḍivaṃṇīga]°
upatsyate hi kauśika anāgate ‘dhvani praṇāpāramitāprativarnīkā /

atra so kulaputro va kuladhitva [aṇ]u[taṛae saṃ]ma +
tatra abudhyamānaḥ kulaputro vā kuladhitā vā anuttarāṃ samyaksambodhīm

(5-11:) ++ ++ duamo ma praṇāśiṣati ta pāḍivaṃṇīga śruṇita
abhisambodhukāmo mā praṇāṃkṣīt tām praṇāpāramitāprativarnīkāṃ śrūtvā //

evaṃ vuto śakro de ++ ++ [bhaga] .. (5-12:) ++ ++ [d]o(ya [ka] + [bhagava]
atha khalu śakro devānāṃ indro bhagavantam etad avocat kathaṃ bhagavan
anāgate ‘dhvani praṇāpāramitāprativarnīkā veditavyā iyam sā

praṇāparamidae pāḍivaṃṇīga
praṇāpāramitāprativarnīkopadiśyata iti

eva[m] v[uto bhagava śakro devaṇa imtr(o) (5-13:) ++ ++ ++
evam ukte bhagavān śakram devānāṃ indram etad avocat

15 Probably upajiṣati; cf. 5:40 +vajiṣati, where Skt has āpatsyate.
For what reason?

(While) a good man or a good woman, in the future, wants to attain *anuttara-samyaksambodhi* and likes to study the *Prajñāpāramitā*, they may, to the contrary, receive teaching on a trifling *Prajñāpāramitā* from a bad acquaintance.

Śakra devendra asked the Buddha: “What is a trifling *Prajñāpāramitā*?”

The Buddha said:

---


17. 此释：Cf. AS.57.11 = R.112.18 = AAA.298.5. *prajñāpāramitā-pratītyānika- (“a counterfeit [of the perfection of wisdom]” [AsP.tr.II 121 = AsP.tr. 40]); ZQ.486a2. 末(戒); Zfn.518c18. 此释(般若波羅蜜); Kj.546b29. 相似(般若波羅蜜); Krsh(2010).635f.

abhāvitakāyā abhāvitaśīlā abhāviticāt tā abhāvitaṃprajñā edamukajātīyā prajñāparaḥ /

[t]e [p](r)aṇapa + + [da] uvadiśīṣa[ma ti paḍīvaṃṇi]
te prajñāpāramitām upadeksyāma iti tasyāḥ prativarṇikām upadeksyanti

(5-14:) + + + + .. [paḍīvaṃṇiga] uvadiśīṣaṃti kathāṃ ca kauśika prajñāpāramitā-prativānghikām upadeksyanti

- rūpavināśo

ruo aṇiṃcaṃ ti uvadiśīṣaṃti rūpānityatety upadeksyanti /

ruo aṇiṃcaṃ ti (5-15:) + + + [ti] gameśīṣaṃti evaṃ ca te uvadiśīṣaṃti yo evaṃ gameśīṣaṃti so praṇapara (5-16:) + + .. pialo
eva vedanāsaṃjñāsāṃkharā viṇaṇo aṇiṃcaṃ ti uvadiśīṣaṃti evaṃ vedanāsaṃjñāsāṃskāraḥ / vijñānāvināśo vijñānānityatety upadeksyanti /
“In the future, \(^{18}\) when a monk -(AS)\(^{19}\) obtains the Prajñāpāramitā and wishes to study it, a bad acquaintance, (then), will give him teachings adverse to (the Prajñāpāramitā):

\(^{20}\) One (should) learn that form is impermanent

and practise (the idea) that form is impermanent. To learn thus is to practise the Prajñāpāramitā.

(The same applies to) feeling, conception, life and consciousness.

\(^{18}\) 比丘得般若波羅蜜，欲學。惡知識反教： = ZQ.486a3. 比丘得經，欲學。惡友教之……，Zfn.518c20. 有比丘學般若波羅蜜，為惡師所反教； ≠ AS.571f. = R.113f. = AAA.298.23f. eke bhikṣavo ... te prajñāpāramitām upadeksyāma iti tasyāḥ prativarṇikām upadeksyati. kathaṃ ca Kauśika! prajñāpāramitā-prativarṇikām upadeksyati? (“In the future) there will be some monks ... When they announce that they will expound the perfection of wisdom, they will actually expound its counterfeit. They will expound the counterfeit perfection of wisdom by teaching [that the impermanence of form, etc., is to be interpreted as the destruction of form, etc.]” [AsP.tr.II 121–122 = AsP.tr. 41]), Kj.546c2f. 有比丘欲說般若波羅蜜，而說相似般若波羅蜜等

\(^{19}\) AS.5715 = R.113f. = AAA.298.23f. abhāvita-kāyā abhāvitaśīlā abhāvita-cittā abhāvita-prajñā edamākajātīya prajñāparīhinās (“[there will be some monks] whose bodies are undeveloped, whose moral conduct, thought and wisdom are undeveloped, who are stupid, dumb like sheep, without wisdom.” [AsP.tr.II 121 = AsP.tr. 41]) = Xz(I).784c27f. 不能善修身、戒、心、慧，智慧狹劣猶如牛羊，Tib.Pk.67a7–8 = D.63b5–6; ≠ Xz(II).879b9. 懐疑顛倒. Other versions (ZQ.486a3, Zfn.518c20, Kj.546c2, Sh.605a11) as well as Lk lack parallels.

\(^{20}\) ‘學色無常，行色無常。作是曹學，行般若波羅蜜。痛痒、思想、生死、識學無常，行識無常。作是曹學，行般若波羅蜜。’： Cf. AS.5717f. = R.113.4f. = AAA.299f. “rūpa-vināśo rūpa-nirvāṇat”\(^{1}\) tv upadeksyanti. evam “vedanā-samjñā-samskāra vijñānavināśo vijñānaviṣayat”\(^{2}\) tv upadeksyanti. evam cūpadeksyanti “ya evam gavesavyayati sa prajñāpāramitāyaṇam carisyati”\(^{3}\). (“They will teach that ‘the impermanence of form is [to be interpreted as] the destruction of form.’ The same applies to feeling, perception, predispositions and consciousness. They will teach that ‘the impermanence of consciousness is [to be interpreted as] the destruction of consciousness.’ They also teach that ‘one, who strives in this manner, will practise the perfection of wisdom.’” [cf. AsP.tr.II 122 = AsP.tr. 41]); ZQ.4863af. 五陰無常學，五陰無常求；Zfn.518c22f. 學色之無常，令人於色求無常。作是行般若波羅蜜，作無常。學痛痒、思想、生死、識，於識求無常。作是行般若波羅蜜；Kj.546c4f. 色是無常。若如是求，是為行般若波羅蜜。受、想、行、識是無常。若如是求，是為行般若波羅蜜.
viñāṇo anīcāṁ ti (5-17:)

_ evāṁ ca te uvadiśiśaṁti yo evāṁ gameśiśaṁti so pra[ñapramidāe] + + + +
  evāṁ copadeśyaṁti ya evāṁ gaveśayisyati sa prajñāpāramitāyāṁ cariṣyatiti /

(5-18:) + + + + [ga] p(ra)ñapramidāe paḍivaṁṇi[gaṇa]
  iyaṁ sā kauśika prajñāpāramitā - prativarṇikā veditavyā /

[na vaṇa] kośiga [ruavi]ṇaśeṇa [ruaṇicada pa]
na khalu punah kauśika rūpavīṇāso rūpāṇityatā draṣṭavyā /

(5-19:) + + + + + .. [daṇa]saṃśasam[kha]ro viñāṇo
  - evaṁ vedanā-saṃjñā-saṃskārāḥ /

[ṇa ho vaṇa] kośiga viñāṇaviṇāśeṇa viñāṇaṇicadā paśi (5-20:) + + +
na khalu punah kauśika vijñānavināso vijñāṇāṇityatā draṣṭavyā /

  + + evaṁ paśati praṇapramidāe pa[diṣaṇa]gac carati
saced evaṁ paṣyati prajñāpāramitā-prativarṇikāyāṁ carati /

tasva dahi kośiga yo praṇaṇa (5-21:) + + + +
tasmāt tarhi kauśika kulaputreṇa vā kuladuhitrā vā prajñāpāramitāyā

.. (th)o uvadiśiśati
  artha upadeśṭavyaḥ /

prajñāpāramitāyā artham upadiśaṇ kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā

ayaṁ te[ṇa bah]odaro puṇo prasaviśati
  bahutaram puṇyaṁ prasavet //
One (should) learn that (consciousness) is impermanent and practise (the idea) that consciousness is impermanent.
To learn thus is to practise the Prajñāpāramitā.’

This is, O Kauśika, a trifling Prajñāpāramitā.”

The Buddha said:

“One, who practises the Prajñāpāramitā, does not view that destroyed form is impermanent, does not view that destroyed feeling, conception, life and consciousness are impermanent.

For what reason? Because of (their) non-existence.

One should, O Kauśika, learn by means of the wisdom of the Prajñāpāramitā.

One’s merit will be much greater.”

22. 不壞色無常誦： “One does not view that destroyed form is impermanent.” The order of words partially parallels that of the Sanskrit version, which makes the syntax of the Chinese sentence unusual. Cf. AS.57.20 = R.113.8f. = AAA.299.21f. na khalu punah Kauśika! rūpavināśo rūpānityatā draṣṭavyā (“But on the contrary, one should not view the impermanence of form, etc., as the destruction of form, etc.” [AsP.tr.II 122 = AsP.tr. 41]); ZQ486a5.不壞五陰無常誦; Zfn.518c25f. 其人作壞色行，求色無常<誦>; Kj.546c7f. 不壞色故觀色無常.
23. 何以故？本無故：＝ZQ486a5f.; ≠ AS.57.21f. = R.113.10f. = AAA.299.23f. saced evaṃ paśyati prajñāpāramitāpārativarnikāyām carati (“For to view things in that way means to course in the counterfeit perfection of wisdom.” [AsP.tr.II 122 = AsP.tr. 41]); = Kj.546c9. (不)作如是觀者，是名行相似般若波羅蜜，Xz(I).785a7f., Sh.605a16f., Tib.Pk.67b4 = D.64a2. Other versions, namely Zfn (518c27) and Xz(II) (879b19; cf. 879b16f.) lack parallels.
24. 汲翼！般若波羅蜜當點慧學：＝ZQ486a6. 如斯當爲普明之學; ≠ AS.57.22f. = R.113.11f. = AAA.299.24f. tasmāt tarhi Kauśika! kulaputreṇa vā kuladuhitrā vā prajñāpāramitāyā artha upadeśavyāḥ (“For that reason, Kausika, should one expound the meaning of the perfection of wisdom.” [AsP.tr.II 122 = AsP.tr. 41]); Zfn.518c27f. 其作行者，若有點慧，當持般若波羅蜜為解之, Kj.546c10. 以是因緣故，菩薩誡般若波羅蜜義.
puñavaro kośiga ko[i] ..
punar aparāṃ kauśika

(5-22:) + + + + + + + +[da]\(^{25}\) vi ye jambudive satva te sarve
yāvanto jambūdvīpe sattvāḥ tān sarvān

kaścid eva kulaputro vā kulaḍuhitā vā

sadavatipale p(r)adiṭhavea
srotaāpattipale pratiśṭhāpayet /

[tak](i) [mañaṣ](i) (5-23:) + +
[tat kīṁ manyase] kauśika api nu sa kulaputro vā kulaḍuhitā vā
tatonidānaṃ
tat kīṁ manyase kauśika api nu sa kulaputro vā kulaḍuhitā vā
tatonidānaṃ
tatonidānaṃ
tatonidānaṃ

[bahu puño prasavea]
bahu punyaṃ prasavet

aha bahu bhamte bhagava
śakra āha bahu bhagavan bahu sugata

\(^{25}\) Restore to koideva kulaputro va kuladhida vi ya-. in a transposed sequence compared to AS.
26 <Moreover, O Kauśika,

if a good man or a good woman makes the people in Jambudvīpa all attain the Path of srotāpañnas, is their merit much, O Kauśika?”

Śakra devendra said: “Very much, very much, O Lord!”

26. <僅次，拘留！……皆從般若波羅蜜中出生故。> : Probably, these sentences were omitted due to haplography. They are reconstructed on the basis of the stereotyped repetitions in the same text. Cf. AS.57.25~58.8 = R.113.14~114.14 = AAA.300.7~301.5. “punar aparāṇa Kauśika! yāvanto Jambudvīpe sattvas tān sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā srotāpañiphe pratiṣṭhāpayet. tat kim manaye Kauśika! api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatoṇādānām bhahupunyam prasave?” Śakra aha “bahu bhagavan! bahu sugata!” bhagavān aha ‘atah khalu punah sa Kauśika! kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaram punyam prasave va imām prajñāprāmityām antaṁ pustakagatām api kṛtvā ... (AS.57.31 = R.114.2 = AAA.300.19) dadyād antaśo likhanāyāpi vācānāyāpy aklāśitayā sampādaivyayā ... (AS.58.5 = R.114.10 = AAA.301.1) evam ca vācaṁ bhāṣayeta eteṣām eva tvam kulaputra dharmaṁ labhi bhava yad uta prajñāprāmityāpratisamyoṣṭānāṁ iti (AS.58.6 = R.114.12 = AAA.301.3) ayam eva Kauśika! tataḥ paurvedatā kulaḥ kuladuhitāro vā sakāśāṁ bahutarām punyāṁ prasavatāt. tat kasya hetoh? ao hi Kauśika! srotāpañippalāṁ prabhāvyate.” (“And that merit would be greater than if one were to establish beings in any number of world systems in the fruit of a Streamwinner.” [AsP.tr.112 = AsP.tr. 41]); ZQ.486a6f. 復次一切天人皆令得溝港、(頻來、不還、應機、緣一所道)皆令成就; Zfn.518c28~519a5. “復次，拘留！故聞浮利人，若善男子善女人，皆令得須陀洹。云何，拘留！其福寧多不？” 释提桓因言：“甚多，甚多。天中天！” 佛言：“不如善男子、善女人書般若波羅蜜，持經卷與人，使書之，教令學，若為人讀。其福倍益甚多。何以故？須陀洹者，皆從般若波羅蜜出。...” Kj.546c11~17. 復次，拘留！若有善男子、善女人教聞浮利衆生，令得須陀洹。於意云何？是人以是因緣其福多不？” 释提桓因言：“甚多，世尊！” 佛言：“拘留！不如善男子、善女人以般若波羅蜜經卷與他人，令得書寫讀誦，作是言：‘汝當得罪應般若波羅蜜功德。’ 其福甚多。何以故？須陀洹者從般若波羅蜜出故。...” As everywhere else, the word “sugata” (AS.57.27 = R.113.18 = AAA.300.12), the sentences “abhiśraddhadād abhiśraddhadādha avakalpayann ... samatpātādabdhicittāya bodhisattvādhetvādhyāsayanena (AS.57.29~31 = R.113.21~114.2 = AAA.300.15~19) and “udvyko ‘mām grāhāvyayati ... yad uta bhūtakotiprabhavātvān iti” have no parallels in ZQ(486a8), Zfn(519a2~3) and Kj(546c13~15). The sentence “evam ca vācaṁ bhāṣāta teśām eva tvam kulaputra dharmānāṁ labhī bhava yad uta prajñāprāmityāpratisamyoṣṭānam iti” (AS.58.5~6 = R.114.10~12 = AAA.301.3~3) has no parallels in either ZQ or Zfn.
bhagavān āha

ado koṣiga so ku + (5-24:) + + + + + .. . vi ba[h]u daro pūnā
atāḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauṣika kulaputra vā kuladuhita vā bahutaram punyaṁ

prasaviṣati yo praṇaparamidae postao
prasavet ya imaṁ prajniṣṭhānim antaśaḥ pustakagatāṁ

api kṛtvā abhiśraddhadh abhiśraddhadhe avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimuṇcann
adhimuṇcate prasannācitāḥ prasannācittāya adhyāśyasampanno dhvyāśayasampannāya
bodhāya cittaṁ utpūḍya samutpaḍidabodhicittāya bodhisattvāya adhyāśayena dadyāt

parasa likhanā
antaśa likhanāyāpi
vācānāyāpi akilāśitāya sampādayiyati udyukto ṭuṁ grāhāiyiṣyati samādaraśayiṣyati
samādāyiyiṣyati samuttejaiṣyati samprahāraśayiṣyati vācā nesyaṁ vinaiṣyati anuneṣyaṁ
artham asaṁ asmauti samprakāśayiṣyati
evaṁ cāṣya cittaṁ visodhāiyiṣyati nīrvidikitsaṁ kariṣyati
evaṁ caiva vāṣyaṁ ehi tvam kulaputra asmin eva bodhisattvamārge śīkṣasvaya
atra hi tvam śīkṣamānas ca vayāyacchamanāḥ kṣipram evānuttaraṁ samyaksambodhīm
abhisaṁbhotyasve abhisambodhīya ca aparimitaṁ sattvadhātum anuttare upadhisamāṅkṣaye
‘bhivīśyasi yad uta bhūtaṁ prabhūvāvanatāyāṁ iti /

(5-25:) + + + + + yeva tua dhamaṇa labhi bhohi
evaṁ ca vācaṁ bhāṣeta eteṣāṁ eva tvam kulaputra dharmāṇāṁ labhi bhava

yam ida _ _ praṇaparamida paḍisamyuteṇa
yad uta praṇaṁpāramitā pratisaṁyuktāṁ iti /

ayam eva kauśika tataḥ paurvakāt kulaputraḥ kuladuhitṛto vā sakāśād
bahutaram punyaṁ prasavet /

ta kisa he +
tat kasya hetoh

(5-26:) + + + + + [ga] sodavatiphale prabhaviati o
ato hi kauśika srotaāpattiphalam prabhāvyate //

tīthadu ho vaṇa koṣiga yaṁ jambudīvo
tīthhaṁ khalu punaḥ kauśika jāmbūdvīpakāṁ

sarvasattvāṁ srotaāpattiphalā pratisiṁṭhāpya punyābhisaṁśkāraḥ

120
The Buddha said:
“It is inferior to that of a good man or a good woman, who copies the Prajñāpāramitā, gives its scriptural scrolls
to other people,
makes them copy or study it, recites it for them.

Their merit is much greater.

For what reason?

Because the Path of srotāpañnas originates from the Prajñāpāramitā.

Moreover, O Kauśika, leave aside (not to mention, let alone) (people) in Jambūdvīpa,
ya[ta] (5-27:) ++ + .. (ma)hasahāṃsa lo __ gadhadue satvā
yāvantah kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sattvāh

tē koideva sodavatiphale pradīṭha[v(e)[a]
tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputo vā kuladuhita vā srotāapattiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet //

(5-28:) [?]i kośiga avi ṇu so bahu puño prasavea

aha bahu bhāmte bhagava

ado kośiga so [ṣa?] (5-29:) ++ + [ge vi?] [bahudar]jō puño prasaviśati yo praṇāparamidae postao para[sa likha .. ].....

tiṣṭhātā khalu punaḥ kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sarvasattvān srotāapattiphale pratiṣṭhāpya. pūṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ yāvantah kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sattvāh tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputo vā kuladuhitā vā srotāapattiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet /
tiṣṭhātā khalu punaḥ kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sarvasattvān srotāapattiphale pratiṣṭhāpya pūṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ yāvantah kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau sattvāh tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputo vā kuladuhitā vā srotāapattiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet /
tiṣṭhātā khalu punaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau sarvasattvān srotāapattiphale pratiṣṭhāpya pūṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ yāvantah kauśika tresāhasramahā-sāhasre lokadhātau sattvāh tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputo vā kuladuhitā vā srotāapattiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet //

(5-30:) ++ + + + [kośiga] trisahāṃsahasahāṃsa [l]o[gadhad]u

tiṣṭhātā khalu punaḥ kauśika tresāhasra- mahāsāhasre lokadhātau sarvasattvān srotāapattiphale pratiṣṭhāpya pūṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ

yavada kośiga gaganati valisa (5-31:) ++ +27
yāvantah kauśika gangānadi vālukopameṣu tresāhasramahāsāhasreṣu

++ + u satva te koideva
lokadhātuṣu sattvāh tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputo vā kuladuhitā vā

sodavatiphale pratiṣṭhāvea ta ki maṃṇasi kośiga
srotāapattiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet / tat kim manyase kauśika

avi ṇu (5-32:) ++ + + + + [ṉ]o prasavea
api nu sa kulaputo vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahu punyam prasavet

27. Cf. the Brāhmī ms (Sander 2000b: 9, 38) -vālikāsāmām /-vālikāsāmām koḷpaṃ tiṣṭatā/tiṣṭatō.
-(AS)\textsuperscript{28} if a good man or a good woman makes (the people) in the triple-thousand great worlds (up to) the people in the \textit{buddha}-worlds (innumerable as) the sands on the riversides of the Ganges attain the Path of \textit{srota\={a}}pannas, is their merit much, O \textit{Kauśika}?"

\textsuperscript{28} AS.58.10–19 = R.114.16–115.7 = AAA.301.8–21. \textit{yāvantaha Kauśika! caturmahādvpake lokadhātau sattvās ... tiṣṭhatu khalu punah Kauśika! dvisāhasre madhyome lokadhātau sarvasattvān srotaāpattiphale pratiśṭhāpya puryābhisāmskāro} = Tib.Pk.68a8–b5 = D.64b5–65a2; ÷ Xz(I).785c1–11; ÷ Sh.605b11–12. 假使若滿四大洲，若滿小千世界，若滿中千世界。 Other versions (ZQ.486a8, Zfn.519a5, Kj.546c18, Xz[II].879b24) as well as Lk lack parallels.
aha baho bhāmte bhagava
śakra aha bahu bhagavan bahu sugata //

bhagavān āha

do kośiga so kulaputro va kuladhita vi ba (5-33:) + + +
ataḥ khalu punah sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladūhitā vā bahutaram

+ nī prasaviṣāti yo praṇaparamidae postao
punyam prasavet ya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ antasaḥ pustakagatām

api kṛtvā abhiśraddhadhā abhiśraddhadhate avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimūncann
adhimūcante prasannacittāḥ prasannaccittāya adhyāśyasampanno 'dhyāśyasamppannāya
bodhāya cittam utpādyā samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāya adhyāśayena dadyāt

parasa likhita [daea]²⁹
antaśo likhanāyāpi

vācanāyāpi akilāsitayā sampādayisyati udyukto 'muṇ grāhāisyati saṃdārapāyiṣyati
samādāpāyiṣyati samuttejāisyati samprahārṣaiṣyati vācā nesai vīnesai anuneṣayati
artham asyā asmai samprakāṣaiṣyati evam cāsya cittam viśodhāisyati nirvicikitsaṃ
kariṣyati evam ca naṃ vāṣyati ehi tvam kulaputra asminn eva bodhisattvamārge śikṣasva /
atra hi tvam śikṣamānaś caran vyāyacchamānaḥ kṣipram evaṃ putāraṃ samyakṣaṃbodhim
abhisambhotisyase / abhisambudhaya ca aparimitaṃ sattvadhātum anuttare
upadhiśaṃkṣaye 'bhivinēṣyasi yad uta bhūtakotiḥprabhāvanatāyām iti / evam ca vācaṃ
bhāṣeta

[etaṣa ye?] (5-34:) + + + [la]bhī bhohi
eteṣāṃ api tvam kulaputra dharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhava

yam idaṃ praṇaparamida paṭisamanuteṇa
yad uta prajñāpāramitā pratisamānyuktāṃ iti /

²⁹. Cf. praṇaparamida likhita daea in 5-49.
Śakra devendra said: "Very much, very much, O Lord! -(AS)\textsuperscript{30}\)

The Buddha said:

"It is inferior to that of a good man or a good woman, who copies the Prajñāpāramitā, -(AS)\textsuperscript{31}\)

gives its scriptural scrolls to other people, makes them copy or study it, recites it for them.

-(AS)\textsuperscript{32}\).

\textsuperscript{30} AS.58.25 = R.115.16 = AAA.302.3. sugata = Xz(I).785c18. 普造 (= Xz[II].879b27), Tib.Pk.69a1 = D.65a5. Other versions (ZQ.486a9, Zfn.519a8, Kj.546c21, Sh.605b17) as well as Lk lack parallels.

\textsuperscript{31} AS.58.27~29 = R.115.19~22 = AAA.302.6~10. abhiśraddhad abhiśraddadhate ... samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvādyādhyāśāyena = Xz(I).785c19~21, Sh.605b19~20, Tib.Pk.69a2~4 = D.65a6~7. The older versions (Lk.437a24, ZQ.486a9, Zfn.519a8, Kj.546c22, Xz[II].879b29) lack parallels.

\textsuperscript{32} AS.58.30~59.3 = R.116.1~8 = AAA.302.11~20. udyakto 'maṃ grāhāisyati samādārāisyati ... yad uta bhūtakṣoṭiprabhāvataṇāyām iti = Xz(I).785c21~25, Sh.605b22~27, Tib.Pk.69a4~8 = D.65b1~4. The older versions lack parallels.

\textsuperscript{33} AS.59.3~5 = R.116.8~10 = AAA.302.20~22. evam ca vācaṃ bhāṣeta 'etesām eva tvaṃ kulaputra! dharmaṃ labhi bhava yad uta prajñāpāramitāpratisamvaktānām" = Tib.Pk.69a8 = D.65b4; = Kj.546c23. 作是言： "善當得是應般若波羅蜜功德。" ≈ Xz[II].879b29~c1. Other versions (ZQ.486a9, Zfn.519a9, Xz[I].785c25, Sh.605b27) as well as Lk lack parallels.
ayam eva kauśika tathaḥ paurvakāṭaḥ kulaputrataḥ kuladuhitrto vā sakāsād bahutaram
punyaṃ prasavet /
tat kasya hetoh
toḥ hi kauśika srotāppattiphalaṃ prabhāvyate //

punar aparāṃ kauśika
 yo hi kaścid eva kulaṇṭhūro vā kuladuhitā vā yāvanto jambūdvīpe sattvāḥ tān sarvān
sakṛdāgāmiphalena pratiṣṭhāpayet /
tat kiṃ manyase kauśika
api nu sa kulaputraḥ vā kuladuhitā vā tatoṇidānaṃ bahu punyaṃ prasavet
śakra aha bahu bhagavan bahu sugata /
bhagavān aha
ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputraḥ vā kuladuhitāḥ vā bahutaram
punyaṃ prasavet ya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ antaśabḍaḥ pustakagatāṃ api kṛtvā
abhṛśraddhadhā abhṛśraddhadhate avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimuṇcatt e adhimuṇceto
prasannacittāḥ prasannacittāya adhyāśaya saṃampampanno ’dhyāśaya saṃampampanāya bodhāya
cittam utpādaṃ samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāyādhyāśayena dadāyāt antaśo
likhānāyāpi vācānāyāpi akilāsitayā sampādayiṣayati udyukto ‘muṃ grāhāiṣayati
samārthāiṣayati samādāpavayiṣayati samuttejāiṣayati samprahārāiṣayati vacā neṣayati
vineśayati anunayeṣayati artham asyā asmai samprakāśaiṣayati evam cāsya cattām
viśodiṣayiṣayati nirvācikītām
kariṣyati evam caīnaṃ vākṣyati ehi tvāṃ kulaputra asminn evabodhisattvamārge śīkṣasva /
aatra hi tvāṃ śīkṣāmaṇaḥ caran vāyacchamānaḥ kṣipram evanuttarām samyaksamboḥdhiṃ
abhissambhotaye / abhisambhudy ca aparimitāṃ sattvadhātum anuttare
upadhisamkṣaye ’bhvineṣyasi yad uta bhūtakotiprabhāvanatāyāṃ iti /
evam ca vācāṃ bhāṣeta eteṣāṃ eva tvāṃ kulaputra dharmānāṃ lābhī bhava
yad uta prajñāpāramitaḥpratisamyuktānam iti /
ayam eva kauśika tathaḥ paurvakāṭaḥ kulaputratāḥ kuladuhitrto vā sakāsād bahutaram
punyaṃ prasavet /

tat kasya hetoh
ato hi kauśika sakṛdāgāmiphalena prabhāvyate //
tiṣṭhātāhu khalu punaḥ kauśika jambūdvīpakān sarvasatvān sakṛdāgāmiphalena
pratiṣṭhāpayya punyābhisaṃskārāḥ yāvantah kauśika cātumahādvipake lokadhātāu sattvāḥ
tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputraḥ vā kuladuhitāḥ vā sakṛdāgāmiphalena pratiṣṭhāpayet /
tiṣṭhātāhu khalu punaḥ kauśika cātumahādvipake lokadhātāu sarvasatvān
sakṛdāgāmiphalena pratiṣṭhāpayya punyābhisaṃskārāḥ yāvantah kauśika sahasre śūle
lokadhātāu sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputraḥ vā kuladuhitāḥ vā sakṛdāgāmiphalena
pratiṣṭhāpayet /
tiṣṭhātāhu khalu punaḥ kauśika sahasre śūle lokadhātāu sarvasatvān sakṛdāgāmiphalena
pratiṣṭhāpayya punyābhisaṃskārāḥ yāvantah kauśika dvisahasre madhyane lokadhātāu
sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputraḥ vā kuladuhitāḥ vā sakṛdāgāmiphalena
pratiṣṭhāpayet /
Their merit is much greater. For what reason?

Because the Path of srotaãpannas originates from the Prajñãpãramitã.

Moreover, O Kauãika, if a good man or a good woman makes the people in Jambãdvãpa attain (the states of) sakãdãgãmins,
tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātāu sarvasattvān
sakṛdāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhīsamāskārāh yāvantaḥ kauśika
trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātāu sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā
kuladhiṭāḥ vā sakṛdāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet /

tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātāu sarvasattvān
sakṛdāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhīsamāskārāh yāvantaḥ kauśika
gangānadīvālukopamesu trisāhasramahāsāhasresu lokadhātusu sattvāḥ tān api sarvān
kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladhiṭāḥ vā sakṛdāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet /

tat kim manyase kauśika

api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladhiṭāḥ vā tatonidānāṃ bahu punyaṃ prasavet śakra āha bahu
bhagavan bahu sugata //

bhagavān āha

ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladhiṭāḥ vā bahutaraṃ punyaṃ prasavastya
imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ antasaḥ pustakagatāṃ api kṛtvā abhiśraddhadad abhiśraddhadate
avakalpayat avakalpayate adhimiṃcchān adhimaṃcchate prasannacittāḥ prasannacittāya
adhyaśayasyaṃpanno 'dhyāṣayasyaṃpannāya bodhāya cīttam utpādyā

samutpādaḥbodhācittāya bodhisattvāya adhyāśayena ādhyāṣaṇāḥ antasaḥ likhanāyāpi
vācānāyāpi akilāsitayā sampādayisyati udyukto 'muṃ grāhīṣayati samādāryāṣayati
samādāryāṣayati samuttejāṣayati sampraharṣayāṣayati vācā nesāyati vīnēṣayati anuṇēṣayati
arthaṃ asayā samprakāṣayāṣayati evaṃ cāṣya cīttam viśodhīṣayati nirvicikṣaṃ
kariṣyati evaṃ ca nainyāṃvākṣyati ehi tvām kulaputra asminn eva bodhisattvamārga śikṣasa /

atra hi tvāṃ śikṣamānāś caran vyāyacchamānāḥ kṣipram evānuttāram samyakṣaṃboḍhin
abhīṣambhōtyase / abhisambudhya ca aparimītāṃ sattvadhātuṃ anuttare

upadvīmaprñāya 'bhīvīṣayati yad uta bhūtakotiprabhāvanatayāṃ iti /
evāṃ ca vācām bhāṣeta etesaṃ eva tvāṃ kulaputra dharmāṇām lābhi bhava

yad uta prajñāpāramitāprāṣamāṣyayuktānāṃ iti /
ayaṃ eva kauśika tataḥ paurvakāt kulaputratāḥ kuladhiṭro vā sakāśaḥ bahutaraṃ
punyaṃ prasavet /

tat kasya hetoḥ

ato hi kauśika sakṛdāgāmīphalaṃ prabhāvyate //

punar aparash ca kauśika

go hi kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladhiṭāḥ vā yāvanto jambūdvīpe sattvāḥ tān sarvān
anāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet /

tat kim manyase kauśika

api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladhiṭāḥ vā tatonidānāṃ bahu punyaṃ prasavet
śakra āha bahu bhagavan bahu sugata //

bhagavān āha

ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladhiṭāḥ vā bahutaraṃ punyaṃ prasavet ya
imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ antasaḥ pustakagatām api kṛtvā abhiśraddhadad abhiśraddhadate
avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimiṃcchān adhimiṃcchate prasannacittāḥ prasannacittāya
adhyaśayasyaṃpanno 'dhyāṣayasyaṃpannāya bodhāya cīttam utpādyā
anāgāmins,
samutpādatabodhicittāya bodhissattvāya adhyāśayena dadyāt antaśo likhanāyāpi vācanāyāpi akilāsītāya sampādavyaśiyati udyaṅko 'muṃ grāhāvyāṣayati samādarśāvyāṣayati samādāpabyāṣayati samutejāvyāṣayati samprahārasyaśiyati vācā neṣaya vinayāṣayati anuṇeṣṭayati artham asyā asmai samprakāṣayāṣayati evaṃ cāṣya cittāṃ viśodhāvyāṣayi nirvīcikitsaṃ kariṣyati evaṃ caiṇaṃ vāṣyaḥ ehi tvam kulaputra asminna eva bodhisattvamārge śikṣasva / atra hi tvam śikṣamānaḥ ca ranen vṛtyacakhamānaḥ kṣipram evanuttaraṃ samyaksambodhim abhīsaṃbhotyase / abhīsaṃbuddha ca aparīmitaṃ sattvadhātum anuttare upadhisamāṃśyayevi bhāvyayeṣa yad uta bhūtaśokaprabhāyanatāyāṃ iti / evaṃ ca vācaṃ bhāṣaṇa iteṣaṃ evaṃ tvam kulaputra dharmaṃ śāhī bhava dad uta prajñāpāramīśpratisamyuktānāṃ iti / avam eva tato bahutaraṃ punyaṃ prasavet /

tat kasya hetoh ? ato hi kauśīka anāgānimphalaṃ prabhāvyate /

ṭiṣṭhata khalu punaḥ kauśīka jāṁbudvīpakaṃ sarvasattvān anāgānimphale pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhīṣaṃskārah yāvanāt kauśīka cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātave sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kāścida eva kulaputro vā kulaudhiṭā vā anāgānimphale pratiṣṭhāpyayet / tiṣṭhata khalu punaḥ kauśīka cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātave sarvasattvān anāgānimphale pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhīṣaṃskārah yāvanāt kauśīka sāhসre cālike lokadhātave sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kāścida eva kulaputro vā kulaudhiṭā vā anāgānimphale pratiṣṭhāpyayet /

ṭiṣṭhata khalu punaḥ kauśīka sāhসre cālike lokadhātave sarvasattvān anāgānimphale pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhīṣaṃskārah yāvanāta kauśīka dvīṣāhhasre madhyame lokadhātave sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kāścida eva kulaputro vā kulaudhiṭā vā anāgānimphale pratiṣṭhāpyayet /

ṭiṣṭhata khalu punaḥ kauśīka dvīṣāhhasre madhyame lokadhātave sarvasattvān anāgānimphale pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhīṣaṃskārah yāvanāt kauśīka trīṣāhhasramahāsahasre lokadhātave sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kāścida eva kulaputro vā kulaudhiṭā vā anāgānimphale pratiṣṭhāpyayet /

ṭiṣṭhata khalu punaḥ kauśīka trīṣāhhasramahāsahasre lokadhātave sarvasattvān anāgānimphale pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhīṣaṃskārah yāvanāt kauśīka gāṅgānīdvālukopameṣu trīṣāhhasramahāsahasreṣṣu lokadhātaveṣu sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kāścida eva kulaputro vā kulaudhiṭā vā anāgānimphale pratiṣṭhāpyayet/

tat kim manyaste kauśīka

api na sa kulaputro vā kulaudhiṭā vā tatoṇidānāṃ bahu punyaṃ prasavet ? śakra āha bahu bhagavaṇ bahu sugata //

bhagavaṇ āha

ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśīka kulaputro vā kulaudhiṭa vā tatoṇidānāṃ bahutaraṃ punyaṃ prasavet ya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ antaśaḥ pustakagatām api kṛtvā abhiśradadhad abhiśradadhate avakalpayann avakalpayate adhiṃuḥicann adhiṃuḥicante prasannacittāḥ prasannacittāya adhyāśayampanno 'dhyāśayampanasaḥ bodhāya cittāṃ upādya samutpādatabodhicittāya bodhissattvāya adhyāśayena dadyāt antaśa likhanāyāpi vācaṃṇāyāpi akilāṣayā sampādaśayiṣayati udyaṅktu 'muṃ grāhāvyāṣayi saṃdārśāvyāṣayi samādāpabyāṣayi samutejāvyāṣayi samprahārasyaśiyati vācā neṣayati vinayāṣayi anuṇeṣṭayati artham asyā asmai samprakāṣayiṣayi evaṃ cāṣya cittāṃ viśodhāvyāṣayi
nirvicikitsam kariyati evam cainam vakṣyati ehi tvam kulpatra asminn eva bodhisattvamārge śikṣasva /
astra hi tvam śikṣamānaś caran vyāyacchamānaḥ kṣipram evānuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim abhisambhotsaye / abhisambhudyā ca aparimitaṃ satvadhātum anuttare upadhisamkṣaye 'bhiṃवeṣyasi yad uta bhūtakotiprabhāvanatāyāṃ iti /

evam ca vācaṃ bhāṣeta eteśāṃ eva tvam kulputra dharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhava yad uta praṇāpāramitāpratisamānyuktānāṃ iti /
ayam eva tato bahutaram puṇyaṃ prasavet /
tat kasya hetoh ? ato hi kauṣika anāgāmiṇiphalam prabhāvyate //

punar aparām kauṣika
yo hi kaścid eva kulputo vā kuladuḥita vā yāvanto jāmbūdvipe sattvāḥ tān api sarvān arhavte pratiṣṭhāpayet /
tat kim manyase kauṣika
api nu sa kulputo vā kuladuḥita vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇyaṃ prasavet ? śakra āha bahu bhagavan bahu sugata /

bhagavān āha
atāḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauṣika kulputo vā kuladuḥita vā bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet ya īmāṃ praṇāpāramitām antaśāḥ pustakagatām api kṛtvā abhisraddadhad abhisraddadhate avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimunācchann adhimaṅcche prasannacittāḥ prasannacīttāya adhyāśayasaṃpanno 'dhyāśayasaṃpannāya bodhāya cittam utpādyā
samutpāditaḥ bhūcitāya bodhisattvāya adhyāśayena dadyāḥ antaśāḥ likhanāyāpi vācanyāpi akilāśayā saṃpadāvīṣyati utyukto 'muṃ grāhāvīṣyati saṃdarśaṃvīṣyati samādāpāvīṣyati samutejāvīṣyati saṃprāvārṣaṃvīṣyati vācā neyati vineṣyaṃ anuṣeṣyaṃ artham asyāḥ asmai saṃprakāśaṃvīṣyati evam cāṣya cittam viṣodhayāvīṣyati nirvicikitsam kariyati evam cainam vakṣyati ehi tvam kulpatra asminn eva bodhisattvamārge śikṣasva.
astra hi tvam śikṣamānaś caran vyāvachchamānaḥ kṣipram evānuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim abhisambhotsaye / abhisambhudyā ca aparimitaṃ satvadhātum anuttare upadhisamkṣaye 'bhiṃवeṣyasi yad uta bhūtakotiprabhāvanatāyāṃ iti /
or arhants, and make them accomplish (their aims), is their merit much, O Kauśika?"

Śakra devendra said: “Very much, very much, (437b) O Lord! -(AS)\textsuperscript{35}"

The Buddha said: “It is inferior to that of a good man or a good woman, who copies
the Prajñāpāramitā,
-(AS)\textsuperscript{36}
gives its scriptural scrolls to other people, makes them copy or study it, recites it for
them.
-(AS)\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{35} AS.62.3 = R.122.7 = AAA.309.5. sugata = Xz(I).785c18. 善逝 (= Xz[II].879b27), Tib.Pk.73a2 = D69a2. bde bar gshegs pa. Other versions (ZQ.486a9, Zfn.519a13, Kj.546c28, Sh.606b17) as well as Lk lack parallels.

\textsuperscript{36} AS.62.5–7 = R.122.10–13 = AAA.309.8–12. abhiśraddadhad abhiśraddadhate ... samutpādātibodhi-cittāya bodhisatvāyādhyāśayena = Xz(I).785c19–21, Sh.606b18–20, Tib.Pk.73a3–5 = D69a3–4. The older versions (Lk.437b2, ZQ.486a9, Zfn.519a14, Kj.546c29, Xz[II].879b29) lack parallels.

\textsuperscript{37} AS.62.8–14 = R.122.14–21 = AAA.309.13–22. udvyuto 'muṇ grāhāisyati saṃdārśāisyati ... yad uta bhūtakoṣiprabhāvanātāvām iti= Xz(I).785c21–25, Sh.606b21–27, Tib.Pk.73a5–b1 = D69a5–7. The older versions lack parallels.
evam ca vācaṃ bhāṣeta eteṣāṃ eva tvam kulaputra dharmānāṃ labhī bhava
yat uta prajñāpāramitā-pratisamyuktānām iti / ayam eva tato bahutaram punyam prasaveta /
tat kasya hetoh
ato hi kauśika arhattvam prabhāvyate /

evam cāsaṃ utoṣāhāṃ vardhayisyati
yathā yathā hi tvam kulaputra prajñāpāramitāyāṃ śikṣisyase
tathā tathā tvam anupūrvena buddhadharmānāṃ labhī bhaviṣyasi
āsannaś ca bhaviṣasya anuttarāyāḥ samyaksaṃbodheḥ /
atra hi tvam śikṣāyāṃ śikṣamāṇaś caran vijeyacchamānaḥ
srotāppattipalam prabhāvaiṣyasi sakṣadāgūmapalam prabhāvaiṣyasi anāgānimahālam
prabhāvaiṣyasi arhattvam prabhāvaiṣyasi pratyekabuddhayam prabhāvaiṣyasi
samyaksaṃbuddhataṃ prabhāvaiṣyasīti/

tīṣṭhatu khalu punah kauśika jāmbūdvīpakān sarvasattvān arhattve pratiṣṭhāpya
punyābhīsamskārāḥ ṣvantaḥ kauśika caturmahādvīpake lokadhātatau sattvāḥ tān api
sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā arhattve pratiṣṭhāpayet /

tīṣṭhatu khalu punah kauśika caturmahādvīpake lokadhātatau sarvasattvān arhattve
pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhīsamskārāḥ yavantaḥ kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātatau sattvāḥ tān
api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā arhattve pratiṣṭhāpayet /

tīṣṭhatu khalu punah kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātatau sarvasattvān arhattve
pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhīsamskārāḥ yavantaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātatau
sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā arhattve pratiṣṭhāpayet

tīṣṭhatu khalu punah kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātatau sarvasattvān arhattve
pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhīsamskārāḥ yavantaḥ kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātatau
sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā arhattve pratiṣṭhāpayet /

tīṣṭhatu khalu punah kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātatau sarvasattvān arhattve
pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhīsamskārāḥ yavantaḥ kauśika gaṅgānaḍīvalu-kopameṣu
trisāhasramahāsāhasreṣu lokadhāṭaṣu sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā
kuladuhitā vā arhattve pratiṣṭhāpayet
tat kim manyase kauśika
api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tapotidanaṃ bahu punyam prasavet
śakra āha bahu bhagavan bahu sugata /
saṃkhyāḥ api bhagavāṃs tasya punyāskandhasya na sukara kartuṃ /
ganānaḥ pi upamā pi aupamyama pi upaniṣā pi upaniṣada pi bhagavāṃs tasya
punyāskandhasya na sukara kartuṃ //
-(AS)\textsuperscript{38}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{38} AS.62.14–15 = R.122.21–22 = AAA.309.22–25. evaṁ ca vācaṁ bhāṣeta ‘eteśāṁ eva kulaputraḥ
dharmāṇāṁ labhī bhava yod uta prajñāpāramitāpratisamuyuktāṁ’ = Tib.Pk.73b1 = D.69a7–b1; = Kj.547a1f. 作是言：“汝當得是應般若波羅蜜功德。” = Xz(II).879b29–c1. Other versions as well as Lk lack parallels.
bhagavan aha
atah khalu punah sa kaushika kulaputro va kuladuhita va bahutaram punyam prasavet ya
imam prajnaparamitam antasah pustakagatam api krtva abhirsradhadh abhirsradhadhate
avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimunccann adhimunicate prasannacitta va prasannacittayya
adhyasayasampanno 'dhyasayasampannaya bodhya cittam utpadya
samutpadatabodhicittayya bodhisattvaya adhyasayena dadyat antaso likhanayapi
vacanayapi akilsatayaa sampadaiyisyatii udyukto 'mun grahayisyati samaddapayisyati
samuttejayisyati sampraharsayisyati vaca nevyati vineyati anunesyatii artham asyaa asmai
samprakasayisyati evam casya citta virodhahisyati nirvicikitsam karyayati evam cainam
vaksyati ehi tvam kulaputra asminna eva bodhisattvamargi sickasvaa /
atra hi tvam sickamanasa caran vyayacchamanaah kispram evanuttarani samyaksambodhim
abhisambhotsyase / abhisambudhya ca aparimitam satvadhatus anuttare
upadhisamkshaye 'bhvineyasi yad uta bhuta kotiprabhavanatayam iti /
 evam ca vacam bhaheta etesam eva tvam kulaputra dharmaman labh bhava
yad uta prajnaparamitapratisamyuktanam iti /
ayam eva tato bahutaram punyam prasavet /

tat kasya heto
ato hi kaushi aharhattvam prabhavayate /
evam ca asyotsaham vardhahisyati
yathaa yathaa hi tvam kulaputra prajneparamitayam sickisyase
tathaa tathaa tvam anupurvena buddhadharmaman labhi bhavisyasi
asanna ca bhavisyasy anuttarayaaa samyaksambodhhe /

atra hi tvam sickayam sickamanaa caran vyayacchamanaa srotapattipalam
prabhavisyasi sakrdagamipalama prabhavisyasi anagamipalama prabhavisyasi
ahattvam prabhavisyasi pratyekabuddhatvam prabhavisyasi samyaksambuddhatvam
prabhavisyasi / iti //

punar aparana kausika
yavanto jambudivee sattvah tan api sarvan kaacid eva kulaputo va kuladuhita va
pratyekabuddhatve pratiishtapayet /
tat kim manyase kausika
api nu sa kulaputo va kuladuhita va tatidanaam bahu punyam prasavet sakra aha bahu
bhagavan bahu sugata /

bhagavan aha
atah khalu punah sa kaushi ka kulaputo va kuladuhita va bahutaram punyam prasavet ya
imam prajnaparamitam antasah pustakagatam api krtva abhirsradhadh abhirsradhadhate
avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimunccann adhimunicate prasannacitta va prasannacittayya
adhyasayasampanno 'dhyasayasampannaya bodhya cittam utpadya
samutpadatabodhicittayya bodhisattvaya adhyasayena dadyat antaso
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likhanāyāpi vācanāyāpi aklāsitayā sampādayisayati udyukto 'mun grāhāhisayati samdrāsāhisayati samadāpadāhisayati samuddejāhisayati samprahārāhisayati vācā nēṣayati vineṣayati anuneṣayati artham asyā asmai samprakāśāhisayati evam cāsya cittaṁ viśodhāhisayati nirvīcikkisām karisyati evant caīnaṁ vakṣyasaytāh ehi tvāṁ kulaputra asmīnna eva bodhisattvaṁ mārga sīkāsya / atra hi tvāṁ sīkṣaṁanaṁ caran vyāyacchamānaṁ kṣipram evanuttaram samyaksambodhim abhisabhotsaye / abhisambudhya ca aparimāṁ sattvadhātum anuttare upadhisaṁkṣaye 'bhīvinvesyasi yad uta bhūtakotiprabhāvanatāyāṁ iti / evant ca vācma bhāṣeta etešām eva tvāṁ kulaputra dharmāṇanāṁ lābhī bhava yad uta praṇāṇāramitāpratisamyuktānāṁ iti / ayam eva tato bhūtaraṁ punyam prasavet /

tat kasya hetoh
to hi kausika pratyekabuddhatvam prabhāvyate / evant caīsyaṁ caṁsambhadhisayati yathā yathā hi tvāṁ kulaputra praṇāṇāramitāyāṁ sīkṣaṁ yathā yathā tvāṁ anupūrvaṁ buddhadharmāṇanāṁ lābhī bhāvyasyai āśannaṁ ca bhāvyasya anuttaraṁ samyaksambodeḥ / atra hi tvāṁ sīkṣāyāṁ sīkṣaṁanāṁ caran vyāyacchamānaṁ kṣipram eva srotapattipphalaṁ prabhāvyasyai sakrāṇāgamipphalaṁ prabhāvyasyai anāgāmipphalaṁ prabhāvyasyai arhattvam prabhāvyasyai pratyekabuddhatvam prabhāvyasyai samyaksambudhatvam prabhāvyasyāsī /

tiṣṭhata khalu punāṁ kausika jambūdvipaṁ karuṇā sarvasattvāṁ pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhīsakṛṣṭāḥ yāvantuḥ kausika cāturmaḥādvipaṁ lokadhātau sattvāḥ tāṁ api sarvāṁ kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhītā vā pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpya

tiṣṭhata khalu punāṁ kausika cāturmaḥādvipaṁ lokadhātau sarvasattvāṁ pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhīsakṛṣṭāḥ yāvantuḥ kausika sāhasre cūle lokadhātau sattvāḥ tāṁ api sarvāṁ kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhītā vā pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpya /

tiṣṭhata khalu punāṁ kausika sāhasre cūle lokadhātau sarvasattvāṁ pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhīsakṛṣṭāḥ yāvantuḥ kausika dīvīsāhasre madhyame lokadhātau sattvāḥ tāṁ api sarvāṁ kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhītā vā pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpya /

tiṣṭhata khalu punāṁ kausika dīvīsāhasre madhyame lokadhātau sarvasattvāṁ pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhīsakṛṣṭāḥ ye 'pi kecit kausika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau sattvāḥ tāṁ api sarvāṁ kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhītā vā pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpya /
tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātatu sarvasattvān
pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpya punyābhīsamskāraḥ yāvantāḥ kauśika
gānḍanādvālokapameṣu trisāhasramahāsāhasresu lokadhātusu tattvāḥ tān api sarvān
kāścid eva kulaṇutro vā kuladuhiṭaḥ vā pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpayet /

tat kim manyase kauśika
api nu sa kulaṇutro vā kuladuhiṭaḥ vā tatonidānaṃ bahu punyaṃ prasavet
śakra āha bahu bhagavan bahu sugata //

bhagavān āha
ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaṇutro vā kuladuhiṭaḥ vā bahutaram
punyaṃ prasavet ya imāṃ praśānāramitān antaśaḥ pustakagatām api kṛtvā
abhiśradṛddhad abhiśradṛddhadate avakalpayann avakalpayate adhiṃuṇcann adhiṃuṇcate
prasannacittāḥ prasannacittāya adhyāṣayasampanno ’dhyāṣayasampannāya bodhāya
cittam utpādyā samutpaṭitabodhicittāya bodhisattvādyādhyāṣayena dadyāt antaso
likhanāyapi vācaṇāyapi akilāsītayā sampādayisyati udyuksa ‘nīmat grahaṃiṣayati
samārāṣaṃisyati samādāpiayisyati samuttejaiṣayati samprahāryiṣayati vācā nesayati
vinoṣaṃiṣayati anunvesayati artham asyā asmai samprakāṣaṃisyati evaṃ cāsya cittaṃ
vishodhāsyati nīrińcikītsaṃ kariṣayati evaṃ caināṃ vaksyati ehi tvam kulaṇutra asmin eva
bodhisattvamārga śikṣaṃsva
atra hi tvam śikṣāṃsva caran vṛāyaçhamānaḥ khipram evānuttaraṃ samyaksambodhim
abhisambhotyasāye / abhisambuddha ca aparimitaṃ sattvadhātum anuttare
upadhisamkṣaye ’bhivinayesya yad uta bhūtakotiḥprabhāvanatāyam iti /
evaṃ ca vācaṃ bhāṣeta etesām eva tvam kulaṇutar dharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhava yad uta
praśānāramitā praśatvamuktānāṃ iti /
ayam eva tato bahutaram tvam prasavet /
   tat kasya hetoh
ato hi kauśika pratyekabuddhatvam prabhāvyate /
evaṃ cāsya uṣāhaṃ vardhayiṣyasi

[yada tula tatra] [śikṣiṣṭ-ś-]
yathā yathā hi tvam kulaṇutra praśānāramitāyāṃ śikṣāṃsva

(5-35.) + + + + rvañudhaṃmana labhi bhaviṣasi
tathā tathā tvam anupūrṇeva buddhadharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhaviṣasi

āśannaś ca bhaviṣasya anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodheḥ /
atra hi tvam śikṣaṃsva śikṣasamānaḥ caran vṛāyaçhamānaḥ
Their merit is much greater. For what reason?

39 (Because) the virtues of sarvajña(tā) (omniscience) bring the virtues of the dharmas to completion. All (beings) train themselves in the Prajñāpāramitā and become buddhas.

39 壇芸若德成法德。一切從般若波羅蜜中學，成佛：(Because) the virtues of sarvajña(tā) (omniscience) bring the virtues of the dharmas to completion. All (beings) train themselves in the Prajñāpāramitā and become buddhas.”; cf. AS.62.16–18 = R.123.2–4 = AAA.309.26–29. evam cāsyōtsāham vardhaviṣyatī yathā yathā hi tvam kulaputra! prajñāpāramitāyāṁ śikṣitvā yathā tathā tvam anupārveṇa buddhadharmānāṁ lābhit bhaviṣyaḥ āsannam ca bhaviṣyaḥ anuttarāyāṁ samyaksambodhena (“And the Bodhisattva will increase his endurance by the reflection that by training himself in the perfection of wisdom, he will be guided and become one who obtains the dharmas which constitute a Buddha, and will get near to full enlightenment.” [AsP.tr.II 122 = AsP.tr. 41]); Zfn.519a15f. 以是故皆從是法各各自得。是般若波羅蜜之所致。何以故？為壇芸若法; Kj.547a2f. 汝隨學是法，當得壇芸若法.
tado tua sodavatiphalo prabhaviśasi pialo
srotaāpattiphalaṃ prabhāvayiśyasi

sai (5-36:) + + + + anāgamiphalo
sakṛdāgāmiphalaṃ prabhāvayiśyasi anāgāmiphalaṃ prabhāvayiśyasi

arahaṇaḥ prabhaviśasi tado tva pracegabosī pravhabhiśasī
arhattvaṃ prabhāvayiśyasi samyaksaṃbuddhatvaṃ prabhāvayiśyasīti /
(The Prajñāpāramitā), then, produces the Path of srotaāpānna,

the Path of sakṛdāgāmins, the Path of anāgāmins,

the Path of arhants, the Path of pratyekabuddhas. -(AS) 40

Leave aside, O Kauśika, (people) in Jambūdvīpa 41; -(AS) 42 leave aside (the people) in the triple-thousand great worlds,

if a good man or a good woman makes people in the buddha-worlds (innumerable as) the sands on the riversides of the Ganges 43 attain the Path of srotaāpānna, the Path of sakṛdāgāmins, the Path of anāgāmins, the Path of arhants, the Path of pratyekabuddhas 44, is their merit much, O Kauśika?"

40. AS.62.20f.= R.123.7f. = AAA.310.3f. samyaksambuddhatvam prabhāvivasyati = Tib.Pk. 73b5f. = D.69b4; ≃ Sh.606c4f. 及彼如來 應供 正等正覺皆悉從是滅若波羅蜜多出生. Other versions (ZQ.486a10, Zfn.519a18, Kj.547a4, Xz[I].785c27, Xz[II].879c4) as well as Lk lack parallels.
41. 閑浮利：S(1), S(2), S(3), Y etc. 閑浮利人 (= Zfn.519a18).
42. AS.62.21-31= R.123.9-21 = AAA.310.5-20. arhatte pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisaṃskāro yavantaḥ Kauśika! cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātav ... yavantaḥ Kauśika! trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātuv sattvās tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulapurūro vā kuladuhītā vā arhatte pratiṣṭhāpayet = Tib.Pk.73b6-74a5 = D.69b4-70a2; ≃ Xz(I).785c1-13; ≃ Sh.606c7-10. 假使若滿四大洲，若滿小千世界，若滿中千世界，若滿三千大千世界所有衆生，普令安住阿羅漢果. Other versions (ZQ.486a8, Zfn.519a19, Kj.547a5, Xz[II].879b24) as well as Lk lack parallels.
43. 恒邊沙佛國中：“in the buddha-worlds (innumerable as) the sands on the riversides of the Ganges"; = Zfn.519a19. 恒邊沙佛國； asi Kj.547a4. 十方如恒河沙等世界 ≃ Xz(I).785c15. 十方如如賢伽沙等世界 (= Xz[II].879b24); * AS.62.32f.= R.124.1f. = AAA.310.23f. gangānadīvālakopāmeṣu trisāhasramahāsāhasreṣu lokadhātus" (“in great trichiliocosms countless like the sands of the Ganges") = Sh.606c10f. 滿覺伽沙數三千大千世界 = Tib.Pk.74a6 = D.70a3; ZQ.486a8.-.
44. 須陀洹道、斯陀含道、阿那含道、阿羅漢道、辟支佛道：“the Path of srotaāpānna, the Path of sakṛdāgāmins, the Path of anāgāmins, the Path of arhants, the Path of pratyekabuddhas"; = Zfn.519a20f., Kj.547a6f. 斯陀含果、阿那含果、阿羅漢果、辟支佛道, Xz(I).785c16, Xz[II]. 879b25f.; * AS.63.2 = R.124.3 = AAA.310.25. arhatva- (“arhatship") = Sh.606c11f. 阿羅漢果 = Tib.Pk.74a7 = D.70a3.
Śakra devendra said: “Very much, very much, O Lord! -(AS)45-(AS)46”

The Buddha said:

“It is inferior to that of a good man or a good woman, who copies the Prajñāpāramitā, -(AS)47 gives its scriptural scrolls to other people, makes them copy or study it, recites it for them. Their merit is much greater.

For what reason?

(Because) all (beings) train themselves in the Prajñāpāramitā and (thus) are able to accomplish (complete, realise) sarvajñā(tā) (omniscience) and bring the virtues of the dharmas to completion. Therefore, (they) attain enlightenment. (The Prajñāpāramitā, then,) produces the Path of srotāpannas, the Path of sakṛdāgāmins, the Path of anāgāmins, the Path of arhants, the Path of pratyekekabuddhas. Therefore, their merit is much greater.

45 AS.63.3 = R.124.6 = AAA.310.28. sugata = Xz(I).785c18. 善逝 (= Xz[II].879b27), Tib.Pk.74a8 = D.70a4. bde bar gshegs pa. The older versions (Lk.437b10, Zfn.519a23, Kj.547a9) and Sh (606c13) lack parallels.

46. AS.63.4–5 = R.124.7–9 = AAA.310.29–311.2. [bhagavān āha] “Samkhya āpi bhagaivaṃ tasya punya-skandhasya na sukarā kartum. gaṇanā 'py upamā 'py aupamyam āpy upaniśā(AS, R “sā” 'py upaniśad āpi bhagavam tasya punyaskandhasya na sukarā kartum” (“One could not easily even calculate that heap of merit, or count it, or find anything that it is similar to, that it resembles, or that it can be compared with.” [AsP.tr.II 123 = AsP.tr. 42]) = Sh.606c13–15. 帝釋天主白佛言：“世尊！是善男子、善女人其所得福轉復多，算數譬喻所不能及。” = Tib.Pk.74a8–b1 = D.70a4–5. Except for the newest versions, the other ones (Lk.437b10, Zfn.519a23, Kj.547a9, Xz[II].785c18, Xz[II].879b27) lack parallels.

47. AS.637–10 = R.124.12–15 = AAA.311.5–9. abhiśraddhadh ābhīśraddadhate ... samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāyādhyātmyena = Xz(I).785c19–21, Sh.606c16–18, Tib.Pk.74b3–4 = D.70a6–7. The older versions (Lk.437b12, ZQ.486a9, Zfn.519a24, Kj.547a10, Xz[II].879b29) lack parallels.
(5-37:) ++ ++ [a] ye jambudi _ ve satva te sarva
punar aparäṃ kauśika yāvanto jambūdvīpe satvāḥ teṣāṃ sarvesāṃ

kaścid eva kulaputo vā kuladuhitā vā

anutarāe saṃmasaṃbosie cito upadeṃsu
anuttarāyaṃ samyaksaṃbodhau cittaṃ samutpadayet

yaś cānyah kaścit kauśika kulaputo vā kuladuhitā vā

te (5-38:) ++ ++ [ .. saṃmasaṃbojsae prathidaṇa
teṣāṃ sarvesāṃ anuttarāyaṃ samyaksaṃbodhau cittaṃ utpādyat tebhya

ima praṇaparamida likhita dajati
imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ likhitvā dadyāt /
Moreover, O Kauśika, \(^{48}\) (suppose that) somebody makes all the people in *Jambūdvīpa* seek for (行; “practise; go to”) the Buddha-path, believe and enter upon the Buddha-path, and thus the thought for studying the Buddha-path occurs to (them).

---

\(^{48}\) 闍浮利人都眾皆使行佛道已，信入佛道，學佛道心以(←已)生：“Suppose (令) that all the people in *Jambūdvīpa* seek for (行; or ‘practise’) the Buddha-path, believe and enter upon the Buddha-path, and thus the thought for studying the Buddha-path occurs to (them).”; cf. AS.65.14f. = R.128.16f. = AAA.315.15f. yāvanto Jambūdvīpe sattvās teṣām sarvesāṃ kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladāhiḥ vā anuttādayām samyak-sambodhau citām samutpādayet (“Moreover, Kausika, if someone were to raise to full enlightenment the hearts of as many beings as there are in Jambudvipa” [AsP.tr.II 122 = AsP.tr. 41]); ZQ.486a8f. 又如恒沙佛刹人民皆求无上正真道福; Zfn.519a28f. 閱浮利人都使發菩薩心; Kj.547a14f. 若滿閻浮提衆生皆發阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心.
yo ya aveva (5-39:) + + + +
yo vā kauśika kulaputro vā kuladhitā vā avinivartanīyāya

.. sa imayeva praṇaparamida likhita uvaṇamea
bodhisattvāya mahāsattvāya enām praṇāpāramitāṁ likhitvā upanāmayet

atra praṇaparamidae śikṣi (5-40:) + + + + vajiśati
atraiva praṇāpāramitāyāṁ śikṣiṣyate yogam āpatsyate /

eva sa praṇaparamida bhuyasamatrae bhavaṇa
atraiva praṇāpāramitāṁ bhāvayan

parivuri gacheśati
vrddhiṁ viruddhiṁ vipulatāṁ gataḥ paripūrayisyati buddhadharmān iti /

aya te (5-41) + + + [ṇa?] puṇavisamkhareṇa
ayaṁ tasmāt paurvakāt kulaputrataḥ kuladhitṛto vā sakāśād

bahudaro puño prasavati
bahutaram puṇyaṁ prasavet /

tat kasya hetoḥ
niyatam eso 'nuttaraṁ samyaksambodhim abhisambdhyā sattvānāṁ duḥkhasyāntaṁ
cariṣyatīti /
If a good man or a good woman, -(AS)⁵⁰ — who gives scriptural scrolls of the Prajñāpāramitā to other people, makes them copy or study it, recites it for them,—writes its scriptural scrolls even for (these) avivartika (non-retrogressing) bodhisattvas and give them,

(thinking): ‘These people will certainly study this faithfully, enter deeply into the Prajñāpāramitā, study the wisdom.

(As a result), the Prajñāpāramitā will be practised in a much greater degree⁵¹ and supreme wisdom⁵² will be fully accomplished’,

their merit is much greater (than that of the former). -(AS)⁵³

⁴⁹ 若善男子、善女人......無有極智悉成就。’, 得其福轉倍多： ‘If a good man or a good woman, ... their merit is much greater (than that of the former).’; [cf. AS.65.15f. = R.128.18f. = AAA.315.17f. यास cāryaḥ kaścit Kauśikā kulaṇḍaḥ va kulaṇḍahāḥ va teṣāṁ sarveṣaṁ anuttarāyāṁ samyaksambodhau cīttaṁ utpādaḥ tebhya imāṁ prajñāpāramitāṁ līkhitā dadvat, yo va Kauśikā kulaṇḍaḥ va kulaṇḍahāḥ va avinivartātāḥ va bhodhisattvāḥ mahāsattvāḥānām prajñāpāramitāṁ līkhitā upānāyate ‘‘atraiva prajñāpāramitāyām śāksīyaté yogam āpatsaye. atraiva prajñāpāramitāṁ bhāvayant vrddhīṁ virādhiṁ viṣputaṁ gataḥ paripṛcchāyant ‘‘buddhaddhamahān’ ity ayaṁ tasmāt paurvakān kulaṇḍaraṁ kulaṇḍahāṁ’’ ity ayaṁ tasmāt paurvakān kulaṇḍaraṁ kulaṇḍahāṁ’’; Kj.547a18f. 不如善男子、善女人以殷善波羅蜜經卷與一阿毘梵致菩薩。作是念：‘‘是善薩於此中學，當能修行般若波羅蜜。’’ 以是故其福轉倍甚多甚多; Kj.547a18f. 不如善男子、善女人以殷善波羅蜜經卷與一阿毘梵致菩薩。作是念：‘‘是善薩於此中學，當能修行般若波羅蜜。’’ 以是故其福轉倍甚多甚多.

⁵⁰ AS.65.16 = R.128.19 = AAA.315.18f. teṣāṁ sarveṣaṁ anuttarāyāṁ samyaksambodhau cīttaṁ utpādaḥ (‘‘having raised their hearts to full enlightenment’’ [cf. AsP.tr.II 122 = AsP.tr. 41]) = Tib.Pk.77b3 = D.72b6. Except for the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions, the other ones (Lk.437b18, ZQ.486a9, Zfn.519a29, Kj.547a19, Xz[I].786b26, Xz[II].879c13, Sh.607a28) lack parallels. Cf. n. 55.

转增亦多： ‘(the Prajñāpāramitā) will be practised in a much greater degree’; [cf. AS.65.19 = R.129.2 = AAA.315.27, vrddhiṁ virādhiṁ viṣputaṁ gataḥ (‘‘as a result of the growth, increase, and abundance [of the perfection of wisdom]’’ [AsP.tr.II 122 = AsP.tr. 41]; Zfn.519b3. 轉増亦多多; Kj.547a21. 增廣流布; Krsh(2010).448f., s.v. 得, 659, s.v. 轉增.

⁵¹ 无极智者： ‘supreme wisdom’; [cf. AS.65.20 = R.129.2 = AAA.315.28, buddha-dharmān (‘‘the Buddha-dharmas’’ [AsP.tr.II 122 = AsP.tr. 41]); Zfn.519b3. 无极智; Krsh(2010).520.

⁵² AS.65.21f. = R.129.4f. = AAA.316.9f. tat kasya hetoh? niyamat eṣo ‘nuttarām samyak-sambodhim abhisambudhvau sattvānām duhkhasāyantām kariṣyatī (‘‘for certainly he will, once he has awoken to full enlightenment, end the sufferings of beings.’’ [AsP.tr.II 122 = AsP.tr. 41]) = Tib.Pk.77b6f. = D.73a1f.; ≠ Sh.607b4f. 何以故？此殷善波羅蜜多出生阿耨多羅三藐三菩提故。Except for the newest versions, the other ones (Lk.437b22, ZQ.486a9, Zfn.519b4, Kj.547a22, Xz[I].786c7, Xz[II].879c18) lack parallels. Cf. n. 56.
tiṣṭhatu khalu punah kauśika jāmbūdvipaṇāṁ sarvasattvānāṁ anuttarāyāṁ samyaksambodhau cittam utpādyā puṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ yāvantah kauśika
cāturmahādvipake lokadhātau sattvāḥ teṣāṁ api sarveṣāṁ kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā anuttarāyāṁ samyaksambodhau cittam utpādayet /
tiṣṭhatu khalu punah kauśika cāturmahādvipake lokadhātau
sarvasattvānāṁ anuttarāyāṁ samyaksambodhau cittam utpādyā puṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ yāvantah kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sattvāḥ teṣāṁ api sarveṣāṁ kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā anuttarāyāṁ samyaksambodhau cittam utpādayet /
tiṣṭhatu khalu punah kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sarvasattvānāṁ anuttarāyāṁ samyaksambodhau cittam utpādyā puṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ yāvantah kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau sattvāḥ teṣāṁ api sarveṣāṁ kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā anuttarāyāṁ samyaksambodhau cittam utpādayet /
tiṣṭhatu khalu punah kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau sarvasattvānāṁ anuttarāyāṁ samyaksambodhau cittam utpādyā puṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ yāvantah kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau sattvāḥ teṣāṁ api sarveṣāṁ kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā anuttarāyāṁ samyaksambodhau cittam utpādayet /

puṇavaroha kośiga

ye trisahamsae maha (5-42:) + + + [d]ue satva te
trisāhasramahāsāhasreṣu lokadhātuṣu sattvāḥ teṣāṁ api sarveṣāṁ
kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā
54 Leave aside, O Kauśika, (people) in Jambūdvīpa,

(suppose that) the people in the triple-thousand great worlds (up to) the people in the buddha-worlds (innumerable as) the sands on the riversides of the Ganges,
anutarae samasaṃbosae cito upadeaṃsu
anuttarāyaṃ samyaksambodhau cittam utpādayet /

yaś cānyah kaścit kauśika kulaputo vā kuladuhitā vā
teṣa [satvaṇa] .. .. .. (5-43:) + +
teṣāṃ sarveṣāṃ anuttarāyaṃ samyaksambodhau cittam utpādyā tebhya

[th]idaṇa koide<va> sarva va ima praṇaparamida likhita dajati
imāṃ praṇāpāramitāṃ likhitvā dadyāt /

yo ya avevaṭiṣaṇa bosisatva (5-44:) + + + + +
yo vā kauśika kulaputo vā kuladuhitā vā avinivartaniyāya bodhisattvāya mahasattvāya

[pa]ramida likhita uvaṇameati
enāṃ praṇāpāramitāṃ likhitvā dadyāt upanāmayet

atra praṇapara _ midae ___ śikṣiṣati (5-45:) + + + + +
atraiva praṇāpāramitāyāṃ śikṣiṣyate yogam āpatsyate /

[e]va sa praṇaparamida bhuyasamāt[rae] [bhavaṇa] (5-46:)
evam asyeyāṃ praṇāpāramitā bhūyasyā mātrayā bhāvanāṃ

++ + + + + + +
vṛddhiṃ virūḍhiṃ vipulatāṃ pariṇāṃ ganiṣṭaṭṭi /

.. [vi?] teṇa purimaṇga
ayāṃ kauśika tataḥ paurvakāt kulaputrataḥ kuladuhitṛto vā sakāśād

puṇavisam[khareṇa bahudaro] puño prasavati
bahutaram puṇyam prasavet /

tat kasya hetoh / niyamam eṣo 'nuttaraṃ samyaksambodhim abhisambudhya sattvānāṃ
duhkhasyāntaṃ kariṣṭasyaṭṭi //
all seek for (行; “practise; go to”) anuttara-samyaksambodhi (i.e. unexcelled, perfect enlightenment), make a resolution (for enlightenment) and practise the Buddha-path.

If a good man or a good woman,

-(AS)\textsuperscript{55}

—— who gives scriptural scrolls of the Prajñāpāramitā to other people, makes them copy or study it, recites it for them ——, writes its scriptural scrolls even for (these) avivartika (non-retrogressing) bodhisattvas and give them,

(thinking): ‘These people will certainly study this faithfully,

enter deeply into the Prajñāpāramitā, study the wisdom. (As a result), the Prajñāpāramitā will be practised in a much greater degree and supreme wisdom will be fully accomplished’,

their merit is much greater (than that of the former).

-(AS)\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{55} AS.66.6 = R.130.5f. = AAA.318.2f. teṣām sarveśāṁ anuttarāyāṁ samyaksambodhau cīttaṁ utpāḍya (“having raised their hearts to full enlightenment” [cf. AsP.tr.II 122 = AsP.tr. 41]) = Tib.Pk.78b1f. = D.73b3. Except for the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions, the other ones (Lk.437b25, ZQ.486a9, Zfn.519b6, Kj.547a25, Xz[I].786c23, Xz[II].879c13, Sh.607b11) lack parallels. Cf. n. 50.

\textsuperscript{56} AS.66.11f. = R.130.12f. = AAA.318.10f. tat kasya hetoh? nivatam eso ’nuttarāṁ samyak-sambodhim abhisambudhya sattvānāṁ duḥkhasvāntam kariṣyatī = Tib.Pk.78b4f. = D.73b5f.; * Sh.607b16f. 何以故？此般若波羅蜜多出生阿耨多羅三藐三菩提故. Except for the newest versions, the other ones (Lk.437b29, ZQ.486a9, Zfn.519b11, Kj.547b2, Xz[I].787a4, Xz[II].879c18) lack parallels. Cf. n. 53.
puṇavaro kośiga (5-47:)
+ + + + sameṣu loghaduṣu satva te sarva anūtarae saṁmasāṁbosae cito
upadeaṁsu
teṣu s. (5-48:)+ + + + .. [e] saṁmasāṁbosae prathidaṇa koideva ima praṇaparamida
saartha saveṇaṇa uvadiśe ..
Moreover, O Kauśika, (suppose that) all the people in Jambūdvīpa seek for (行; “practise; go to”) anuttara-samyaksambodhi — ‘anuttara-samyaksambodhi’ means that all (beings) make a resolution to seek for enlightenment —. If a good man or a good woman, — who gives scriptural scrolls of the Prajñāpāramitā to other people, makes them copy it, explains the wisdom (written) within it or make them study it —, gives scriptural scrolls of the Prajñāpāramitā even to (these) avivartika (non-retrogressing) bodhisattva-mahāsattvas and makes them enter into the wisdom, their merit is much greater (than that of the former).

Leave aside, O Kauśika, (people) in Jambūdvīpa, (suppose that) the people in the triple-thousand great worlds (up to) the people in the buddha-worlds (innumerable) as the sands on the riversides of the Ganges, all seek for (行; or “practise; go to”) anuttara-samyaksambodhi — ‘anuttara-samyaksambodhi’ means that all (beings) make a resolution to seek for enlightenment —.

57 復次，拘翼！闍浮利人皆進阿耨多羅三藐三菩提行，不如善男子、善女人持般若波羅蜜經卷與人，使書之，為解說其義，令學之，及授與阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心，不如善男子、善女人持般若波羅蜜經卷與人。使書之，教令學，入法慧中，若授與阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心，其其其福厚益多；Kj.547b2~15. 復次，拘翼！闍浮利人皆進阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心。若善男子、善女人以般若波羅蜜經卷與人，為解其義。於意云何？是人以是因緣其福多不？” 釋提桓因言：“甚多，世尊！” 佛言：“憍尸迦！不如善男子、善女人以般若波羅蜜經卷與人，為解其義。福多於彼。憍尸迦！是闍浮利人皆進阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心。若善男子、善女人以般若波羅蜜經卷與人，為解其義。於意云何？是人以是因緣其福多不？” 釋提桓因言：“甚多，世尊！” 佛言：“不如善男子、善女人以般若波羅蜜經卷與人，為解其義。福多於彼。” = Xz(J).879c18~28; ≠ Xz(I).787a4~788a14 (greatly detailed). The newer versions (AS.66.13 = R.130.14 = AAA.3181.17, Xz(J), Sh.607b17, Thb.789b5 = D73b6) and ZQ (486a12) lack parallels. The content of this paragraph differs from the preceding one in the fact that, while it mentions giving scriptural scrolls of the Prajñāpāramitā to other people, including non-retrogressing bodhisattva-mahāsattvas, the other paragraph includes not only giving but also expounding the Prajñāpāramitā.
(5-49:) + + + + .. [s· bosisatvasa] mahasatvasa imayeva prañaparamida likhita daeati ayan teṇa puṇṇo (5-50:) ______ puṇavisaṃkhareṇa bahudaro puṇio prasavati

puṇavaro kośiga ye jambudive satva (5-51:) + + + + ..
punar aparāṇ kauśika yāvanto jambudvīpe sattvāḥ te sarve

[sam]ma[sabosae] cito upadeati avevaṭia bhaveṃti

avnivartaniyā bhaveyur anuttarāyāḥ
samyaksaṃbodheḥ /

tebhyaḥ kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā anuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhim
abhisaṃprasthithebhya imaṃ praṇāpāramitāṃ pustakalikhitaṃ kṛtvā dadyād upanāmayet /
yāś ca tebhyaḥ kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imaṃ praṇāpāramitāṃ
pustakalikhitaṃ kṛtvā dadyād upanāmayet sārthāṃ savyaṇjanāṃ upadiṣet

tat kim manyase kauśika

api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṇāṃ bahu puṇyaṃ prasavet?
śakra āha bahu bhagaṇaṃ bahu sugata /
śaṃkhyā pi bhagavāṃs tasya puṇyaskandhasya na sukaṃ kartum /

Gaṇanā pi upamaḥ pi aupamyaḥ api upaniṣad api bhagaṇaṃs tasya
puṇyaskandhasya na sukaṃ kartum /

bhagaṇā āha

ataḥ khalu punah sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaram puṇyaṃ prasavet yas
tēṣām avinivartaniyānāṃ bodhisattvānāṃ mahāsattvānāṃ kṣiprataram anuttarām
samyaksaṃbodhim abhisamaṃbodhukāmakārla
imaṃ praṇāpāramitāṃ pustakalikhitaṃ kṛtvā dadyād upanāmayet
sārthāṃ savyaṇjanāṃ upadiṣet iha ca tān praṇāpāramitāyāṃ avavade anuśisyāt /

tiṣṭhau khalu punah kauśika jāṃbūdvīpakebhayaḥ

sarvasattvebhaya 'vinivartaniyevbhya imaṃ praṇāpāramitāṃ upanāmya
puṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sattvāḥ te 'pi sarve
'vinivartaniyā bhaveyur anuttarāyāḥ samyaksaṃbodheḥ / tebhya 'pi kaścid eva kulaputro
vā kuladuhitā vā imaṃ praṇāpāramitāṃ pustakalikhitaṃ kṛtvā dadyād upanāmayet
sārthāṃ savyaṇjanāṃ uddhiṣet /

tiṣṭhau khalu punah kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sarvasattvebhaya
'vinivartaniyevbhya imaṃ praṇāpāramitāṃ upanāmya puṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ yāvantaḥ
kauśika sāhasre cilake lokadhātau sattvāḥ te 'pi sarve 'vinivartaniyā bhaveyur
anuttarāyāḥ samyaksaṃbodheḥ /
If a good man or a good woman, — who gives scriptural scrolls of the *Prajñāpāramitā* to other people, makes them copy it, study it or enter into the wisdom —, copies scriptural scrolls of the *Prajñāpāramitā* even (₽; 及至(←若)有) for avivartika (non-retrogressing) bodhisattva-mahāsattvas and give them, make them study the wisdom and enter into it, their merit is much greater (than that of the former).\(^{58}\)

Moreover, O Kauśika, suppose that all the people in *Jambūdvīpa* seek for (行) anuttara-samyaksambodhi as avivartika-bodhisattvas.\(^{59}\)

If a good man or a good woman teaches and makes them enter into the *Prajñāpāramitā*, what do you think, O Kauśika, is their merit not great?\(^{60}\)

Śakra devendra said: “Very much, very much, O Lord! -(AS)\(^{61}\)-(AS)\(^{62}\)"
tebhyo 'pi kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imāṃ praṇāpāramitaṃ pustakalikhītaṃ kṛtvā dadyāḍ upanāmayet sārthāṃ savyaṇjanām upadiśet /

ṭīṣṭhatu khalu puṇaḥ kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātāu sarvasattvebhyo 'vinivartaniyebhya imāṃ praṇāpāramitaṃ upanāmya punyābhisamśkāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātāu sattvāḥ te 'pi sarve 'vinivartaniyā bhaveyur anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodeḥ / tebhyo 'pi kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imāṃ praṇāpāramitaṃ pustakalikhītaṃ kṛtvā dadyāḍ upanāmayet sārthāṃ savyaṇjanām upadiśet /

ṭīṣṭhatu khalu puṇaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātāu sarvasattvebhyo 'vinivartaniyebhya imāṃ praṇāpāramitaṃ upanāmya punyābhisamśkāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātāu sattvāḥ te 'pi sarve 'vinivartaniyā bhaveyur anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodeḥ / tebhyo 'pi kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imāṃ praṇāpāramitaṃ pustakalikhītaṃ kṛtvā dadyāḍ upanāmayet sārthāṃ savyaṇjanām upadiśet /

ṭīṣṭhatu khalu puṇaḥ kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātāu sarvasattvebhyo 'vinivartaniyebhya imāṃ praṇāpāramitaṃ upanāmya punyābhisamśkāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika gaṅgānaḍivālukopameṣu trisāhasramahāsāhasreṣu lokadhātusu sattvāḥ te 'pi sarve 'vinivartaniyā bhaveyur anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodeḥ / tebhyo 'pi kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā / imāṃ praṇāpāramitaṃ pustakalikhītaṃ kṛtvā dadyāḍ upanāmayet sārthāṃ savyaṇjanām upadiśet /

tat kiṃ manyase kauśika
api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇya prasavet

śakra aha
bahu bhagavan bahu sugata /
saṃkhyāpi bhagavams tasya puṇyaskandhasya na sukarā kartum/ gaṇanāpi upamāpi aupamyam api upanisāpi bhagavams tasya puṇyaskandhasya na sukarā kartum //
bhagavān āha
ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladhitā vā bahutaram pūnyaṃ prasavet

tesa sarveṣa aveṇāṇa (5-52::) + + + + + + + + +
yas teṣām avinivartaniyānāṁ bodhisattvānām mahāsattvānām kṣiprātaram
anuttāraṁ samyaksambodhim abhisambodhdhukāmebhya

[ku]lap(u)tro va kuladhita vi
ima praṇaparamida likh[ita] uvaṇa(m)e
imāṁ prajñāpāramitāṁ pustakalikhitāṁ kṛtvā dadyād upanāmayet

(5-53::) + + + [ṅa]ṇa uvatidīśea
śārthāṁ savyāṅjanāṁ upadīśet

iha ca tān prajñāpāramitāyāṁ avavadeḥ anuśīṣyāt /

ta ki maṅasi kośiga
athāparaḥ kauśika

aviṇu so kulaputro va kuladhita vi bahu p(u)ño

(5-54::) + + + + bahu bhamte
The Buddha said:

"Suppose that a bodhisattva appears amongst them (i.e. amongst these avivarta-bodhisattvas) and says: 'I wish to become a buddha swiftly.' When (he thus) wishes to become a buddha swiftly, somebody writes a scriptural scroll of the Prajñāpāramitā and gives him, this person’s merit is much greater.

Leave aside, O Kauśika, (people) in Jambūdvīpa, (suppose that) the people in the triple-thousand great worlds up to the people in the buddha-worlds (innumerable as) the sands on the riversides of the Ganges, all seek for (�行) anuttara-samyaksambodhi as avivarta-bodhisattvas. If a good man or a good woman teaches and make them enter into the Prajñāpāramitā,

what do you think, O Kauśika,

is their merit not great?"

Śakra devendra said: "Very much, very much, O Lord! -(AS)⁶⁵-(AS)⁶⁶"

---

⁶³ 從是輩中，若有一菩薩出，便作是言：‘我欲疾作佛。’正使欲疾作佛，若有人持殷若波羅蜜經卷書，授與者，其福勝倍多： “Suppose that a bodhisattva appears amongst them ... this person’s merit is much greater.”; cf. AS.66.21f. = R.131.4f. = AAA.319.4f. atah khalu punah sa Kauśika! kulaputro va kuladuhiṇaḥ vahurāzam puṇyaṃ pravaśed yasya teṣām avinihartanyaṁ bodhisattvamahāsattvānāṁ ksipratah anuttarāṁ samyaksambodhim abhisambodhikāmebhya imāṁ praṇjāpāramitāṁ pustakālikiḥāṁ kṛtvā dadyāḥ upanāmayet sārthāṁ savanjanānāṁ upadiṣet iva ca itan praṇjāpāramitāyāṁ avavādaḥ anuṣīṣyāt (“Still greater would be the merit of someone who in addition would instruct and admonish in this perfection of wisdom those irreversible Bodhisattvās who want more quickly to win full enlightenment.” [AsP.tr.II 123 = AsP.tr. 42]]; ZQ.486a12f. 若有善願欲疾作佛，以經施之，令成大士，得斯定者，其福難盡; Zfn.519b24f. 從是輩中若有一菩薩，便作是語：“我欲疾作佛。” 正使欲疾作佛，不如入般若波羅蜜。其福勝倍益多; Kj.547b19f. 於是中有一菩薩，疾得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提。若有人以殷若波羅蜜義教之，福多於彼.

⁶⁴ 若有善男子、善女人教入般若波羅蜜中： “If a good man or a good woman teaches and make them enter into the Prajñāpāramitā”; cf. AS.67.13f. = R.132.14f. = AAA.320.15f. tebhya 'pi kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhīṇaḥ vā imāṁ praṇjāpāramitāṁ pustakālikiḥāṁ kṛtvā dadyāḥ upanāmayet sārthāṁ savanjanānāṁ upadiṣet. Zfn.519b28f. 若有善男子、善女人教般若波羅蜜中; Kj.547b23f. 若有善男子、善女人以殷若波羅蜜義教之。

⁶⁵ AS.67.16 = R.132.19 = AAA.320.20. sugata = Xz(II).788b27. 善逝 (= Xz[II].880a18), Tib.Pk.80a2 = D.75a1. Other versions lack parallels.

⁶⁶ AS.67.16 = R.132.19f. = AAA.320.20f. samkhya ‘pi bhagavaṁs tasya puyaskandhasya na sukārā kartum. goanā ‘py upamā ‘py upamām apy upanisā ‘py upanisad api bhagavaṁs tasya puyaskandhasya na sukārā kartum = Sh.607c6f., Tib.Pk.80a2f. = D.75a1f. Other versions lack parallels.
bhagava
avarō bosisatvo upajēti aham kṣipadaro bodhisattvato mahāsattva utpadyeta sa evaṃ vade tāh eṭeṣaṃ kṣiprataram

añutarasamjasambosi [a] (5-55:) + + [bo]ji ī śami anuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim abhisamābhotsya iti /

yo ayaṃ kṣipadaro yas taṃ kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā kṣiprabhijñataram bodhisattvaṃ mahāsattvaṃ

añutarasamjasabosi avisaṃbuji duamo yo so p[raṇapa] (5-56:) _______ ramidae ovadeati anuṣāseati ayaṃ tena purimakeṇa67 prajñāpāramitāyām avavadē anuṣīṣyāt ayaṃ tataḥ paurvakāt

kulaputrāt kuladuhitā vā sakāśād

puṇa visaṃkhareṇa [baho] (5-57:) _______ daro puño prasavati bahutaram puṇyaṃ prasavet //

asa hu śakro devaṇa imtro bhagavado edadoca atha khalu śakro devānām indro bhagavantam etad avocat

The Buddha said: ‘–(AS) Suppose that a bodhisattva appears amongst them (i.e. amongst these avivartika-bodhisattvas) and says: ‘I wish to become a buddha swiftly.’

When (he thus) wishes to become a buddha swiftly,

somebody writes a scriptural scroll of the Prajñāpāramitā and gives him,

this person’s merit is much greater.”

Śakra devendra said:

\[\text{\textsuperscript{68}} \text{AS.67.18–21 = R.132.22–133.5 = AAA.320.24–30. atah khalu punah sa Kausika\textsc{'} kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaram punyam prasaved yas teśām avinivartavānāṃ bodhisattvanāṃ mahāsattvanāṃ samyaksambodhim abhisambodhikāmebhya inām prajñāpāramitāṃ pustakalikhitāṃ krtvā dadyād upanāmayet sārthām savarnjanāṃ upadiśet iha ca tān prajñāpāramitāṃ avavādat anuṣṭyāt (AAA. 5\textsuperscript{Śikṣyāt [misprint]}) (“Still greater would be the merit of someone who in addition would instruct and admonish in this perfection of wisdom those irreversible Bodhisattvas who want more quickly to win full enlightenment.” [AsP.tr.II 123 = AsP.tr. 42]) = Tib.Pk.80a4–6 = D.75a2–4. Other versions lack parallels.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{69}} \text{若有人若波羅蜜經卷書,授與者,其福轉倍多: “Suppose that a bodhisattva appears amongst them ... this person’s merit is much greater.”; cf. AS.67.21f. = R.133.5f. = AAA.320.30f. aha\textsuperscript{ā}parah Kausika\textsc{'} bodhisattva mahāsattva utpadyeta. sa evaṃ vaded “aham eteśāṃ kṣiprataram anuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim abhisambhotsya” iti. yas taṃ Kausika\textsc{'} kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā kṣiprābhijñātāram bodhisattvaṁ mahāsattvaṁ prajñāpāramitāṁ avavādat anuṣṭyād, ayam tathā puruvakāt kulaputrāḥ kuladuhitāḥ sakāśād bahutaram punyam prasaved (“And further, still another Bodhisattva would arise, who would say that he would win full enlightenment more quickly than they. If someone would instruct and admonish in the perfection of wisdom that Bodhisattva of quicker understanding, he would beget a still greater merit.” [AsP.tr.II 123 = AsP.tr. 42]); ZQ486a12f. 若有善願欲疾作佛,以經施之,令成大土,得斯定者,其福難盡; Zfn.519c2f. 若有一菩薩,從其中作是言: “我欲疾作佛。” 正使疾作佛,不如持般若波羅蜜授與人者。其福轉倍益多; Kj.547b26f. 於是中有一菩薩,疾得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提。若有人以般若波羅蜜義教之,福多於彼.}

163
yasa ya[sa] + (5-58:) + + [bha]gava b(o)[sisatv]e mahasatve asanobhatiti
yathā yathā bhagavan bodhisattvo mahāsattva āsannibhavaty

bosa[e tasa tasa yo so praṇaparami] + (5-59:) + +
anuttarāyāḥ samyaksamboḍheḥ tathā tathā prajñāpāramitāyām

[o]vadeti anusāṣeti
avavaditavyo 'nuśāsitavyaḥ

tathā tathā prajñāpāramitāyām avodyamāno 'nuśisyamāṇas tathatāyā āsannibhavati /
tathatāyā āsannibhavan yeśāṁ paribhuṅkte

civarapeḍavada-śayasaṇa–gilaṇa-praceabheṣa[ja] +
cīvarapiṇḍapāta–ṣayanāsana–gīla–pratyayabhaiṣajyaparipārān

teśāṁ tān kārān kṛtān mahāphaḷān karoti mahānuṣaṁsān /

(5-60:) + + .. [a?]sa daje so bahu[da]ro puṇo [prasav]eti
ataḥ sa bahutaram puṇyaṁ prasavati /

taxa hedu
tat kasya hetoh
“It is so, O Lord, (O Most Composed One), if a bodhisattva-mahāsattva, while coming swiftly near enlightenment, teaches people the Prajñāpāramitā or gives (438a) them (its scriptural scrolls), -

(AS) his merit is much greater.

For what reason, O Lord?

70 極安隱： “a most composed one” (a translation of Skt. sugata [“one who has attained bliss”; cf. BHSD, s.v.]); = ZQ486a14, Zfn.519c5; cf. AS.67.26 = R.133.11 = AAA.321.10f. yathā yathā bhagavan! bodhisattvo mahāsattva āsannibhavatu anuttarāyāh sanyaksambodhes tathā tathā prajñāpāramitāyām avavaitavyo ‘nusīsitavyaḥ tathā tathā prajñāpāramitāyām avodyamāno ‘nusīsyamānas tathatāyā āśannibhavati. ... ataḥ sa bahutarāṃ puṇyaṃ pravasati (“To the extent that a Bodhisattva comes nearer to full enlightenment, to that extent he should be instructed and admonished in the perfection of wisdom, for that brings him nearer and nearer to suchness. ... His merit now becomes still greater, in consequence of the fact that he comes nearer to full enlightenment.” [Asp.tr.II 123 = Asp.tr. 42]; ZQ486a15. 世尊士・大士疾近佛。用是故，受其福轉倍多; Zfn.519c5. (極安隱者)即世尊士・摩诃薩今近佛。…… 不如持般若波羅蜜教授人者。其福轉倍益多; Kj.547b29f. 世尊近阿耨多羅三藐三菩提，轉應以般若波羅蜜義教之。…… 其福甚多.

72 AS.67.29f. = R.133.14f. = AAA.321.14f. tathātāyā āsannibhavān yeṣāṁ paribhunkte cīvarapindapāta-sayanāsagāna-pratyayabhaiṣajyaparīśkarāṁ teṣāṁ tān kāraṇā kṛtān mahāphalān karoṭi mahānusāsān (“When he comes nearer to Suchness, he confers many fruits and advantages on those who have done him services, i.e. on those through whom he enjoys his robes, alms-bowl, lodging, and medicinal appliances for sickness.” [Asp.tr.II 123 = Asp.tr. 42]; Zfn.519c6. 持衣、食、床臥具、供養、醫藥所當得; Kj.547c1f. 亦轉應以衣服、飲食、臥具、醫藥而供養之; Xz(I).790b19~ 22, Xz(II).880a28~b2, Sh.607c17~18, Tib.Pk.80b2~3 = D75b1. Lk(438a1) and ZQ(486a15) lack parallels.

73 何以故？天中天！(佛言)其得般若波羅蜜，疾近佛者，近佛座： “For what reason, O Lord? One, who attains the Prajñāpāramitā, will be immediately near enlightenment, near the seat of enlightenment.”; cf. AS.68.1f. = R.133.16f. = AAA.322.10f. tat kasya hetoh? evam hy etad bhagavan! bhavati yad bodhisattvo mahāsattva āsannibhavaty anuttarāyāḥ sanyaksambodeḥ (“For what reason? It is, O Lord, in this manner that bodhisattva-mahāsattva comes near to unexcelled, perfect enlightenment.”); ZQ486a16. 何以故？其得是法，疾近佛坐; Zfn.519c7f. 何以故？天中天！其得般若波羅蜜者，今近佛坐; Kj.547c2f. 何以故？世尊！法應爾隨近阿耨多羅三藐三菩提，得福轉多. The characters 佛言 in Lk are superfluous and should be deleted.
evaṃ hy etad bhagavan bhavati yad bodhisattvo mahāsattva āsannihavaty anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodheḥ ∥

atha khalv āyuṣmān subhūtiḥ śakram devānām indram etad avocat sādhu sādhu kauṣīka

yas tvam bodhisattvāyāṅikānaṁ pudgalānām utsaham ādāsi anugṛḥṇīṣe anuparivārayasi /

evamedo bhate karaṇio
evaṃ ca kauṣīka tvaya karaṇiyan -

ya [aṇ] (5-61:) + [aṇ]ravago bosisatvasesa anugraho karoti
ya āryaśrāvakaḥ sarvasattvānām anugrahaṃ kartukāmaḥ

[aṇ]u[tara(e) saṁmasambosie [usaha] .. .. + +
sa bodhisattvānāṃ mahāsattvānāṃ anuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhāv utsāhaṃ

(5-62:) + + [ṇa]ṭi anuparivaretī
vardhayati anugṛḥṇīte 'nuparivārayati

evaṃ tvayaṃ karaṇio
evaṃ etat karaṇiyan /
{The Buddha said:} One, who attains the Prajñāpāramitā, will be immediately near enlightenment, near the seat of enlightenment.”

Subhūti said to Śakra devendra: “Very good, O Kauśika! -(AS)\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{75}This is what (you) should do,

O venerable disciple (of the Buddha)!

Bodhisattva-mahāsattvas, who receive (the Prajñāpāramitā?) in this manner, will swiftly become buddhas.

In this manner (如是)\textsuperscript{76} one should act.(?)

\textsuperscript{74} AS.68.4 = R.134.1f. = AAA.322.20f. yas tvam bodhisattvavayānīkānāṁ pudgalānāṁ utsāham dadāsi anugṛhnīṣe anuparivārayasi (“You fortify those who belong to the Bodhisattva-vehicle, help them, stand by them.” [AsP.tr.II 123 = AsP.tr. 42]) = TibPk.80b5 = D75b3; \textsuperscript{)}} {Xz(I).790b26-27, Xz(II).880b6-7, Sh.607c22-23. The older versions (Lk.438a3, ZQ.486a17, Zfn.519c9, Kj.547c5) lack parallels.

\textsuperscript{75} 當所為。尊弟子！菩薩・摩訶薩作是教，疾成佛。所為作者，當如<是>。佛弟子從中出：“This is what (you) should do, O venerable disciple (of the Buddha)! ... Disciples of the Buddha originate from it (i.e. the Prajñāpāramitā).” cf. AS.68.4f. = R.134.2f. = AAA.322.22f. evan ca Kauśika! tvayā karanīyam. ya āryavārvakah sarvasattvānāṁ anugrahaṁ kartukāmāṁ sa bodhisattvānāṁ mahāsattvānāṁ anuttaraīyāṁ samyaksambodhau utsāham vardhayat anugṛhnīte 'nuparivārayatv. evam etat karanīyam. tat kasya hetoh? atah prasūtā hi bodhisattvānāṁ mahāsattvānāṁ anuttaraī samyaksambodhiḥ (“Even so should you act. A holy disciple who wants to give help to all beings, he fortifies the Bodhisattvas in their attitude to full enlightenment, helps them, stands by them. It is so that one should act. For begotten from the perfection of wisdom is the full enlightenment of the Bodhisattvas.” [AsP.tr.II 123 = AsP.tr. 42]); ZQ.486a17f. 當作是解。眾士受浄定，疾得成佛。所作行當如淨; Zfn.519c9f. 與尊弟子菩薩・摩訶薩中乃作是觀。諸聲聞者因是而得成; Kj.547c5f. 汝是聖弟子，法應佐助諸菩薩，以阿耨多羅三藐三菩提安慰懺念.

\textsuperscript{76} 當如<是>： All the editions and manuscripts read 當如 which is probably a scribal error for 當如是; cf. AS.68.7 = R.134.5 = AAA.322.25. evam etat karanīyam (“This is what one should do.”).
tat kasya hetoh

ado praṇatīa bhagavado śavaga ya
ataḥ prasūtā

hi bodhisattvānāṃ mahāsattvānāṃ anuttarā samyaksaṃbodhiḥ /

yadi

edo] (5-63:) ++ to ṇa upadito siati
yadi hi bodhisattvā mahāsattvā etad bodhicittaṃ notpādayeran

ṇa idaṃ bosisatva

ṣikṣeṇti

na caite bodhisattvā mahāsattvā anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau ṇikṣeran

na śatprāmitāsu śikṣeran aśikṣamāṇā anuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhiṃ nābhisaṃbhudhyeran/

yasmāt tarhi bodhisattvā mahāsattvā bodhisattvaśikṣāyāṃ āsu

ṣah[i] [p:] + + + + + + + + + +

śatpāramitāsu śikṣante tasmād etad bodhicittam utpādayante tasmād

(5-64:) anuttaraṃ sammasambosi a비스ambuji[eaṃ]tī
anuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhiṃ abhisaṃbhudhyanta iti //

[y] .. + + + + + + + + + + (5:65:) + + + + [sa](m)bujia vi

āryaṣṭasāhasrikayāṃ prajñāpāramitāyāṃ puṇyaparyāyaparivarto nāma pañcamaṇḥ //
Disciples of the Buddha originate from it (*i.e.* the *Prajñāpāramitā*).

77 If these people, *i.e.* bodhisattva-mahāsatvas do not seek for the Buddha-path, they will not study the six pāramitās within it.

As they do not study these dharmas, they cannot become buddhas.

78 (If) one follows the Dharma and studies it, one will swiftly become an *anuttara-samyaksambuddha*.

[Ask (me) as you like!]

---

77 詩人不索佛道者，菩薩·摩诃薩不於其中學六波羅蜜，不學是法，不得作佛： “If these people... they cannot become buddhas.”; Zfn.519c11f.; cf. AS.68.8f. = R.134.6f. = AAA.323.11f. *yadi hi bodhisattva mahāsatvā etat bodhicittam nātpādayanā ca cāte bodhisattvā mahāsatvā anuttarāyām samyaksambodhau āśīrmanā na śātāpparamītaśu āśīrman aśīṣamāṇā anuttarām samyaksambodhām nābhisambudhyanām (“Because, if the Bodhisattvas would not produce that thought of enlightenment, they would not train themselves in full enlightenment, nor in the six perfections, and in consequence they would not awake to full enlightenment.” [AsP.tr.II 123 = AsP.tr. 42]); ZQ.486a18. 不得是定，不得作佛; Kj.547c6f. 若佛初發阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心時，過去諸佛及諸弟子若不以六波羅蜜安慰佐助者，不能得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提.

78 隨法學，疾作阿耨多羅三藐三佛： “(If) one follows the Dharma and studies it, one will swiftly become an *anuttara-samyaksambuddha*.”; cf. AS.68.10f. = R.134.9f. = AAA.323.17f. *yasmāt tarhi bodhisattvā mahāsatvā bodhisattvaśākṣāyāṃ āśu śātāpparamītaśu śākṣante tasmād etad bodhicittam utpādayante tasmād anuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim abhiṣambudhyante (“But because the Bodhisattvas train themselves in the Bodhisattva-training, in these six perfections, therefore do they produce this thought of enlightenment, therefore do they awake to full enlightenment.” [AsP.tr.II 123 = AsP.tr. 42]); ZQ.486a18.: Zfn.519c12f. 隨法如學，疾成阿耨多羅三藐三菩提，便得至佛; Kj.547c9f. 佛初發意時，過去諸佛及諸弟子以六波羅蜜應安慰佐助，故得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提.

79 在所問： “Ask (me) as you like (在; cf. Krsh[2010].620f.)!”; = ZQ.486a18. The other versions lack parallels.
Was the \textit{A\textasciitilde stas\textasciitilde hasrik\textasciitilde Praj\textasciitilde \textasciitilde n\textasciitilde paramit\textasciitilde} Compiled in Gandh\texti{\textaudi}ra in G\texti{\textaudi}ndh\texti{\textaudi}r\texti{\textaudi}?

Seishi Karashima

Prologue

Each Mah\texti{\textaudi}y\texti{\textaudi}na scripture must have its own complex background and history. Probably, many of the early ones were originally transmitted in Middle Indic or in a mixed language of Middle Indic with Sanskrit elements, and later “translated” gradually into (Buddhist) Sanskrit. This long cherished hypothesis has been proven by newly-discovered fragments of a Gandh\texti{\textaudi}r\texti{\textaudi} version of the \textit{A\textasciitilde stas\textasciitilde hasrik\textasciitilde Praj\textasciitilde \textasciitilde n\textasciitilde paramit\textasciitilde} (Falk/Karashima 2012, 2013), dating back with an 81.1\% probability, based on a C14 test, to between 47~147 C.E. Even the oldest Sanskrit Buddhist texts, representing the form in which we usually have access to them, are, in other words, the result of constant sanskritisation, wrong backformations, reductions, additions and interpolations over the centuries. This means that when we attempt to understand early Mah\texti{\textaudi}y\texti{\textaudi}na scriptures properly so as to draw nearer to their original features or trace their transmission, if we restrict ourselves only to extant Sanskrit manuscripts, most of which date from the eleventh century onwards, the explanatory value of such studies is rather limited. In addition to Sanskrit texts, we should investigate all other available materials in order to flesh out this history. The Chinese translations, particularly those which were made between the second and the sixth century, which thus antedate most of the extant Sanskrit manuscripts, are indispensable sources as, in most cases, the exact periods of their translations are known. Apart from these Chinese translations, old Sanskrit and Gandh\texti{\textaudi}r\texti{\textaudi} fragments, discovered in Central Asia and “Greater Gandh\texti{\textaudi}ra” (present-day Pakistan, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan), Khotanese texts, Tibetan translations and so on, may provide substantial clues to tracing the origination, development and alternation of Buddhist scriptures. Especially the Gandh\texti{\textaudi}r\texti{\textaudi} manuscripts of Mah\texti{\textaudi}y\texti{\textaudi}na scriptures, dating even back to the first century, which have been discovered in recent years, may change our understanding of Mah\texti{\textaudi}y\texti{\textaudi}na Buddhism. In addition to written evidence, we should also pay attention to the results of research conducted on archaeological and art historical materials. By doing all this, we might be able to attain new perspectives on early Mah\texti{\textaudi}y\texti{\textaudi}na scriptures and hence, reconsider what we have understood through “eyeglasses” of common sense, by removing them and looking anew at primary materials. In this way, we may be able to draw nearer to the original features of early Mah\texti{\textaudi}y\texti{\textaudi}na scriptures.

* I am very grateful to Peter Lait and Kazuhiro Iguchi, who went to great trouble to check my English and to Mark Allon, Timothy Lenz and Jonathan Silk, who read through my draft and offered many useful suggestions.
(1) Gândhārī manuscripts of the Prajñāpāramitā

In 1999, a collection of Buddhist manuscripts, written on birch bark in Kharoṣṭhī characters, was discovered in the ruins of a Buddhist monastery in the Bajaur area of the North-West Frontier Province of Pakistan, bordering Afghanistan. When found, these manuscripts were “in a deplorable state of preservation” and it took Prof. Nasim Khan two years merely to unroll the fragments (Nasim Khan 2008: 1). Since then, Prof. Khan together with his German colleague, Dr. Ingo Strauch, have been doing research on them and photographs and preliminary transcriptions of nineteen fragments in this collection were published in 2008. However, although 13 years have passed since this sensational discovery, careful transcriptions and comparative studies of one of the most important collections of Buddhist manuscripts have yet to be undertaken. These manuscripts, which are thought to date back to the first or second century based on palaeographical evidence, include fragments of the Madhyamāgama, the Prātimokṣasūtra, a Mahāyāna text (Nasim Khan 2008: 47–93), which refers to the three vehicles (sravagayaṇa, praceadbhayana, samsatabhayana) and Akṣobha (Skt. Ākṣobhya) Buddha, a text which refers to praṇaparamida (Skt. praṇāpāramitā) (ibid., 113–119) and so on. Another collection, which is similarly thought to have come from northern Pakistan and is referred to as the "Split" collection, contains fragments of a second Gândhārī Mahāyāna text. This is a Gândhārī version of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā which has been dated back to between 47~147 C.E., and is therefore probably contemporary with the original text of the Daoxing Banre jing 道行般若經, the oldest Chinese translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā, translated by Lokakṣema in 179 C.E. With these newly-discovered fragments, we are now entering a new phase of research on early Mahāyāna scriptures and hence, we should make an exhaustive study of these, comparing them in particular with early Chinese translations.

In my A Critical Edition of Lokakṣema’s Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā (Krsh 2011), I compared word-for-word the oldest Chinese translation made by Lokakṣema in 179 C.E. (T. 8, no. 224) with the Sanskrit version, the Tibetan translation, the six other Chinese translations and a part of the Gândhārī fragments of the same text. In this way, I attempted to trace additions, interpolations, deletions, reductions, changes and restructuring during the transmission of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā. In general, the older versions — namely the Gândhārī fragments, the Chinese translations by Lokakṣema, by Zhi Qian (fl. ca. 220~257 C.E.; T. 8, no. 225), by Zhu Fonian (382 C.E.; T. 8, no. 226), by Kumārajīva (408 C.E.; T. 8, no. 227) and by Xuanzang (660~663 C.E.; T. 7, no. 220, pp. 865~920) — are simpler, while the newer ones — namely another translation by Xuanzang (660~663 C.E.; T. 7, no. 220, pp. 763~865), Shihu’s translation (in 982~984; T. 8, no. 228), the Sanskrit version and the Tibetan translation — are more detailed. It is quite remarkable that expressions concerning compassion — a notion in fact contradictory to emptiness (śūnyatā), the main theme of the Prajñāpāramitā scripture — are often wanting in the oldest versions, namely the first three Chinese translations.

1 Nasim Khan 2008; cf. also the following site: http://www.geschkult.fu-berlin.de/e/indologie/bajaur/content/index.html
though later ones give a great deal of elaboration on this theme. On the contrary, the story of Sadāprardīta is given in great detail in the Chinese translations by Lokakṣema and Zhi Qian as compared with later versions. Also, as we shall see below, the theme of the story seems to have changed as it moved from the oldest to the later versions. As I have demonstrated elsewhere recently, the Chinese translations by Zhi Qian and Zhu Fonian are none other than “modified versions” of Lokakṣema’s oldest translation, which is basically word-for-word, very literal and rudimentary. Zhi Qian merely "sinicised" it, while Zhu Fonian basically copied Lokakṣema’s translation, only replacing old-fashioned, vernacular words and expressions within it. Therefore, in order to clarify the original features of Prajñāpāramitā thought as well as so-called Mahāyāna Buddhism, one should not rely only on the Sanskrit version, the Tibetan translation, the more readable translation by Kumārajīva or the later Chinese translations, all of which show later qualitative and quantitative development, but rather follow Lokakṣema’s translation and the newly-discovered Gândhārī manuscript fragments, which may retain more of the original shape of the text.

The recto of the Gândhārī fragments of the Aṣṭasahāsrikā Prajñāpāramitā corresponds to the beginning part of the first juan (卷) of Lokakṣema’s translation (T. 8, no. 224, 425c4-426c10), while its verso, to the ending part of the second juan (436c17-438a7). Therefore, the original manuscript must have consisted of a huge scroll. Prof. Falk has published transliterations of the fragments together with my English translation of the parallel parts in Lokakṣema’s translation (Falk/Karashima 2012, 2013). In general, the Gândhārī version is simpler than Lokakṣema’s translation, though in some cases, the opposite is evident. Although the two versions are thus not identical, their similarity is astonishing. For example, both lack the following phrase prakṛtiḥ cittasya prabhāsvaraḥ (“the original nature of thought is luminous”; AS.3.18 = R.5.14 = AAA.38.23), which denotes a very significant concept i.e., prakṛti-prabhāsvaramacittā 自性清浄心 “the innately luminous (pure) mind”, while all the other Chinese and Tibetan translations have it.


(2) The original language of Lokakṣema’s translation was probably Gāndhārī

A Dictionary of Gāndhārī (http://gandhari.org/a_dictionary.php) edited by Stefan Baums and Andrew Glass, has made it significantly easier to search for information on Gāndhārī words and documents. With the above-mentioned discoveries of Gāndhārī Mahāyāna texts, the Gāndhārī vocabulary of Mahāyāna Buddhism has increased dramatically. By analysing the transliterations found in Lokakṣema’s translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrika Prajñāpāramitā (hereafter “AS(Lk)”) by means of these new tools and materials, it is evident that its original language was Gāndhārī (hereafter “Gā”).

(1) -th- > -s-

The phonetic development -th- > -dh- > -s- is peculiar to Gāndhārī. The transliteration 恒薩阿竭 (429a27, 429c14 etc.; cf. Krsh 2010: 98; EH. tat sat ʔa gjiat; *tasa-agad(a)), which occurs around 200 times in AS(Lk), corresponds to Gā. tasagada⁴ (< BHS. tathāgata). It is interesting that this Chinese transliteration demonstrates that the word tathāgata was understood not as tathā-gata (“one who has thus gone”) but rather as *tathā-āgata (“one who has thus come”), which agrees with the later standard Chinese rendering rulai 如來 (“one who has thus come”).

(2) -dh- > -s-

The transliteration 末須(←順)撝提 (471c11; cf. Krsh 2010: 329) may have been based on the Gāndhārī form masu-ga<m>dhi (< BHS. madhu-gandhika < mṛdu-gandhika⁵; cf. Gā. masu < Skt. madhu). The words bodhi and bodhisat(va) become bosī and bosisatva in Gāndhārī and from their transliterations 佛 (438a2, 460c26 etc.; cf. Krsh 2010: 164f.) and 菩薩 (425c8, -10 etc.; cf. Krsh 2010: 351) in AS(Lk), we cannot say for sure what their original forms were.

(3) -bh- > -h-

The transliterations 首呵 (435a12; EH. ्śhuha < Śubha; Krsh 2010: 454), 波栗多修呵 (435a13; EH. pa lijet ta śhu he; *Paritṭaśuha < Partttaśubha; Krsh 2010: 45f.), 首呵迦 (439c25; EH. śhuja: ha kja[kra]; *Śuhaka- < Śubhakṛṣna; Krsh 2010: 453) and 阿波摩首呵 (439c24; EH. ʔa pa ma sju: ha; *Apana(na)suha < Apramāṇaṇubha; Krsh 2010: 1) indicate that the underlying Indian text read śuha, which is actually found in the Gāndhārī Dharmapada⁶, instead of Śubha. Therefore, this shows that the development -bh- > -h-, common in Middle Indic, including Gāndhārī⁷, occurred in the underlying text.

From the transliteration 須菩提 (425c5 etc.; EH. sjou bo dei; Skt. Subhāti; Krsh 2010: 554), which occurs more than 600 times, one may assume its underlying form to be Subhuti or *Subhudi, while, in the Gāndhārī fragments of the same text, both Suhuti and Subhuti are found⁸.

(4) -h- > ə

One of the characteristics of Gāndhārī is that the h in the medial position, is

⁴ Ajītusena Inscription: 3–4; British Library Fragment 7: a Da1 = Baums 2009: 241; Nasim Khan 73.18f., 77.3f., 81.10 etc.
⁶ Dhp-G⁵: 19b, 217a, 241b.
⁷ Cf. Karashima 1994: 24, § 2.4.6.i.
⁸ Falk/Karashima 2012: 28(1-02), 30(1-05) etc. Suhuti; 30(1-04), 32(1-10) etc. Subhuti.
sometimes elided, or is treated merely as a glide consonant and replaced by another glide consonant\(^9\). The following transliterations from AS(Lk) indicate that in its underlying Indic text, \(h\) was either elided or became a mute character: 會波羅 (467b9; EH. γωτ- pa la; \(*Ve'a(p)iphala \leq Vehapphala\) ≤ PA ≤ BHS. Vṛhatphala / Brhatphala; Krsh 2010: 234), 梵摩三鉢 (431a27; EH. b(r)jam- ma sām pat; Brāma Sa'āmpati < Gā. Brāma Sahampati\(^10\) < BHS. Brah㎡a Sahampati; Krsh 2010: 159), 僧那 (443a24; EH. sāng na; *sa(m)nā'a < *sa(m)nāha < Skt. saṃnāha; Krsh 2010: 405), 摩訶僧那僧涅 (427b29, 427c2 etc.; EH. ma ha sāng na sāng nīt; *mahasa(m)nā'a-saṃnaddha < Gā. *mahasa(m)nāha-saṃnaddha < BHS. mahāsaṃnāha-saṃnaddha; Krsh 2010: 323).

\((5)\) -bh- > -h- or ø

The following transliterations indicate that in the underlying text, the intervocalic -bh- had already developed into -h- which was, in turn, either elided or became a mute character: 阿摩那摩 (467b9; EH. ṭa pa ma na; *Ap(r)amaṇa'ā / *Ap(r)amanāha < Apamānābha; Krsh 2010: 1), 阿摩摩修 (435a13; EH. ṭa pa ma sju; *Ap(r)amanāsa'ā / *Ap(r)amanāsaROUGHER < Apamānasārubha; Krsh 2010: 1-2), 阿會巨修 (431a16, 435a12 etc.; EH. ṭa ywa- sjwan sju; *Avasvara śu'a / *Avasvara śuha < BHS. Ābhāsvāra + śuha; Krsh 2010: 2-3), 波利陀 (345a11, 349c23; EH. pa ljioi- da; *Paritta'a / *Parittaha < Parīttābha; Krsh 2010: 45), 城(v.l. 廣)波摩那 (435a12, 439c23; EH. ṭap pa ma na; *Ap(r)amaṇa'ā / *ApamānaROUGHER < BHS. Aparamānābha; Krsh 2010: 143), 翻乾 (435a13; EH. sju gjian[kan]; *Su'akīṅ[a] / *Suḥkīṅa < Śubhakṛśna; cf. Pa. Śubhakin, *kīṇa; Krsh 2010: 552). The transliteration 阿彌陀 (EH. ṭa mjjei[mjjei:] da; Amida'a / *Amidaha < Amitābha) for the well-known Mahāyāna Buddha, which Lokākṣema used in his Chinese translation of the Larger Sukhāvatvīyūha, namely the Da Amituo jing 大阿彌陀經 (T.12, no. 362), is also an example of this development.

\((6)\) -p- > -v-

The transliterations 優婆塞 (431a15, 451a13 etc.; EH. ṭju ba sāk; Gā. *uvasak(a) < BHS. upāsaka; Krsh 2010: 595), 優婆夷 (431a15, 451a13 etc.; EH. ṭju ba žjioi; Gā. uvasia < BHS. upāsika; Krsh 2010: 595) indicate that in the underlying Indic text had -v- for OIA -p-. Actually, in the above-mentioned Bajaur fragments, similar forms uvaśea (˂ BHS. upāsaka), uvaśia (˂ BHS. upāsika) occur (Nasim Khan 110.\(^9\)). Also, the Chinese characters 慈 (EH. γwa), 和 (EH. γwa), 湖 (EH. γwan), 曰 (EH. γjwat), 越 (EH. γjwat) in the following transliterations, show that the same development -p- > -v- were a feature of the original language of the Indic text upon which the Chinese translation was based: 湖毘拐舍羅 (433c7 etc.; EH. ōu γwa kou[kjou] śja- la; *uvaakośalla\(^12\) < BHS. upayakauśala or upāyakauśala; Krsh 2010: 346f), 演耶和提 (431a1; EH. pa žj[a][a] γwa de; *Pajavadi, *Prajapati < BHS. Prajāpati; Krsh 2010: 48), 和夷羅洹 (455b28; EH. γwa žjioi la γwan; *Vajiravāni, Vayiravāni\(^13\) < BHS. Vajrapāni; Krsh 2010: 212), 提和竭羅 (431a7; EH. dei

---


\(^11\) uvaśīna is a misprint of uvaśiṇa.

\(^12\) Cf. Gā. kośāla < kaśālya (Baums 2009: 636–637).

\(^13\) Cf. Gā. vayira- (Senavarman Inscription: 5; Mount Banj Inscription: 3–2).
γwa gjiat la; *Diva(m)gara < BHS. Dtpamkara; Krsh 2010: 478f., 摩訶惟曰羅 (468c12; EH. ma ha ꜐jwɔi ꜐jwat la; *Maha-vuvela14 < *Maha-vevulla < BHS. Mahā-vaipulya; Krsh 2010: 324), 三昧越 (455b14f.; EH. som mat- ꜐jwat; *samavaj(adi)15 < Skt. samāpadyate; Krsh 2010: 400-401).

(7) -t- > -d-

The Chinese characters 陀 (EH. da), 榙 (EH. dan) in the following transliterations, indicate that the development -t- > -d- was a feature of the language of the original Indic text: 阿陀波 (435a15; EH. ꜐a da pa; *Adapa < BHS. Atapa; Krsh 2010: 11), 阿比陀 (439c25; EH. ꜐a bjiw[i]bjiw[i] ꜐ja[zi] da; *Aviyada(va)? < *Aviha Adava < Pa. Avihā Atapā > BHS. Avṛhāḥ Atapāḥ; Krsh 2010: 1), 兜術陀 (EH. tou ꜐jwat da; 435a4, 468b-3; Gā. Tuṣīda16 < BHS. Tuṣīta; Krsh 2010: 129f.), 沙羅伊栴 (470a21; EH. sra la ꜐jiw[i] dan; *saḷ-ayadāṇ(ani) < BHS. saḍ-āyatanāṇi; Krsh 2010: 405).

(8) -d- > -l-, -q- > -l-

The following transliteration shows the development of -d- > -l-: 捜文羅 (471c10; EH. kou[kjou] mjan la; Gā. kumula17 < Skt. kumuda; Krsh 2010: 281f.). The following suggests the changes of raina > MI. ratana > Gā. raḍana18 > *raḷamṇa19; 羅蘭(一麟)那枝頭 (461c1, 9; EH. la lan[麟] lijan] na kie?/tʃei dou; *Raḷamṇakedu? < *Raḍana° < Ratana° < BHS. Ratnaketu; Krsh 2010: 315f.). Also, the following transliteration indicates the development of -d- > -l-: 沙羅伊栴 (470a21; EH. sra la ꜐jiw[i] dan; *saḷ-ayadāṇ(ani) < BHS. saḍ-āyatanāṇi; Krsh 2010: 405).

(9) jnih > (m)ñ

In Gandhārī, like other Middle Indic languages, jnih becomes (m)ñ. The transliterations in AS(Lk) also indicate the same development: 般若波羅蜜 (425c8 etc.; EH. pan nga: pa la mjia; Gā. praṇaṇaparamida20 < BHS. praṇjñāpāramitā; cf. Krsh 2010: 23), 般遮句 (433b29, c2 etc.; EH. pan tʃja jwhn; Gā. *pa(m)cavi(m)ñ(a)21 < BHS. pañcabhiñjña; Krsh 2010: 23f.), 尼惟先 (465a7; EH. n̄jia[n]i- ꜐jwɔi sian; *Nevasaṃjñjña22 < BHS. Naivasaṃjñjña(nāsaṃjñjñyatanā; Krsh 2010: 336), 萨芸若 (426a24 etc.; EH. sat ꜐jwɔn nga.; Gā. sarvañña23 < Skt. sarvañjña; Krsh 2010: 395-396). Thus, the Chinese word 般若 (EH. pan nga), though pronounced in various ways such as bo re, ban ruo or ban re, should be

---

14 Cf. Gā. vehula (< veula < vevulla < vaipulya) (Nasim Khan 81.12); Gā. vivula (CKI 249: 4; Dhp-G²: r 164) < Skt. vijula.
16 Cf. Nasim Khan 73.38. Tuṣiḍaṇa.
17 Cf. Dhp-G²: r 145d.
18 Cf. Nasim Khan 77.8, 83.55 etc.
19 In an old, anonymous Chinese translation of the Devadatta-chapter of the Lotus Sutra (T. 9, no. 265, translated in the Western Jin Period (265-316 C.E.), we find a transliteration 抱休羅蘭 (EH. bau hju la lan; 197a12), parallelising Skt. Prabhutaratana > *Prabhutaradana > *Pahū(la)ralan(a)?, in which the EH. hju indicates that the Middle Indic development -bh- > -h- had already occurred in the underlying text.
20 Falk/Karashima 2012: 28(1-03), 32(1-13), 34(1-14, 16) etc.
22 Cf. Gā. sañña (British Library Fragment 1: r 32d; Senior Fragment 5: r 17, 21, v 26; Baums 2009: 678f. saña-; Nasim Khan 75.18, 79.23, 81.1f., Nasim Khan 81.14f., 83.38f. etc.) < saṃñjñ; Pa. Nevasaṃjñjña(nāsaṃjñjñyatanā).
23 Gā. sarvañña- (CKD 399: Obv 2; CKD 272: Obv 3; CKD 358: Obv 3; CKD 241: 7, 10); Gā. sarvañña (EĀ-G: r 3d); cf. Pā sabbaññā.
pronounced *ban re*, due to its being originally a transliteration of the Gāndhārī form *praṇa* and not that of Skt. *prajña*. It is probable that the pronunciation *bo re* was a later artificial one, invented in the Tang Period by a Sanskritist who had no knowledge of Middle Indic.

(10) *-nt-* > *-ndl-*; *-mp-* > *-mb-*


Also, from the transliteration 占hawks (471c12; EH. tšam bjok?; cf. Krsh 2010: 623), we may assume its original form to have been *kambaka* (< Skt. *campaka*; cf. Kho. *cambaa*).

These transliterations show the developments *-nt-* > *-nd-* and *-mp-* > *-mb-*4 which are attested in the Gāndhārī Khotan Dharmapada, the Gāndhārī documents from Niya and the Gāndhārī loanwords in Khotanese25.

(11) *-ndl-* > *-nn-*

The following three transliterations show the development *-ndl-* > *-nn-* peculiar to the Gāndhārī Khotan Dharmapada and the Gāndhārī documents from Niya: 不那利 (471c11; EH. *pjū na ljiāi-*; *puṇṇari(a)* < Skt. *pundarīka*; cf. Krsh 2010: 51f.), 縺垣 (475b19; EH. *kju ǰiwan*; *kuvan(a)*28 < *kubhaṅda* < BHS. *kumbaṅda(k)a*; cf. Krsh 2010: 281).

(12) 波斯翕 = Gā. *Prasenigara = BHS. Prasenajit*

The transliteration 波斯翕 (434a9; EH. pa sjei nrjok; cf. Krsh 2010: 47), ending with the velar /kl/, corresponds to Gā. *Prasenigara29*, differing from BHS. *Prasenajit*.

(13) 彌勒 = Bactrian *Metraga*

The transliteration 彌勒 (425c6, 438a-16; EH. mjei[mjei:] lsk; cf. Krsh 2010: 318), ending with the velar /kl/ differs from BHS. *Maitreya*, Pā. *Metreya*. In the Gāndhārī inscriptions, the personal names *Metreya27*, *Metrea* (in an inscription dating back to 74 C.E.)28 are attested, but they do not refer to the well-known Bodhisattva / Buddha. There are several forms of his name, which contain velars as their endings, as the Chinese transliteration does. Such are the Bactrian spelling *Metqayq Boudo* (*Metrago Boudo*) on the bronze coins of the Kushan king, Kaniška I, dating back to the second century C.E.; the form *Maitraka*, referring to this Bodhisattva, found in the verses of the *Samādhirājasūtra* (four times)29, in the verses of the 54th chapter (*Maitreya*) of the *Gaṇḍavyūha* (twice)30 and in the prose part of the *Mekhaladhāraṇī* (once)31; and the Tocharian forms *Maitrāk, Mettrak*32. I assume that while the

---

27 CKI 141 = Peshawar Museum inscription, no. 5: 1 = Konow 1929, 133, pl. 24.7; IBInsc I 988.2.
28 CKI 564 = Copper Manuscript in Five Sheets: 6 = Falk 2010: 18.
29 *Samādhī* (D) 165.7 (ch. 11, v. 60), 380.9 (ch. 29, v. 82), 424.12 (ch. 32, v. 137), 580.2 (ch. 37, v. 68) = *Samādhī* (V) 76.15, 183.11, 204.12, 273.10.
30 Gv 488.25 (ch. 54, v. 171), 489.7 (ch. 54, v. 175) = Gv(V) .392.17, 393.2.
31 Md 116R2. bhagava Maitrekaṃ.
Bactrian form *Metqaya (*Metraga) was sanskritised to Maitraka on the one hand, it was Gândhârîised to Metreya, Metreya on the other. From these Gândhârî forms, BHS. Maitreya, Pâ. Metteya were coined, though it is unlikely that they were the original forms. As I pointed out several years ago, there is a description of Metteya receiving the prediction of Buddhahood from the Buddha in the Cakkavatti-Stihananda-suttanta of the Digha-nikâya (No. 26, III 75f.) and in the Chinese translation of the same text, namely the Zhuanlunshengwang xiuqing jing 轉輪聖王修行經 of the Dirghâgama of the Dharmaguptaka school (T. 1, no. 1, 41c29f.), while their parallel text, namely the Zhuanlunshengwang jing 轉輪聖王經 in the Chinese translation of the Madhayamâgama of an unknown school (T.1, no. 26, 520b~525a) lacks this description, which is apparently truer to the original. Throughout the Pâli Nikâyas, the name Metteya occurs only once and therefore, it is unlikely that faith in Metteya / Maitreya existed in early Buddhism. I assume that such faith, which occurred first in northwest India, was interpolated into this particular scripture long after the formation of the canon. The original meaning of Metqaya or Metreya is unknown, while its relationship with the Vedic Mitra and Avestan Mithra has not been clarified as of yet. It is possible that a god or hero, who had been worshipped in the Gândhâra region was at some point introduced into Buddhism.

(14) 善闠崛 = *G(r)iya-guḍa

From the transliteration 善闠崛 (425c4 etc.; EH. gjiā dīja gjwāt; cf. Krsh 2010: 356), we may be able to reconstruct an original form like *G(r)iya-guḍa, which resembles Gâ. Griija-uda in the AS(Gâ) and Pâ. Gijjhakâta, while differing from BHS. Grdhra-kâta.

(15) 泥犁 = nirea

The transliteration 泥犁 (440b14 etc.; EH. niāi liāi[jiāi]; cf. Krsh 2010: 337f.) is closer to Gâ. nirea than to Skt. niraya (“hell”).

(16) 塔 = thuva

The character 塔 (435b11; EH. thēp; cf. Krsh 2010: 475f.) was invented specially to transliterate Gâ. thuva or Gâ. thuva(< Skt. stupa).

(17) 三耶三菩提 = *samya-bosi, *samya-buddha

The transliterations 阿耨多羅三耶三佛 (432a13; EH. ʔa nou ta la sâm žja[zja] sâm bjọt; cf. Krsh 2010: 8), 阿耨多羅三耶三菩提 (437b24 etc.; EH. ʔa nou ta la sâm žja[zja] sâm bo; cf. Krsh 2010: 8-9) and 三耶三佛 (429a28 etc.; EH. sâm žja[zja] sâm bjot; cf. Krsh 2010: 403) parallel Skt. anuttara- samyaksambodhi-, samyaksambuddha-, while their Gândhârî equivalents are Gâ. anuttara- sa(m)masa(m)bosi-39, anuttara- saṁmasa(m)bosi-40, sa(m)masa(m)buddha-41, sa(m)mesa(m)buddha. The Chinese 三耶 (EH. sâm žja[zja]) in the

---

37 Falk/Karashima 28, 1-01; cf. MPS-G: r1v1. Gri[ja]///.
39 Nasim Khan 77.8.
40 British Library Fragment 1: r 82c; Senavarma Inscription: 2 etc.
41 Nasim Khan 73.13, 81.12, 81.29, 83.53.
42 Falk/Karashima 2013: 5-55.
43 CKI 176: D2; CKI 334: 4; CKI 564: 3–4.; Nasim Khan 50.20, 52.27, 73.13, 73.18, 73.24 etc.
above-quoted transliterations, indicates that its original form was Gā. saṃyā-<i>ś</i>, saṃyā-<i>ś</i> (<i>Skt. saṃyak</i>) rather than Gā. sa(m)ma-, sa(m)me-.

(18) 倭無竭 = Gā. *Dha<em>n</em> <em>mogada</em>

The transliteration 倭無竭 (471c23 etc.; EH. dam mjo gjiat; cf. Krsh 2010: 477) suggests that its original form was not Sanskrit but Gāndhārī, such as Gā. *Dha<em>n</em> <em>mogada</em> (<i>&lt; BHS. Dharmodgata</i>), which is not attested anywhere.

(19) 阿僧祗, 般泥日, 釋迦文, 釋提桓因, 伊沙

The following various transliterations seem to have been based on Gāndhārī forms: 阿僧祗 (427c5 etc.; EH. ā sang gji; Gā. asa(m)khe<em>a</em> <i>&lt; Skt. asaṃkhyeya</i>; cf. Krsh 2010: 10), 般泥日 (438b25; EH. pan nāi yjwat; Gā. parīnvuda <i>&lt; BHS. parinirvṛtā</i>; cf. Krsh 2010: 22), 釋迦文 (431a10 etc.; EH. śijak kja mjon; Gā. Śakamuni <i>&lt; Śakya muni</i>; cf. Krsh 2010: 447f.), 釋提桓因 (429a11; EH. śijak dei ywan ṭjīn; Gā. Śakra- <em>deva</em>na <em>intra</em>-<i>ś</i>; Gā. Śakra- <em>deva</em>naī <em>intra</em>-<i>ś</i>; Gā. Śakra- <em>deva</em>ni(m)dra-<i>ś</i>; Gā. Śakra- <em>deva</em>nī(m)dra-<i>ś</i> <i>&lt; Skt. Śaka devānā indra</i>; cf. Krsh 2010: 448), 伊沙 (431a2; EH. ṭjiai sra; Gā. iṣī <i>&lt; Skt. rṣi</i>; cf. Krsh 2010: 566).

(20) 斯陀含 = Gā. <em>sa</em>id<em>a</em>g<em>a</em>mi, 須陀洹 = Gā. <em>s</em>oda<em>v</em>āna

The transliterations 斯陀含 (429b8 etc.; EH. sjei da gom; cf. Krsh 2010: 459f.) and 須陀洹 (429b8 etc.; EH. sjou da ywan; cf. Krsh 2010: 555) correspond well with Gā. saida<em>g</em>ami <i>&lt; BHS. s</i>ak<em>r</em>d<em>a</em>g<em>a</em>mi and Gā. sodava<em>n</em>ā <i>&lt; BHS. s</i>rota<em>a</em>p<em>a</em>n<em>a</em> respectively. However, they occur also in the <i>Qichusanguan jing</i> 七處三觀經 (T. 2, no.150A, 877a11–12) and in the Kongōji (金剛寺) Manuscript of the <i>Anbanshouyi jing</i> 安般守意經, both of which are attributed to An Shigao 安世高 (fl. 148–168 C.E.).

From the above-quoted transliterations, we may assume that the underlying language of Lokākṣema’s translation of the <i>Āṣṭāsāhasrika Prajñāpāramitā</i> was Gāndhārī or at least contained Gāndhārī elements.<ref type="foot">Dhp-G: 3b, r 77d, 304d.<ref type="foot">Mansehra Rock Edict 9: 4. samya-( </ref>pati<i>pati</i>).</ref> <ref type="foot">Mansehra Rock Edict 11: 12. samya-( </ref>pati<i>pati</i>).</ref> <ref type="foot">Nasim Khan 73.12.</ref> <ref type="foot">Senavarman Inscription: 7 = von Hinüber 2003: 23; Nasim Khan 66.42; 46, 76.12.</ref> <ref type="foot">Senavarman Inscription: 11 = von Hinüber 2003: 37; Senior Fragment 14: r 21 = Salomon 2008: 354 etc.</ref> <ref type="foot">Falk/Karashima 2013: 5-57.</ref> <ref type="foot">BL16+25: r 25 = Lenz 2003: 144.</ref> <ref type="foot">Loña’s Reliquary Inscription 1.</ref> <ref type="foot">Senavarman Inscription: 10 = von Hinüber 2003: 34.</ref> <ref type="foot">AG-G: r 25a (= Salomon 2008: 220); Nid-G: 9.2 (= Baums 2009: 242); Nid-G: 13.58 (= Baums 2009: 268).</ref> <ref type="foot">Nasim Khan 36.6; Falk/Karashima 2013: 53.5, saida<em>g</em>ami-; cf. CKI 358 = Reliquary Inscription of the <i>Az</i>es year 98, B = Sadakata 1996: 308, Nasim Khan 1997; Senavarman Inscription: 8b = von Hinüber 2003: 28. saida<em>g</em>ami.</ref> <ref type="foot">Nasim Khan 54.26f., 73.34f.; Reliquary Inscription of the <i>Az</i>es year 98, B = Sadakata 1996: 308, Nasim Khan 1997.</ref> <ref type="foot">The following words in Lokākṣema’s translation of the <i>Āṣṭāsāhasrika Prajñāpāramitā</i> demonstrate that he understood their original words through his knowledge of Middle Indic. Thus, 所語如甘露 (431b29; “the speech is like ambrosia”), corresponding to AS.27.7 = R.53.14 = AAA.197.16. <i>mr</i>du-vacana- <i>...</i> m<em>i</em>ta-vacana- ("the speech ... will become ... soft, measured") indicate that he confused <i>mr</i>du ("soft") or <i>m</i>īta ("measured") with <i>am</i>ṛt<em>a</em> ("ambrosia"); MI. *<i>am</i>ṛt<em>a</em>, Gā. *<i>am</i>ṛ<em>de</em>a, *<i>am</i>ṛ<em>da</em>); cf. Krsh 2011: 62, n. 69. Also, 藉芸若 (457c29; EH. sat ṭj</em>wan nja; a set transliteration of <i>sar</i>vaiṇ<a>ṇ</a>ā “omniscient, all-
(3) Was the Prajñāpāramitā scripture composed in the Gandhāra region?

In the various versions of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā, there is a prophecy of the Buddha’s foretelling the spreading of this scripture after his passing away. Lokakṣema’s translation says that this sūtra will first appear in southern India, then spread through western India, finally reaching northern India. The translations by Kumārajīva and Shīhu depict the same route, namely from the south through the west and finally to the north. The older version of the two translations by Xuanzang (7, no. 220, 889c26f.) describes the route as directly from the south to the north, whereas the newer version (7, no. 220, 808b21f.) relates the route as from the southeast to south to southwest to northwest to north to northeast. However, the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions specify that “these sūtras associated with the six perfections will, after the passing away of the Tathāgata, appear in the south (Dakṣināpatha). From the south, they will spread to the eastern country (Vartani). From the eastern country, they will spread to the north (Uttarāpatha) when the Dharma and Vinaya have just reached their peak and the good Dharma (begins to) disappear”.

Finally, Zhi Qian’s translation states that this scripture will appear in the country of Śakyaṇa, then spread to the countries in Vartani and then to those in Uttarakuru (爵單日) (7, no. 225, 490a24f.). Except for this last one, the other versions agree that this scripture will appear first in southern India and finally reach northern India, though via different routes.

Just after the above-stated descriptions, in all the versions, the Buddha says “In northern India, there will be very many bodhisattvas. However, there will be only a few among them who will study the Prajñāpāramitā.”

These descriptions apparently suggest that the text of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā took shape in northern India, though we can never exclude the possibility that the basis of Prajñāpāramitā thought was formed in southern India, such as in the Andhra region where the Mahāsāṃghika school, with which this scripture is closely related, predominated, as is often maintained. However, it is evident from the above-stated descriptions that the text itself was composed in Uttarāpatha (in Chinese 北天竺 “northern India”) which commonly designates the “Northern Region”, “encompassing territories

knowing”) in the following sentence: 菩薩至無水漣中時，心不畏怖。自念言：“……願我後得阿惟三佛時，使我剎中皆有水漣，令我剎中人悉得諸根具足妙味水。” corresponds to AS.179.21 = R.363.5 = AAA.741.6, tathā ca sarvasattvān punyāth sanmnīyokṣye yathā ‘ṣṭhaṇgotaparpaṇyaḥlābhino ‘mī bhaivīyanti. Lokakṣema seems to have confused Skt. pūnya (MI. pūṇaḥ; “merit”) with MI. pūṇaḥ (< Skt. pṛjñāḥ “wisdom”); cf. Kṛṣṇa 2011: 337, n. 327.

Moreover, Lokakṣema transliterated Skt. jana (“people”) sporadically as 禪 (EH. dzān; cf. Kṛṣṇa 2010: 57–59, s.vv. 禪, 禪法), which he used to render MI. jhāna, Skt. dhyāna (“meditation”) as well, namely 速達得禪 (428c7–8, 10; “one, who has attained all the jhānas”) and 速達得禪者 (454b–13; “one, who has attained jhāna”) correspond to AS.15.3, 7, 161.5 = R.29.18f., 20, 323.7 = AAA.120.2f., 10, 666.3, pṛthajāna– (“the common people”) (cf. Kṛṣṇa 2011: 33, n. 266; ibid., 304, n. 7), while 速達得禪法 (428c11; “one, who has attained jhāna-Dharma completely”) corresponds to AS.15.7 = R.29.22 = AAA.120.15, pṛthajāna-dharma– (“the dharmas which constitute the common people”) (cf. Kṛṣṇa 2011: 33f., n. 269). Presumably, this fact reflects that in the underlying language as with Gandhāri, both Skt. jana (“people”) and MI. jhāna had merged as jāna, jana.


57 AS.112.16 = R.226.7 = AAA.489.3; cf. Kṛṣṇa 2011: 226f.
from the Gangetic basin in northern India to Mathura, Taxila, and Bactria in northern Afghanistan and western Central Asia. I assume that, in the above-quoted prophecy by the Buddha, Uttarapatha is none other than the Gandhāra region. As we shall see later, in the story of Sadapradudita, which constitutes the ending part of this scripture, the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata is said to live in a palace, where a jewelled box containing the Prajñāpāramitā, written with "melted" lapis lazuli (vītāna vaidūrya) on golden tablets, is placed and to preach this perfection of wisdom in the country of Gandhāvatī, whose name seems to hint at Gandhāra.

If this sūtra was really composed in the Gandhāra region, it is quite probable that its language was Gāndhāri, as the newly-discovered Gāndhāri fragments and Lokakṣema’s translation, dating back to the first and second centuries, suggest. On the other hand, there are also fragments of a Sanskrit manuscript of the same scripture, discovered in Bāmiyān and now preserved in the Schøyen Collection and elsewhere, which are written in an old Brāhmaṇ script of the Kuśāna Period and are supposed to date back to the second half of the third century C.E. based on palaeographical evidence (Sander 2000b: 288). Dr. Sander, who has studied this manuscript, states (2000a: 3f.) that it shows traces of a Middle Indic language, e.g., tat kisya heto; kho, khu (< Skt. khalu); āvusa; thera, arahatā, ummiyata-nimmyitāni (< BHS. ummiñjita-nimmiñjitāni), bhoti (< Skt. bhavati) etc. In spite of its antiquity, it is remarkably close to the Sanskrit edition based on the manuscripts from Nepal, dating from the eleventh century onwards. Therefore, one may assume that, at an early stage of the transmission of this scripture, it branched into two, i.e., the older versions — namely the Gāndhāri fragments, the Chinese translations by Lokakṣema, Zhi Qian, Zhu Fonian, Kumārajīva, and a translation by Xuanzang — and the newer ones — namely the Sanskrit manuscript fragments of the Kuśāna Period, the other translation by Xuanzang, Shihu’s translation, the Sanskrit version and the Tibetan translation.

(4) The story of Sadāprudita and the origin of Buddha-images

The final part of the Aṣṭasahasrika Prajñāpāramitā is the story of Bodhisattva Sadāprudita and his quest for the Dharma. When he was lamenting over his misfortune of being born in a time when there was no buddha, a voice from the sky told him “Go East, there you will hear the Prajñāpāramitā!” He journeyed in that direction, not knowing how far he should go. Then a buddha-figure (tathāgata-vigraha; 化佛) appeared and told him to go five hundred yojana further to a country called Gandhavattī and to listen to the teaching on the Prajñāpāramitā being given by the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata. Following these instructions, he went to Gandhavattī and worshipped the Prajñāpāramitā, written with melted lapis lazuli on golden tablets and placed in a jewelled box in a storeyed pavilion which the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata had made built for the worship of this scripture. Having worshipped there, Sadāprudita went to where Dharmodgata was preaching and listened.

---

59 Underlying Indian texts of the Chinese translations by Kumārajīva and Xuanzang were written probably in Sanskrit.
He then entered into a good many meditations one after another — only the oldest Chinese translations by Lokakṣema and Zhi Qian tell us at the end of the story that infinite numbers of buddhas in the ten directions bestowed a prophecy on Sadāprarudita of his becoming a buddha. This story was adapted in Kang Senghui’s Liudui jing 六度集經 (Collection of Stories concerning the Six Pāramitās), under the title Changbei pusa bensheng 常悲菩薩本生 (the previous life of Constantly-Lamenting Bodhisattva) (T.3, no.152, 43a13f.).

The story of Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita, found in the Chinese translations by Lokakṣema and Zhi Qian, is of great detail as compared with later versions — unfortunately Gāndhārī fragments of this portion have not been discovered to date. Also, the themes of the story found in the oldest Chinese translations and the later versions seem to differ. The following passages (476b17f.; Krsh 2011: 525f.), which are often referred to as being the first to mention Buddha-images, also furnish us with a clue about when and where this Prajñāpāramitā text was composed.

The Bodhisattva Dharmodgata said: “... For instance, after the Buddha enters parinirvāṇa, somebody makes an image of the Buddha. People, who see the Buddha-image, all kneel and worship it. The image is neat and beautiful and resembles the Buddha perfectly. Everybody who sees it admires it and offers flowers, incense, and variegated silk fabric to it. Do you think, O wise man, that the god Buddha (or “the deity Buddha” 佛) is inside the image?”

Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita replied: ‘No, he is not inside. The reason for creating a Buddha-image is just in order to make people obtain the merit (from worshipping it). A Buddha-image is not made on one condition; a Buddha-image is not made on two conditions. (There are three necessary conditions, namely) there is gold; there is a clever person; and somebody who saw the Buddha in his lifetime. Because he thinks of the Buddha after his parinirvāṇa, he makes a Buddha-image and wishes to make people in the world worship it and obtain the merit (from worshipping it)”.

Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita (further) replied to the master: “Because the Buddha has already entered parinirvāṇa, one makes a (Buddha-)image”.64

Yūichi Kajiyama has assumed that this portion, which is wanting in the later versions, was composed by Lokakṣema, but I do not agree with this assumption. Presumably, the

---

64 “譬如佛般泥洹後，有人作佛形像。人見佛形像，無不敬拜供養者。其像端正殊好，如佛無異。人見，莫不稱歎，莫不持華、香、唾繡供養者。賢者！於佛像中耶？” 蔗陀波頭善菩薩報言： “不在中。所以作佛像者，但欲使人得福耳。不用一事成佛像，亦不用二事。有金，有點人，若有見佛時人。佛般泥洹後，念佛故，作像，欲使世間人供養得其福。” 蔗陀波頭善菩薩報師言： “用佛般泥洹後故，作像耳。” Cf. the parallel passages in Zhi Qian’s translation: T. 8, no. 225, 507a22f. “譬如佛滅度後，有人作佛形像，端正殊好，如佛無異。人見，莫不稱歎持花、香、唾繡供養者。賢者！於佛像中耶？” 對曰： “不也。所以作佛像者，但欲使人憂敬敬自詫，得其福耳。亦不用一事、二事。有金，有智人，若有見佛時人。佛滅度後，念佛故，作像，欲使十方供養得其福。”
composer(s) — he or they might have been a dharmabhānaka / dharmabhānakas — of the story of Sadāprarudita was (were) cynical about the worship of Buddha statues which, at that time, might have just started in Gândhara. He (or they) must have been convinced that, in a time when there was no buddha in the world after Śākyamuni Buddha’s parinirvāṇa, to worship the Prajñāpāramitā — i.e., to worship actual copies of the Prajñāpāramitā scripture —, which generates a budha’s omniscience and consequently all the buddhas themselves, was true worship of the Buddha which actualises meeting him and living in his presence, whereas worshipping a Buddha-image would not afford the same effect at all.

As this story of Sadāprarudita mentions the worship of the Prajñāpāramitā, “written” with melted lapis lazuli on golden tablets, it must have come into existence later than the other parts of this scripture. It might have taken more than fifty years for a newly-

---

66 Cf. AS. 116.2 = R.234.10 = AAA.502.24f. prajñāpāramitā aharikā sarvajñāhārasya; AS. 260.14 = R.527.19 = AAA. 989.23. prajñāpāramitā bodhisattvā lamahāsatvā māravāhārasya sarvajñāhārāhārāhāriṃ etc.

67 Cf. AS(Lk).477c11f. 殺若波羅蜜是恆薩阿摩・阿(一呵)羅訶・三耶三佛母 (“The Prajñāpāramitā is the mother of tathāgatas, arhantis, samyaksambuddhas”; ≈ AS[QZ].508a2f.）是諸如來・無所著・正等正・最正覺母; the other versions lack this phrase; cf. Krsh 2011: 533, n. 203); AS.134.28f. = R.272.4f. = AAA.559.6f. evam hi Subhāte! prajñāpāramitā tathāgatānam arhatām samyaksambuddhānām mātā janant janayiṣṭī (This phrase is wanting in the oldest translations; cf. Krsh 2011: 262, n. 112); AS. 228.4f. = R.461.10f. = AAA.870.2f. prajñāpāramitā ’tattvaatparamatvatpannām tathāgatānam arhatām samyaksambuddhānām mātā janant janayiṣṭī sarvajñatvā aharikā (This phrase is wanting in the older versions; cf. Krsh 2011: 442, n. 34).

68 Cf. AS(Lk). 477c29f. 殺若波羅蜜汝誦受，誦念。用於孝於佛故。承用教故。都靈是過去、常來、今現在佛・天中天所施教。用是供養。若於薩婆為極大慈故，諸菩薩等視如見佛 (“The Buddha said to Ananda:] ‘You should receive the Prajñāpāramitā carefully and think of it attentively. Because you respect the Buddha and because you follow his teachings obediently. [The Prajñāpāramitā] is the teaching which all the past, future and present buddhis, Lords teach. Therefore, one [should] serve it. You possess great compassion for sarvasattva [“all sentient beings”]. Bodhisattvas, regard [the Prajñāpāramitā] as they see the Buddha. ... ‘”; ≈ ZQ.508a10–19; the other versions lack this phrase; cf. Krsh 2011: 536f., n. 232); AS. 260.30f. = R.529.2f. = AAA.990.24f. avirahatā te Anandal sattva buddhadhārānena dharmasraṇaṃ saṅghopasthānena ca vediptavyaṃ tathāgatānīkavacaras te Anandal sattva vedatiyya va evam prajñāpāramitāṃ śroṣayanti udgrahayanti dhārayissanī vacayissantī paryavayissantī pravartayissantī desaṭayissantī uddeśayissantī svaṭhyayissantī likhyayissantī satkariyissantī gurukarayissantī mānasīyissantī pāpayayissantī aracayissantī apacyissantī puspā-dhāpa-gandha-māla-vilepana-cārṇa-caṭava-caṭhata-divaja-ghaṭa-patakaḥ bhūtān ca dipamalabhīr bahuvihadbhiḥ ca pājābhīḥ (“It should be known that those beings — who will hear this Prajñāpāramitā, take it up, study, spread, repeat and write it, will honour, reverence, worship and adore it with heavenly flowers, incense, perfumes, wreaths, ungents, aromatic powders, strips of cloth — posters, banners, bells, flags, with rows of lamps all round, and with manifold kinds of worship — are not lacking in meeting the Buddha, hearing the Dharma and serving the community, and those beings should be known as living in the presence of the Tathāgata.”; cf. As.P.tr. 300 = As.P.tr.II 225).

69 This attitude is quite similar to this scripture’s opinion on stūpa-worship; Śakra, the king of the gods, asked the Buddha: “Suppose that there are two people. One of them would, having written down (līkhītva) the Prajñāpāramitā and made it into a manuscript (pustakagatam kṛteva), lay it (in a proper place), honour, revere, worship, and adore it with heavenly flowers, incense, and the like, while the other would place relics of the Tathāgata, who had entered parinirvāṇa, in stūpas; he would preserve them, keep them; he would honour, worship and adore them with heavenly flowers, incense, and so on. Which of the two, O Lord, would obtain the greater merit?” In answering this question, the Buddha replied: “... the Tathāgata is not named as such from the fact that he has acquired this physical body, but from the fact that he has acquired omniscience (sarvajñatā). And this omniscience of the Tathāgata has been generated (nirjāta) from the Prajñāpāramitā. ... Therefore, the person, who would, having written down the Prajñāpāramitā and made it into a manuscript, lay it (in a proper place) and honour it, would beget the greater merit. As by worshipping the Prajñāpāramitā, he worships the wisdom of the omniscient (sarvajñā-jiñāna).” (AS. 28.29–29.27 = R.57.5–59.5 = AAA.208.22–212.12; cf. As.P.tr. 105f. = As.P.tr.II 24f.) Thus, the composer of this scripture, by using the Buddha’s mouth, placed absolute superiority of the worship of the Prajñāpāramitā scripture over that of stūpa-worship.
created text to become accepted as a scripture formulated by the Buddha. If that were the case, then it could be assumed that the original Indic text used by Lokakṣema for his translation of this scripture had appeared by the beginning of the second century at the latest, though more probably in the latter half of the first. This supposition may be supported by these newly-discovered Gândhārī fragments, dating back to between 47~147 C.E., and this would also agree with the assumption that the appearance of Buddha statues in Gandhāra began to occur in the latter half of the first century. Realising that both making and worshipping Buddha statues were gaining popularity, the compiler of this scripture (or at least of the original texts of the oldest Chinese translations) regarded these new practices or this new movement cynically as merely expedient devices for meeting the Buddha and hence, obtaining the merit from worshipping a statue in a time when no buddha existed after Śākyamuni Buddha’s passing away.

As is stated above, this portion is found only in the oldest Chinese translations by Lokakṣema and Zhi Qian — Zhu Fonian’s translation lacks the last ten chapters and no Gândhārī fragments of the latter part have been discovered as of yet — while it is wanting in the later versions. One may assume that, by the time of the compilations of the later versions, the practice of making statues of the Buddha and worshipping them had become so commonplace that the cynical point of view concerning such practices was felt to be anachronistic as well as irrelevant and consequently, this portion was simply deleted from the text.

In my opinion, one important theme in the oldest Chinese translations was to claim absolute superiority of the worship of the Prajñāpāramitā scripture over that of Buddha-images, which was thus deleted in later versions, resulting in the story’s contents becoming more abstract and philosophical. This difference may reflect the transition in time, namely from the period when the practice of making statues of the Buddha arose to when it became commonplace to do so. It must be interesting and meaningful to compare and analyse the story of Sadāprarudīta in different versions from such a historical point of view.
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On the "Missing" Portion in the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā

Seishi Karashima

The series of editions of Buddhist Sanskrit texts, *Buddhist Sanskrit Texts*, Darbhanga 1958–1970: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, of which vols. 1, 2–7, 10–12, 17–23 are edited by Parashuram Lakshman Vaidya and vols. 8, 9, 13, 14, 16 are edited by S. Bagchi, are easily accessible and, therefore, used universally by Buddhist students throughout the world. However, anybody, who works on a Buddhist text seriously, may soon realise that these editions are not always reliable, as they are not always faithful copies of the excellent editions, compiled by dedicated Japanese, Indian and Western scholars of the golden age of Buddhist philological studies, namely forty years around the turn of the 20th century, though the editors of the series maintain their faithfulness. Therefore, when I happen to find a title of this series in the bibliography of a book or an article, my evaluation of the seriousness of that particular work decreases automatically, let alone a translation made from an "edition" of this series!

In 2011, I published *A Critical Edition of Lokākṣema’s Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 道行般若經校注, Tokyo 2011: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XII). For its preparation, I compared, almost word-for-word, the three Sanskrit editions, a Tibetan translation and seven Chinese ones. At times, I checked an old Sanskrit manuscript from Nepal as well. The Sanskrit editions, which I consulted, were:


Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā with Haribhadra’s Commentary called Āloka, ed. P. L. Vaidya, Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1960 (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, no. 4). (abbr. AS)

Wogihara simply copied Mitra’s edition of the scripture, while Vaidya changed Dandas and Samdhis frequently and thus, "standardised" the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit text, following the Classical Sanskrit rules.

During my preparation of the above-mentioned work, I found that one long portion is wanting in all the three Sanskrit editions, namely R. 465.1, AAA 874.4, AS 229.30.
In Mitra’s edition, p. 464 ends with “śrāvakayāni-” and the next page starts with “gatam arhaṇam”. He did not comment on this omission, even though his edition was made very carefully, with added footnotes here and there.

However, Wogihara realised this and wrote: “Acc. to the commentary some passages are wanting” (p. 874) in the footnote given to the word “śrāvakayāni-”. What he meant by this, was that some passages were wanting, as Haribhadra had commented on them in his commentary. Thus, Wogihara just edited Haribhadra’s comments here (p. 874). After that, the reading in Mitra’s edition is quoted, starting with “gatam arhaṇam”.

Vaidya’s edition reads: śrāvakayāni ... gatam arhaṇam

His footnote (p. 229) on śrāvakayāni is as follows:

“It appears that some portion of the text after śrāvakayāni is missing in all MSS. The commentator Haribhadra notes śrāvakayānikānām as a pratīka and gives explanation of kṣaṇa, lava etc, though the available text does not contain these words here.”

Anybody, reading this, might believe, naturally, that the manuscripts of this scripture lack this portion, though Mitra did not say anything about this omission. Perhaps, students and scholars have not questioned this, as Vaidya stated confidently “missing in all MSS.”. As well as this, Mitra’s edition, published in 1887–1888, is difficult to access. Therefore, it was natural for the Japanese translators of the Sanskrit Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā to have translated this “missing” portion from the Tibetan translation instead.

Also, an eminent Japanese specialist of the Prajñāpāramitā scriptures, Takayasu Kimura, who edited the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā, wrote an article, entitled “On the Omission and its Filling in the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā” in which he tried to restore the “missing” portion from the quotations, found in the Śiksāsamuccaya and its parallels in the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā and the Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā. When writing this article, he checked only the manuscripts of these two Prajñāpāramitā scriptures, preserved at the Library of the University of Tokyo, but did not examine any manuscript of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā also preserved there.

As I wrote above, it is strange that the very careful Sanskritist, Rajendralala Mitra, did not mention the omission in his edition. It is also strange that the last word of p. 464 ends with “śrāvakayāni-” (with a hyphen!), which would suggest a continuation to the next word at the top of the next page, but p. 465 begins with “gatam arhaṇam”, which does make any sense.

Therefore, I have consulted the relevant portion (folio 221 verso 4–folio 222 verso 3) in a palm-leaf manuscript of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā, preserved

---

1 The original is written in Devanāgarī.
3 See op. cit. p. 289, l. 15–p. 291, l. 15; cf. p. 391f., n. 171.
now in the Library of the University of Tokyo, no. 47.6 In it, the "missing" portion can be found and it reads as follows:7

“(221 verso 4) sacet tvam ānanda! śrāvakayānikānāṃ pudgalāṇāṃ śrāvakabhūmā dharmāṃ desayes tasyāṃ ca dharmadesāṇāḥ(221v5) yāṃ ye trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātav satvās te sarve arhatvāṃ sākṣāt kuryus tathāpi tvayā me śrāvakeṇa dharmakrāpravartāntanupravartāntano dharmadesayatā śrāvakaśṛtyaṃ na kṛtaṃ śyāt sacet punas tvam ānanda bodhisatvasya mahāsatvasya ekam api prajñāpāramitā(222r1)pratīṣṭhyuktāṃ (read: "ktām) dharmāṃ desayēḥ samprakāśayeḥ evam ahaṃ tvayā śrāvakeṇa dharmakrāpravartāntanuṇapravartāntāḥ dharmāṃ desayanato arādhitaḥ syāṃ. na tu tayā pauvikayā dharmadesanayo yayā te trisāhasramahāsāhase lokadhātav sarvasatvāḥ arhatvāḥ prāpitāḥ. teṣaṃ cārhatāṃ yad dānmayāṃ puṇya(222r2) kriyāvastu śilamayaṃ puṇyakriyāvastu bhāvanāmayaṃ puṇyakriyāvastu tat kiṃ manyase ānandaṃ na su bahu puṇyakṣandhaḥ?” | ānandaḥ āha | “bahu bhagavan! bahu sugata!” bhagavān āha | “tata sa ānanda! śrāvakayānikāḥ pudgalo bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavatā yo bodhisatvānāṃ mahāsatvānāṃ prajñāpāramitā(222r3) pratīṣṭhyuktāṃ (read: "ktām) dharmāṃ desayati. ato (")pi sa ānanda! bahutaram puṇyaṃ prasavatā yo bodhisatvo mahāsatvo ’parasya bodhisatvasya mahāsatvasya prajñāpāramita-pratīṣṭhyuktaṃ dharmāṃ desayati | antāsa ekadivasam api tiṣṭhatv ānandaikadivasam antataḥ (read: antasaḥ) purobhaktam api. tiṣṭhatv ā(222r4) nanda! purobhaktam api. tiṣṭhatv ānanda! purobhaktam desītaḥ | antaśa ekanālikām api ekanālikāntaram api vā tiṣṭhatv ānanda! ekanālikāntaram antaśa muhūrttaṃ api tiṣṭhatv ānanda! muhūrttaṃ antaśa ekalavam api tiṣṭhatv ānanda! ekalavam antaśa ekakṣaṇasamnipātam api yo hy ā(222r5)nanda! bodhisatvo mahāsatvāḥ aparasya bodhisatvasya mahāsatvasya ekakṣaṇalavam api prajñāpāramitāpratīṣṭhyuktaṃ dharmāṃ desayanty ayaṃ tato ’tibahunāṃ puṇyaṃ prasavatui | idaṃ hy ānanda! tasya bodhisatvasya mahāsatvasya dhammadānāṃ sarvaśrāvakapratyekabuddhayānikānāṃ (222v1) pudgalānāṃ kuśalamūlāḥ abhiḥbhaṭti | evam ānanda! kuśalamūlasamanyāgato bodhisatvo mahāsatva evam etat kuśalamūla<m> samanvāharāṃ asthānam etad ānandāvakaśo yat sa bodhisatva mahāsatva vivarttēnantuttārayāḥ savyakṣāṃbodher nātāt sthānaṃ vidya(222v2)te” || atha khalu bhagavāṃs tasyāṃ velāyāṃ tathārūpam ṛddhayabhisamśkrām abhisamskrātāṃ yathārūpaṇa ṛddhyabhisaṃskṛtena tāś catasraḥ parṣado bhikṣubhiṣṇumpyupāsakopāśikā-devanāgayakṣagandharvāṣuragarudakinnaramahorāga manuṣyāmanuṣyāḥ vā sarve te (222v3) buddhānubhāvenākṣobhyāṃ tathāgatam arhantam ...

I asked a colleague in Beijing as well to examine the microfilms of a palm-leaf manuscript of the same text, formerly kept in the Library of the Cultural Palace of the

---


7 I should like to express my gratitude to Dr. Jirō Hirabayashi for his kindness in correcting my reading of the manuscript.
Nationalities, Beijing. It also has the "missing" portion. Therefore, it might not be necessary to check the manuscripts, which P. L. Vaidya maintained he had checked.

The length of the "missing" portion is the same size as a page of Mitra’s edition. Most probably, he gave his manuscript, including the missing page (it should have been p. 465), to the publisher, but somehow the latter lost that particular page and without noticing it, pp. 464 and 465 were paginated as they are now. Thus, it was not ancient scribes of the Sanskrit manuscripts but a modern publisher who missed this portion. The editor of this volume in the Buddhist Sanskrit Texts is responsible for misleading later scholars by his statement “missing in all Mss.”. My above-stated reaction upon finding a name of an edition of this series in a reference of somebody’s work is, thus, not unfounded.
The Circulation of the *Buddhāvatamsaka* in India

Peter SKILLING (Bangkok) and SAERJI (Beijing)

This article continues research on the Tibetan *Buddhāvatamsaka* published in *ARIABIAB XV.*

The protohistory and history of the *Buddhāvatamsaka* collection and its component text units, which we describe here as the *Buddhāvatamsaka* family of texts, pose many complex and difficult questions. A great deal remains to be done before we can understand the development and circulation of this vast florilegium, which is known primarily from “complete” Chinese and Tibetan translations.\(^1\) The components of the collection are only partly preserved in Sanskrit, and there is so far no evidence for a complete South Asian *Buddhāvatamsaka* corresponding to the versions attested, or suggested, by the Chinese and Tibetan translations. That is to say, there is no manuscript evidence for a unitary Indic *Buddhāvatamsaka* collection, either from South Asia or Central Asia. As a collection, the *Buddhāvatamsaka* is known only from Chinese and Tibetan catalogues and canons, and from references in Khotanese and other sources. In addition, outside of these collections, some of the component family members circulated independently in miscellaneous Chinese and Tibetan sūtra translations. In this article we discuss only the latter.\(^2\)

We do not intend to address the questions of where or when the individual units of the *Buddhāvatamsaka* family were composed, or where or when the “final”

\(^*\) This article is part of our current research, The Tibetan Kangyur: Indian Buddhist literature in Tibetan translation, sponsored by the Khyentse Foundation. We are grateful to Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche and the Khyentse Foundation for their generous support.

\(^1\) The idea (or ideal) of “complete text” or “final form” is only provisional, since the collections are not identical, and their composition changed over time. The members of the family and their genealogies and defining characteristics have scarcely been studied. For one preliminary study, see Peter Skilling and Saerji, “‘O, Son of the Conqueror’: A note on jinaputra as a term of address in the *Buddhāvatamsaka* and in Mahāyāna sūtras,” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2011*, Vol. XV, Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, 2012, pp. 127–130. In the article we propose that the term of address *bho jinaputra(ā)/bhavanto jinaputrā* is characteristic of the *Buddhāvatamsaka* family of texts.

\(^2\) For this research, we have used assorted Kanjurs, registers, and catalogues as accessible to us, and we are deeply grateful to individuals and institutions that have readily supplied crucial materials. In many cases it would have been useful to consult more Kanjurs, but we do not think this would have substantially affected our conclusions. Our research amply proves the *necessity* in Kanjur studies of consulting Kanjurs belonging to both the Them spangs ma and Tshal pa lineages, and local Kanjurs.
Buddhāvatamsaka collection was compiled. One important field of investigation is the history of the long succession of Chinese translations of the components of the Buddhāvatamsaka family. In this paper, we follow another line of enquiry, and attempt to sketch the history of the Buddhāvatamsaka family according to South Asian sources. We restrict the scope of the investigation to technical śāstra literature of Indian origin, mainly in Sanskrit or in Tibetan translation. This enables us to demonstrate that from about the fourth to the ninth centuries CE, many of the family members circulated in South Asia in Indic-language versions, and that they did this significantly, insofar as they were referred to or cited as fully authoritative by leading intellectuals.

This is a preliminary survey – we do not doubt that further references to, and citations of, texts belonging to the Buddhāvatamsaka family, whether by title or otherwise, remain to be studied. We hope that the present sampling is sufficient to give a general picture of the circulation of Buddhāvatamsaka texts in South Asia during the fourth to the ninth centuries CE, which we might describe as the middle period of Indian Buddhism.

Our sources include the Sūtrasamuccaya, the Ratnagotrabhāgaśgavyākhya, the Vyākhyāyuktī and its commentary, the Vyākhyāyuktiśīlā, the Madhyamakahrdayatarkajvalā, the Madhyamakālokā, the Šīksāsamuccaya, and the three Bhāvanākramas. Only the Ratnagotrabhāgaśgavyākhya, the Šīksāsamuccaya and the first and last Bhāvanākramas survive in Sanskrit. These sources were composed during the approximate period mentioned above – approximate because, typically, not a single work can be securely dated. Further, the places of composition are not known, and attributions of authorship are often contested. In this research, we cannot reexamine the dates or identities of the authors. We refer for convenience to Nakamura and Ruegg, both of whom give reference to earlier research, and occasionally other sources, in the understanding that the dates are all provisional.

---


4 To investigate the large corpus of śāstras in Chinese translation or of Chinese compilation, for example those by Kumārajīva, is a separate field of study that requires different principles of analysis.

5 In the Tibetan translation, the three sections of the Bhāvanākrama are referred to as three progressive “stages” – bsgom rim dang po, bar, tha ma – rather than as chapters or sections.

I The *Buddhāvatamsaka* in the Land of Snows

For the study of the *Buddhāvatamsaka*, we examine Kanjurs\(^7\) and Kanjur catalogues or registers.\(^8\)

(1) *Buddhāvatamsaka* in Kanjurs

In the Kanjurs available today, the *Buddhāvatamsaka* is presented as a single text,\(^9\) divided into 45 chapters. The number of *bampos* varies,\(^10\) for example: 113 *bampos* in the Derge Kanjur,\(^11\) 114 *bampos* in the Phug brag Kanjur,\(^12\) and 115 *bampos* in the Stog Palace\(^13\) and Shel dkar\(^14\) Kanjurs. The chapters are numbered consecutively and continuously, but the *bampos* are numbered either consecutively and continuously in the whole section (in the Stog Palace, Shel dkar, and Phug brag Kanjurs), or within a single


\(^9\) The *Buddhāvatamsaka* section of Phug brag Kanjur appends three texts to the last volume (*phal chen, ca*) of *Buddhāvatamsaka sūtra* proper, in the following order: no. 29 (*’Phags pa za ma tog bkod pa chen po*), no. 30 (*’Phags pa byams pa lung bstan pa*), no. 31 (*’Phags pa thabs mkhas pa chen po sangs rgyas drin lan bsab pa’i mdo*): see Jampa Samten, *A Catalogue of the Phug Brag Manuscript Kanjur*, Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works & Archives, 1992, pp. 19–20. Cat. no. 29 (*’Phags pa za ma tog bkod pa chen po*) is also included two more times in different volumes of the *Mdo sde* section (no. 101 in vol. *mdo sde*, da and no. 381 in vol. *mdo sde, ngi*).

\(^10\) The *bampo*, a quantitative measure of length, rather than a formal textual division, is generally defined as consisting of three hundred stanzas (*slokas*).

\(^11\) This is as checked directly from the Kanjur; Hakiju Ui, Munetada Suzuki, Yenshō Kanakura, and Tōkan Tada, *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons (Bkha’hgyur and Bstan’hgyur)*, Sendai: Tōhoku Imperial University, 1934, does not give the number of *bampos*.

\(^12\) This is as checked directly from the Kanjur; Jampa Samten (1992) does not give the number of *bampos*.


\(^14\) This is as checked directly from the Kanjur; Ulrich Pagel and Séan Gaffney, *Location List to the Texts in the Microfiche Edition of the Šel dkar (London) Manuscript bKa’ ’gyur (Or. 6724)*, London: The British Library, 1996, does not give the number of *bampos*.
volume only (in the Derge, Bathang,\textsuperscript{17} and Gondhla\textsuperscript{18} Kanjurs). There is only one opening title at the beginning and only one colophon at the end of this literally voluminous text. That is, individual components which are well-known today under their own names, for example the \textit{Ganḍavyūha} or \textit{Daśabhūmika} sūtras, do not open with their own titles in “the language of India” and “the language of Tibet” (\textit{rgya gar skad du}, \textit{bod skad du}), and do not end with their own translators’ colophons, as independent sūtras usually do. It seems that the component parts of the Tibetan \textit{Buddhāvatamsaka} have all been merged into one single and continuous work, with one important exception. This is the \textit{Daśabhūmika} sūtra, which occurs not only as a chapter of the \textit{Buddhāvatamsaka} section, but also as an independent sūtra in Kanjurs belonging to the Them spangs ma branch like Stog Palace,\textsuperscript{17} Ulan Bator,\textsuperscript{18} Shel dkar,\textsuperscript{19} and in local Kanjurs like Phug brag.\textsuperscript{20} In these cases, it has its own individual title and a concluding colophon. The \textit{Daśabhūmika} is also preserved in Dunhuang manuscripts.\textsuperscript{21} After checking the Kanjurs available to us as well as the Dunhuang manuscript,\textsuperscript{22} we found that Dunhuang manuscript no. 82 and the independent sūtra preserved in the Them spangs ma branch are the same translation, and that this translation is different from that embedded in the \textit{Buddhāvatamsaka} section.\textsuperscript{23} In other words, two different recensions of the \textit{Daśabhūmika} are preserved in Tibetan.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{15} Helmut Eimer, \textit{A Catalogue of the Kanjur Fragment from Bathang Kept in the Newark Museum} (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 75), Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 2012.


\textsuperscript{17} Tadeusz Skorupski (1985), no. 38, p. 83.

\textsuperscript{18} Géza Bethlenfalvy, \textit{A Hand-List of the Ulan Bator Manuscript of the Kanjur Rgyal-ris Tsha Kha-spa} (Debter, Deb-ther, Debtelin – Materials for Central Asiatic and Altaic Studies 1: Fontes Tibetani 1), Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1982, no. 85, p. 21. According to the editor, the volume which should contain “Sa bcu pa’i ndo” is missing.

\textsuperscript{19} Ulrich Pagel and Séan Gaffney (1996), no. 14, p. 18.

\textsuperscript{20} Jampa Samten (1992), no. 349, p. 128. For the Them spangs ma and other branches of the Kanjur, see P. Skilling, “From bKa’ bstan bcos to bKa’ ’gyur and bsTan ’gyur,” and Helmut Eimer (2012), pp. xvii–xxi.


\textsuperscript{22} We have examined the Stog Palace, Shel dkar, and Phug brag Kanjurs, and Dunhuang manuscripts nos. 82, 83, 85, 86, 132.

\textsuperscript{23} Apart from no. 82, which consists of 66 folios, the Dunhuang manuscripts are fragments, preserving only several folios. Among them, no. 132 merits special notice: it consists of only one folio, but it preserves a translation colophon which states that this sūtra belongs to the \textit{Bodhisatvapitaka}, the \textit{Buddhāvatamsaka-mahāyāna-sūtra} (byang cub sems dpa’i sde snod | sangs rgyas phal po che teg pa chen po’i mdo la rims kyis | thams cad mkhyen pa’i ye shes kyi ’byung gnas shes bya ba sa bcu pa bstan pa’i le’u rdoregs so). It gives the translators as Surendrabodhi and Ye shes sde. Because Tibetan tradition ascribes the whole \textit{Buddhāvatamsaka} section to the same translation team, we do not know to which of the two Daśabhūmikas the Dunhuang colophon fragments belongs.

\textsuperscript{24} Jampa Samten noted that the Phug brag version is different from that preserved in the \textit{Avatamsaka} section: see Jampa Samten (1992), p. 128, n. 2.
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(2) *Buddhāvatāṃsaka* in the early registers

When we turn to the registers of translated texts compiled during the early period of translation, however, the picture is quite different. Out of the three early registers that are mentioned by scholars like Bcom ldan rig pa’i ral gri (1227–1305) or Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364), only two are available at present: the *'Phang thang ma* and the *Lhan dkar ma*. A third, the *Mchims phu ma*, is not known to survive. In the two available registers, the *Buddhāvatāṃsaka* is a primary category or class under which a series of titles are grouped. Each of the individual units given under the primary category *Buddhāvatāṃsaka* is counted separately in terms of *bampos*, implying that they once existed as independent physical manuscripts.

In both registers, the *Buddhāvatāṃsaka* is the second section, following the *Prajñāpāramitā (Shes phyin)*. In the *Lhan dkar ma*, the *Buddhāvatāṃsaka* is the second out of thirty sections; in the *'Phang thang ma*, it is the second out of twenty-seven or thirty-two sections. In later registers like those of Bcom ldan rig pa’i ral gri or Bu ston Rin chen grub, or in most Kanjurs, the *Buddhāvatāṃsaka* also follows the *Prajñāpāramitā* to make the second section. This privileged position reflects the exalted status of the *Buddhāvatāṃsaka*.

The registers do not give Sanskrit titles. In the following, we assign Sanskrit titles according to those given in the Sanskrit texts studied here or in the *Mahāvyutpatti* (for which see below). This research allows us to correct some of the Sanskrit titles which have been wrongly reconstructed in modern research.

(2.1) *The 'Phang thang ma* register

Section 2 of the *'Phang thang ma* register lists only five titles “belonging to the Exalted Great Extensive Buddhāvatāṃsaka Sūtra,” in the following order:

[18] *Āryabuddhāvatāṃsakavaipūlyasūtra*

*Phags pa shin tu rgyas pa’i mdo sangs rgyas phal po che*

[19] *Āryalokottaraparivarta*

*Phags pa ’jig rten las ’das pa’i le’u*

---


26 In the following, we reconstruct the Sanskrit titles individually, without any attempt to standardize, in each case keeping as close as possible to the original Tibetan — with or without *Ārya*, with or without final elements like *–parivarta, –sūtra*, etc. When there is no original Sanskrit evidence for a title, we prefix it with an asterisk.

27 *Phags pa shin du rgyas pa chen po sangs rgyas phal po che’i mdo sder giogs pa*: the numbers follow Kawagoe (2005).
[20] Āryabodhisatvadāsabhūmika

'Phags pa byang chub sems dpa’i sa bcu

[21] Āryarāmolkā

'Phags pa dkon mchog ta la la

[22] Tathāgatopattisambhavanirdeśa

De bzhiṃ gshogs pa skye ba ’byung ba bstan pa.

(2.2) The Lhan dkar ma register

Section 2 of the Lhan dkar ma lists eight titles “belonging to the extensive sūtras of the Mahāyāna,” in the following order:

[17] Āryabuddhāvatamsakanamahāvaipālyasūtra

'Phags pa shiṅ tu rgyas pa chen po’i sde sangs rgyas phal po che

[18] *Tathāgatāvatamsakaparivarta

De bzhiṃ gshogs pa phal po che’i le’u

[19] *Bodhisatvavajradhvajaparināmaparivarta

Byang chub sems dpa’i rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyis yongs su bsngo ba’i le’u

[20] Āryabodhisatvadāsabhūmikānirdeśa

'Phags pa byang chub sems dpa’i sa bcu bstan pa

[21] Āryasamantabhadracarīyānirdeśa

'Phags pa kun du bzang po’i spyod pa bstan pa

[22] Āryatathāgatopattisambhavanirdeśa

'Phags pa de bzhiṃ gshogs pa skye ba ’byung ba bstan pa

[23] Āryalokottaraparivarta

'Phags pa ’jig rten las ’das pa’i le’u

---

28 We prefer to follow the mainstream Buddhist Sanskrit usage of manuscripts and inscriptions by spelling “bodhisatva” with a single rather than a double “t”. See Gouriswar Bhattacharya, “How to Justify the Spelling of the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Term Bodhisatva?,” in Eli Franco and Monika Zin (eds.), From Turfan to Ajanta: Festschrift für Dieter Schlingloff on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday, Rupandehi: Lumbini International Research Institute, 2010, Vol. II, pp. 35–50. Note that this is also the preferred spelling in Khotanese, in Tibetan lexicography, and in old Thai documents. See n. 38 below.

29 * Theya pa chen po’i mdo sde shiṅ tu rgyas pa’i phyogs su gto gs pa: the numbers follow Adelheid Herrmann-Pfandt, Die lHan kar ma: ein früher Katalog der ins Tibetische übersetzten buddhistischen Texte; kritische Neuausgabe mit Einleitung und Materialien (Denkschriften / Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, 367. Bd.), Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2008, pp. 12–17. We have corrected the Sanskrit titles given by Herrmann-Pfandt for nos. 22 and 23 according to the forms given in the Mahāvyutpatti, Śīṣṇamuccaya and Bhāvanākrama.

30 This refers to Kun tu bzang po’i spyod pa bstan pa’i le’u, chapter 42 of the Tibetan Buddhāvatamsaka (= chapter 36 of Śiksānanda’s Chinese version). It should not be confused with the Samantabhadracarīyāpranidhāna, which, when it rounds off the Buddhāvatamsaka collection, is placed at the end of the Gandavyūha. The Samantabhadracarīyāpranidhāna, which to the present day is recited daily in some monastic traditions in Tibet and China, goes under several titles, such as Bhadracari(-i), Bhadracaryāpranidhāna, Samantabhadracaryāpranidhāna.
[24] Āryagāndavyūhasūtra

"Phags pa sdong po bkod pa’i mdo.

The Lhan dkar ma list is noticeably different from that of the 'Phang thang ma in that it does not include the Āryaratnolka (no. 21 in the latter), which it places in Section 5, “Sūtras of the Great Vehicle” (Theg pa chen po’i mdo sde). The colophons of the Stog Palace, Ulan Bator and Shel dkar Kanjurs describe the Ratnolka as “from the Great Extensive Sūtra, Exalted Buddhāvatamsaka,” and thus agree with the 'Phang thang ma.\(^{31}\) The Stog Palace and Ulan Bator Kanjurs represent the Them spangs ma branch of the Kanjur; this information is also preserved in local Kanjurs, like the Phug brag\(^ {32} \) and Bathang\(^ {33} \) Kanjurs, but not in representatives of the Tshal pa branch like the Derge and Peking Kanjurs.\(^ {34} \) The Ratnolka is indeed incorporated into the Tibetan translation of the Buddhāvatamsaka (as we will see below), although it is split into two non-consecutive chapters in a different sequence.\(^ {35} \)

---

\(^{31}\) Shin tu rgyas pa chen po’i mdo ‘phags pa sangs rgyas phal po che las | dkon mchog ta la la zhes bva’i gzungs kyi chos kyi rnam grangs rdzogs so. Cf. Skorupski (1985), no. 127, p. 108. We are grateful to Paul Harrison for supplying copies of the relevant folios of the Ulan Bator Kanjur.

\(^{32}\) Jampa Samten (1992), no. 348, p. 128.


\(^{34}\) In the Them spangs ma branch and local Kanjurs listed above, the Ratnolka occurs in the Sūtra (Mdo, Mdo sde, Mdo mangs, etc.) section. In the Derge Kanjur, it occurs in both the Sūtra and Dhāraṇī sections (nos. 145 and 847); in the Peking Kanjur, it occurs in the Tantra (Rgyud) section (no. 473). In the Mustang Kanjur catalogue, it occurs as many as four times: in the Tantra (no. 116), Gzungs 'dus (no. 122), Gzungs 'bum (no. 303), and Sūtra (no. 562) sections (see Helmut Eimer, The Early Mustang Kanjur Catalogue, A Structured Edition of the Mdo snyags bka’ 'gyur dkar chag and of Nor chen kun dga’ bzang po’s bka’ 'gyur ro cog gi dkar chag bstan pa gsal ba’i sgron me [Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 45], Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 1999). In his catalogue, Bcom ldan rig pa’i ral gri stated that the Ratnolka had apparently been removed from the Avatamsaka and placed in the Dhāraṇī section: but since it is not dhāraṇī, it should be counted as belonging to the Buddhāvatamsaka (dkon mchog ta la la bom po lnga ste gung [sic! we read gud] na yod do | ‘di’i shin tu rgyas pa chen po’i mdo sangs rgyas phal po che las zhes bva phyi nas gzungs ‘dus su bcug nas snang ste | ‘di gzungs ma yin pas phal chen gyi lta la gzhus so), cf. Kurtis R. Schaeffer and Leonard W. J. van der Kuip (eds.), An Early Tibetan Survey of Buddhist Literature: The Bstan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nying ‘od of Bcom ldan ral gri (Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 64), Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2009, pp.118–119. In his history of Buddhism, Bu ston Rin chen grub notes that some people list the Ratnolka in the Tantra section, but that this is wrong, because the catalogues which distinguish sūtra and tantra without mixing them up, take it as a sūtra (‘dir kha cig gi ... dkon mchog ta la la ... la sogs pa bris pa ni nor ba yin te mdo dang gyud ma ’dres par phyé ba’i dkar chag dag tu mdor bshad pa’i phyir ro), cf. Sōshō Nishihara, “‘Putun Bukkyōshi’ mökurokubusakuin III,” Tōkyō Daigaku Bungakubu Bunka Kōryū Kenkyū Shisetsu Kenkyū Kiyō 6, 1983, pp. 64–65.

\(^{35}\) Our tentative conclusion is that the Ratnolka can be divided into five parts (at least in the Derge version). The second part corresponds to chapter 20 of the Tibetan Buddhāvatamsaka, the fourth part to chapter 17. The fifth part is a single stock concluding line, while two parts have no counterpart. Further comparison is needed. The Ratnolka was translated into Chinese by Fa Tian 天 during the Northern Sung dynasty, and during the Ming dynasty, the renowned Chinese master Zhi xu 僧旭 (1599–1655) noticed the correspondences between the Ratnolka and the Buddhāvatamsaka in his Yue zang zhi jin 月藏知津 [Annotated Catalogue of Chinese Tripitaka]. Cf. Taishō shinshū daizōkyō 大正新脩大藏經, appended
(2.3) The Mahāvyutpatti (Bye brag tu rtogs par byed pa chen po)

The Mahāvyutpatti, a thematically ordered register of officially sanctioned Tibetan equivalents of Sanskrit terms, was composed by royal command at an uncertain date, probably commencing in 814 CE. A section entitled “Names of the Saddharma” (§ 1325, Dam pa’i chos kyi ming) lists the titles of 104 texts, of which 85 are sūtra, etc. titles. The opening texts are:37

[S 1326] Śatasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā
    Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stong phrag brgya pa
[S 1327] Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā
    Nyi khri lnga stong pa
[S 1328] Aṣṭasāhasrikā
    Brgyad stong pa
[S 1329] Buddhāvatamsakam
    Sangs rgyas phal po che
[S 1330] Bodhisatvāpiṭakam38
    Byang chub sems dpa’i sde snod.

The hierarchy of the opening titles of the Mahāvyutpatti seems to be determined by length combined with category, although the significance of Bodhisatvāpiṭaka here is not clear. Does the Mahāvyutpatti intend to refer to the collection of Bodhisatva texts, to a separate Piṭaka, frequently mentioned in literature but no longer extant (and of which even the contents or components are not known)? Or is it referring to the individual sūtra, a long text included in Tibetan translation in the Mahārātnakūta collection, available in Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia, and recently in a complete manuscript from the Potala in Lhasa?39

After this, the Mahāvyutpatti lists titles of individual sūtras. There does not seem to be any particular order, or, at least, the principles of the sequence are not clear to us —

---

36 S 1411 to S 1414 list the components of the Tripiṭaka, followed by the titles of six books of the Abhidharma (S 1415–1420), the four Āgamas (S 1421–1424), and the four books or sections of the Vinaya (S 1425–1428). The section closes somewhat enigmatically with the Rājāvadhaka (Rgyal po la gdams pa).
37 梶原三郎編著《梵藏漢和四譯對校翻譯名義大集》京都帝國大學文科大學叢書3, 京都：真言宗京都大学，1916年，1925年(初版)，東京：鈴木學術財團，1973年(第五次印刷) [Ryūzaburō Sakaki, (ed.), Mahāvyutpatti, parts 1 and 2, Kyoto: Kyoto Imperial University, 1916 and 1925]. We give the Sanskrit titles (with Sakaki numbers) as in the Mahāvyutpatti and do not attempt to standardize them against other lists or sources.
38 In the Mahāvyutpatti, the term bodhisattva occurs ten times: it is consistently transcribed in Tibetan (at least in the Derge version) with single “t”: see D 4346, sna tshogs, co, 9b3; 15b1; 16b5 (twice); 20b1, 3, 5; 28b3; 45a5; 89a1.
the sequence does not follow size, genre (for example, sūtra, nirdeśa, paripṛcchā, vyūha), or category (for example, Ratnakūta, Prajñāpāramitā, Dhāraṇī). The Mahāvyutpatti lists the following members of the Buddhavatāṃsaka family, but does not group them together or give any indication of their relation to the Buddhavatāṃsaka:

[S 1334] Lokottaraparivartah
‘Jig rten las ’das pa’i le’u
[S 1341] Gaṇḍavyūhaḥ
Sdang po bkod pa
[S 1350] Daśabhūmikam
Sa bcu pa
[S 1375] Ratnolkā
Dkon mehog ta la la
[S 1376] Gocharaparīśuddham
Spyod yul yongs su dag pa
[S 1378] Tathāgatotpattisambhavanirdesāḥ
De bzhiṅ gshegs pa skye ba ’byung ba bstan pa.

In addition to the texts mentioned above, we can add two further texts to the Buddhavatāṃsaka family: the Tathāgata-guṇaṇājñācintyaviśayāvatāranirdeśa (D 185) and the Śraddhābalādāhāvatāramudrā (D 201). As we will see below, there is evidence to indicate that these two sūtras are associated with the Buddhavatāṃsaka.⁴⁰

The Stog Palace Kanjur preserves a text entitled Mdo sde snyan gyi gong rgyan zhes bya ba theg pa chen po ’i mdo. A preliminary study reveals that the text corresponds to chapters 9 and 10 of Tibetan Buddhavatāṃsaka.⁴¹ The text is also included in the Ulan Bator Kanjur, but not in the Shel dkar or in other Kanjurs like Derge and Peking, or in local Kanjurs like Phug brag. Nor is it available in the surviving volumes of incomplete local Kanjurs like those from Gondhila or Bathang, but in the absence of registers of their complete contents it is impossible to know whether or not they included this text. Both the Stog Palace and the Ulan Bator Kanjurs give the translator’s name as Ce Btsan skyes. A text translated by a Che Btsan skyes together with Dharmabodhi and Dānarakṣita is included in the Rnyiṅg rgyud section of the Derge Kanjur (D 829); it bears the long title De bzhiṅ gshegs pa thams cad kyi thugs gsang ba ’i ye shes don gyi snying po rdo rje bkod

---


⁴¹ The text mentions two chapter titles, that of chapter 9 (150b4): ‘jig rten gyi kham kyi rigs rnam par gzhag pa’i sgra ma las pa zhes bya ba bsgyur ba dgu po rdzogs so; and that given in the concluding colophon (166b4–5; see Skorupski [1985], no. 248, p. 140): sangs rgyas kyi snyan gyi gong rgyan las shin tu rgya che ba ’i theg pa chen po bshad pa rnam par snang mdzad kyi le ’u zhes bya ba theg pa chen po ’i rgyud rdzogs so.

⁴² Sangs rgyas kyi snyan gyi gong rgyan zhes bya ba theg pa chen po ’i mdo: Bethlenfalvy (1982), no. 296, p. 31.
pa'i rgyud rnal 'byor grub pa'i lung kun 'dus rig pa'i mdo theg pa chen po mngon par rtogs pa chos kyi rnam grangs rnam par bkod pa zhes bya ba'i rgyud. The Derge Kanjur colophon states that it was translated from the Bru zha language in the Bru zha area (Gilgit?); the text opens with customary (but not necessarily authentic) Sanskrit and Bru zha titles. The same text is also included in the Rnying ma rgyud 'bum, the colophon of which gives the same information as does the Derge Kanjur. According to the Blue Annals, Che Btsan skyes, who came from Bru zha, translated the Mdo dgongs pa 'dus pa, and was teacher of Gnubs chen Sangs rgyas ye shes.

II The Buddhāvatamsaka in South Asia

Now that we have reviewed the structure and history of the Buddhāvatamsaka in the Land of Snows, let us return to South Asia. Scholars have long been familiar with the two sections of the Buddhāvatamsaka that have been preserved in complete Sanskrit manuscripts in Nepal:

[1] Daśabhūmika

These are transmitted independently as palm-leaf and paper manuscripts. They have ritual functions, and have often been described in the literature since the time of Brian Hodgson (1800–1894) as belonging to the “Nine Dharmas,” a category that denotes ceremonial rather than “canonical” status.

Recently, the Anantabuddhakṣetragūṇodbhāvanānāmamahāyānasūtra has been published in a collection of twenty Sanskrit sūtras. The Sanskrit colophon describes the sūtra as “from the Buddhāvatamsaka, the Extensive Basket.” A few fragments of the

---

43 290a6: Rgya gar gyi mkhan po dharma bodhi dang | ring lugs chen po dānakṣita dang | zhu chen gyi lo tṣā ba che btsan skyes khyi bru sha'i yi ge las bru sha'i yul gyi khor mdu bskyur cing gタン la phab pa.

44 The Bru zha title (86b1–2) is Hon pan ril til pi bu pi til ti ta shing 'un 'ub hang pang ril 'ub pi su bang ri the hal pa'i ma kyang ku'i dang rong ti.


48 Vinita Tseng (ed. and tr.), A Unique Collection of Twenty Sūtras in a Sanskrit Manuscript from the Potala (Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region 7, 2), Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press / Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House, 2010, pp. 557–593. This is chapter 37 of the Tibetan Buddhāvatamsakā; it also exists in two independent Tibetan translations (D 104 and D 268).

49 Buddhāvatamsakādr vaipulyapitakār: ibid. p. 582. Note that the two independent Tibetan translations (D 104 and 268) do not give this detail.
Buddhāvatamsaka from Central Asia have been identified in the Hoernle collection in the British Library, London. These are written on paper in Southern Turkestan Brāhmī, and date to the sixth century or later. These finds have added to the corpus of Buddhāvatamsaka texts in Sanskrit. In this paper, we study the Buddhāvatamsaka in India from the perspective of citations in Indian śāstra literature both in Sanskrit and in Tibetan translation.

(1) Buddhāvatamsaka in the Śūtrasamuccaya

The date, authorship, and provenance of the Śūtrasamuccaya are all problematic. At present, only two small Sanskrit fragments of the Śūtrasamuccaya from Central Asia have been identified; for our purposes, we study this anthology as attested by the Tibetan translation by Jinamitra, Śīlendrabodhi, and Ye shes sde. The Śūtrasamuccaya

---

50 Seishi Karashima and Klaus Wille (editors-in-chief), Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia: The British Library Sanskrit Fragments, Volume II, 2, Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University, 2009, especially p. 28. Most of the fragments belong to the Gandavyūha; Shin’ichirō Hori, however, has identified a few fragments form the early chapters of the Buddhāvatamsaka, and at least one fragment from the Lokottaraparivarta: see Shin’ichirō Hori, “Sanskrit Fragments of the Buddhāvatamsaka from Central Asia,” in Robert Gimello, Frédéric Girard, Imre Hamar, (eds.) Avatamsaka Buddhism in East Asia: Huayan, Kegon, Flower Ornament Buddhism. Origins and Adaptation of a Visual Culture (Asiatische Forschungen 155), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012, pp. 15–35. We are grateful to Prof. Hori for sending an off-print of his article.

51 The dating is contingent on whether or not the anthology was compiled by Nāgārjuna, on whether or not this Nāgārjuna was the same as the famed author of the Mūlamadhyamakakārikā, and if that is the case, on Nāgārjuna’s date. See most recently, with references to earlier literature, Bhikkhu Pāśādiка, “Der Mahāyāna-Buddhismus gemäß Nāgārjunas Śūtrasamuccaya,” in Hörin: Vergleichende Studien zur Japanischen Kultur, vol. 10 (2004), pp. 73–96, and idem, “Śūtrasamuccaya,” Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, Vol. VII, Fascicle 1, Sri Lanka: The Department of Buddhist Affairs, Ministry of Religious Affairs, 2007, pp. 203–205. If the Śūtrasamuccaya is by another, later Nāgārjuna, then we have even less to go on, since several later Nāgārjunas have been proposed, not because there is any compelling historical or biographical evidence for them, but as expediences to explain traditional attributions of tantric, medical, or other works to “Nāgārjuna” – works which, in the eyes of modern scholarship, cannot possibly be by the Nāgārjuna. Most strictly, the lower date of the Śūtrasamuccaya is the date of the earliest evidence, the Sanskrit fragments from Khādalik (IOL San 964 and IOL San 966: see Seishi Karashima, “A Sanskrit Fragment of the Śūtrasamuccaya from Central Asia,” in Martin Straube, Roland Steiner, Jayandra Soni, Michael Hahn, and Mitsuyo Demoto (eds.), Pāśādikadānam. Festschrift für Bhikkhu Pāśādika [Indica et Tibetica no. 52], Marburg: 2009, pp. 264–273), which, written in South Turkestan Brāhmī (main type), should date from the fifth to sixth centuries. As long as authorship remains unknown or uncertain, all that can be said is that the Śūtrasamuccaya is older than the Khādalik fragment. In this study, however, we must bear in mind the possibility that the Śūtrasamuccaya is by the Nāgārjuna (following Karashima 2009, c. 150–250 CE), in which case the earliest evidence for the circulation in India of texts belonging to the Buddhāvatamsaka family would be the mid-second to mid-third centuries CE. Nakamura states that the date c. 150–250 CE “is accepted by most Japanese scholars” (Nakamura [1980], p. 235, n. 4). For the range of dates assigned to Nāgārjuna up to the 1970s, see David Seyfort Ruegg (1981), p. 4, n. 611.

52 See n. 51, reference to Seishi Karashima (2009).
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cites the members of the *Buddhāvatamsaka* family under seven individual titles, without relating them to the broader *Buddhāvatamsaka* category, with the exception of no. 6:

[1] *Daśabhūmikasūtra*  
*Sā bcu’i mdo sde*

[2] *Tathāgatotpattisambhasūtra*  
*De bzhin gshegs pa skye ba srid pa’i mdo*

[3] *Lokottararivartha*  
*’Jig rten las ’das pa’i le’u*

[4] *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra*  
*Sdong po bkod pa’i mdo*

[5] *Tathāgatagūraṇācintayavishayavatāranirdeśa*  
*De bzhin gshegs pa’i yon tan dang ye shes bsam gyis mi khyab pa’i yul la ’jug pa bstan pa’i mdo*

[6] *Buddhāvatamsakasūtra*  
*Sangs rgyas phal po che’i mdo*

[7] *Śraddhābalādānāvatāramudrā*  
*Dad pa’i stobs bskyed pa la ’jug pa’i phyag rgya’i mdo.*

The *Sūtrasamuccaya* cites nos. 1, 2, and 3 once each. It quotes the *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra* six times, both under the title *Gaṇḍavyūha* and under the name of individual *vimokṣas.*

It cites the fifth text two times; one of these is a selective quotation, but is quite long.

The last two titles need special attention. The three *Sūtrasamuccaya* citations of “the (or a?) *Buddhāvatamsaka*” all correspond to the *Śraddhābalādānāvatāramudrā*, which the same *Sūtrasamuccaya* also quotes twice under the title *Dad pa’i stobs bskyed pa la ’jug pa’i phyag rgya’i mdo.* The same author or text cites one and the same sūtra under two different titles – one the specific title of the sūtra, the other that of the *Buddhāvatamsaka* collection. How can we explain this discrepancy? But the question is even more complicated than this: the *Sūtrasamuccaya* also cites a similar title, *Dad pa’i stobs bskyed pa’i mdo,* as many as three times. At first glance, the title should indicate the *Śraddhābalādānā-(avatāramudrā)-sūtra,* but these citations do not occur anywhere in the extant Tibetan or Chinese versions of the sūtra. The situation is as follows:

*Buddhāvatamsaka* (Sangs rgyas phal po che’i mdo, 3 citations) = *Dad pa’i stobs bskyed pa la ’jug pa’i phyag rgya’i mdo*

*Dad pa’i stobs bskyed pa la ’jug pa’i phyag rgya’i mdo* (2 citations): verified in both Tibetan and Chinese translations under this title.

*Dad pa’i stobs bskyed pa’i mdo* (3 citations): not found in the sūtra (Tibetan or Chinese).

---

54 This system of classification refers to chapters by the name of the spiritual friend, *kalyāṇamitra,* followed by *vimokṣa,* liberation, with the sense of the “liberation taught by so and so,” for example, *yathā-ārya-maitreyavimokṣe.*
The Sūtrasamuccaya definitely knows a version of the Śraddhābalādhānāvataramudrā, to which it refers both under the name Buddhāvatamsaka and under its own title, since the Sūtrasamuccaya cites a further three passages which cannot be traced in the extant versions, if we take the Dad pa’i stobs bskyed pa’i mdo as the Śraddhābalādhānāvatāramudrā proper (as the later Chinese version of Sūtrasamuccaya has indeed done), this version may have been different than the one extant today in Tibetan and Chinese translation. On the other hand, we cannot exclude the possibility that here Dad pa’i stobs bskyed pa’i mdo indicates a different sūtra which only shares a similar title with the text in question.

(2) Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhya

The Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhya, of which the full title is Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantrasāstravyākhya, is preserved in Sanskrit and in Tibetan and Chinese translations. The Tibetan version was translated by Sajjana and Blo Idan shes rab in the eleventh century; the Chinese translation is ascribed to Ratnamati (Le na mo ti, 雷那摩提), a monk from “Central India” (zhong tianzhu, 中天竺), in the early sixth century. Tibetan tradition ascribes the text to Asaṅga (c. 310–390), but the Chinese translation gives the author’s name as *Sāramati (Jian Yi, 堅意, 350–450). The Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhya quotes the Tathāgatotpattisambhava twice. One of the quotations is quite long, but neither of the citations is given a title. At the beginning, the Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhya quotes the Tathāgataugnajñānācintayāvyavatāranirdeśa as an authority; the passage corresponds to part of a much longer citation in the

---


57 Ibid. p. 261.


59 The Chinese version of the Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhya gives a reference for the second citation, saying that it is from Huayan xingqi 華嚴性起, which indicates the (Tathāgata-)uttpattisambhava chapter of Buddhāvatamsaka; the corresponding passage is indeed to be found in this chapter (both Chinese and Tibetan). The Chinese Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhya does not assign a title to the other citation, but the passage quoted is almost same as the Tathāgatotpattisambhava chapter of the Chinese Buddhāvatamsaka (Buddhabhadra’s version), suggesting that the translator(s) must have been aware of the relationship between the citation and the Buddhāvatamsaka. In his English translation of the Tibetan Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhya, Obermiller attributes the second quotation to the Jñānālokālamkārasūtra, where there is a very close parallel. It is not uncommon for different sūtras to share the same passages, so that it is impossible to say which was the original source. For Obermiller’s translation, see E. Obermiller, “The Sublime Science of the Great Vehicle to Salvation, Being a Manual of Buddhist Monism: The Work of Arya Maitreya with a Commentary by Aryasanga, translated from the Tibetan with introduction and notes,” Acta Orientalia, vol. 9, 1931, pp. 81–306.

60 D 4025, 75a7–b1: De bzhin gshegs pa’i yon tan dang ye shes bsam gyis mi khyab pa’i yul la ’jug pa bstan pa; cf. Johnston (1950); p. 3,7–9.
Śūtrasamuccaya.  

(3) Vasubandhu's Vyākhya-yukti
Vasubandhu's (320–400) Vyākhya-yukti is only preserved in Tibetan translation, done by Viśuddhasimha, Śākyasimha and Devendrarakṣita during early spread of Buddhism in Tibet. Vasubandhu appeals to two members of the Buddhāvatamsaka family, the Lokottarararivarta and the Tahāgatopattisambhava, as authorities. Although he only invokes their titles, this nonetheless indicates the importance of these two sūtras, and suggests that in Vasubandhu's time and intellectual milieu, Indian scholars were acquainted with them.

(4) Śāntideva's Śikṣāsamuccaya
The Śikṣāsamuccaya of Śāntideva (c. 650–750) is the greatest compendium of Mahāyāna sūtras available in Sanskrit. The original Tibetan translation done by Jinamitra, Dānaśila, and Ye shes sde was later revised by the “Kashmiri paṇḍita” Tilacakalasa and the Tibetan Bhikṣu Blo Idan shes rab. Several texts of the Buddhāvatamsaka family were important sources for Śāntideva, in that he cites them more than once and cites them at length. He does not, however, relate them to a broader Buddhāvatamsaka category: rather, he cites them under their individual titles:

1. Gocaraparīṣuddhismūtra
2. Ratnolākādhāraṇī
3. Vaijradhvajastūtra

---

64 ‘Jig rten las ’das pa’i le’u (D 4061, 113a4; Lee, 246.6) and de bzhin gshegs pa skye ba bstan pa'i mdo (D 4061, 114a4; Lee, 248.22); see also the Vyākhya-yukti: ‘jig rten las ’das pa’i le’u (D 4069, 277b2) and de bzhin gshegs pa skye ba bstan pa'i mdo (D 4069, 278a3; 286a2–3).
[4] Daśabhūmikasūtra
[5] Lokottararāparivarta

The Śiksāsāmuccaya mentions only the title of the Gocaraparāsiuddhīsūtra, which is also cited in the Mahāsūtrasamuccaya and in the second or middle Bhāvanākrama. Both citations are very brief, and cannot be traced anywhere in the corresponding chapter of the Buddhāvatamsaka. It is not impossible that they refer to another sūtra with the same title.

In his Mahāyānasāṅgrahabhāṣya, Vasubandhu quotes a sūtra entitledSpyod lam yongs su dag pa'i mdo as an authority; this should be the same Gocaraparāsiuddhīsūtra. In his commentary on the Mahāyānasāṅgraha, the Mahāyānasāṅgrahopanibandhana, the Indian master Asvabhāva (approximately fifth century?) quotes a sūtra under the title Spyod yul yongs su dag pa'i mdo in the corresponding places, including one sentence which may be traced to chapter 16 of the Tibetan Buddhāvatamsaka. In his Sūtrālaṃkārayākyāya, Vasubandhu also invokes the authority of a sūtra entitled Spyod yul yongs su dag pa'i mdo.

The title Tathāgatagarbocaraparāsiuddhi does occur in both the Lhan dkar ma and the 'Phang thang ma registers, but in the Mahāyāna sūtra section rather than the Buddhāvatamsaka section. The Sanskrit and Tibetan titles are also listed in the Mahāvyutpatti. The Tanjur preserves a short summary of this text entitled “Compendium of the meaning of the Bodhisatvagarbocaraparāsiuddhīsūtra” (Bodhisatvagarbocaraparāsiuddhīsūtrārthhasāngraha, D 3965); the author is given as Rāhulabhadra, and the translation ascribed to Śākyasrībhadra and Gnubs Byams pa'i dpal. The Bodhisatvagarbocaraparāsiuddhīsūtrārthhasāngraha is indeed a summary of the contents of a text similar to chapter 16 of the Tibetan Buddhāvatamsaka.

67 D 3961, 78b3–5.
68 D 3916, 54a5–6.
69 D 4050, 157a2.
70 D 4051, 240b3.
72 No.165: 'Phags pa de bzhin gshegs pa'i spyod yul yongs su dag pa.
73 No.145 and no. 713: De bzhin gshegs pa'i spyod yul yongs su dag pa. In the 'Phang thang ma, this title occurs twice, one (no. 145) under the section of Mahāsūtra (Mdo chen po'i tshar), the other (no. 713) in a section reserved for texts for which the information could not be confirmed by more than one register (for this category, see Halkias, op. cit., p. 73).
74 S 1376: Gocaraparāsiuddham, Spyod yul yongs su dag pa.
75 The identity of this Rāhulabhadra is not at all clear, for example, whether he can be the same as the Rāhulabhadra mentioned in connection with Nāgārjuna and the Madhyamaka tradition, whose identity and date are, at any rate, obscure. See David Seyfort Ruegg (1981), pp. 54–56.
At present we cannot assume that all of the quotations mentioned above necessarily indicate one and same text, or that they necessarily refer to counterparts of chapter 16 of the Tibetan Buddhāvataṃsaka. We can only conclude that a text bearing the title Gocaraparīṣuddhisūtra was important and authoritative among Indian Buddhist scholars from the fourth to ninth centuries CE, and that in some cases this text has a counterpart in the Buddhāvataṃsaka.

The Śīkṣāsamuccaya cites the Ratnolkādhāraṇī four times; the parallels can be traced both in the independent Tibetan translation of the sūtra itself and in the Tibetan Buddhāvataṃsaka (three times in chapter 17, all in verse, and once in chapter 20). One of these citations is perhaps the longest quotation in the whole Śīkṣāsamuccaya, and the other three reproduce almost the entire chapter 17 of the Buddhāvataṃsaka – we can conclude that the Ratnolkādhāraṇī was one of Śāntideva’s most favoured texts. In the Ratnolkādhāraṇī, the corresponding part of chapter 20 of the Buddhāvataṃsaka precedes chapter 17. The relationships between the Ratnolkādhāraṇī and the Buddhāvataṃsaka need further investigation.76

Śāntideva mentions the Vajradhvajasūtra five times. He gives four quotations, all of them quite long; the fifth and last only invokes the title. In his Bodhisatvacaryāvatāra (chapter 7, verse 46), Śāntideva recommends following “the method of Vajradhva” (vajradhvajasya vidhīna), one of few texts explicitly recommended in the whole Bodhisatvacaryāvatāra.77 The fact that he refers to the Vajradhvajasūtra in both of his main works demonstrates the importance of the Vajradhvajasūtra to Śāntideva.

The title Vajradhvajaparinīma occurs in both the Lhan dkar ma78 and the ‘Phang thang ma79 registers under Smon lam sna tshogs (Assorted pranidhānas, a section made up of usually short aspirations). The two registers state that it has eighteen verses. Bcom ldan rig pa’i ral gri’s catalogue also lists a text with the same title,80 but Bu ston Rin chen grubs catalogue does not. The Derge and Peking Kanjurs do not include a work of this title, but it is included in the Stog Palace,81 Ulan Bator,82 Shel dkar,83 Phug brag,84

76 For the complexity of the piecemeal evolution of the Buddhāvataṃsaka family in Chinese translation see for example Nattier, “The Proto-History.”

77 Here Prajñākaramati refers to the title Vajradhvajasūtra in his commentary on the verse. See P.L. Vaidya (ed.), Bodhicaryāvatāra of Śāntideva with the Commentary Pañjikā of Prajñākaramati (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts No. 12), Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1960, p. 128.1 (note the misprint in the verse itself, p. 127 ult. – vajradhvajastha instead of vajradhvajasya).

78 [468] ‘Phags pa rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyi bsngo ba.

79 [447] Rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyi bsngo ba.


81 Skorupski (1985), no. 327, p. 166.

82 Bethlenfalvy (1982), no. 373, p. 34.


Gondhla, and Bathang Kanjurs. The Mustang Kanjur catalogue lists two texts with a similar title. Two copies of this text, one complete and another incomplete, are preserved among the Dunhuang manuscripts. Only the incomplete Dunhuang manuscript opens with own title in “the language of India” (rgya gar skad du), and all of them lack translators’ colophons. Judging from the contents, the Kanjur version and the Dunhuang manuscripts represent same text, but are different recensions. The fact that the two versions are different, but contain the same contents, leads us to conclude that this is a genuine translation of an Indic text and not an early Tibetan composition. This text should be associated with the Buddhāvatamsaka. In his Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts, Bendall notes that the last folio of one Prajñāpāramitā text contains a short treatise ending Vajradhajaparināma (= Vajradhvaja?) nāma samāptā. It is possible that this is a Sanskrit – or even Prakrit? – Vajradhvajaparināma.

Śāntideva cites the Lokottaraparivarta once, the Śraddhābalādhānāvatāramudrā four times, the Daśabhūmikasūtra nine times, and the Gaṇḍavyūha sixteen times, both as Gaṇḍavyūha and by individual vimokṣas.

(5) Kamalaśīla’s Bhāvanākrama (First, Middle, and Last)
The three Bhāvanākramas of Kamalaśīla (c. 740–795) were translated by Prajñāvarman and Ye shes sde. The Bhāvanākrama is not an anthology, but it regularly makes short citations to support or illustrate points. Kamalaśīla quotes at least the following Buddhāvatamsaka texts:

1. Gocarapariśuddhisūtra
2. Daśabhūmika

---
85 Tauser (2008), no. 35.41, p. 108.
86 Eimer (2012), no. 161, p. 112.
89 This might become clear when the Cambridge Sanskrit folio becomes available (see n. 91 below). Here, as in the case of the independent translation of the Daśabhūmika, we meet a text which is “lost” in the Tshal pa branch, but is preserved in a manuscript from Dunhuang and in the Them spangs ma branch. The question of the inclusion and exclusion of texts in different Kanjurs needs further research.
[3] Tathāgatotpattisambhavasūtra
[4] Lokottaraparivarta
[6] Bhadracaryāprāṇidhāna

Generally speaking, Kamalaśīla does not cite Buddhāvatamsaka texts very frequently, and when he does, the quotations are so brief or abbreviated that sometimes they are difficult to locate. Some quotations overlap with (or may be drawn from) the Śikṣāsamuccaya.

(6) Kamalaśīla's Madhyamakāloka

The Madhyamakāloka was translated by Śilendra bodhi and Dpal brtsegs rakṣita in the early period of translation. In this text, Kamalaśīla cites the Lokottaraparivarta once, the Daśabhūmika twice, and the Gaṇḍavyūha once. The same citations also occur in his first Bhāvanākrama and in the Śūtrasamuccaya, with the exception of those from the Daśabhūmika.

(7) Bhavya's Madhyamakāḥdayatarkajvalā

In his Madhyamakāḥdayatarkajvalā, translated by Jo bo rje (Atiśa) and Tshul khrims rgyal ba in the eleventh century, Bhavya (c. 490—570) cites the Lokottaraparivarta one time and the Daśabhūmika four times. All of the citations are short or abbreviated.

Further evidence for the circulation of the Buddhāvatamsaka

Looking more broadly, we find tangible evidence of the circulation of the texts belonging to the Buddhāvatamsaka family in central Asia, in the form of Sanskrit manuscript fragments from Khotan (fifth, more probably the sixth century), on the southern Silk route. In about the eighth century, the Gaṇḍavyūha spread to central Java, where, carved in full detail on the great stone monument of Borobudur, it is a masterpiece of

---

95 D 3887: ‘Phags pa sa bcu pa (145b1; 158b5–7).
97 The author's name is uncertain, we follow the form given in the Tanjur for this work. Recently some scholars have preferred the form Bhāviveka.
99 D 3856: ‘Jig rten las ‘das pa’i le’u (186b3–187a2); so far we could not locate this short passage in the Tibetan Buddhāvatamsaka.
100 D 3856: Sa bcu pa’i mdo (53a4–5); de bzhin gshegs pa’i sa bcu pa’i mdo (144b5); sa bcu pa la sogs pa’i mdo sde (144b6); sa bcu pa’i mdo sde (207b6–208a1).
101 Karashima and Wille (2009), ibid. p. 28; Hori (2012).
world art. At Nalanda, a tenth-century verse inscription from the Bhadracārī was engraved on a stone caitya.\textsuperscript{102}

It can be conclusively said that the texts of the Buddhāvatāmsaka family circulated in Sanskrit in Central Asia in the sixth centuries. In India, they circulated from the fourth to ninth centuries; the śāstras studied here indicate that they were highly esteemed as authoritative sources. Two texts, the Daśabhūmika and the Gaṇḍavyūha, maintained independent existences in India and Nepal, where they led ritual lives of their own which led to their survival in numerous manuscripts.\textsuperscript{103} The other members, significantly present in the intellectual world of neighbouring regions of India and Tibet, at least up to the eighth or ninth centuries, apparently lost their status, ceased to be copied, and did not survive. The reasons for this remain to be explained.

This result is also important for the study of the evolution of language. The verses of the Buddhāvatāmsaka family of texts are all in Buddhist Sanskrit: Daśabhūmika, Gaṇḍavyūha, Bhadracarī, and also Ramōkādhāraṇī. Further studies are here required, along with individual glossaries of the sūtras that are fully preserved and of those that survive in citation. This would facilitate comparative studies. At present we can conclude that the prose sections are in “Buddhist hybrid prose” – that is, a particular Sanskritized literary language that draws heavily on a Prakritic substratum – and the verse sections are in the “gāthā language” or “Buddhist Sanskrit verse.”

Beyond the sections discussed above, there is so far no Sanskrit manuscript evidence for the rest of the Buddhāvatāmsaka, either as a whole or its remaining parts. This has led to the questioning of the Indian credentials of the Buddhāvatāmsaka. Some researchers have suggested that some parts may have been composed in Central Asia. The fact that the manuscripts circulated in India does not alone disprove the Khotanese or Central Asian origin theories, but the sustained circulation and high visibility of members of the Buddhāvatāmsaka family in India, coupled with the regular use of hybrid Sanskrit verse – the ‘gāthā language’ – as a natural complement to the prose makes this, it seems to us, highly unlikely.\textsuperscript{104}

The situation in India seems to have stayed much the same at the time that the Buddhāvatāmsaka texts were introduced to the Land of Snows. The early Tibetan


\textsuperscript{104} To propose a Central Asian composition of the component texts is tantamount to proposing Central Asian origins for hybrid Sanskrit, with the implication that it developed within an Iranian rather than a middle-Indic substratum.
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registers record the same titles, but treat them as, if not quite independent, then as autonomous texts, with their own titles and measurements of length. It is true that they are grouped under the broader category *Buddhāvatamsaka*, but each text has its own identity. This is different from the extant Kanjurs, in which the same texts become chapters, merged in the great, continuous *Buddhāvatamsaka*. The question that remains is when, and why, did the merger occur?
Appendix

Main Citations of the Buddhāvatamsaka in Indian Buddhist Literature as Attested in Sanskrit Versions and Tibetan Translations

I. Members of the Buddhāvatamsaka family cited or referred to in Indian works

Sūtrasamuccaya

1. Daśabhūmikaśūtra / Sa bcu’i mdo sde


2. Tathāgatotpatisambhavasūtra / De bzhiṅ gshegs pa skiye ba srid pa’i mdo

Pāśādika (1989): pp. 113.6–120.5 = LSPEB 13, pp. 37.26–41.29

3. Lokottararāparivarta / ’Jig rten las ’das pa’i le’u


4. Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra / Sdorn po bkod pa’i mdo

Pāśādika (1989): pp. 3.22–4.4 = LSPEB 2, pp. 22.42–23.2;
pp. 15.17–19.13 = LSPEB 3, pp. 34.9–36.30;
pp. 190.12–194.19 = LSPEB 19, pp. 59.27–61.43;
pp. 194.20–198.20 = LSPEB 20, p. 32.11–15;
pp. 100.22–103.12 (dpal ’byung ba dang | dpal gyi blo gros kyi rnam par thar pa) = LSPEB 12, pp. 32.8–33.24;
pp. 132.5–133.16 (sdong po bkod pa’i rnam par thar pa) = LSPEB 14, pp. 22.27–23.36

5. Tathāgataagujñānācintnayāsāvatārārāmarāhā / De bzhiṅ gshegs pa’i yon tan dang ye shes bsam gyis mi khyab pa’i yul la ’jug pa bstan pa’i mdo

pp. 200.19–202.9 = LSPEB 20, pp. 35.21–36.19

6. Buddhāvatamsakasūtra / Sangs rgyas phal po cher’i mdo

pp. 202.11–206.17 = LSPEB 20, pp. 36.20–39.23 = D 201 49a6–b7;
pp. 206.23–207.22 (mdo ’di nyid) = LSPEB 20, pp. 39.30–40.17 = D 201 61b4–62a2

7. Śraddhābalādhānāvātārāmudrā / ’Dad pa’i stobs bsksed pa la ’jug pa’i phyag rgya’i mdo

Pāśādika (1989): p. 11.12–25 (Dad pa’i stobs bsksed pa’i mdo) = LSPEB 2, p. 27.3–18;
p. 12.1–14 (yang de nyid) = LSPEB 3, p. 31.9–24;
pp. 133.20–134.12 (Dad pa’i stobs bsksed pa’i mdo) = LSPEB 14, pp. 23.40–24.15;
pp. 32.14–35.19 (Dad pa’i stobs bsksed pa la ’jug pa’i phyag rgya’i mdo) = LSPEB 5, pp. 24.11–26.14;
pp. 38.2–40.12 = LSPEB 6, pp. 28.2–29.22

Śikṣāsamuccaya

1. Gocarapariśuddhisūtra

Bendall (1902): 350.21

---

105 This is a condensed quotation.

106 We have not been able to trace any of the three passages with the title Dad pa’i stobs bsksed pa’i mdo in the Kanjur version. Note that there are discrepancies in the title, and it could be a different sūtra.

107 This is a reference by title without citation: evam ayaṃ ... sarvāvasthāsi satvārthah ... puttyāvṛdhīhetuḥ vistaratas tv ārya-gocarapariśuddhisūtre draṣṭayāḥ.
2. Ratnalkādhāraṇī

Bendall (1902): 2.15–5.1 = Chapter 17 of the Tibetan Buddhāvatamsaka;
pp. 5.3–6 (...( tat parisamāpya samkṣepataḥ punar āha | ...))108 = Chapter 17 of the Tibetan Buddhāvatamsaka;
p. 153.11–15 = Chapter 20 of the Tibetan Buddhāvatamsaka;
pp. 327.5–347.11 = Chapter 17 of the Tibetan Buddhāvatamsaka

3. Vajradhvajasūtra

Bendall (1902): 22.5–27.3;109
27.4–33.10 (...( punar atraivāḥa | ...));110
213.3–216.5 (Vajradhvajasūtraṃpanīmanāyāṃ uktā ...);
278.14–283.2 (Āryavajradhvajasūtraṃ py āha ...);
291.10111

4. Daśabhūmikāsūtra

Bendall (1902): 10.15–11.11, 11.3–4 (pramuditāyām tu pathyate ...); 11.4–8 (evam ādisūṭreṣu ...); 11.10–11; 126.9–14; 227.11–228.6; 287.14–288.11; 288.11–289.10 (...( tathātraivāḥa | ...)); 291.11–296.1

5. Lokottaraparivarta

Bendall (1902): 151.13–152.19

6. Gandavyūha

Bendall (1902): 2.3; 5.20–6.8; 8.16–18; 9.8–12; 34.18–36.4; 36.4–8; 95.6–10; 101.13–104.8; 122.15–123.12; 149.7–10; 154.1; 177.14–178.8; 180.15–17; 276.10–278.3; 296.2–11; 310.1–311.4

7. Śraddhābalādhānavatāramudrā

Bendall (1902): 86.1–13; 87.4–13; 153.16–18; 311.6–12

Bhāvanākrama

1. Gocaraparipuṣuddhīsūtra

The second Bhāvanākrama: D 3916 54a5–6 (‘Phags pa spyod yul yongs su dag pa’i mdo)112

2. Daśabhūmika

Tucci (1958): 195.10–11
Tucci (1971): 21.14–16 (Daśabhūmika);113 24.15–17114

3. Tathāgatopattiṃsambhavasūtra

Tucci (1971): 13.2–6

4. Lokottaraparivarta

Tucci (1958): 217.9–11

5. Gaṇḍavyūha

Tucci (1958): 191.2–9 (tathā coktaṃ maitreyamokṣe ...) = Bendall (1902): 9.8–12;

---

108 The citation is condensed, omitting three verses.
109 The citation is selective.
110 The Bodhicaryāvatārapaṇḍjikā also quotes the passage from sa tāni kuśalamūlāni (29.13) to sukhacittāḥ parināmavati (30.2); see Vaidya (1960), p. 39.6–14.
111 Only the title is mentioned.
112 We have not been able to trace the passage in the Kanjur version.
113 This is a condensed citation.
114 We have not been able to trace the passage in the Kanjur version.
II. Distribution of citations from the Buddhāvatamsaka family in Indian works

1. Gocarapariśuddhisūtra / Spyd yol yongs su dag pa'i mdo
   Śīksāsamuccaya (1); Sūtrālamkārayavṛtthi (1); Mahāyānasāṅgrahābhāṣya (1);
   Mahāyānasāṅgrahāghopaibandhana (1); Second Bhāvanākrama (1)

2. Ratnolādhāraṇī / Dkon mehog ta la la'i gzungs
   Śīksāsamuccaya (4)

3. Vajradhvajāsūtra / Rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyi mdo
   Śīksāsamuccaya (5); Bodhisavacaryāvatāra (1); Bodhicaryāvataraṇājñikā (2)

4. Daśabhūmikāsūtra / Sa bcu'i mdo
   Sūtrasamuccaya (1); Śīksāsamuccaya (9); Madhyamakāhyādayatarkajñvala (4);
   First Bhāvanākrama (1); Third Bhāvanākrama (2); Madhyamakāloka (1)

5. Tathāgatopatisambhayasūtra / De bzhin gshegs pa skye ba srid pa'i mdo
   Sūtrasamuccaya (1); Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā (2); Vyākhyāyukti (1);
   Vyākhya-yuktiśākā (2); Third Bhāvanākrama (1)

6. Lokottaraparivarta / 'Jig rten las 'das pa'i le'u
   Sūtrasamuccaya (1); Vyākhya-yukti (1); Vyākhya-yuktiśākā (1);
   Śīksāsamuccaya (1); Madhyamakāhyādayatarkajñvala (1); First Bhāvanākrama (1);
   Madhyamakāloka (1)

7. Gāndavyūhāsūtra / Sdorg po bkod pa'i mdo
   Sūtrasamuccaya (6); Śīksāsamuccaya (16); First Bhāvanākrama (4); Madhyamakāloka (1)

8. Bhadracaryāprāṇidhāna / 'Phags pa bzang po spyod pa (smon lam)
   First Bhāvanākrama (1)

9. Tathāgataśūravajñānācintyaviśayāvatārānirdeśa / De bzhin gshegs pa'i yon tan dang ye shes bsam
   gyis mi khryab pa'i yul la 'jug pa bstan pa'i mdo
   Sūtrasamuccaya (2); Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā (1)

10. Buddhāvatamsakasūtrasūtra / Sangs rgyas phal po che'i mdo
    Sūtrasamuccaya (3)

11. Śraddhābaladānīvatārāniruddha / Dad pa'i stobs bskyed pa la 'jug pa'i phyag rgya'i mdo
    Sūtrasamuccaya (5); Śīksāsamuccaya (4); First Bhāvanākrama (2)

III. Circulation of the Buddhāvatamsaka family in Indian works: A tentative chronology

The table is meant to give a general overview of the circulation of texts in the Buddhāvatamsaka family as outlined in this article. Given the uncertainties of dating, the chronology is tentative, in particular that of what so far is potentially the oldest source, the Sūtrasamuccaya. If an early date of Sūtrasamuccaya is rejected, then the earliest evidence for the use of the texts as authorities becomes the fourth century, by which time several titles are attested. From then on, the texts are regularly cited. Unfortunately, it is impossible to locate the sūtras' activities on the map of India, given that we know so little about the authors of the sāstras and their careers.

115 This is a reference to the title only, without citation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>ŚĀSTRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150–250 CE</td>
<td>Gaṇḍavyūḥasūtra</td>
<td>Sūtrasamuccaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tathāgataguṇajñānācintyaviṣayāvatāraṇirdeśa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tathāgatotpattisambhavasūtra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daśabhūmikasūtra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lokottaraparivarta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Śraddhābalādhānāvatāramudrā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320–400 CE</td>
<td>Gocaraparīśuddhisūtra</td>
<td>Mahāyānasangrahabhāṣya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tathāgatotpattisambhava</td>
<td>Sūtrālaṁkāravyākhya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lokottaraparivarta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350–450 CE</td>
<td>Tathāgataguṇajñānācintyaviṣayāvatāraṇirdeśa</td>
<td>Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tathāgatotpattisambhava</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500–570 CE</td>
<td>Daśabhūmika</td>
<td>Madhyamakahṛdayatarkajvalā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lokottaraparivarta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650–750 CE</td>
<td>Gaṇḍavyūha</td>
<td>Śikṣāsamuccaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gocaraparīśuddhisūtra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daśabhūmikasūtra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratnokādhāraṇī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lokottaraparivarta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vajradhvajasūtra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Śraddhābalādhānāvatāramudrā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740–795 CE</td>
<td>Gaṇḍavyūha</td>
<td>Bhāvanākrama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daśabhūmika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gocaraparīśuddhisūtra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tathāgatotpattisambhavasūtra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhadracaryāpranidhāna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lokottaraparivarta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Śraddhābalādhānāvatāramudrā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maitreyavyākaraṇa

Li Xuezhu (Beijing) and Jundo Nagashima (Tokyo)

Five manuscripts of the Maitreyavyākaraṇa are known to us so far.¹ This paper deals with another Maitreyavyākaraṇa manuscript confirmed to be present by Luo Zhao,² who undertook research on Sanskrit manuscripts in Tibet in 1980s. According to him, this palm-leaf manuscript is complete with six folios, whose size is 30.3 cm × 5.5 cm. While the original is in possession of the Potala Palace, its reproduction in facsimile is kept in a card box numbered 111 at the China Tibetology Research Center (CTRC) in Beijing. This box contains the reproductions of more than ten texts in a total of 168 folios, including the Hetubindu of Dharmakīrti, in which the Maitreyavyākaraṇa is sequenced seventh. The manuscript is in good condition and written by a skilled scribe in Bengali script using black ink. Each folio has a string hole, preserves the folio number in the left hand margins of the verso side and contains 6 lines, each comprising about 55 aṅgaras, which amount to approximately 660 aṅgaras in one folio. Although the title is shown at the end of the manuscript as “Maitreyavyākaraṇaṃ saṃāptaṃ” together with its Tibetan translation “byams pa lung bstan rdzogs sho”, there is no colophon relating to the date or location. In the light of rdzogs sho, which reflects old Tibetan usage, this manuscript probably dates back earlier than the twelfth century.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

C. The Sanskrit text of the Maitreyavyākaraṇa based on the manuscript in the possession of the Asiatic Society of Calcutta, as in Lévi [1932].

G. The Sanskrit text of the Maitreyavyākaraṇa based on the manuscript discovered in Gilgit, as in Majumder [1959].

K. The Sanskrit text of the Maitreyavyākaraṇa based on the manuscript in the possession of the National Archives in Kathmandu, as in Ishigami [1989].

P. The Sanskrit text of the Maitreyavyākaraṇa based on the facsimile of the manuscript in the possession of the China Tibetology Research Center (CTRC) in Beijing.

S. The Sanskrit manuscript of the Maitreyavyākaraṇa in the Schøyen Collection, as in Hartmann [2006].

¹ Lévi [1932], Majumder [1959], Ishigami [1989], Wille [2004] and Hartmann [2006].
Maitreyavyākaraṇa

(1b) namo buddhāya

evaṁ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye bhagavān rājagrhe viharati sma l veṣuvane kalandakanivāpe tatra bhagavān bhiksūn āmantrayate sma l athāyuṣmān

śāriputro (1b2) mahāprājñō dharmasenāpatir vibhuḥ

trilokasyānukaṁ pārtham śāstāram paripṛcchati "(1) yo (')sāv anāgato buddho nirdiṣṭo lokānayakah

maitreya iti nā[1][2] ṣetre pūrvarupāntake (2)

---

3 namo buddhāya : K. Oṃ namo maitreyanāthāya.
4 kalandakanivāpe : K. ʾnīvase.
5 tatra bhagavān bhiksūn āmantrayate sma : K. mahātā bhiksusaṃghena sārdham ardhatrayodaśabhir bhikṣusataih.
6 athāyuṣmān*: K. atha khalv ayuṣmān.
7 mahāprājñō : K. mahāprajñō.
8 trilokasyānukampārtham : K. lokasya anukampārtham (Ms. lokasyānukampārtham).
9 T. (2013.33r) / /[O]ṣṭo lokānayakā{h} / ..///.
10 sūtre pūrvarupāntake : K. sūtrapūrvarupāntike.
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tasyāhaṁ vistarāṁ sarvvaṁ śroṭum11 icchāmi nāyaka12 [K.3ab]
ṛddhiṁ cāsyānubhāvaṁ ca tan me brūhi narottama || 3 || [K.3cd]
athainām avadac chāṣṭā śṛṣṭum andho (13b) mahāmato13 | [K.4ab]
vistarāṁ tasya buddhasya maitreyaṁsya mahātmanaḥ14 || (4) [K.4cd]
udadhīs tena kālena dvātrimśatśatayojanaḥ15 | [K.5ab]
śoṣam āyāsyate yasmāc cakravarttṛ yatho16 hy a(16b)ṣau || (5) [K.5cd]
dāsayojanasāhasrō janbūdīpo bhaviṣyati18 | [K.6ab]
ācūlayāṁ sarvabhūtānāṁ vistarāya19 samantataḥ || (6) [K.6cd]
rddhisphītā janapadā adanḍā anupadravāḥ | [K.7ab]
tatra kāle bhavi(16c)ṣanty narās te śubhakārināḥ20 || (7) [K.7cd]
akaṇṭa[kā] vasmatī samāharitaśādvalā21 | [K.8ab]
unnamanti namantī ca mrūttulāpicūpamā || (8) [K.8cd]
akrṣotpadyate śāliḥ madhurāṁ ca sugandhikam22 | [K.9ab]
cai(22a)javrksā bhaviṣyanti nāṇāraṅgopāṣobhitāḥ || (9) [K.9cd]
puspapatraphaloṭpatī23 vrksāḥ kroṣṭrayocchritāḥ24 | [K.10ab]
aśṭīvarṣasahasrāṇy25 āyus teśāṁ bhaviṣyati || (10) [K.10cd]
nirāmayāś ca te (22b) satvā vitaśokā26 mahotsavāḥ | [K.11ab]
varṇnavanto mahaśāōkhyā27 mahānagnabalānvitāḥ28 || (11) [K.11cd]
trayo29 rogā bhaviṣyanti icchā anasanaṁ30 jaraḥ | [K.12ab]

---

11 vistarāṁ sarvvaṁ śroṭum : K. vistarāṁ caivaṁ śroṭum.
12 T. (2013.33rx) /// [Ό] icchāmi na'yaka + + ///.
13 śṛṣṭum andho mahāmato : K. vaikarisyāmy aham (Ms. aham) tava; T. (2013.33ry) /// [Ό] rṣyāmy aham tava + + ///.
14 mahātmanaḥ : K. śṛṣṭi me.
15 T. (2013.33rz) /// [Ό] cchatayojanaḥ + ///.
16 yatho : K. yatha.
17 daśayojanasāhasro : K. daśayojanasāhasra.
19 vistarāya : K. vistarāya.
20 śubhakārināḥ : K. śubhakārmyaḥ.
22 śaliḥ madhurāṁ ca sugandhikam : K. sālimadhunāḥ ca sugandhi ca.
23 puspatraphaloṭpatā : K. puspapatraphalōṭpatā.
24 vrksāḥ kroṣṭrayocchritāḥ : K. vrksāḥ ca kroṣṭam ucchritāḥ.
25 aśṭīvarṣasahasrāṇy : K. aśṭīvarṣasahasrāṇi; T. (2013.33v3) /// [Ό] sthī praṇī[n], + + ///.
26 vitaśokā : K. vitaśoko.
27 mahaśākhyā : K. mahaśākhyā. Read mahaśākhyā.
28 mahānagnabalānvitāḥ : K. mahānagnabalān tināḥ.
29 trayo : K. traya.
pañcavarṣaśatā kanyā svāmī(28)no31 varayisyati || (12) [K.12cd]
tadā ketumati nāma rājadhānī bhaviṣyaṁti l [K.13ab]
[āvāsas śuddhāsa]tvānāṁ prāpināṁ śubhakarmināṁ32 || (13) [K.13cd]
yojanadvādaśāyāmam saptayojanavis[t]aṃ{ḥ} || (20) [K.14ab]
nagarāṁ kṛtapunyānāṁ bhaviṣyati manorāmaṁ || (14) [K.14cd]
[sapt]āratnamamōyāś caiva prakārāḥ kroṣam uchritāḥ34 l [K.15ab]
iśikā dvāraśaṃdaś ca35 nānāratnavibhūṣiṭāḥ || (15) [K.15cd]
parikhaś36 ca bhaviṣyanti ratna iṣṭakasamcitaḥ l [K.16ab]
padmo[t]palāḥ samā kṛṇāḥ37 cakravāogopasobhitāḥ || (16) [K.16cd]
samantatāḥ parivṛtṛḥ saptabhis talāpāṅkтиbhīḥ38 l [K.17ab]
catūrataṇamayās tālāḥ kimkīṭī jāla[28]śobhitāḥ || (17) 39 [K.17cd]
tenaiwa tālaśabdena krīḍisyanti pramoditāḥ l [K.19cd]
puṣkariyō46 bhaviṣyanti kumudotpalasaṇcetāḥ || (18) [K.20ab]
udyāvānasampannaḥ bhaviṣyati ca tat puraṁ l [K.20cd]
rājā bhaviṣyā,28ti tatra saṅkho41 nāma mahādyutiḥ || (19) [K.21ab]
 mahābalaś cakravartti42 caturdvīpēsvaraḥ43 prabhuḥ l [K.21cd]
caturāṅgabalopetalāḥ saptaratnasamanvitāḥ || (20) [K.22ab]
pūrṇaṁ sahasraṁ putrānāṁ44 tasya rājño bhaviṣyati l || (262) [K.22cd]
imāṁ samudraparyantāṁ aṇḍāṇa vasundharāṁ || (21) [K.23ab]
prasādayisyati45 ○ dharmanena samena sa narādhīpaḥ l [K.23cd]
mahānīdhayaś46 ca tvāro nīyatāḥ śatakalasitāḥ47 || (22) [K.24ab]

31 svāmino : K. svāminam.
32 śubhakarminām : K. śubhakarminām.
33 saptayojanavis[ta]ṃ{ḥ} : K. saptayojanavisṭaram.
34 uchritāḥ : K. uccitaḥ (Ms uchitaḥ).
35 tākā dvāraśandaś ca : K. iṣṭaka dvārakhaṇḍanām .
36 parikhaś : K. pariśaś.
38 saptabhis talāpāṅktibhiḥ : K. saptabhiḥ(s) talapa(n)khibhiḥ (Ms saptabhik talapakthiiḥ);
39 K. addu : vāteteritalebhyas tada śroti(Ms śroti) manoharaḥ l bhaviṣyanti śubhā sabdas turyaś pañcāṅgikāriva l || 18 l
ye ca tasmin puśrayaṣaḥ kṛtāḥ(Ms kṛtāḥ) ratisukhaṇvitāḥ(Ms ˚atvitaḥ) l
40 puṣkariyā : K. puṣkariṇo.
41 rāja bhaviṣyati tatra saṅkho : K. bhaviṣyati tada rāja saṅkho.
42 mahābalaś cakravartti : K. mahābalaṇcakravartti,
43 caturdvīpēsvaraḥ : K. catudvīpēsvaraḥ.
44 pūrṇaṁ sahasraṁ putrānāṁ : K. pūrṇasya sahasraputraḥ.
45 prasādayisyati : K. palaśisyati.
46 mahānīdhayaś : K. mahānīdhānaś.
bhāviṣyanti ṭadā tasya rājaḥaṁ jñāḥo sanākhasyaṁ bhūpateḥ l ṭaptaṁ skaritvā rājñāyaṁ ca kālaṁ भावनामि [K.24cd]

pingalaś ca kālaṁ asyaṁ mithilāyāōōn ca pāṇḍukaḥ ll (23) [K.25ab]

elapratṛasṛ ca gāndhāre sanākhā vāraṇāśīpure l [K.25cd; C.25cd]
caturbhir ebhir niṇhibhiḥ sa rājā susanānvātaḥ taḥ ll (24) [K.26ab; C.26ab]

bhāviṣyati mahāvīraḥ satapunyavaloditaḥ [53] [K.26cd; C.26cd]
brāhmaṇas tasya rājñāsyā subrahmā nāmaṁ purohitaḥ ll (25) [K.27ab; C.27ab]
bahuṣrūtas ca caturveda upādhyāyo bhāviṣyati [96] [K.27cd; C.27cd]
adhyāpako mantradharaḥ śrīṃśām [57] vedapāraγaḥ ll (26) [K.28ab; C.28ab]
kaitābhe sa nīghanṭo ca padavayakaraṇāṅvitaḥ [58] [K.28cd; C.28cd]
tadā bhramavatī nāma tasyaṁ bhāvyā bhāviṣyati ll (27) [K.29ab; C.29ab]
tuṣiṭe bhīṣya cyavītva [63] maitreyaḥ atyaḥ agrapudgalaḥ ll (28) [K.30ab; C.30ab]
tasyāḥ kuṣau sa niyataṁ pratisandhiṁ grahiṣyati [64] [K.30cd; C.30cd]
daśamāṃśaḥ ca 65 nikhilāṁ dhārayitvā mahādyutim ll (29) [K.31ab; C.31ab; G.31ab]
supūṣpita (33a) ca utyāne gatvā maitreyamātarah [96] [K.31cd; C.31cd; G.31cd]
mahāyā rāja-ṛddhyā ca nānāpaksini nādiṁ ll (30) [K. – ; C. – ; G. –]

47 niyataṁ śatalaksitāh : \ K. + + + (Ms nṛdhūta) satalaksitāh
48 sanākhasya : \ K. sanākhasya
49 kālingesya : \ K. kālingesu
50 C. starts here.
51 elapatṛaś (= K.) : \ C. elapatraś.
52 sanākhā : \ K. sanākhā
53 satapunyavaloditaḥ ll : \ K. satapunyaphalārpiṭitaḥ ll 26 ; C. satapunyabaloditaḥ ; T. (2013.30r1) /// + +
tapunyā[balo]ditaḥ 20 (the number should be 23?).
54 brahmaṇas : \ K. brahmaṇas
55 rājñāsya subrahmā nāma : \ K. rājñā ṭha subrahmā nāma(Ms nāma?); C. rājñāṣa ca subrahmaṇaḥ.
56 caturveda upādhyāyo bhāviṣyati l : \ K. caturvedi upādhyāyo bhāviṣyati ll 27 ; C. caturvedas tasyopādhyāyo bhāviṣyati ; T. (2013.30r2) /// + + dhyaṇyo bhāviaṁ[ati] 2[4].
57 śrīṃśām (= K.) : \ K. śrīṃśā[en](Ms ṭat).
58 kaitābhe sa nīghanṭe ca padavayakaraṇāṅvitaḥ : \ K. kaitābhe ca sa nīghanṭe ca padavayakaraṇaṁ tathā; C. kaitābhe sa nīghanṭe ca padavayakaraṇaṁ tathā.
59 tada (= K.) : \ K. tasya
60 tasya (= K.) : \ K. tada
61 prāśaṅkā dārśantiyaḥ : \ K. ĉarastya prasādikā.
62 abhirūpā yasasvinī : \ K. abhirūpā yasasvinī(K. Ms ṭanṛ); T. (2013.30r3) /// ... bhṛjṛa ... ... ... iī iī
cyavītva (= C.) : \ K. tataś cyavīta
63 niyataṁ pratisandhiṁ grahiṣyati l : \ K. niyataṁ pratisandhiṁ grahiṣyati ll 30 ; C. niyataṁ pratisandhiṁ grahiṣyati ; T. (2013.30v1) /// im pratisandhiṁ gṛi Jahiṣyati [26].
64 G. starts here.
65 supūṣpita ca utyāne gatvā maitreyamātarah l : \ K. supūṣpita codyāne gatvā maitreyamātarah(Ms ṭaraṁ) ll 31 ; C. supūṣpita ca utyāne gatvā maitreyamātarah; G. supūṣpitesminni uṭyāne maitreyajananā tathā; T. (2013.30v2) /// .i Jehovah yan janaṁyati 27.
na nisaññā nipannā va67 sthitā sā dharmmacāriñī68 | [K.32ab; C.32ab; G.32ab]
drumāsākhām69 ālambya maitreyam janayisyati || (31)70 [K.32cd; C.32cd; G.32cd]
nīskrami(33a)Syyati pārśvāc ca71 daksīnāme72 narottamah | [K.33ab; C.33ab; G. –]
abhraṅkūṭād yathā sūryo nirgataś ca prabhāyate73 || (32) [K.33cd; C.33cd; G. –]
karisyati jagalokaṁ74 sanarāmaravanditaḥ | [K.34ab; C. – ; G. –]
alipto garbhapāṅkena padmaṁ caiva75(33b) yathāmbunā76 || (33) [K.34cd; C.34ab; G.33ab]
traidhātukam idaṁ sarvvaṁ prabhāya pūrayisyati | [K.34ef; C.34cd; G.33cd]
77prśtOto tha taṁ78 sahasraṅko devarājā79 sācipatiḥ || (34) 80 [K. – ; C.35ab; G.34ab]
grahisyati kumāraṁ taṁ jāyamānam narottamaṁ | [K. – ; C.35cd; G. –]
śriyā ja(33c)lantam maitreyam dvātrimśadvaralakṣaṇam || (35) [K. – ; C.36ab; G. –]
muṇca muṇca sahasraṅkṣat || jātamātra vadiyati | [K. – ; C.36cd; G. –]
padāni sapta saptaśa kramisyati caturdaśaṁ81 || (36) [K. – ; C.37ab; G.35ab]
pade pada nidhānaṁ82 ca padmaṁ(36a) padmaṁ bhaviyati || (37) [K.35ab; C.37cd; G.35cd]
diśaṁ catasaṁ codvīksya83 vācaṁ pravāhiyasiya Cóti || (37) [K.35cd; C.38ab; G.36ab]
iyam me paścimā jāti84 nāsti bhūyaṁ punarbhavaḥ | [K.35ef; C.38cd; G.36cd]
na punar āgamiyāmi85 nirvāśāmi88 nirāraṇavā87 || (38) 88 [K.36ab; C.39ab; G.36ef]
sītoṣṇa(36b)varidhārābhīṁ89 snāpayiyanti pannagāḥ90 || [K.36cd; C.39cd; G.38cd]

---

68 dharmmacāriñī: K. brahmacāriñī; C. G. dharmacāriñī.
69 drumāsākhāṁ: K., C., G. drumasaya śākhāṁ.
70 maitreyam janayisyati || (31): T. (2013.30v3) /// + + m(ai)treyam janayisyati (presumably v.28).
71 pārśvāc ca: K. pārśvaṇa(Ms *epa); C. pārśvā; G. –
72 daksīnāme: K. daksīnāge; C. daksīnena; G. –
73 prabhāyate: K. prabhāyate; C. prabhāṣate; G. –
74 karisyati jagalokaṁ: K. karisyate samalokam; C., G. –
75 padmaṁ caiva: K. padmaṁ caiva; C. padmaṁ caiva; G. kuśeṣayam.
76 yathāmbuṇa: K. yathāmbuṇa; C. yathāmbuṇa; G. ivambuṇa.
77 The other versions each have a similar verse, which is not found in P. See fn. 94.
78 prśtOto tha taṁ (= G.): K. – ; C. atha prttas.
80 G. adds: jyāmaṁtaṁ grahita sa maitreyam dvipadottamaṁ* || 34 ||
81 sapta saptaśa kramisyati caturdaśaṁ: K. – ; C. jātamātras tu saptaśa prakramisyati; G. jātamātraś ca saptaśa prakramisyati.
82 nidhānaṁ (= K., G.): C. nidhānaṁ; G. nidhanāṁ.
83 codvīksya (= C., G.): K. udvīksya.
84 jāti (= K., G.): C. jātir.
85 āgamiyāmi (= K., C.): G. abhyāgamisyami.
86 nirvāśāmi (= K., C., G. nirvāśāmi.
87 nirāraṇavā (= G.): K. C. nirāraṇavā.
88 G. adds: sāpanaṁsaṁvatamānaṁ saitvamanāṁ duḥkhahāgānāṁ ||
89 śītoṣṇa: K. C. G. dhārābhīṁ.
90 snāpayiyanti pannagāḥ: K. C. G. dhārābhīṁ.
divyāsvarāṇi 90 puṣpāṇi prakṣeṣpsyanti divaukaṣaḥ 92 || (39)

svetaṇ cāsyā mahacchatraṃ hemadaṇḍam manoramanam 93 | 94

vicitraṃ ratnakhaicitraṃ dārayiṣyanti mūrdhiṇi || (40) (391)

pusaraṅ 95 grhītvā maitreyam devarājā sacīpatiḥ |

prasādajato jagannātham mātuhaste pradāsyati || (41)

manoramanam ca śivikām nānāratnavihūṣṭiṃ |

ārūḍhāṃ putrasihitāṃ 96 ayaṃ nesyaṃtaṃ 932 devatah 97 || (42)

tatas tūryasahasrēṣu 98 vādyamāneṣu tapuṛam 1 |

praviOṣṭamātre maitreya puṣpavṛṣṭiḥ 99 patiṣyati 100 || (43)

tasmin dīne subhe nāryaḥ prasāviṣyanti tapure 101 |

sarvvās tā {ja} 930 janaiṣyanti putrāṃ* kṣemaṇa svastinā || (44)

dṛṣṭvaiva 102 putraṃ subrahmā O dvātrīṣadvaralakṣaṇam 1 |

pratyavekṣya sumantreṣu tataḥ 103 prīto bhaviṣyati || (45)

gatidvayaṃ kumārasya yathā mantreṣu 936 dṛṣṭaye 1 |

narādhīpaṃ cakravartā buddho vā dvipadottamah || (46)

sa ca O yauvanasamprāpto 104 maitreyah puruṣottamah 105 |

90 snāpayiṣyanti pannagāḥ (= C.) : K. snāpayiṣyanti pannagāḥ; G. nagendrāu snāpayiṣyatah.

91 divyāsvaraṇi : K. divyaśuroṇi; C. divyāmbarṇi.

92 prakṣeṣpsyanti divaukaṣaḥ : K., C. patiṣyanti nabhastataḥ; G. –.

93 svetaṇ cāsyā mahacchatraṃ hemadaṇḍam manoramanam : K., C., G. śvetāṃ tasyā surāḥ chaṭtraṃ dhārayiṣyanti mūrdhāni.

94 K. adds : hṛṣṭaś caiva sahasrāko devarājāḥ saṅctpatiḥ |

pragahyati kuṇḍaraṃ taṃ dvātrīṣadvaralakṣaṇaḥvītanām |

śriyā jvalantam maitreyam māturaḥ haste pradāsyati || 38 ||

C. adds : hṛṣṭaś caiva sahasrāko devarājāḥ saṅctpatiḥ |

ghrahītya taṃ kuṇḍaraṃ dvātrīṣadvaralakṣaṇaṃ |

śriyā jvalantam maitreyam māturaḥ haste pradāsyati || (41)

G. adds : pratiṇgṛhyā ca taṃ dātā dvātrīṣadvaralakṣaṇaṃ* |

śriyā jvalantam maitreyam mātraṃ samapaneṣyati || 39 ||

95 pusaraḥ : S.e. for punar.

96 ārūḍhāṃ putrasihitāṃ (= K., G.) : C. ārūḍhā putrasihitām.

97 ayaṃ nesyaṃtaṃ devataḥ : K. vahisyanti (ca) devataḥ; C. vahisyate ca devavati; G. vahisyanti ca devatā.

98 tūryasahasrēṣu (= C., G.) : K. tūryasahasrēṣu(Ms *reṣa).


100 patiṣyati : K. patiṣyati(Ms pratītśa).

101 tasmin dīne subhenāryaḥ prasāviṣyanti tapure : K. tasminīś ca divaśe nārāyo guṛvinyāḥ prasāviṣya(n)īti; C. tasminīś ca divaśe bhāra guṛvinyāḥ prasāviṣyanti; G. –.

102 dṛṣṭvaiva : K., G. dṛṣṭvaivaṃ; C. dṛṣṭvā ca.

103 pratyavekṣya sumantreṣu tataḥ : K. pratyavekṣya sumantreṇa tataḥ; C. pratyavekṣya ca mantreṇa tataḥ; G. pratyavartātha mantreṇa taddā.

104 yauvanasamprāpto (= G.) : K. *samṛtoprāpita; C. samprāpto.

105 maitreyah puruṣottamah (= G.) : K., C. maitreyo hy agrapudgalah.
cintayisati dharmmātā duḥkhitā khalv iyam prajā\textsuperscript{106} || (47) [K.44cd; C.47cd; G.44cd]

brahmaśvaro \textsuperscript{(35)} mahāghoṣo\textsuperscript{107} hemavṛṇyo mahādyutih \textsuperscript{1} || [K.45ab; C.48ab; G.45ab]

viśālacakṣuḥ pīṇāṁsah padmapatranibheksanā\textsuperscript{108} || (48) [K.45cd; C.48cd; G.45cd]

aśī\textsuperscript{ta}ḥ hastam uccrayas tasya kāyo bhāviṣyat\textsuperscript{109} || [K.46ab; C.49ab; G.46ab]

vistaram viśāhastāṇi tato \textsuperscript{(36)} (')ṛdham mukham maṇḍalam\textsuperscript{110} || (49) [K.46cd; C.49cd; G.46cd]

aśṭibhiṣ catu<\textsuperscript{>}>hiṣ ca sahasraṁ saṁpuraskṛtaḥ\textsuperscript{111} || [K.47ab; C.50ab; G.47ab]

māṇavāṇāṁ sa\textsuperscript{112} maitreyo maṅtrān adhyāpīṣyat\textsuperscript{1} || (50) [K.47cd; C.50cd; G.47cd]

tataḥ saṁkho mahārāja\textsuperscript{113} ūpam uccṛāpīṣyat\textsuperscript{1} || [K.48ab; C.51ab; G.48ab]

śoḍaśavyāma\textsuperscript{(46)} vistāram\textsuperscript{114} āṛddhvaṁ vyāmasahasrakaṁ\textsuperscript{115} || (51) \textsuperscript{116} [K.48cd; C.51cd; G.48cd]

saptaratnamayaṁ ūpamā\textsuperscript{117} brāhmaṇeṣhyāḥ\textsuperscript{118} pradāṣyat\textsuperscript{1} || [K.49cd; C.52ef; G. – ]

tāṁ\textsuperscript{119} ca ratnaṁyayam ūpaṁ dattamātraṇa manorāmaṁ || (52) [K.50ab; C.53ab; G.50ab]

brāhmaṇāṇāṁ\textsuperscript{120} sahasraṁ viṣaṁyanti tatkaṇaṁ\textsuperscript{121} || [K.50cd; C.53cd; G.50cd]

tasya \textsuperscript{(42)} yūpasya\textsuperscript{122} maitreyo dṛṣṭvā caṁnāṁ\textsuperscript{123} anityatāṁ || (53) [K.51ab; C.54ab; G.51ab]

krtsnam vicintya ○ saṁsāraṁ pravrāj[y]āṁ rocayisati\textsuperscript{1} || [K.51cd; C.54cd; G.51cd]

\textsuperscript{106} duḥkhitā khalv iyam prajā (= K.) : C. duḥkhitāḥ khalv imāṁ prajāḥ; G. duḥkhitā khalv iyam prajāḥ.

\textsuperscript{107} mahāghoṣo (= C, G.) : K. mahāvego.

\textsuperscript{108} viśālacakṣuḥ pīṇāṁsah padmapatranibheksanāḥ : K. viśālacakṣuḥ(Ms viśālavakṣaḥ) pīṇāṁgah padmapatranibheksanāḥ; C. viśālavakṣaḥ pīṇāṁgah padmapatranibheksanāḥ; G. viśālavakṣaḥ pīṇāṁsah padmapatranibheksanāḥ.

\textsuperscript{109} aśī\textsuperscript{ta}ḥ hastam uccrayas tasya kāyo bhāviṣyat\textsuperscript{1} : K. uccrayena āhaṭṭhitāṁ kāyaṁ tasya bhāviṣyat; C. samucchrayena āhaṭṭhitis tasya kāyo bhāviṣyat; G. haṭṭhitāḥ pāḥcāsūd uccṛāhyā tasya kāyo bhāviṣyat.

\textsuperscript{110} vistaram viśāhastāṇi tato (')ṛdham mukham maṇḍalam : K. vistāram viṃsātīr hasta tato 'ṛdhmaṁ mukhamandalam(Ms 'ṛṇam); C. vistāram viśāhastāṇi tato 'ṛdham mukhamandaṁ; G. viṣṛṭa ca tato 'ṛdhmaṃ sūbhavarṇasamuccrayaḥ.

\textsuperscript{111} sampuraskṛtaḥ (= G.) : K. sa puraskṛtaḥ.

\textsuperscript{112} māṇavāṇāṁ sa : K. māṇavāṇāṁ sa; C. māṇavāṇāṁ ca; G. māṇavāṇāṁ sa; S. māṇavāṇāṁ sa.

\textsuperscript{113} tataḥ saṁkho mahārāja : K. tataḥ saṁkho mahārāja; C. tataḥ saṁkho mahārāja; G. aha saṁkho narapatiḥ.

\textsuperscript{114} śoḍaśavamsnavistāram (= K, C.) : G. tīryaṁ ca śoḍaśavyāmaṃ.

\textsuperscript{115} āṛddhvaṁ vyāmasahasrakaṁ (= C, G.) : K. āṛdhrvaṁvyāmasahasrakaṁ.

\textsuperscript{116} K. adds: sa tāṁ (Ms śatām) yatpam narapatin nānāratnavibhāṣitaṁ !

\textsuperscript{117} K. adds: sa tāṁ yatpam narapatin nānāratnavibhāṣitaṁ ! pradāṣyati dvijātīḥyo yajñaḥ krivā purasāram !

\textsuperscript{118} K. adds: sa tāṁ yatpam narapatin nānāratnavibhāṣitaṁ ! pradāṣyati dvijātīḥyo yajñaḥ krivā purasāram ! vībāṣitaṁ + pradāṣyati dvijātīḥyo yajñaḥ kṛti [Kṛ. Ṛ. Ṛ] s. ra !

\textsuperscript{119} S. does not have a half verse that corresponds to P. 52ab (K. 49cd, C. 52ef) since the following aksara is t. which is the initial aksara of P. 52cd (see fn 119 and Hartmann p. 9, fn 9).

\textsuperscript{117} nānāratnamayaṁ ūpamā (= C.) : K. nānāratnasamakīrtanām.

\textsuperscript{118} brāhmaṇeṣhyāḥ (= C.) : K. brāhmaṇeṣhyāḥ(Ms 'bhāḥ).

\textsuperscript{119} tāṁ (= C, G): K. tāc; S. t. //.

\textsuperscript{120} brāhmaṇāṇāṁ (= K, C.) : G. brāhmaṇāṇāṁ.

\textsuperscript{121} viṣaṁyanti tatkaṇaṁ : K., C. viṣaṁyanti tatkaṇaṁ; G. viṣaṁyanti tatkaṇaṁ*.

\textsuperscript{122} tasya yūpasya (= K., C.) : G. yūpasya tasya.

\textsuperscript{123} dṛṣṭvā caṁnāṁ (= K., C, G.) : S. (2382/286 line 3) (dṛṣṭevan tām.
yatv aham^{124} pravrajitveha sr̥ṣeyam amṛtam padam || (54) [K.52ab; C.55ab; G.52ab]
vimocayeyam janatāṁ vyādhi{{45a}mrtyujarabhāyat ||{i}} [K.52cd; C.55cd; G.52cd]
aśṭibhiś caturbhiś ca sahasraśaṁ sampurośaskṛtaḥ {55} [K.53ab; C.56ab; G.53ab]
niṅkramisyati^{136} maitreyaḥ pravrajyāṁ agrapudgalah || (56) [K.53cd; C.56cd; G.53cd]
nāgavrkaśa tādā tasya bodhivṛkṣo bhaviṣyati{a40a}ti || (56) [K.54ab; C.57ab; G.54ab]
paṅcāsadyojanaś tasya^{126} urdhvahaṁś śākhaḥ samudgataḥ^{129} cı ○ [K.54cd; C.57cd; G.54cd]
ṣaṭkrośāvitaśāpyāṇī^{130} vīvṛtāṁ^{131} samantataḥ || (57) [K.54ef; C.57ef; G. – ]
tasya mūle niṣaṇṇo (')sau^{132} maitreyo dvipadotamaḥ^{133} || (46a) [K.55ab; C.58ab; G.55ab]
amuttaram śivāṁ bodhīṁ^{134} jīvā māraṁ avāpsyaṁ || (58) {36} [K.55cd; C.58cd; G.55cd]
asāṅgoś petayā vācā tataḥ sa puruṣottamaḥ || [K.56ab; C.59ab; G.57ab]
deśaśayati saddharmaṁ sarva-vadukāpaḥ^{157} śivāṁ || (59) [K.56cd; C.59cd; G.57cd]
duḥkhaṁ duḥ{44a}khasamutpādaṁ duḥkhasya samatikramam || (60) [K.57ab; C.60ab; G.58cd]
āryaṁ caṣṭāṅgikam^{138} mārggam kṣemaniṛvāṇagnaminam^{139} || (60) [K.57cd; C.60cd; G.59ab]
prasannāṁ janaṇāṁ dṛṣṭvā satyāṁ kathayasya || [K.58ab; C.61ab; G.58ab]
taṁ cāsya^{140} dharmmaṁ saṃśrutya^{141} pratipadya_{a0b}nti^{142} śāsane || (61) [K.58cd; C.61cd; G.59cd]

supuṣpīte {{tā}} ca udvāne{143} sannipāto bhaviṣyati || [K.59ab; C.62ab; G.60ab]

^{124} yatv aham (= K., G.) : C. yatraham.
^{125} aśṭibhiś caturbhiś ca sahasraśaṁ sampurasakṛtaḥ (= K.) : C. aśṭibhiś caturbhiś ca sahasraśaṁ sa puraśkṛtaḥ; G. aśṭibhiś sahasraśaṁ ca caturbhiś ca puraśkṛtaḥ; S. (2832/826 line 4) + + + + + hasraī sampurusakṛtaḥ.
^{126} niṅkramisyati (= K.) : C., G., S. (2832/826 line 4) niṅkramisyati.
^{127} pravrajyāṁ (= C., G.) : K. pravrajyātham.
^{128} paṅcāsadyojanaś tasya (= C.) : K. paṅcāsadyojanaś tasya; G. paṅcāsadyojanaṁ asya.
^{129} urdhvahaṁ śākhaḥ samudgataḥ : K. urdhvāṁ śākhāḥ bhaviṣyantī; C. urdhvāṁ śākhāḥ samudgataḥ; G. śākha urdhvāṁ samucchritāḥ.
^{130} ṣaṭkrośāvitaśāpyāṇī : K. ṣaṭkrośāvitaśāpyāṇī; C. ṣaṭkrośāvitaśāpyāṇī asya; G. –.
^{131} vīvṛtāṁ (= C.) : K. vidhūtāṁ; G. –.
^{132} tasya mūle niṣaṇṇo (')sau (= K., C.) : G. niṣadāṁ tasya cādhastāṁ.
^{133} dvipadotamaḥ (= K., C.) : G. puroṣottamaḥ; S. (2832/826 line 5) [p]. [ruṣ]o ..
^{134} śivāṁ bodhīṁ (= K., C.) : K., C. ca sambodhiṁ.
^{135} jīvā māraṁ avāpsyaṁ : K. prāpsyate nātra saṃśayāḥ; C. prāpsyati nātra saṃśayāḥ; G. samavāpsyati nāyakāḥ.
^{136} G. adds : yasyāṁ eva ca rātrau sa pravrajyāṁ niṅkramisyati / tasyāṁ eva ca rātrau hi paraṁ bodhīṁ avāpsyaṁ || 56 ll
^{137} sarva-vadukāpaḥ (= C., G.) : K. sarva-vadukāpaḥ.
^{138} āryaṁ caṣṭāṅgikam (= C., G.) : K. āryaṣṭāṅgikam.
^{139} kṣemeniṛvāṇagnaminam : K., C., G. kṣemaṁ nirvāṇagnaminam.
^{140} taṁ cāsya (= C., G.) : K. taṭhasya.
^{141} saṃśrutya (= C., G.) : K. saṃśrutva.
^{142} pratipadyaṁ (= K., C.) : G. pratipatsyānti.
^{143} supuṣpīte {{tā}} ca udvāne : K. supuṣpīte ca udvāne(Ms codyāne); C. supuṣpīte ca udvāne; G. udvāne puspācarme/onchan.
paripūrṇaṁ yojanaśatam 144 paryantasya 145 bhaviṣyati || (62) [K.59cd; C.62cd; G.60cd]
tataḥ śrutvā narapatiḥ saṃkhro rājaḥ 146 mahāyasyāḥ | [K.60ab; C.63ab; G.61ab]
dattvā dāna(460,461)ṃ asaṃkhyeyam pravrajyāṃ rocaisyati 147 || (63) [K.60cd; C.63cd; G.61cd]
aśṭībhiḥ caturbhiḥ ca 〇 sahasraḥ pariśritah 148 | [K.61ab; C.64ab; G.62ab]
narādhīpo ("niśkramya") 149 pravrajyām upayāsyati || (64) [K.61cd; C.64cd; G.62cd]
anenaiva 150 pramāṇena mānava(460)ḥnāṁ puraskṛtaḥ | [K.62ab; C.65ab; G.63ab]
maitreyasya pitā caiva 151 pravrajyān niśkrami○ṣyati 152 || (65) [K.62cd; C.65cd; G.63cd]
tato grhapatis tasya 153 sudhano nāma viśruteḥ | [K.63ab; C.66ab; G.64ab]
pravrajisyatī dharmātmaḥ sahasraḥ pariśritiḥ 154 || (66) (464) [K.63cd; C.66cd; G.64cd]
strīratnam atha saṃkhya 155 viśākhā nāma viśruteḥ | [K.64ab; C.67ab; G.65ab]
aśītyā ca 156 〇 caturbhiḥ ca sahasraḥ sampuraskṛtaḥ 157 || (67) [K.64cd; C.67cd; G.65cd]
nāri{450}bhīḥ saha niśkramya 158 pravrajyām upayāsyati 159 | [K.64ef; C.67ef; G.65ef]
prāninām 160 tatra samaye sa(460)ḥsāhasrāni śatāni ca || (68) [K.65ab; C.68ab; G.66ab]
pravrajyām upayāsyanti maitreyasyā〇nusāsane 161 [K.65cd; C.68cd; G.66cd]
tataḥ kāruṇikaḥ śatā maitreyo dvipadottamaḥ 162 || (69) [K.66ab; C.69ab; G.68ab]
samitiṁ 163 vyavalokayātha idam 164 a(460)ṛtham pravakṣyati 165 | [K.66cd; C.69cd; G.68cd]

144 paripūrṇaṁ yojanaśatam : K. sampūrṇaḥ yojanaśatam; C. pūrṇaḥ ca yojanaḥ śatam; G. pūrṇaḥ ca yojanaśatam.
145 paryantasya : K., C., G. parṣat tasya.
146 tataḥ śrutvā narapatiḥ saṃkhro rājaḥ : K. tataḥ śrutvā narapatiḥ saṃkhro nāma; C. tataḥ śrutvā narapatiḥ saṃkhro rājaḥ; G. śrutvā narapatiḥ rājaḥ nāma.
147 rocaisyati (= K., C.) : G. niśkramisyati.
149 ("niśkramya") (= K.) : G. viṇiśkramya.
150 anenaiva (= G.) : K., C. tenaiva ca.
151 caiva (= K., C.) : G. tatra.
152 niśkramisyati (= G.) : K., C. upayāsyati.
153 tasya : K., G. tatra; C. ++ .
154 dharmātmaḥ sahasraḥ pariśritah (= K., C.) : G. śuddhātma maitreyasyanuśāsane.
155 saṃkhya : K. saṃkhya(Ms saṃkhya); C., G. saṃkhya.
156 aśītyā ca : K., C., G. aśṭībhiḥ.
157 sampuraskṛtaḥ (= G.) : K., C. sā puraskṛta.
158 nāri{450}bhīḥ saha niśkramya : K. nārīnāṁ saha niśkramya; C. nārīnāṁ saha niśkramya; G. nārīnāṁ abhiṇiśkramya.
159 upayāsyati (= K., C.) : G. rocaisyati.
160 prāninām (= K., C.) : G. prāninaḥ.
161 G. adds : supspite 'śmin udyāne samipāto bhaviṣyati || samantato yojanaśatam parṣat tasya bhaviṣyati || 67 ||
162 dvipadottamaḥ (= K., C.) : G. puruṣottamah.
163 samitiṁ (= C., G.) : K. samitiṁ.
164 idam (= K., C.) : G. imam.
165 pravakṣyati (= C., G.) : K. pravakṣyate.
sarve te śākyasimhena
tāyinā
artha lokanāthena sprāṣṭā
daddharmadhātunā
ropitā mokṣamārggeva
nīkṣiptā mama sāsane
chattarā dvajapatakābhīr
gandhamālyānulepanaih
kṛtvā śākyamunē pūjām āgata
mama sāsane
kumkumodakasekena
candana vīlepanam
kṛtvā śākyamunē stūpe
 śātabhihīrāmā
śātabhihīrāmā
caturāśīṁ pāñcadaśaśīṁ
pratihārakaṇaṁ
cācāṣṭāṁgāmī
upavāsam upoṣītva āgata
mama sāsane

166 śākyasimhena (= G.) : K., C. śākyamunīnā.
167 muniśreṣṭheṣe- tāyinā (= G., C.) : G. guniśreṣṭhenā trāyinā.
168 sprāṣṭā : K. drṣṭa; C. drṣṭas; G. drṣṭavā.
169 ropitā mokṣamārggeva : K. āropitā mokṣamārgge(Ms. mārgge); C. ropitā mokṣamārgge; G. ropitā mokṣamārggena.
170 nīkṣiptā (= K.) : G. viśikṣipta.
171 gandhamālyānulepanaih : K., C. gandhamālyānulepanaih; G. gandhamālyāvilepanaih.
172 pūjām āgata : K., C. pūjāṁ hy āgata; G. see the next fn.
173 G. 70cd : kṛtvā stāpesu sakāraṁ āgata hi mamāntikam
174 kumkumodakasekena : K., C. kumkumodakasekena; G. kumkumodakasekaṁ ca.
175 candana vīlepanam : K., C., G. candanenāulepanam.
176 kṛtvā : K., G. datva; C. dattvā.
177 stāpe āgata mama sāsane : K., C. stāpe hy āgata mama sāsane; G. stāpesu āgata hi mamāntikam.
178 datva śānghaṇa : K. datva śānghe ca; C. dattva śānghe ca; G. śānghe datva ca.
179 vicītrāṁ (= K., C.) : G. vividdham.
180 āgata mama sāsane : K., C. hy āgata mama sāsane; G. āgata hi mamāntikam.
181 G. 75ab : śānti ca samādhiṣya samprāptāṁ ca sāsanaṁ.

182 kṛtvā tu śaraṇatrayam sadā : K., C. kṛtvā tu śaraṇam sadā; G. sattvāṁ te sāsanaṁ gataḥ.
183 kṛtvā : K., C. kṛtvā tu; G. kṛtvā ca.
184 āgata mama sāsane : K., C. hy āgata mama sāsane; G. macchāsanam upāgatāḥ.
185 śākṣyapadām samādhyā : K. śākṣyapadānī samādhyā; C. śākṣyapadānī samādhyā; G. śākṣyapadānī cādāyā.
186 śākṣyamuniṣyā sāsane (= K., G.) : C. + śākṣyamunīśāsane.
187 pratipālya (= C.) : K. pratipādyā; G. paripālya.
188 āgata mama sāsane : K., C. hy āgata mama sāsane; G. āgata hi mamāntikam.
189 susaṃhitāḥ : K. susaṃhitāḥ; C., G. susaṃhitam.
190 upoṣītva āgata : K. upoṣeyha hy āgata; C. upoṣītva hy āgata; G. –.
tenaiva preritaḥ sarve mamāpy ete (56a) pratīcchitaḥ | [K. – ; C. – ; G.76ab]

ganāśreṣṭhena (59) muninā paritaḥ bhūrimedhāsā || (78) ○ | [K. – ; C. – ; G.76cd]

prasannāṁ janatāṁ dṛṣṭvā satyāṇi kathayasyati | [K. – ; C. – ; G.77ab]

śrutvā ca te tada (54d) dharmmaṁ prāpsyanti padam uttamaṁ || (79) | [K. – ; C. – ; G.77cd]

pratīkā, rathrayenāsau śrāvakāṁ vinayasyati | [K.74ab; C.77ab; G.78ab]

sarve te sāsravān dharmanā (56b) kṣapasyanti sūratāḥ (80) || | [K.74cd; C.77cd; G.78cd]

prathamāḥ sannipāto (╯) sya śrāvakānāṁ bhavasyati | [K.75ab; C.78ab; G.79ab]

pūrṇā śanvavatiḥ kotyāḥ (56a) śrāvaṁśa vikānaṁ bhavac chidām (81) || | [K.75cd; C.78cd; G.79cd]

dvītyaḥ sannipāto (╯) sya śrāvakānāṁ bhavasyati | [K.76ab; C.79ab; G.80ab]

pūrṇas ca caumnavati kotyo muktānāṁ kleshabandhanat (82) || | [K.76cd; C.79cd; G.80cd]

trītya sannipāto (╯) sya śrāvakānāṁ bhavī (82) | [K.77ab; C.80ab; G.81ab]

pūrṇā dvānavati kotyo (83) dāntānām (84) śāntacetasāṁ || | [K.77cd; C.80cd; G.81cd]

dharmacakraṁ pravartyātha vinīya suramānuśanā || | [K.78ab; C.81ab; G.82ab]

sāradham śrāvakāsāṁghena (85) pure pīṇḍam carisyati || (84) | [K.78cd; C.81cd; G.82cd]

tatāḥ (86) praviśatas tasya (86) ramyāṁ ketumatiṁ purīṁ || | [K.79ab; C.82ab; G.83ab]

māndaravāni (88) puṁśpāṇi prakṣepsyanti divākasah (89) || (85) 210 | [K.79cd; C.82cd; G.83cd]

catvāraś ca mahārājaḥ (211) śakraś ca trīdaśādhipaḥ | [K.80ab; C.83ab; G.84ab]

191 G. 74ab: upoṣayadham uposyeha āryam aṣṭaṅgikam śubham ||
192 G. 76ab: tenaite presitaḥ satvā pratīṣṭaḥ ca mayāpy āmt ||
196 sāsravān dharmanān: K. sāsravān dharmanān; C. hy asravān dharmanān; G. asravās tatra.
197 kṣapasyanti sūratāḥ (= G.): K. kṣapasyanti sūratāḥ; C. kṣapasyanti + + .
198 pūrṇaḥ śanvavatiḥ kotyāḥ: K. pūrṇaḥ śanvavatiḥ (Mr. śanvavati) kotyāḥ; C. pūrṇaḥ śanvavatiḥ kotyāḥ; G. pūrṇaḥ śanvavatiḥ kotyāḥ,
200 muktānāṁ kleshabandhanat (= C.) K. klesa(Ms klesa) muktā(Ms muktastā) kṣaṇāt; G. śāntānāṁ bhūrimedhāsā.
201 trītya: K., G. trītyaḥ; C. trītas.
202 dvānavati (= K.): C. dvānavatī; G. dvāvīṃśati.
203 kotyo (= C.): K. koty; G. kotyāḥ.
204 dāntānām: K., C. muktānām; G. śāntānām.
207 ketumatimaḥ purīṁ (= G.): K. ketumatiḥ purīṁ; C. ketumatiḥ purīṁ.
208 māndaravāni (= K., C.): G. māndarākānāi.
209 prakṣepsyanti divākasah: K., C., G. pariṣyanti purottane.
210 K. addas: devataḥ prakṣamisyanti tasmin pure gate munau || 79
C. addas: devataḥ prakṣamisyanti tasmin puragatae munau || (82)
G. addas: devataḥ prakṣamisyanti tasmin puragatae munau || 83 ||
211 mahārājaḥ: K. mahārājānāḥ; C. mahārājaḥ; G. mahārāja.
brahmā²¹² devaganaīḥ (Sā) sārddham pūjān tasya kariṣyati²¹³ || (86) [K.80cd; C.83cd; G.84cd]
upalām kumudam padmaṁ puṇḍarīkam sugandhikam²¹⁴ | [K.81ab; C.84ab; G.85ab]
agurum candanaṁ caiva²¹⁵ divyaṁ mālyam patiṣyati²¹⁶ || (87) [K.81cd; C.84cd; G.85cd]
cailaṅṣepaṁ kariṣyanti²¹⁷ devaputraḥ mahardhikāḥ, || (88) ²¹⁸ [K.82ab; C.85ab; G.86ab]
tan lokanāthaṁ udvīkṣya praviṣantaṁ purottamaṁ ○ || [K.82cd; C.85cd; G.86cd]
pathi bhūmyāstaraṇaṁ tatra²¹⁹ mṛduḥ tūlapicūpamā²²⁰ | [K.83ab; C.86ab; G.89ab]
vicitraṁ ca śubhaṁ²²¹ mālyam prakariṣyanti te pathi²²² || (89) [K.83cd; C.86cd; G.89cd]
chatradinghājapādaḥ tākābhīr²²³ arccayiṣyanti nayakaṁ²²⁴ | [K.84ab; C.87ab; G.90ab]
śubhais²²⁵ ca tūryanirghoṣaiḥ prasannamanaso narāḥ || (90) [K.84cd; C.87cd; G.90cd]
śāstūḥ pūjān²²⁶ kariṣyanti devaputraḥ mahardhikāḥ | [K.84ef; C.87ef; G. – ]
śa²²⁷ ca sakraḥ sahasrakṣo devarājā maṇiḥ hdvyutih²²⁸ || (91) [K.85ab; C.88ab; G.91ab]
pṛavrtaḥ pṛāṇaṁ kṛtvā²²⁹ stōṣyate lokanāyaṅakaṁ²³⁰ | [K.85cd; C.88cd; G.91cd]
namas te puruṣājanya²³¹ namas te puruṣottama || (92) [K.86ab; C.89ab; G.92ab]
anukampava janatāṁ bhagavāṁ agrapudgala²³² | ²³³ [K.86cd; C.89cd; G.92cd]

²¹² brahmā devaganaīḥ (K., G.) : C. brahmādevaganaīs.
²¹³ pūjāṁ tasya kariṣyati (K., G.) : K. pūjāṁ tasya vidhāsyati.
²¹⁴ upalāṁ kumudam padmaṁ puṇḍarīkam sugandhikam (K., G.) : C. upalakumudapadmapuṇḍarīkamsugandhikam.
²¹⁵ caiva (K., G.) : G. ċāpi.
²¹⁶ divyaṁ mālyam patiṣyati (G.) : K. divyamālyam tathaiva ca; C. divyamālaya tathaiva ca.
²¹⁷ kariṣyanti (K., G.) : C. vidhāsyanti.
²¹⁸ G. adds : divyaḥ ca tūryanirghoṣaiḥ divyaṁ mālyam patiṣyati | devata prakariṣyanti tasmin puraṇe munaḥ || 87 ||
ye tu ketumāṁ kecit° vasāyitāṁ mānusāḥ ||
te pi tām pāyāyaṁ praviṣantaṁ purottanam° || 88 ||
²¹⁹ bhūmyāstaraṇaṁ tatra (K., G.) : K. tatra sīṣita bhāmīr; C. bhāmīṁ sīṣita tatra.
²²⁰ mṛduḥ tūlapicūpamā (K., G.) : C. mṛduṭūlapicūpamā; G. mṛduṭūlapicūpamā.
²²¹ śubhaṁ (K., G.) : K. sūtraṁ.
²²² prakariṣyanti te pathi | K. vikariṣyanti te pathi; C. vistarīyantī te pathi; G. vikariṣyanti te tadā.
²²³ chatradinghājapatakābhīr (K., G. chatradinghājapatakābhīr; C. chatradinghājapatakāṇi.
²²⁴ arccayiṣyanti nayakaṁ (K., G. Gandhanāṃ yānulepanalī; G. arccayiṣyanti mānusāḥ.
²²⁵ śubhais (K., G.) : G. śrutaiś.
²²⁶ pūjāṁ (K., G.) : K. pājkāṁ; G. –.
²²⁷ sa (K., G.) : G. tāṁ.
²²⁸ devarājā mahādyutih (K., G. devarājō mahādyutih; G. devarājā śaṭpāthī.
²²⁹ pṛāṇaṁ kṛtvā (K., G.) : G. pṛāṇaṁ bhūtvā.
²³⁰ stōṣyate lokanāyaṅakaṁ (K., G.) : G. maitreyam stōṣyate jīnam°.
²³¹ puruṣājanya (K., G.) : K. puruṣasimha.
²³² bhagavāṁ agrapudgala (K., bhagavāṁ agrapudgala; C., G. bhagavāṁ agrapudgala.
²³³ K. adds : mahardhikō devaputrās tasyāḥ māro bhavīṣyatī l
sa caiva prāṇaṁ bhūtvā stōṣyate lokanāyaṅakaṁ || 87 C. adds : mahardhikō devaputrās tasyāḥ māro bhavīṣyatī l
sa caiva prāṇaṁ kṛtvā stōṣyate lokanāyaṅakaṁ || (90)
G. adds : mahardhikō devaputrās tasyāḥ māro bhavīṣyatī l
sa ċāpi prāṇaṁ bhūtvā stōṣyate lokanāyaṅakaṁ° || 93 ||
śuddhāvāsahasraś ca bahubhiḥ parivāritaḥ || (93)

pravekṣate ketumati|m maitreṇa lokanādanāh 234 ||

brāhma{n}naparivārena 235 brahmāś caiva puraskṛtaḥ 236 || (94)

kathayiṣyati saddharmmaṃ brahmaḥ ghoṣam udārayan* || (95)

ākṛtā prathivī sarvā arhadbiṣ ca bhāvīṣyati || (95)

kṣīnasravair 237 vvāntadoṣaḥ pṛahāvabhandhanaḥ || (96)

hrṣā devamanusyaś 238 ca gandharvā yakṣaṃ rākṣasaḥ || (96)

śāstuḥ pūjāṃ karisyanti nāgās cāpi mahāraddhiokāḥ || (97)

[88ab; C. – G.94ab]

[88cd; C. – G.94cd]

[89ab; C.91ab; G.95ab]

[89cd; C.91cd; G.95cd]

[90ab; C.92ab; G.96ab]

[90cd; C.92cd; G.96cd]

[91ab; C.93ab; G.97ab]

[91cd; C.93cd; G.97cd]

[92ab; C.94ab; G.98ab]

[92cd; C.94cd; G. – ]

[92ef; C.94ef; G.98ef]

[93ab; C.95ab; G.99ab]

[93cd; C.95cd; G.99cd]

[93ef; C.95ef; G.99ef]

[93ef; C.95ef; G.99ef]

[94ab; C.96ab; G.100ab]

[94cd; C.96cd; G.100cd]

[94ef; C.96ef; G.100ef]

[94ef; C.96ef; G.100ef]

[95ab; C.97ab; G.101ab]

[95cd; C.97cd; G.101cd]

[95ab; C.98ab; G.102ab]

234 pravekṣate ketumati|m maitreṇa lokanādanāh (= K.): G. pravekṣate ca maitreṇa lokanātho vināyakaḥ.
235 brāhma{n}naparivāreṣa: Read brāhmaṇap (= K., C., G.).
236 brahmāś caiva puraskṛtaḥ: K., C. brahmā caiva puraskṛtaḥ; G. brahmā cāpi girāsphuṭam*.
237 kṣīnasravair (= C.): K., G. kṣīnasravair.
238 devamanusyaḥ (= K., G.): C. deva mansyaṭ.
239 akhilas (= K.): G. cyaṇaghās.
240 chinnasrōt 'nyadānā: K. chinnasrotā anādāta; C. chinnasrotā anādīna; G. –.
241 uttṛṇā bhavasagārāḥ: K. uttṛṇā bhavasagārā; C. uttṛṇaḥbhavasagārāḥ; G. –.
242 G. 98cd: utkṣępaparīkṣāḥ dhītrā anādānā nirutsakāḥ ||
243 te vai nānaṃ (= C.): K. te vai nānaṃ; G. te 'pi nānaṃ.
244 asambhāvāḥ (= K.): C. G. asambhavāḥ.
246 nāmaḥ bhavisyanti (= K., C.): G. pāram gamsiṣyanti.
247 echīva jālam ivāṇḍajāḥ: K. chinnajālam asākṣitaḥ; C. chinmaṇāljaviṣaktiḥ; G. chīvā jālam eva bhujāt*.
248 ye dhyanāṇy upasampādyāḥ: K. dhyānāṇy upasampādyāḥ; C., G. dhyānāṇy upasampādyāḥ.
249 saṣṭiḥ vārasaḥasrāṇī: K., C. saṣṭiḥvārasaḥasrāṇī; G. saṣṭiḥm vārasaḥasrāṇī.
250 sarvabhūtānavikampakāḥ (= K.): C. sarvabhūtānavikampakāḥ; G. śāstā lokānākampaye.
251 śatām laikṣaḥasrāṇī: K., C. śatalaikṣaḥasrāṇī; G. śatāni ca sahasrāṇī.
252 prāṇiṇām (= K.): C. prāṇiṇām; G. prāṇiṇām.
vinayitvā ca saddharmme Śtanto nirvāṇam esyati |
tasmiṁoḥ ca nirvrte dhire maitreye dvipadottame || (103) 254

dāśavarṣahasrāṁi saddharmmah Śtsthāyati sadā 256 |

prasādayiṣyatā 257 cittāni tasmiṁ 258 chākyamunau jīne || (104)
tato draṁkṣathā 259 maitreyāṁ saṁbudhāṁ dvipadottamaṁ ||
idam āscaryakaṁ śrutvā imāṁ rddhim anuttamaṁ 261 || (105)

na praśīde ṭa ko vidvān 262 api kṛṣṇāḥ jātikāḥ 263 |

tasmād ihātmakaṁomena māhātmyam abhikāṅkṣatā 264 |
saddharmmo gurukarttavyaṁ smaratā buddhaśāsanāṁ || (106)

266 ārabhadhvā niskrāṁ mata yuyadhva buddhaśāsane |
dhunīta mṛtyunāṁ sainyam naOḍāgāram iva kuṇjaraḥ ||
yo hy asmin dhammavinaye apramattāṁ ca bhavīyati |
Prahāya jātisamaṁ ṭaṛaṁ duḥkhasyāntaṁ karisyati ||

|| maitreyavāyāraṇaṁ samāptaṁ 267 || || 268
A Sanskrit folio of the *Yuktiṣaśṭikāvyṛtti* from Tibet

YE Shaoyong (Beijing)*

The Sanskrit folio of the *Yuktiṣaśṭikāvyṛtti* presented here (Fig. 1–2) is found in bundle no. 17 of the collection of Sanskrit manuscripts formerly preserved in the China Ethnic Library. The microfilms I used belong to the Research Institute of Sanskrit Manuscripts and Buddhist Literature at Peking University. Wang Sen described this bundle as “Sanskrit miscellaneous leaves.” Checking with Sāṅkṛtyāyana’s catalogues, it seems this bundle was most probably taken from Zhalu Monastery. Years ago, I published editions of three folios of the *Mīlamadhyamakakārikā* and eleven of the *Buddhapālītamaṃlamadhyamakavyṛtti* that were found in the same bundle (Ye 2007, 2008, 2011). There are still more Sanskrit leaves yet to be edited in this bundle.²

This folio of the *Yuktiṣaśṭikāvyṛtti*, of unknown dimensions, is made of palm-leaf. The script, which could be called a variety of the Eastern Nāgarī script, might suggest a date around the 10th or 11th century. The right end of the folio is broken and five to six *aṅgaras* are lost. The folio number in two digits is written on the left side of the verso. Judging from the microfilm, only the symbol representing 20 is clear while the units digit is not sure.

The *Yuktiṣaśṭikā-kārikā* is regarded as one of the authentic works of Nāgarjuna (ca. 150–250), whose original Sanskrit is not extant. On the basis of identifications previously made by various scholars, C. Lindtner (1982) collected twelve verses (vv. 1, 5, 6, 19, 30, 33, 34, 39, 46, 47, 48, 55) of its Sanskrit text preserved through citations in other works. Thanks to the newly identified folio introduced here, another two Sanskrit verses are recovered (vv. 31, 32).

Candrakīrti composed a commentary on the *Yuktiṣaśṭikā-kārikā* named *Yuktiṣaśṭikāvyṛtti*, whose Sanskrit original was believed to be lost, except for the opening dedication and a few following words found in a line of *aṅgaras* on the verso of the last folio of the *Madhyamakahādaya-kārikā* found at Zhalu Monastery (Fig. 3–4). This line, whose

---

* My thanks are due to Mr. Diego Loukota and Ms. Ting Lee Ling who took the trouble of checking my English. Needless to say, any errors that remain are my own.


² I have given a preliminary report on these miscellaneous leaves preserved in bundle no. 15 to 17 of this collection at the 5th Beijing International Seminar on Tibetan Studies (Oct. 2011). These bundles contain remaining folios from manuscripts of the *Vinīcayasamgrahani*, an unknown commentary on the *Vinīcayasamgrahani*, the *Sūtrakārapindārtha* by Sañjana, the *Sūtrakārādikārasamgrahat* by Mahājana, the *Sūtrakāraparicaya*, the *Mahāyānottaratantraparicaya* and an unknown commentary on the *Madhyamakāloka*. It is worth noting that, according to Luo Zhao’s catalogue (1985, 133–140, no. 44), some other folios of the above mentioned manuscripts are preserved in a bundle at the Potala Palace. Dr. Li Xuezhu of the China Tibetology Research Center is currently working on these leaves. It may be expected that in the future some more folios of these texts, including the *Yuktiṣaśṭikāvyṛtti*, will be found.
script is different from the one of the newly identified folio, was first transliterated by Sāṅkṛtyāyana (1937, 48, n. 1) and then identified by V. V. Gokhale (1958, 165, n. 1; cf. also Scherrrer-Schaub 1991, 19, n. 4). The newly found folio presented here contains Candrakīrti’s commentary from the second half of verse 30 to the beginning of verse 34.

Critical transliterations collated with the Tibetan translation are provided here both for the opening line and for the newly identified folio of the Yuktiṣaṭikāvṛtti. The Tibetan text follows the critical edition by Scherrrer-Schaub (1991) checked against Loizzo et al. 2007.

The opening line of the Yuktiṣaṭikāvṛtti:

(namo) (Mā)m(ju)nāṭhāya ||

janasya' yo muktipathānuyāyinīn īnirāṅkṛtāntadvayayuktiṣaṭikām ||
cakārā[hip] tasya pranīpataśaśā mayā vibhajyate madhyamakānusārataḥ ||

(Vamśastha)

ihāyām ācāryo yathāvasthita-praṇītṛyasamutpādādāraśānāsādītapṛiti-viśeṣaḥ paraprāsādāyatananām taddhigama((m a)vetya praṇītṛya-samutpādādāra[n]a)prabhā . . . .

D no. 3864, dBu ma, Ya 1b1; P. no. 5265, dBu ma, Ya 1b1
|| rgya gar skad du | Yuktiṣaṭikāvṛtti | bod skad du | Rigs pa drug cu pa’i ’grel pa |

'Jam dpal ye shes sems dpa’ la phyag ’tshal lo ||

rgyal ba’i rigs pa’i lam gyi rjes ’gro’i ba || D1b2
mtha’ gnyis sel ba’i Rigs pa drug cu pa ||
gang gi mdzad pa de la phyag ’tshal te ||
bdag gi dBu ma’i tshul gyis de rnam’ || D1b3
dbye ||

de la’ slob dpön ’di ni rten cing ’brel par P2a1
’byung ba ji ltar gnas pa bzhiṅ du de kho na gzigs pas dgyes pa’i khyad par brnyes pa ste || de rto gs pa ni dad pa mchog gi’ gnas yin D1b4
par mkhyen nas rten cing ’brel par ’byung ba mthong ba las ’jig rten dang ’jig rten las ’das pa’i dge ba’i tshogs ma lus par ’byung ba dang ’phags pa’i gang zag ma’ lus par D1b5
’byung ba dang | sangs rgyas bcom ldan ’das ye shes sgrib pa med pa dang ldan pa rnams kyi rnam pa thams cad du de kho na nyid4
mgon par rdzogs par byang chub pa yang’ D2a1
.gzigs nas [...]
The newly found folio of the *Yuktisastikavṛtti*:

1. (ṣarvam astti vaktavyam
daustattvageśiṣṇah |
pasćād avagatārthasya
niḥsaṅgasya viviktatā|| 30)

\[1\]

\[r1\] pasvabhāvaḥ bhaven nānyathety evam
upādāya vā pratītya vā |

katham avagatārthasya |

\[r2\] kāryāṇām aparayavāmanatvāt
eaikāsya ca ○ kārayānēka-
pratayatvād ekaikāsya ca pratayasya
nirūpyamāṇaśasya vādi3 saṃsāravat
kāraṇasamagriparsaṃparāyāḥ ○
paryantādārśanāt kāraṇamabhaya-
darsinah kāraṇasamagriparsaṃparasyo-
pārjītānacakratvaya(jātakārtyasyā)īm-
lābhāntantaravānāśītā]|m
[adhī]tyātiprayatnasādhyam udayaṃ
dang | 'bras bu re re'i rkyen kyang du ma
[adhī]tyātiprayatnasādhyayāntopanatam
vyāsaṃ cādhitya saṃskṛtā-dharmatāṁ
tuskiḥ | ○ saṃsāraṃ
bālajānacaritam  anabhīnandatā ||
udaye 'nabhīrataśya vināśe
'pratikūlawartinaṃ | ○ saṃsāraṃ
tiṣyoktoḥ saṃsāraṃ
prāhātukaṃsya śīhīkṛtātmā-
snehasya | evam avagatārthasya mata)

\[r3\] uttarkālaṃ viviktātā yujyate | na
prāk* |

\[2\]  de nyid tshol la thog mar ni ||
thams cad yod ces brjod par bya ||
don rnams rtags shing 'chags med2 D20a7
nas ||
de yi 'og tu dben pa'o || (30)

\[r3\] phung po la sogs pa de dag kyang nye bar
bzung ste de dang 'di'i yod pa gang yin pa
de nye bar bzung nas ring bo dang | thung
ngu' bzhin du'am | mar me'i 'od bzhin du
bstan te gyur pa de las' gzhhan du ma yin
D20b5
te | de itar na nye bar bzung ba'am brten
par' zad do ||
don rtags zhes bya ba ji lta bu zhe na |

'bras bu mams kyi mtha' med pa'i phyir
dang | 'bras bu re re'i rkyen kyang du ma
yod pa'i phyir dang | rkyen re re la yang
brtags na thog ma med pa'i 'khor ba bzhin
du' rgyu'i tshogs pa gcig nas gcig tu
D20b6
brgyud pa'i mtha' mi mthong ba'i phyir
'bras bu'i rtsom pa la 'jig' par lta bas
rgyu'i tshogs pa gcig 'nas gcig tu'
brgyud
pas bsgṛubs pa'i 'bras bu rkyen du ma las
byung ba grub ma thag tu 'jig par rtags
shing | skye ba ni shin tu 'bad pas bsgṛub
par' bya ba yin la | shin tu 'bad pas
d20b7
bsgrubs pa 'jig pa ni 'bad pa med par yang
byung bar rtags nas 'dus byas kyi chos
nyid la sgyid lug pa | byis pa skye bo'i
spoyd pa la mgon par mi bstod pa | skye
ba la mgon par mi dga' ba | 'jig pa la ni
'
phrod par 'dzin pa | 'khor' ba mams la D21a1
chags pa 'dor bar 'dod pa | 'khor ba spong
bar 'dod pa | bdag la chags pa lhod par
gyur pas de itar don khong du chud pa la
de'i 'og tu dben pa ni rigs kyi snga rol tu
ni ma yin no ||

1 Quoted from Lindner 1982, 110.
2 Read (pradīpaprabhāvad (= Tib. mar me'i
'od bzhin du) ?
3 Read nāḍi (= Tib. thog ma med pa).
4 Read anutṣāhaheṭho or anutṣāhināḥ? Tib.
sgyid lug pa.
5 Read tītyakṣoḥ (= Tib. 'dor bar 'dod pa) ?

\[3\] DC tshul.
\[2\] DC pa.
\[3\] = PNDC; Scherrer-Schaub 1991 du.
\[4\] PN brten.
\[5\] PN 'jigs.
\[6\] DC om.
\[7\] D du.
evaṃ hi nācāryasya viphalāḥ śūnyatopadeso bhavati | na caśopi śīṣyāṇāṁ pratiśekma-viparītāvagamabhyāṁ vinipātaḥ {pā} syāt* |

delṭa byas na slob dpon gyis stong pa nyid bstan pa yang 'bras bu med par mi D21a2 'gyur | slob ma rmons kyang spong ba dang | phyin ci log tu 'dzin pas log par l투ng bar mi 'gyur ro ||
de lṭar ma byas na kun rdzob dang don dam pa'i bden pa gnyis rnam par gnas1 pa dang | 2 mi mthun par gyur pa'i phyir stong pa nyid bstan 'pas log par l투ng bar D21a3 'gyur ro3 || de lṭar gyur na mi dge ba spong3 mi nus so || mi mkhas pa'i blo can dag 'gro ba 'di'i stong pa'o snyam du 'dzin zhin5 'di ni stong pa nyid na 'dis ci zhig bya zhes nges par bsgrub par bya ba'i dge ba'i las la mi spro bar 'gyur te | de bas na ' 'di yang sgro gshog ma skyes D21a4 pa'i bya rang gi tshang bor nas 'phur ba bzhin du brlag par 'gyur te |

'di lṭar so so rang gis rtogs pa dang brag ba'i phyir |

rnam par bden don mi shes la ||

'gnga par gnam pa gnos pa dang l mi mthun par gyur pa'i phyir, seems to be a rendering derived from a wrong reading (vaipakṣya?)

Cf. Prasamāpāda (la Vallée Poussin 1903–1913, 69.3) so 'ham samyṛtisatyayavasthāvaicakṣanyābhdvād, “because of the lack of skill in determining the two truths.” Tib. bden pa gnyis rnam par gnas pa dang l mi mthun par gyur pa'i phyir, seems to be a rendering derived from a wrong reading (vaipakṣya?).

Read "viharāt."

Read pratyātmādhipaśāntatattavasya (≡ Tib. stong pa nyid kyi de kho na so so rang gis rtogs pa na)?

1 samyṛtisamārtha-satyayavasthā-vācikṣanyābhāvād, “because of the lack of skill in determining the two truths.” Tib. bden pa gnyis rnam par gnas pa dang l mi mthun par gyur pa'i phyir, seems to be a rendering derived from a wrong reading (vaipakṣya?).

2 See note 1 on the left.

3 P om.

4 NDC spang.

5 PN cing.

4 Read akarāṇaṁ.
gang dag stong pa nyidʰ so so rang gis D21a6 rtags paʰ med par stong pa nyid kyis gsa thos pa tsam gyis bya ba byas paʰ rams kyis spyod pa ltar rjes su 'chos pos na mi dge baʰi las nyid la zhus gs byin gyi | dge ba la ni ma yin te | de dag gdon mi za bar sgo gshog rdzogs paʰi byaʰi tshul byiʰu phrug sgo gshogʰ ma skyes pas bya ba D21a7 bzhin du nyon mongs paʰi mthar 'gyur roʰ chu thos pa tsam gyis skoms pa mi phyidʰ la | zas thos pa tsam gyis kyang bkres pa mi phyid² de | de bstenʰ na de dag phyid⁷ pa bzhin du 'di rtags nas skyes bu thal de dag brlag go zhes brjod do || gcig tu mi dge baʰ la 'jug D21b1 pas de dag ni skyes bu thal slh lo || de ltar deʰi nyes pa yongs su spang bar bzhed nas | bcom idan 'das kyis nyanʰ pa rams la kun rdzob kyi bden pa las yongs su ma nyams paʰi don re zhig thog ma nyid du | lasʰ kyis 'bras bu yod pa dang || 'gro ba rnam kyangʰ shin tu brjod || D21b2 (32ab)

tevs can rams gang la gnas nas las rams byed cing deʰi 'bras bu yang za baʰi 'gro ba lnga bcom ldan 'das kyis gsungs so || deʰi 'og tu de dag gi 'di bden no snyam du mngon pa zhen pa mchog tu 'dzin pa lus kyis mdud pa 'diʰi gnyen por | de yI rangʰ bzhin yongs shes dang || D21b3 skye ba med pa dag kyang bstan || (32cd)

gro ba la sosgs pa yang rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba yin pas ngo bo nyid kyis ma skyes paʰo || deʰi rang bzhin yongs su shes pa lam dang 'gro ba la sosgs pa rnam kyis skye ba med pa las gyi ye¹⁰ shes thob par byaʰ ba yang bstan to || D21b4

¹ Read anisṭair?
² Read hamyetān.
³ Read (aparīḥ)mārthañ?
⁴ Read 'pratipokṣena (= Tib. gnyen por).
de bas na ‘di ltar gnyi ga’i bdag nyid bstan pa mam par gzhag1 pa ‘di la dgos pa’i ched du bstan pa ni’2 gang don gyi ched du bstan pa ni’2 gang zhe na | ‘di la dpyad na gtan la dbab tu rung ste | dgos pa’i dbang du rgyal ba rnam ||
nga dang nga yi zhes gsungs ltar ||
phung po kham dang skye mched rnam ||
de bzhin dgos pa’i dbang gis gsungs || (33)
sangs rgyas bcom ldan ‘das ni nga dang nga yir ‘dzin pa spangs pa yin yang brjod par bzhed pa’i don gyi3 sgo nas bstan pa’i phyir ‘jig rten gyi ched du nga dang' D21b6 nga’i zhés gsungs pa de bzhin du dgos pa’i dbang gis phung po dang skye mched dang kham rnam gsungs te | de’i rnam par dbye ba bstan pa med par ‘jig rten de kho na la zhugs pa’i thabs med pa’i phyir ro ||
jī ltar dgos pa’i dbang du phung po dang | skye mched dang | kham rnam bshad 'D21b7 kyi de kho na’i don du ni ma yin par ‘di ji ltar shes par ‘nus pa’4 ‘di ni ’thag pa dang lung gis nges par rung ste | de la re zhih ‘thag pa’i dbang du byas nas ||
'bhyung ba che la sogs bshad pa ||
 rnam par shes su yang dag ’du ||
de shes pas ni ’bral ’gyur na ||
 log par rnam ’brtags ma yin nam || D22a1 (34)

zhes bya ba smos so || mam par shes pas dmnigs pa gang gi rnam pa ‘dzin cing skye ba’i dmnigs pa de | rnam par shes pa la rnam pa nye bar bsgrubs pa’i rang gi dngos po thob nas dngos po’i don gyi ngo bo nyid kyis ’bhyung ba chen’ po la D22a2 sogs par yongs su brtags so || rnam par shes pa la ‘ga’ zhig gi rnam par ma bzhag pa la ni ’jig rten gyis yod

1 PN bzhag.
2 PN om.
3 DC kyi.
4 = PNDC; Scherrer-Schaub 1991 ms l.
pa nyid du nam par gzhag mi nus te | mo
gsham gyi bu la sogs pa yang yod par thal
bar ’gyur ba’i phyir ro || de bas na ’byung
ba dang ’byung’ ba las gyur pa dang | sems D22a3
dang sems las byung ba dang | sems dang
Idan pa ma yin pa rams ni ram par shes
pa’i ram pa’i rgyu can yin pa’i phyir
’byung ba chen po la sogs pa gang dang
gang bshad pa ci yang rung ba de dag thams
cad ni ram par shes par yang dag par ’du D22a4
zhing khongs su chud do ||

SYMBOLS USED IN THE TRANSLITERATION

( ) restored aksara(s)
(italic) uncertain restoration or back-translation from Tibetan
[] aksara(s) whose reading(s) is(are) uncertain
<> omitted (part of) aksara(s) without gap in the manuscript
<< interlinear insertion
{} superfluous aksara(s)
{}} deleted aksara(s)
. one illegible aksara
. illegible part of an aksara
* virāma
' avagraha (not used in the original manuscript)
O string hole
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Diplomatic Transcription of Newly Available Leaves
from Asaṅga’s *Abhiddharmasamuccaya*
—Folios 1, 15, 18, 20, 23, 24—*

Li Xuezhu (Beijing)

Until recently, only the Sanskrit manuscript of *Jinaputra’s commentary (Bhāṣya)* to Asaṅga’s *Abhiddharmasamuccaya (= AS)* was available in full; the text of AS itself was known only through fragments, and the related Sanskrit manuscripts of Sthiramati’s Vyākhya were thought to be lost. I previously reported newly available folios of AS and the Vyākhya (Li 2011), both currently preserved at the Potala palace and Norbulingka.¹ I have utilized facsimile copies held at the China Tibetology Research Centre in Beijing. In the present paper, I present a diplomatic transcription of half the newly available folios of the AS manuscript, including the first folio.

The newly available folios of AS, eleven in total, came from a single bundle that also included the already known seventeen folios of AS photographed by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana at Zhwa lu Ri phug in the 1930s. At present, the last folio is numbered “44,” so we may assume at least sixteen more folios are yet to be found.

[Table: Folios of the *Abhiddharmasamuccaya* manuscript]

**Newly available eleven folios:**

Fols. 1, 15, 18, 20, 23, 24, 29, 33, 39, 43, 44.

Previously available seventeen folios photographed by Sāṅkṛtyāyana:

Fols. 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 30, 31, 36, 38, 42.

Presumably missing sixteen folios:

Fols. 2, 6, 7, 17, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32, 34, 35, 37, 40, 41.

In addition, the newly available Sanskrit manuscripts of the Vyākhya contain the entire text of both AS and its Bhāṣya; we can now extract a complete Sanskrit text of the AS from it. I am

* I am grateful to Prof. Seishi Karashima, Dr. Jundo Nagashima, Dr. Kazuo Kano, Dr. Yoshihiko Nasu, and members of the *Abhiddharmasamuccaya* research group, who have supported to complete the present paper.

¹ Two manuscripts of the Vyākhya have become newly available: one consists of 215 folios (the first folio is missing) and dates back to the Pāla dynasty, ca. 1156, according to its colophon; the other consists of 84 folios (about half of the folios are missing). They are preserved at Norbulingka.
currently preparing a critical edition of AS, collating the text contained in the *Vyākhya* (together with the help of the AS research group in Kyoto).

**A Description of the Manuscript**

The size of the folios is, according to Sāṅkṛtyāyana’s report (Sāṅkṛtyāyana 1937: 48, No. 312), 21½ x 2 inches. The script is the type commonly seen in eastern Indian Sanskrit manuscripts of around the 10th to 11th century (Sāṅkṛtyāyana calls it Māghadi). The colophon runs just: *samāpto (')yam abhidharmmasamuccayaḥ ||* (fol. 44v6).

**Conventions in the Diplomatic Transcription**

The following diplomatic transcription of AS corresponds to lacunae of the text published by Gokhale (1947). I keep the reading as found in the manuscript and do not modify the standard orthography with regard to gemination/degemination before or after semi-vowels and sandhi. The sigla used in the transcription, edition and notes are as follows:

- O string hole
- + one lost akṣara
- .. one illegible akṣara
- * virāma
- ; gap filling sign before a string hole or end of a line
- | danda
- || double danda
- [ ] unclear/damaged akṣara(s) in the manuscript
- « » Akṣara(s) inserted by the scribe in the manuscript
- { } Akṣara(s) cancelled by the scribe in the manuscript
- () Akṣara(s) restored by the present editor
- < > omitted (part of) akṣara(s) without gap in the manuscript
- {} superfluous akṣara(s) or a danda
- /// A broken point at the right/left end of the palm leaf
- =/pc The raised letters ac (*ante correctionem*) and pc (*post correctionem*) after manuscript sigla indicate readings before and after scribal correction.

Ch. The Chinese translation of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, namely 大乘阿毘達磨集論, Taisho No. 1605

r recto
s.e. scribal error

Tib. The Tibetan translation of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, namely *Chos mgon pa kun las btus pa*, Peking No. 5550, Derge No. 4049

v verso
Diplomatic Transcription

1r (cover folio)

mngon pa kun las btus kyi ’grel pa’i dum bu yin bal dpe

Fol. 1: [Hayashima, p. 14; Derge No. 4049, 44b1-45b1; Taisho No. 1605, 663a2-663b5]

(1v1) nama[h] sarvabuddhebyaḥ saṣrāvakasamgehebhyo namo namaḥ ||

«uddānaḥ»

kati kasmād upādānaṃ laksanāṃ ○ tadyavasthitih karmārthaupamyabhedāś ca sāmgraḥādi catuṣṭayaṃ ||
sāmgraḥā ca samprayogaś ca samanvāgama eva ca l vinīścayaś caturbhedāḥ piṇḍoddānaṃ samuccaye || satyadharmaṃapṭisāmkathyaviniśca(ya)vibhedataḥ

kati skandhāḥ [kati dhātavaḥ katy āya](1v2)tanāni ||

paṃca skandhāḥ | rūpaskandho vedanāskandhaḥ saṃjñāskandhaḥ saṃskāraskandho vijñānakandhaḥ ||

aśṭādaśa dhātavaḥ | caksurdhātuḥ | rūpadhātuḥ | caksurviṃśañadhātuḥ | śrotadhātuḥ šabdadhātuḥ (l) śrotavijñānadhātuḥ | ghrāṇadhātuḥ (l) ghandhadhātuḥ (l) ghrāṇavijñānadhātuḥ | jihvādhātuḥ (l) rasadhātuḥ | jihvāvijñānadhātuḥ | kāyadhātuḥ spraṣṭavyadhātuḥ (l) kāyavi(1v3)jñānadhātuḥ | manodadhātuḥ | dharmadhātuḥ | manovijñānadhātuḥ ||

dvādaśayatanāni | caksurāyatanāṃ | rūpāyatanāṃ | śrotāyatanāṃ | šabdāyatanāṃ | ghrāṇāyatanāṃ | ghandhāya<s>ta</s>nam | jihvāyatanāṃ | rasāyatanāṃ | kāyāyatanāṃ | spraṣṭavyāyatanāṃ | maṅgaṇyāyatanāṃ | dharmāyatanāṃ ||

kasmāt paṃcaiva skandhāḥ (l) paṃcākārātmavastūdbhāvanatāṃ upādāya ||

sapatikṣa(1v4)hadeḥatmavastūdbhāvanatāṃ upādāya | upabhogatmavastūdbhāvanatāṃ upādāya | vyavahārātmavastūdbhāvanatāṃ upādāya | dharmmādharmmābhisaṃskārātmavastūdbhāvanatāṃ upādāya ||

dvādaśaśaiva dhātaOvaḥ | dehapaṃgrihāhṛhyām {l}ṣaḍākārāttavarttamānopaḥgogahārāṇatāṃ upādāya ||

kasmād dvādaśaśvāya(1v5)tanāni | dehapaṃgrihāhṛhyām eva ṣaḍākārānaṇāṭopahogāya dvāraṃ upādāya ||

kasmād upādānaOskandhā ity ucyaṇe | upādānena yuktās tasmād upādānakandhā ity ituṣcyaṇe | upādānaṃ katam | yo ’(’)tra chhandarāgaḥ kena kāraṇena cchandarāga evopādānaṃ | anāgatavarttamānakandhāhini(r)vrīt(t)yaparityāgatāṃ upādāya | anāgataḥbhāṣṣato varttamāḥ(1v6)nādhyavasānatas ca ||

kena kāraṇena dhātavaḥ āyatanāni ca {l} sopādānā dharmmā ity ucyaṇe | tatra skandhavan niOrdeśaḥ ||
kiṃlakṣaṇo rūpaskandhah | rūpanālakṣaṇaḥ | dvividhayā rūpanayā | sparśarūpanayā |
deśaṇī{rūpaṇa}rūpanayā ca | sparśarūpanā katamā | pāṇisaṃsparṣena sprṣṭo rūpyate |
loṣṭasamsparṣena | daṇḍasamsparṣena | śastraśamsparṣena | (1v7) śītenoṣṭena | jīghatsaya |
pipāsāya | damśamaśakāvattatapaśrūpasamsparṣaṇīḥ sprṣṭo rūpyate | desaṇirūpanā{rūpanā} |
katamā | yā deśe idam cedāna ca rūpam iti «eva va caiva ni ca rūpam»² |{ii} samāhitena manasā |
asamāhitena vā tarkasampravuktena citrīkārata ||
kīṃlakṣaṇaḥ vedanā | yā rūpeṇaḥubhavena | subhāsubhānāṃ karmmanāṃ phalavipākaṃ + + +

Fol. 15: [Hayashima, p. 292; Derge No. 4049, 75b7-78a2; Taisho No. 1605, 672c13-673b15]

(15r1) (bahirmu)khaprabhedaḥ katamaḥ (i) yadbhuyasā kāmāvacaraḥ{ḥ kāmācarah}prabhedaḥ³ |
| antarmukhaprabhedaḥ katamaḥ | samāhitabhūmikah⁴ ||
| āyatakālkaprabhedaḥ katamaḥ (i) prthagjananām ||
| parichchinnakalaprabhedaḥ katamaḥ (i) saikṣānām asakaśānān ca caramāni {} |
| skandhadhātvayanāni sthāpayītā ||
| tattkālkaprabhedaḥ katamaḥ asaikṣānān cara{r}māni² {} | skandhadhātvayanāni ||
| samantaraprabhedaḥ katamaḥ | (15r2) yad buddhāḥ pāramipraptāḥ ca bodhisatvāḥ |
skandhadhātvayanāni sandarśanayāni ||
| samgrahaḥ katamaḥ (i) ekādasaviOdho draṣṭavyaḥ | laksanaṃsamgrahaḥ {} dhātusamgrahaḥ |
| jātisamgrahaḥ {} avasthāsamgrahaḥ {} sahāyasaṃgrahaḥ {} deśasaṃgrahaḥ {} |
kālasamgrahaḥ {} ekadesasaṃgrahaḥ sakalasaṃgrahaḥ {} itaretarasasaṃgrahaḥ |
| paramārthaṣaṃgrahaḥ ca ||
| laksanaṃsaṃgrahaḥ katamaḥ | skandhadhā(15r3)tvayanānāṃ pratyekaṃ yat svalaksanaṃ | tair eva teṣāṃ samgrahā draṣṭavyaḥ |
| dhātusam(ṛ)grahaḥ katamaḥ (i) skandhadhātvayaōnāṃ | yad bijam ala«ya»vijñānāṃ | sa |
esām dhātusamgrahaḥ |
| jātisaṃgrahaḥ katamaḥ | bhinnalaksanaṇy api skandhadhātvayanāni skandhārtham |
| pramāṇikrtya dhātvayanārtham pramāṇikrtya sarvāṇi anyonyaṃ samgrhitāni ||
| avasthāsamgrahaḥ katamaḥ (i) sukhaāvasthāni (15r4) skandhadhātvayanāni tair eva |
samgrhitāni | e«vaṃ» duḥkhaavasthāṇi aduḥkhaāvasthāni tair eva saṃgrhitāni ||
| sahāyaasaṃgrahaḥ katamaḥ | rūpaskandhas ta[di]nayaiḥ skandhaḥ sahāyaḥ saparivāraḥ |
sahāyaasaṃgrahaṇa samgrhitāḥ | evan tadanyāni skandhadhātvāōyatanāni veditavyāni ||
| deśasaṃgrahaḥ katamaḥ (i) yāni pūrvvayaṃ diśi skandhadhāōtvayanāni tāni | tair eva |
saṃ[grh]i(15r5)tāni | evaṃ tadanyāsūdiṣu veditavyāni ||
| kālasaṃgrahaḥ katamaḥ | aṭtāni skandhadhātvayanāṇi | tair eva saṃgrhitāni | evam |
anāgatāni prayutpannāni {} tair eva saṃgrhitāni ||

² Cf. Vyakhya: yā deśe idaṇ cedāna ca rūpam eva va caiva ni ca rūpam iti.
³ Cf. Tib. phal cher 'rod pa'i khams na spyod pas rab tu dbye ba'o.
⁴ Cf. Tib. mnyam par gzhag pa'i sa pa thams cad do.
⁵ S.e. for caramāni.
ekadešasamgrahā katamaḥ (l) yāvanto dharmāḥ skandhadhātvāyatanaiḥ samgrhītāḥ {1} teṣām anyatamasamgrahā ekadešasamgrahā viditavyāḥ ।

«sakalasamgrahā katamaḥ » yāvanto dharmāḥ skandhadhātvā (15r6) yatanaiḥ samgrhītāḥ {l} teṣām aśeṣataḥ samgrahāḥ sakalasamgrahā viditavyāḥ ।

itaretarasamgrahā kaṭāmāḥ l rūpaskandhaḥ katibhir dhātubhiḥ katibhir āyatanaiḥ samgrhītāḥ l daśābhir dhātubhikā daśābhir āyatanaiḥ ekasya ca dhātavyatanāsyaikadeśena । vedanāśkandhaḥ katibhir dhātubhiḥ katibhir āyatanaiḥ samgrhītāḥ l ekasya dhātavyatanāsyaikadeśena । yathā veda(nā) (15r7) skandhaḥ evaṃ samjñāśkandhaḥ {l} samksāraskandhaḥ l vijñānaskandhaḥ katibhir dhātubhiḥ katibhir āyatanaiḥ samgrhītāḥ l saṃpadbhā dhātubhr ekenāyatanena samgrhītāḥ l caṇḍuddhātuḥ katibhir skandhaiḥ katibhir āyatanaiḥ samgrhītāḥ l rūpaskandhaikadeśena {l} ekenāyatanena । yathā caṇḍu(r)dhātuḥ evaṃ śrotadhātuḥ {l} ghrāṇadhātuḥ {l} jihvādhātuḥ kāyadhātuḥ l rūpadhātuḥ ka(15v1) tribhīḥ skandhaiḥ katibhir āyatanaiḥ samgrhītāḥ l rūpaskandhaikadeśena {l} ekenāyatanena । yathā rūpadhāvītur evaṃ śabdadhatuḥ gandhadhātuḥ rasadhātuḥ ṭraṣṭāvadyadhātuḥ l caṇḍuṣvijñānadhātuḥ katibhir skandhaiḥ katibhir āyatanaiḥ samgrhītāḥ । vijñānaskandhamaṇaayatanayor ekadeśena । yathā caṇḍuṣvijñānadhātuḥ evaṃ śrotaghrāṇajīvāyamanovijñānadhā[ā]tavaḥ । (15v2) dharmadhātuh katibhir skandhaiḥ katibhir āyatanaiḥ samgrhītāḥ l tribhīḥ skandhayaiḥ ekasya caṇḍekādeśena evākena ēvaiṭaṇena samgrhītāḥ l caṇḍuṣāyatanam catibhir skandhaiḥ catibhir dhātubhīḥ samgrhītāḥ l rūpaskandhaikadeśena ekena ca dhātunā । yathā caṇḍuṣāyatanam evaṃ śrotaghrāṇajīvāyataṇāṇi {1} rūpadabdagandharasprasṭāvāyatanāṇī ca || (15v3) [manal]ayatanam catibhir skandhaiḥ catibhir dhātubhīḥ samgrhītan ekena skandhena saṃpadbhā dhātubhīḥ samgrhītan l dharmāyatanam catibhir skandhaiḥ catibhir dhātubhīḥ samgrhītan l tribhīḥ skandhaiḥ ekasya caṇḍekādeśena ekena dhātunā samgrhītan l evaṃ ye tadanye dharmāḥ skhandhanirdiṣṭā dhātavyatanānirdiṣṭāḥ {l} ye ca tathānirdiṣṭāḥ tadyathā dravyasantaḥ prajñāptisa[nthā](15v4) samvṛtisantaḥ paramārthasantaḥ jīvīyaḥ vijñānabhājeyā跛 rūpīṇa (') rūpīṇa\footnote{Tib. \textit{rnam par shes par bya ba dang / mgon par shes par bya ba dang}. We can emend the phrase to *vijñeyā \textit{abhijñeyā} according to Tib. } ।

\footnote{Tib. \textit{rnam par shes par bya ba dang / mgon par shes par bya ba dang}. We can emend the phrase to *vijñeyā \textit{abhijñeyā} according to Tib.}

sanitarśanā anidarśanā īoṭe evamādayāḥ {l} teṣām api skandhadhātvatanaṇaḥ samgrahaḥ yathāyogaṃ viditavyāḥ (l) sa ca pūrvam eva nirūḍiṣṭaḥ l paramārthasamgrahaḥ kaṭāmāḥ l yā skandhadhātvatanaṇīṃ tathātaḥ l evaṃ samgrahakūḍalāḥ l

katham anusaṃśa(m) labhate l ālambanābhīṣaṃ(15v5)keśeṃ anusaṃśa(m) labhate l yathā yathā cālambanābhīṣamkṣepas tathaḥ tathā kuśamālābhīvṛddhiḥ l

sampraṇa(ya) goaḥ katamaḥ (l) saḍvidho draṣṭavyāḥ l avinibhāgasamprayogaḥ {l} miśrībhāvasamprayogaḥ {l} samavadhānasamprayogaḥ {l} saḥabhāvasamprayogaḥ {l} kṛtyānustānasamprayogaḥ {l} sampratipattisamprayogaḥ ca l

avinibhāgasamprayogaḥ katamaḥ (l) para(15v6)māṇudeśe sarveśāṃ desinām avinibhāgaḥ l

miśrībhāvasamprayogaḥ katamaḥ l paramāṇo(r) ur[ṇ][dh]van desīṇāṃ miśrībhāvāḥ l

\footnote{Tib. \textit{rnam par shes par bya ba dang / mgon par shes par bya ba dang}. We can emend the phrase to *vijñeyā \textit{abhijñeyā} according to Tib.}

\footnote{Read: ‘rūpīṇa’.}
samavadhānasamprayogaḥ katamaḥ | desīnām eva samudāyinām anyonyasamavadhānam ||
sahabhāvasamprayogaḥ katamaḥ | yāni skandhadhātvayatanāni sahabhāvena varttante {I} ekotpādānī ekasthāyāṃ ekaniroḍhānī ||

Kṛtyānusthānasamprayogaḥ (15v7) katamaḥ | tadyathā dvau bhikṣū anyatamasmin adhikarāne (‘)anyonyam samprayuktā ||
sampratipa[t]ī] samprayogāgaḥ8 katamaḥ | cittacaitaisikānāṃ dharmānāṃ ekālambanā sampratipattiḥ sa punaḥ sampratipattisamprayogaḥ | parabhāvena na sva[bhā]vena aviruddhayor na viruddhayoh samānāśrayayoḥ(s) sadṛśakālayoh {I} na visadṛśa[dhātukālayoh]

Fol. 18r1: [Hayshima, p. 340; Derge No. 4049, 75a7-77a5; Taisho No. 1605, 674c5-675b14]

(asallakṣaṇam vināśalakṣaṇam viparinatilakṣaṇam viyogalakṣaṇam sannihitalakṣaṇam) (18r1)
dharma«tā»lakṣaṇam {I} kṣaṇalakṣaṇam {I} prabhandalakṣaṇam {I} vyādhīyānilakṣaṇam {I} cittacitrākāravrttilakṣaṇam[m] {I} O [bhoga]sampattivipatilakṣaṇam {I} bhājanasampatti-
vipatilakṣaṇam [ca] {I} l asallakṣaṇaṃ katamā l yan nityakālam skandhadhātvayatanānāṃ ātmātmīyatyā asatvaṃ l
vināśalakṣaṇaṃ katamā l yad utpannānaṃ sam[skā]rānāṃ vināśaṃ l
vīpatiṇāṃ[18r2]tilakṣaṇaṃ katamā l yāḥ samskārānāṃ anyathānyathyā cotpādaḥ l
viyogalakṣaṇaṃ katamā l O samskārasyādhipatyabhramṣaḥ paraśīvākaraṇaṃ l
sannihitalakṣaṇaṃ katamā* l samārūḍhā anityata l
dharmatālakṣaṇaṃ katamā l bhāvi[nī] anityata hetuto (‘)nubaddha l
kṣaṇalakṣaṇaṃ katamā l samskārānāṃ kṣaṇādī ārdhavam anavasthānam l
prabhandalakṣa(18r3)ṇaṃ katamā l anādiśālikānāṃ samskārānāṃ janmaprabandhā-
upacchitiḥ l vyādhīyānilakṣaṇam kaōtamar l dhātuvayośivitānāṃ vipariṇāmaḥ l
cittacitrākāravrttilakṣaṇaṃ katamā l ekādā sarāgam cittaṃ {I} ekādā vigataragam {I} evam
sadveśam vigatadveśam {I} samoham9 samkṣiptam vikṣiptam līmaṇ pragṛhitam[m]m
[uddhatam anuddhatam]10 a(18r4)vyupāsāntam vyupāsāntam {I} samāhitam asamāhitam
ityevamādina ākāreṇa yā cittasya vrōṭtiḥ l

bhogasampattivipatilakṣaṇaṃ katamā l sarvāḥ sampattivipattiparyavasānata l
bhājanasamvarttavivarttalakṣaṇaṃ katamā l t{l}israḥ samvarttanyah l agnīnāpbhiri11
vāyunā ca l triṣṭi samvarttanīśrāṇī {I} dvitiyaṃ dhya[ā]i(18r5)naṃ tṛtiyaṃ caturtham l
sahavīmānānī utpādanirodhenā caturthe dhyaṇe samvarttavivarttaḥ l trayo O (‘)antarakkalpaḥ l
durbhikṣontararakalpaḥ {I} rogantararakalpaḥ {I} sastrāntararakalpaḥ ca l yāḥ kalpasya nīrāṇām
bhavati l ekottarakalpaḥ l apakarṣakalpaḥ l āstādāsotkarśapakarṣāḥ l eka-utkarṣavimśatim
antararakpal l loko vivarttate l (18r6) vimśatim antararakpalāṃ samvarttas tiṣṭhati l vimśatim
antararakpal l loko vivarttate l vimśatim antaO rakalpa[d] v]ivṛtta tiṣṭhati l te bhavanti aśītir
antararakpalāḥ sa ca māhakalpaḥ l tāyā kalpagananayā rūpāvacarānā{m}m ārūpāvacarānāna ca

8 Read: sampratipatti*.
9 Pradhan inserts here vigatamoham.
10 Cf. Tib. rgod pa dang mi rgod pa dang.
11 Read: *abhbir.
devānām āyuśpramāṇam | āyuḥkṣayāt pūnyakṣayāt karmakṣayāt teṣām satvānān tasmāt
ta(18v7)smāt sthānāc cyu(t)i r bhavati || katham āyuḥkṣayāt (1) kālamaraṇena || katham
pūnyakṣayād (1) akālamaraṇena || tathā hi teṣām satvānām samāpattim āsvādayatām
pūnyakṣayo bhavati | yenaṁke mriyante || katham karmakṣayāt || tatropapadya-
vedaniyasyāparaparyāvedaniyasya ca karmanāḥ paryādānāt* | (18v1)

duḥkhalaksanāṇam katamat* (1) tiso duḥkhata astākāram vā duḥkham duḥkhatety ucyate ||
kena karaṇena yad aṁnityan tad duḥkham ity uktām | dvayaṁśikī anityatā (1) udayāṁśikī
vyayaṁśikī ca | udayāṁśikīm anityatāṁ pratiyā duḥkhaduḥkhata prajñāyate | vyayaṁśikīm
anityatāṁ pratiyā vāpiranāṃduḥkhatā prajñāyate | tadubhayāśikīm anityatāṁ prati(18v2)tya
samskāraduḥkhatā prajñāyate | idaṇ ca sandhāyoktaṁ bhagavataṁ samskāraṁ
anityatāṁ samskāravipariśāṃmatāṁ sandhāyoktaṁ mayā | yat kīcchid veditam idam adra duḥkhasyeti ||
api khalu udayavavyadharmattanubandheṣu samskāreṣu (1) jātyādikam astākāram duḥkham
prajñāyate | tad ucyate yad anityam tad duḥkhim iti ||

śūnyalaksanāṇam katamat* (1) yady a(18v3)tra na bhavati (1) tat tena śūnyam iti (1)
samanupāśyati | yat punar atrāvāsiṣṭam bhavati (1) tat sad ihāṣitī ○ yathābhūtaṁ prajñāṇī |
iyam ucyate śūnyatāvākṛantī yathābhūtā aviparitā |
kim kutra na bhavati (1) skandhadhātvāyatanēs nityo dhruvaḥ śāśvataḥ (1) avipa[ṛ]ṇāmadharmā ātmā vātmīyaṃ vā na bhavati | tasmāt tāti tena śūnyāni (1) kim punas
tatrāvaśi(18v4)ṭam bhavati | yat tad eva nairātymyam ity ātmano cābhāvo nairātymyasya ca
bhavaḥ śūnyatā pratYTETVAYA | ○ idam ca sandhāyoktaṁ bhagavataṁ sarvvasa[to] yathābhūtaṁ
prajñāṇītavyasa sarvvasāta iti ||
api khalu trividhā śūnyatā | svabhāvaśūnyatā (1) ○ tathābhāvaśūnyatā (1) prakṛtiśūnyatā ca
prathamo12 paraiklpitaṁ svabhāvam upāḍāya draṣṭavyā || dvitiyā
pa(18v5)ṛataṁrasvabhāvam upāḍāya | tṛtiyā pariṁsappanrasvabhāvam upāḍāya draṣṭavyām13 |
anātmalaksanāonāṁ katamat* | yathātmavādinā atmānaṁ pral[jā]payanti | tena laksanena
skandhadhātvāyatanānāṁ vikāsanata iti | skandhadhātvācāyaṁ yatātmya nātmā
idaṇ ca sandhāyok[t]āṁ bhagavata sarvve dharmā anātmāna iti ||

yad u(18v6)ktāṁ bhagavata sarvvaṁ naitat mama naiṣo ('')ham asmi{ṇ} naiṣa me ātmety
evan etad yathābhūtaṁ samyak*pra[ṇ]jāyā draṣṭavyam iti | asya bhāṣitasya ko ('')ṛthāḥ |
<bāhye vastuṁ naitant mametī>14 ādhyāmike vastuṁ naiṣo ('')ham asmi naiṣa me ātmety
sandhāyoktaṁ | tathā hi bāhye vastuṁ (1) atmāyākārah pratisidhyate15 | ādāyāmike punar
ātmātyākārah ||

yad uktāṁ kṣa(18v7)nikalaksana anityateti tat katham | yathā cittacaitasikā kṣanikā
evaṁrupaṁ api kṣa[ṇ]ikaṁ draṣṭavyam | cittapattatām upāḍāya (1) cittaikayogakṣematāṁ

---

12 Read: prathama.
13 Read: draṣṭavya.
14 Cf. Tib. phyi'i dangs po 'di ni bdag gi ma yin no.
15 Read: pratisidhyate. Tib. bkag, Ch. 殲.
upādāya «cittavikāratadvikāratām upādāya» cittāśrayatām upādāya {1} cittādhipatya«sāṃbhūta»tām upādāya {1} cittavaśāvarttināś copādāya || api khalv ante vikāropalambitām upādāya ||

Fol. 20: [Hayashima, p. 372; Derge No. 4049, 78b5-80b1; Taisho No. 1605, 676b3-677a6]

(lakṣaṇaṃ katmat || yo dharmā utpadyāmāno 'praśāntalakṣaṇatā utpa)

{r(20r1)dyate ||} tasya cotpādād aparāśāntā cittasatatiḥ pravarttate tat kleśalakṣaṇam ||

uttānāṃ katmat* || kle'Ośānuṣayaś cāprahūṇo bhavati kleśasthānyaś ca dharmā ābhāṣagato bhavati || tatra cāyoniśomanasikāraḥ pratypaṇṭhito bhavaty {r} evaṃ kleśasyotpādo bhavati ||

ālambanāṃ katmat || sarvakleśāḥ sarvakleśālambano draṣṭav[ya]ḥ || kle

(20r2)śavastvālambanaḥ{7} ca kāmāvacarakešāḥ sthāpayītvā avidyām drṣṭiṃ vickeyitaṃ
corddhvām bhūmiṃ nāOīlambate || Ġrddhvabhūmikasya kleśasyādharabbhūmir

a'nāOīlambanam || yah punar nirodhāmārgālambanam kleśāḥ so (')tadālambanād draṣṭavyāḥ ||
tatparikalpa«va»ṣtv asyālambanam || avastukālambanāḥ kleśo drṣṭir drṣṭisamprayuktaś ca ||
tadanyāḥ sava(20r3)stukālambanah ||

samprayogah katamah || rāgaḥ skeptighena na sa(m)prayuyjate || yathā pratigheOṇaivaṃ
cickeyitai {r} sīstais tv asya samprayogah || yathā rāgaḥ skeptighenaiṣvaṃ pratiṣṭha
māṇena drṣṭiḥ ca na samprayuyjate || mānah skeptighena vickeyitasā ca || avidyā
carvakleṣasamprayoginiḥ āvēnikt ca || (20r4) āvēnikt punah satyesv ajñānam ||

drṣṭih skeptighena
cickeyitasā ca na samprayuyjate || viciOkitsā rāgena māṇena drṣṭiḥ ca na samprayuyjate ||

krodhādaya upakleśā anyonyam (na) samprayuyjate || āhibhyam anapattaOpyaṃ ca
carvvarākuśale samprayuyjate || styānam auddhatyam sarvatra kliṣte || āśraddhyam kauśidyam

pramāda(20r5)ṣ ca ||

paryāyaḥ katamah {r} sa(m)yojanāṇī bandhāṇāny anuśāya upakleśāḥ paryavasthānāni {r}
o'Oghā yogā {r} upādānāni granthā nivaranāni khilā malā nighāḥ sayāḥ kīcchānānu duścaritāni

{r} ārsava vighātāḥ paridhāḥ upāyāsā ranā jvarā vanasaḥ {r} vinibbandhā iti ||

kati saṃyojanāṇī || katham kutra (20r6) saṃyojayanti || nava saṃyojanāṇī ||
anunayaśaṃyojanam || pratiṣṭhasamyojanam || mānasamyojaOṇam || avidyāsamyojanam ||
drṣṭisamyojanam || parāmarṣasamyojanam || vickeyitasamyojanam || tṛṣyaśaṃyojanam ||
māṭyasamyojanam ||

anunayasamyojanam {r} traiḥhutkuḥ rāgaḥ || anunayaśaṃyojanena saṃyuktam{18} {r}

traiḥhutkuḥ nodvjate || (20r7) anuvignā saṃkuśalam ācarati kuśalam nācarati || yenāyatyāṃ
duḥkham abhinivarttaṣ'ya'ṃ duḥkhena O saṃyujuṣte ||

pratiṣṭhasamyojanam saṭvesu duḥkhe duḥkhasthāṇyeṣu ca dharmeṣu cetasa āghāṭah {r}

pratiṣṭhasamyojanena saṃyuktam {r} pratiṣṭhanimittāc citaṃ nādhvyakṣate || yenākuśalam

ācarati kuśalaṇa ca nācarati || yenā(20v1)yātyāṃ duḥkham abhinivarttaya[n] duḥkh[e][n]a|

{16} Gokhale mistakenly transcribes here as praśāntalakṣaṇa utpadya.
{17} Cf. Tib. dmigs par bliga' or nyo mongs ...
{18} Read: saṃyuktah.
सांयुज्याते
मानसांयोजनां सप्ता मानान्हि मानो (ि)तिमानो ○ माना́तिमानो (ि)मिमानो 'भिमाना
अुँमानो मिथ्यांमानांस का ।
मानान्ह खातामाण (ि) हिन्द आसमि {ि} श्रेयान्हि साद्रेणावा साद्रेणा इति या चित्ताय सायोनातिि ।
तिमानान्ह खातामाण (ि) साद्रेणाह आसमि {ि} श्रेयान्हि श्रेयावा साद्रेणा इति या चित्ताय सायोनातिि ।
(20वी)
मानातिमानान्ह खातामाण (ि) श्रेयावाह श्रेयावातर (ि)स्मिति या चित्ताय सायोनातिि ।
आसमानान्ह खातारोिि पांचपादानांकडां हान हाती हाता अतिमानो वा सामाना पाया यो
चित्ताय सायोनातिि ।
अभिमानान्ह खातामाण (ि) अपर्याेत उत्तरी विशेषाद्धिगामे प्राप्ते मे उत्तरी विशेषाद्धिगामा इति {ि} या
चित्ताय सायोनातिि ।
अुँमानो खातामाण (ि) बाहि (20वी) वो (ि) नतारातिि अलपादताहिि (ि)स्मिति या चित्ताय सायोनातिि ।
मिथ्यांनान्ह खाताण (ि) गुणावि आसमि तिि चित्ताय सायोनातिि ।
मानसांयोजनाना सांयुक्ता {ि} आम्खारमा आम्खारारा नार पारिंजानीि ला अपरिंजानाना
आम्खारमाकारार्हनिमित्ता {ि} आसुलाम सामारारिबा{ि} ला यन्यायांम दुःखानि
अभिनिवर्त्याने (20वी) दुःखानि सांयुज्याते ।
वाियासांयोजनाना सांयुक्तो दुःखाद्धर्मां सुमुदाद्धर्मां (ना) अद्यावस्यातो ।
तादा(ना) ध्यासाविता (ि) अक्षालम अराराति {ि} कुसालम नाराराति ला यन्यायांम दुःखानि
अभिनिवर्त्याने दुःखानि सांयुज्याते ।
द्रष्टिामो योजनान्ह सिरो द्रष्टाहि ला सत्काया प्रद्रष्टिति आस्मानि हाद्ध्रष्टिि सा
द्रष्टिसांयोजनाना सांयुि (20वी) क्षो मिथ्यांनीसानाना पारिंजाति {ि} अभिनिवितेि
ला मिथ्यान्नीसारानि मिथ्यान्नीमित्ता {ि} ○ अक्षालम अराराति {ि} कुसालम नाराराति ला यन्यायांम
दुःखानि अभिनिवर्त्याने (20वी) दुःखानि सांयुज्याते ।
परार्मासांयोजनान्ह {ि} द्रष्टिपरार्मासा श्लोकत्त परार्मासा श्लोकत्त सा
ला परार्मासा
सांयोजनाना सांयुक्ता {ि} मिथ्यान्नी (20वी)सारानोपायम काल्पति अभिनिवितेि
ला मिथ्यान्नीसारानोपायभन्निमित्ता {ि} आक्षालम अराराति {ि} कुसालम नाराराति ला यन्यायांम
दुःखानि अभिनिवर्त्याने (20वी) दुःखानि सांयुज्याते ।
विकीकीत्सांयोजनान्ह सत्येशु विमातिि ला विकीकीत्सांयोजनाना सांयुक्ता {ि} बुध्भटाति
कामक्षाति {ि} भर्माति कामक्षाति {ि} सम [ि] ग्हिि (20वी) राति कामक्षाति ला कामक्षातिि
नार समया प्रतिपाद्याति ला प्रतिशु समयक्षाप्रतिपाद्यामानिि {ि} ○ अक्षालम अराराति {ि}
कुसालम नाराराति ला यन्यायांम दुःखानि अभिनिवर्त्याने (20वी) दुःखानि सांयुज्याते ।
ि यशसांयोजनान्ह लाहानात्काराद्धवस्यास्यासद्धाि सरसांपाद्याति मारास्करा सितािि
ि भयासांयोजनान्हा।

Fols. 23-24: [Hayashima, p. 442; Derge No. 4049, 86b4-89b2; Taisho No. 1605, 679b28-681a14]

(23वी) सत्यां अन्यन्तरिह्यत्यां इत्युच्छाया इति उच्छाया इति तथाहि [ि] उच्छायां सत्यांहि सुलबारुपो यद अन्यन्त्यांि
{ि} सत्यां अन्यन्त्यांिम अन्यन्तयांिम दारासनानिबिरिि [ि] उच्छायोहि इति

19 Cf. Ch. 伽法不能解了。
20 Cf. Ch. 伽解了故。
21 Read: कान्धासन。
balavatkarma katmat | pratipaksyabalikasya pudgalasya yat sa[m]cetaniyam akuśalakam
karma tad pratipaksabalādhānataya {i} yan narakavedanīyan [t]ad drṣṭadharmavedaniya(m
bhava)(23r2)ti | yad vā drṣṭa<dharma>vedanīyaṁ tad avenādyaṁ bhavati | iti
pratipaks[ḍ]ikam karma balavoṭ | sarvvaḥ ca kuśalaṁ karma sām[ce]tanīyaṁ | idaṁ ca
sandhāyok(t)āṁ bhagavatā apramāṇavipulasvabhā[vinī] khālv āryaśravakasya citte yat
pramāṇakṛtam karma na ma22 tena niyate {i} na sa tatrāvatiṣṭhate na tena ta[ṣya] (saṃkhya)
(23r3) bhavatī | pratipaksadurbhalasya punaḥ pudgalasya yat akuśalamo sām[ce]tanīyaṁ
karma ta[ṭ]d balan bhavati | yac ca sām[ce]tanīyaṁ karma nīyatvipākaṁ tad aprahāṇam
aparijnātām ity ayam [atṛa]ḥbisandhīḥ | a[o]pi khulu yat kāmapratipaksyamuktaṃ akuśalaṁ karma
tat prakṛtyā balavat | yad api pū[ṛvabhyastam]23 (23r4) yad api pādasthām {i} | yad api
asādhyam aparirvṛṇadharmakāṇām {i} kṣetrato (')pi {i} cīttaḥhisamskārato (')pi balavat
karma veditavyaṁ | api khulu navabhir ākārāir balavat karma veditavyaṁ | kṣetrato (')pi
vastuto (')pi svabhāvato (')py āśrayato (')pi manasikārato (')py āśayato (')pi [saḥ]hāyato (')pi
bahuḷ[ṛ]to (')pi bahuja(23r5)yato (')pi etadviparyayen[ābalavat karma] veditavyaṁ 24 |

     yad uktaṃ bhagavatā yad idāṃ vaded yaOthā yathāyaṃ puruṣapudgalāḥ karma karoty
upacinti | tathaḥ tathā viyākaṃ pratiṣamvedayatity (i) evan sam sati {i} brahmacyavāsino na
bhavaty avakāsaś ca {i} na pra[jīr]haty samyagduḥkha[kṣayaya duḥkha][syānta][kriyāyai26 |
yas tv evan vaded yathā] (23r6) vedaniyaṃ yathā vedaniyaṃ ayam puruṣapudgalāḥ karma
karoty upacinti | tathaḥ vedanīyo yan tathaḥ vedi niyaṃ ayam viyākaṃ pratiṣamvedayaty (i)
 evaṃ sati {i} brahmacyavāso bhavaty avakāśaś ca pra[jīnaye] samyagduḥkha[kṣayaya
duḥkhasyantakriyayai | iti tatra ko ('')hisandhiḥ (i) sūkhasahagatasya karmanāḥ
sukha(23v1)sahagato vipākāḥ prati[ṣ]lijhdo (')tra bhagavatā | evam duḥkhasahagatasya
duḥkhahasagatāḥ | aduḥOkhāsukhahasagatasyāduḥkhasahagatāḥ || api khulu
sukhasahagatasya karmanāḥ sukhavisedaniyaṣya sukho viyāko ('')nūjātaḥ |
duḥkhavedaniyaṣya duḥkhaḥ | aduḥkhasukhavedaniyaṣyāduḥkhasukhahasagatāḥ || api khulu
sukhahasagatasya karmanāḥ sukhavisedaniyaṣya sukho viyāko ('')nūjātaḥ |
duḥkhavedaniyaṣya duḥkhaḥ | aduḥkhasukhavedaniyaṣyāduḥkhasukhahasagatāḥ || api khulu
sukhahasagatasya karmanāḥ sukhavisedaniyaṣya sukho viyāko ('')nūjātaḥ |
duḥkhavedaniyaṣya duḥkhaḥ | aduḥkhasukhavedaniyaṣyāduḥkhasukhahasagatāḥ || api khulu
sukhahasagatasya karmanāḥ sukhavisedaniyaṣya sukho viyāko ('')nūjātaḥ |
duḥkhavedaniyaṣya duḥkhaḥ | aduḥkhasukhavedaniyaṣyāduḥkhasu(23v3)kha27 ity ayam atṛabhishandhiḥ ||

karmaprabhedāḥ punaḥ samvarakarma {||} asamvarakarma {||} naivasa[Omvaranāsamvara-
karma ca || samvarakarma katmat* (i) prātimoksasamvarasamgrhiṭam {||} dhyānasamvarasamgrhiṭam
{i} anāsravasamvarasamgrhiṭam ca ||
prātimoksasamvarasamgrhiṭam karma katmat* | aṣṭaṇaikāyi(23v4)kaṇṭ28 bhikṣusamvarah

23 Cf. Tib. gang sngon goms par byas pa dang; Ch. 先所計著.
24 Cf. Tib. lan mang du byed pa dang l skye bo mang pos; Ch. 與多眾生共所行故
25 Cf. Tib. 'di las bzlog pa ni stobs dang mi idan pa i l las so; Ch. 與此相違是劣力
26 Fol. 23r6 has the exactly same phrase.
27 Read aduḥkhasukha
28 Cf. Ch.七衆
bhikṣuṇīsamvarah śīkṣamāṇāsamvarah śrāmanerāsamvarah śrāmaṁerītsamvarah
upāsakasamvarah upāsikāsamvarah upāvasasamvarah ca

pravrajitasamvarah kīḍrśam puṭdgalam adhiṅkṛtya vyavasthāpitaḥ | duścaritavivekacaritaṁ

{kīm kāmavivekacaritaṁ ca

u(23v5)pāsakopāsikāsamvarah {kīm kīḍrśam pudgalam adhiṅkṛtya vyavasthāpitaḥ | duścaritaṁvivekacaritaṁ no tu kāmavivekacaritaṁ

upāvasasamvarah kīḍrśam pudgalam adhiṅkṛtya vyavasthāpitaḥ | naiva duścaritavivekacaritaṁ | na kāmavivekacaritaṁ 29 | upāsakaḥ śīkṣāpaḍaikadeśasīkṣamān[ah] 29 (23v6) upāsakasamvarena samanvāgato vaktavyaḥ {kīm samanvāgato vaktavyaḥ (kīm śaṇḍhapanḍakānām upāsakasamvarah

pratīṣṛddhaḥ |nopāsakasamvarah pratīṣṛddhaḥ | upāsakatvan tu pratīṣṛddhaṁ bhikṣubhikṣuṇīpaṭayor upāsanāyogatām upādāya (kīm paṇḍakāḥ 24r1) paṇca | jātipaṇḍakāḥ

{kīm īrṣyāpaṇḍakāḥ {kīm paṇḍakādakāḥ {kīm āśiṭapaṇḍakāḥ {kīm īranāpaṇḍakāḥ ca 30

dhyānasamvarah katamah | daubhīṣyasaṃmutthāpākānāṁ kleśānāṁ {kīm bijopahātakāle kāmavitarāgasya 31

{āpāyaṃvitarāgena} 32 prathamadhyānāvitarāgasya dvitiyadhyānāvitarāgasya tṛtiyadhyānāvitarāgasya (24r2) ca ya viratiḥ ||

anāsrasamvarah katamah | drṣṭasaṭasyaṃnāśravena manasikāreṇa ya viratiḥ ||

asmavarah katamah | ya āsamanvīryakānām ārūbhikānānāṁ māṃśikānaṁ mṛgaḥdhanānāṁ

śākunānāṁ śaśāvagurikānāṁ vairāṇāṁ vadhyaḥghātakānāṁ goghaḥtākānāṁ

nāgbandhaḥkānāṁ nā(24r3)gamaṇḍalikānāṁ bandhanāpālakānāṁ sūcakānāṁ kāraṇākārakānāṁ {kīm abhijñamato vā ||

tatkarmasamudāyārata vā tatkarmadhyācāraniścayaḥ ||

naivasamvaranāsamvarah 33
katamah | naivasamvaranāsamvarasthasya yat kuśalam

akuśalam vā karma

sukhavedaniyaṁ karma katamat (kīm) yat kuśalam kāma(24r4)dhātāv triṣu ca dhīyeṣu vā

duḥkhavedaniyaṁ karma katamat (kīm) akuśalam ||

aduḥkhāsukhaṃvedaniyaṁ karma katamat (tṛtiyād dhīyeṣad uṛdhvam kuśalam ||

dṛṣṭadharmaṇvedaniyaṁ karma katamat (yasya dṛṣṭe dharme vipāko vipacyate) tad yathā

maṁśaṁmādheḥ vyuttihite yad upakārāpākārāmayam (kīm yathā maṁśamaḥ(24r5) dhīr evam

arāṇāsamadhāvīrodhasamāppateḥ {kīm śrotāṭapattiphalad arhavvoprūpa ca vyuttia Ote

buddhappramukhe ca (bhikṣusamghe itī) yaḥ vā punar anyantatiṣṭvāṣayaṇapravṛgyena kuśalam

akuśalam vā ācāritam ||

upapadyavedaniyaṁ karma katamat (yasyāyanantare janmanī pariṣṭopakārāḥ) vā pariṣṭopakārāḥ vā

yad yā punar anyakusalakusalam ||

aparaparyāyavedaniyaṁ (kīm karma katamat (yaṣya tata uṛdhvaṁ vipāko vipacyate ||

---

29 S.e. for kāmavivekacaritaṁ.
30 Cf. 根本薩婆多部律摘, Taisho vol. 24, 597c25-a1; and Abhidharmakośavyakhya, Wogihara ed., p. 94.20-21.
31 Read: rāgasya.
32 The phrase {āpāyaṃvitarāgena} is to be deleted in view of the present context and of the Chinese and Tibetan translations.
33 Read: naivasamvaranāsamvarah.
krṣṇaṁ krṣṇavipākaṁ karma katamat | yad akuśalaṁ ||
śuklaṁ śuklāvipākaṁ karma katamat* | traidhātukaṁ kuśalaṁ ||
krṣṇaśuklaṁ krṣṇaśuklāvipākaṁ karma katamat (l) ya(t) (24r7) kāmapratisamyuktam
vyāmiśraṁ | āśayataḥ krṣṇaṁ prayogataḥ śuklaṁ | prayogato vā krṣṇaṁ āśayataḥ śuklaṁ ||
akṛṣṇaśuklāvipākaṁ karma karmakṣayāya samvarttate katamat | prayogāntaryamārgesv
anāśraṇaṁ karma ||
dānakarma katamat | tan niḍānato (24v1) samutthānato (l) adhiṣṭhānato svabhāvato ca
veditavyaṁ | niḍānam alobhādveśāmohāḥ  || (l) samutthānato tatsahagataḥ cetana | adhiṣṭhānam
deyaṁ vastu | svabhāvaḥ pratipādane kāyakarma vākkarma ||
kathāṁ dānaṁ sampannaṁ bhavati | abhiśkaṇḍanatāṁ upādāya (l) apakṣapātaṅgatāṁ
upādāya (l) icchāparipūra(24v2)ādānataṁ copādāya || api khalv aniśritadānatayā (l)
viṣadadānatayā  | muditādānatayā (l) | pātradānatayā (l) susamvibhaktaparipātanātiḥdānatayā ca dānāṁ sampannaṁ veditavyaṁ ||
kathāṁ deyaṁ sampannaṁ veditavyaṁ | anabhidrugdhadeyavastutām upādāya (l)
aparāṅgatayavastutā(24v3)m upādāya (l) akūṭitavimaladeyavastutām upādāya (l)
kālpikadeyavastutām uṇopādāya (l) dharmārjita środayavastutām copādāya ||
kathāṁ śīlavān* bhavati (l) samāttaśīlānurakṣanatāṁ upādāya ||
kathāṁ prātimokṣasamvarasamvrto bhavati | nairyaṁikaśīlātām upādāya ||
kathāṁ ācārāgo(24v4)acarasampanna bhavati | anupākräkṣaśīlātām4 upādāya ||
kathāṁ ānumātreṣv avadyeṣu  | bhayadarṣi bhavati | tīvragaurasikṣaṅaśīlātām upādāya ||
kathāṁ samādāya śīkṣate | śīkṣāpadeṣu  (l) paścīpūṛiṣaṁśīkṣāśīkaśīlātām upādāya ||
kathāṁ kāyena vācasaṁvṛto bhavati | sa(m)paja(24v5)nyapariprātām upādāya ||
kathāṁ kāyavākkaśampaṭtyā sampanno bhavati | āpattyānādhyāpadyanatāṁ upādāya ||
kathāṁ pariṣuddhakāyavāksamudācāro bhavati | avipratisāradyānupūrvvyo yāvat
samādhisannātāya  upādāya ||
kathāṁ kuśalakāyavāksamudācāro bhavati | kliṣṭavitarkavya(24v6)vakīrṇatāṁ upādāya ||
kathāṁ anavadyakāyavāksamu{pā}dācāro bhavati | prāṇidhāÔyabrahmacaryavāsā-
vivarjitaṁ upādāya ||
kathāṁ anyāvadhyakāyavāksamudācāro bhavati | parānaṁyama(mā)nuskhasaṁvāsatām
upādāya35 ||
kathāṁ ānulomikakāyavāksamudācāro bhavati | nirvāṇaṁprā(24v7)ptyanukulatāṁ upādāya ||
kathāṁ ānucchaviakāyavāksamudācāro bhavati | pratiçcchannakalyāṇatāṁ vivṛta-
papakām copādāya ||
kathāṁ aupayiakahāyavāksamudācāro bhavati | sabrahmacaryupagrahaśīlataṁ upādāya ||

44 Cf. Tib. ma smad pa'i tshul khrims yin pa; Ch.具淨尸羅難為毀損
35 Cf. Tib. gzhon la brnyas thabs mi byed cing 'grogs na bde ba'i phyir ro, Ch.不輕陵他易共住故.
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A Newly Identified Manuscript of Āryaśūra's Pāramitāsamāsa in the Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts

Noriyuki KUDO

Recently, the present writer came to know that a single folio (Serial No. 57) in the Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (= GBM) is a part of manuscript of the Pāramitāsamāsa composed by Āryaśūra. According to the previous classification of GBM, this folio was classified as a part of a manuscript of the Bhaisajyagurūsūtra. However, due to the poor condition

In autumn 2011, the National Archives of India (New Delhi) and the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University (Tokyo) agreed on publishing a new facsimile edition of the Gilgit manuscripts — except those of the Saddharmapundarikasūtra — now deposited at the former organization. This joint project is conducted under the general editorship of Dr. Oskar von Hinüber (Prof. Emeritus, Freiburg University), Prof. Seishi Karashima and the present author (IRIAB, Soka University). The manuscripts are re-classified (though retaining their original serial number) according to their genre such as Vinaya texts, the Mahāyānasūtras, avadānas and so on. Our joint publication contains the photographs which are newly taken in color, a concordance to editions and to parallels in Chinese and/or Tibetan, and up-to-date surveys of research on individual texts. The superior quality of the new color facsimile edition will allow scholars working on the Gilgit manuscript easily to distinguish parts of letters from the stains on the birch-bark and read the manuscripts more precisely. This paper is a result of our joint project and was made possible by reading the new photographs.

All the manuscripts of the Saddharmapundarikasūtra (serial Nos. 44, 45, 47, 48, 49) from Gilgit are jointly published by the National Archives of India, Soka Gakkai, and the Institute of Oriental Philosophy; Saddharmapundarikam: Gilgit Lotus Sutra manuscripts from the National Archives of India = インド国立公文書館所蔵ギルギット仏華経写本 [Indo kokuritsu kōbunshokan shozō Girugitto Hokekyō shahon], (Lotus Sutra manuscript series 12) 2012, Tokyo. ISBN 978-4-88417-031-8.

At this point, I would like to thank Dr. Shayne Clarke, who took trouble in checking and correcting my unidiomatic English. Needless to say, any errors which remain are of my own.

For example, editors of the GBM, Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra, classified this manuscript as follows: “57. Bhaisajyagurū-sūtra. It is a single folio, bearing the number 2” [Preface in part 10, 1974, p. 10]; Schopen 1977, 1978, and Matsumura 1982. Gregory Schopen, who edited the Gilgit Bhaisajyagurūsūtra text in his doctoral dissertation (Schopen 1978), does not support GBM’s attribution (see Schopen 1977: 206): “The two mss. consisting of a single leaf are nos. 32 and 57 (I have not yet been able to find no. 57 on my microfilm and so have had to take Chandra’s word that it is a ms. of Bhyg. [= Bhaisajyagurūsūtra, abbreviation expanded by N.K.]).” Later again Schopen points out that “Two other Gilgit fragments — serial no. 52, facsimile no. 3306 and serial no. 57, facsimile nos. 3257-3258 — have been identified as possibly being from manuscripts of the Bhaisajyagurū-sūtra, but neither, it now seems, are” (2009: 194, 16-18). See also Buddhist Text Information No. 14, March 1978, pp. 1-3. (Cf. As to serial no. 52, facsimile no. 3306, see p. 358 of above replica edition of the Saddharmapundarikasūtra. In the margin of the pasteborder of the fragment, a remark concerning its attribution is written as “[Bhaisayja . . .] (probably by the editors). Actually this fragment is a right part of folio 102 of no. 44.) Matsumura 1982 lists all the materials of the Bhaisajyagurūsūtra not only in Sanskrit but also in Tibetan and Chinese translations; among them, although six Gilgit manuscripts including a single folio of No. 57 are mentioned as Sanskrit sources, he himself could not utilize this folio because its condition in the facsimile edition was
of the photos and the illegibility of the published facsimile edition (first ed. in 1974; second/revised in 1995) it was difficult for scholars to utilize this manuscript to the point that no textual description of this folio was made. Consequently, scholars inevitably have had to accept the classification made by the editors of the GBM—, even if they have not been able to identify this manuscript as belonging to the Bhaisajyagurussūtra.

Moreover, a text of the Pāramitāsamāsā was edited on the basis of a sole manuscript kept in the National Archives of Nepal, Kathmandu and studied. To date, this manuscript written in Newārī script, probably between the 13th to 14th centuries, has been believed to be the only extant manuscript of this text. Therefore, our newly identified manuscript is a only the second known Sanskrit manuscript of the Pāramitāsamāsā and it is considerably older than the Nepalese manuscript.

1. About Manuscript
This manuscript (Serial no. 573) is a single folio of birch bark written in Gilgit/Bāmiyan, Type II (Protośāradā), having 9 lines on the recto and 10 lines on the verso, approximately 51 letters per line; its size is 38.4 cm long and 6.8 cm high and a part of the first line of the verso is damaged (for its appearance, see the black/white facsimile nos. 3257/3258, GBM volume 10, part 10)5. There is a string hole on the left half-side of the folio (both sides) between lines 4 and 6; a space for the string hole is somewhat squarish6. It bears the folio number 2 on the recto side.

---
3 On its manuscript cover made of thick paper, the following description is found, probably written after the Gilgit manuscripts were shifted to New Delhi (1947): “S No. 57, 1 leaf / Box No. 5 / Bhaišajyanya [sic.] Guru Sutram / bhaisajyaguru sūtram [in Devānāgarī].” In this description, we find the remark “Box no. 5.” It is not clear to what this refers, but as far as we know from Lokesh Chandra (1959: 135), all the Gilgit manuscripts which had been transferred from Srinagar to New Delhi were “preserved in five big boxes.” It might be a mere coincidence that the manuscripts were in five boxes when they were found at mound C of finding site in Gilgit (see Hakim’s report in Lévi 1932: 15 (“Le centre est occupé par les fragments de cinq poteaux de bois, le cinquième étant entouré par les quatre autres’’)). (This is mere speculation but does the ‘Box no.’ indicate their original preservation in the site?) According to the manuscript covers, ‘Box no. 1’ contains the manuscripts of serial no. 1 (all Vinayaśrūtras); ‘Box no. 2’ = those of serial nos. 2-23; ‘Box no. 3’ = those of serial nos. 24-28 [all the Prajñāpāramitā texts]; ‘Box no. 4’ = those of serial nos. 29-43; ‘Box no. 5’ = those of serial nos. 44-62 [= all Sadharmapundarīka manuscripts]. Serial numbers (1-62) were given when the manuscripts were preserved in Srinagar (see Bapat 1961-62. During 1957-60 when Bapat did research on the Gilgit manuscripts at the National Archives of India, he noticed that “There was also a list, prepared by the local pandits, of this collection ...” [p. 127]). This list in which the manuscripts were classified into 62 and given the details such as numbers of folio, titles known so far and so on — is slightly different from the list published by Lokesh Chandra 1959.
4 It is interesting to note that only two scripts are used in the GBM, namely Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I and Type II (or Protośāradā). The former is always used to write the manuscripts of Mahāyāna works and the later is used for writing non-Mahāyāna works such as Vinaya literature, non-Mahāyāna sūtras, avadāna texts, gāthās and so on. There are some exceptions of which Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II or Protośāradā is used for transcribing the Mahāyāna texts, for example, Bhaisajyagurussūtra (No. 32, one folio = Dutts A and Schopen’s V), Sanghātāsūtra (No. 39, fifteen folios), Prajñāyasmātupūḍhādṛṇyakārikā of Nāgārjuna (No. 61, three folios) and No. 57: Pāramitāsamāsa.
5 A new facsimile edition including this folio will be published in Volume IV of our publication.
The author is Āryaśūra but he is not the same person as the author of the Jātakamālā. The date of this 'Āryaśūra' is not fixed; Meadows (see below) places the Pāramitāsāṃśa "to around 7th or 8th Century A.D." (1986: 21). However, as is stated by herself, since the "only firm lower limit is the translation of the text into the Tibetan in the late 8th century", its exact dating is difficult to settle. According to paleographical studies, the script of this manuscript (Protośāradā) was used in 7th and 8th century. If this dating is accepted, this would mean that this Gilgit manuscript is earlier than its Nepalese counterpart (13–14th century) on the one hand and very close to an original text on the other hand. Furthermore, our Gilgit manuscript might be earlier than the Tibetan translation by Vairocanarakṣita (ca. 8th or 9th century). Therefore, the date of composition of this text should be considered to be at least earlier than 7th or 8th century.

Our folio contains text from the 6th verse to pāda c of the 46th verse of the first chapter (Dānapāramitā) of the Pāramitāsāṃśa.

2. Previous Studies

As far as I know, there are three Sanskrit editions, namely Ferrari 1946, Meadows 1986 and Saito 2005. All three editions use the same manuscript material known to them at that time but their readings differ from each other.

Ferrari 1946 is the first edition of this text; she uses a modern copy of the Nepalese manuscript. Her edition is, according to Meadows, "based on a modern copy made in Nepal at the request of Professor Giuseppe Tucci ... Ferrari states that the ms. from which her copy was made was found in the library of the Mahārāja of Nepal ...."11

Meadows 1986 is based on the palm-leaf manuscript written in Newār12 (abbreviated as "K." by Meadows) although she works through a microfilm. In the introduction of her book, she writes: "According to Mr. Dangol and Dr. Michael Witzel, ... the ms. was originally in the collection of the Rājguru, Hemrāj Pandit; upon his death in the early 1960s, his son arranged for the transfer of the manuscript collection to the Nepalese government and specifically to the Bir Library on the Trichandra campus; the manuscripts in the national collection were transferred to the National Library at Harihar Bhawan, Pulchowk, and finally to the present National Archives."13 It is unclear whether

---

8. Meadows op. cit., p. 21. Tibetan translation was done by Vairocanarakṣita; on his date, see Saito 2005: 9.
13. Meadows 1986: 22. On this history of the collection, de Jong 1989: 239, note 2, asks: "Is there any evidence showing that manuscripts from the library of the Mahārāja were later transferred to the collection of the Rājguru?"
K is indeed an original of Ferrari's copy\textsuperscript{14} but Meadows concludes that "on the basis of evidence I have in hand I believe K was the ms. from which Ferrari's copy was made."\textsuperscript{15} There are a number of discrepancies in the readings between the materials they used; Meadows discusses the relationship of K to Ferrari's copy and enumerates the differences (Meadows 1986: 25-37).

After Meadows' book was published, de Jong published a review of her book (de Jong 1989); he criticizes her emendations and translation. Later he obtains a microfilm of manuscript K and again discusses her readings (de Jong 1991).

By 1986, we had had two Sanskrit editions; both editors also use a Tibetan translation by Vairocanaraksita for correction but Ferrari "does not mention which particular edition of Tanjur was used"\textsuperscript{16} and Meadows "does not say anything about the Tibetan translation apart from remarking that 'All substantive emendations (those affecting meaning) were made by me on the basis of the Tibetan'."\textsuperscript{17} Saito (2005) published a comprehensive study of the Tibetan translation of the \textit{Pāramitāsamāsa}. In editing the Tibetan text, he uses editions from the Chone, Derge, Ganden, Narthang and Peking Tanjur along with a quotation in the \textit{Lam rim chen mo} by Tson kha pa (two versions). Furthermore, he made preliminary observations on the Sanskrit text and compares in detail the readings of the previous two editions and the Sanskrit manuscript.\textsuperscript{18} (Unfortunately the present writer could not consult the Nepalese manuscript due to time constrains, but by using Saito's study I have been able to compare the Gilgit manuscript [= G, hereinafter] with the Nepalese manuscript).

3. Some remarks on the text

G's reading does not show significant differences with the aforementioned Sanskrit editions. However, at some points, particularly where editorial problems have been pointed out, G gives a better reading. In many cases, G corresponds well with the Tibetan translation. Here, however, one major divergence is worth noting in the sequence of verses.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{14} Saito who also reads this manuscript states that "Damit liefern die 47 besseren Lesarten bei F gegenüber K keinen zwingenden Beweis dafür, daß Fc nicht von K abhängig ist, ..." (Thus, 47 better readings found in F deliver to K no compelling evidence that Fc does not depend on K ...) (2005: 333).

\textsuperscript{15} Meadows 1986: 31. de Jong (1989: 234) remarks: "There is no doubt that both manuscripts are closely related to each other but this is not sufficient to suppose that Fc is copied directly from K." After gaining a photocopy of K, he states that "F co. is a direct or indirect copy of K and that the differences between the two manuscripts are due to mistakes made by one or more copyists" (de Jong 1991: 181).

\textsuperscript{16} Meadows' comment on Ferrari (Meadows 1986: 21).

\textsuperscript{17} de Jong's comment on Meadows (de Jong 1989: 235). The sentence in single quotation marks is quoted from Meadows (1986: 36) by de Jong.

\textsuperscript{18} As to the Sanskrit text, Saito gives "corrections to Meadows' text" in his introduction (pp. 3-5); then discusses in detail orthographical features and readings in M, F, and K (pp. 319-335); and finally presents a Sanskrit text with his textual footnotes. (pp. 339-395).

In addition to the aforementioned editions, note Sato 1991—, in which Sato translates the first chapter of the \textit{Pāramitāsamāsa} into Japanese with annotations.

\textsuperscript{19} There are other cases where verse sequence in Sanskrit differs from that in the Tibetan translation.
Comparing the verse numbers given in the previous Sanskrit editions, viz., verse numbers of M and S, G preserves a different order; verse 26 in M, S corresponds to 28 in G and 2720 in Tib. Likewise, M, S 27 = G 26 = Tib. 25; M, S 28 = G 27 = Tib. 26. There is another instance of verse disorder: M, S 33 = G 34 = Tib. 33; M, S 34 = G 33 = Tib. 32.21 As to the sequence of verses, G and the Tibetan translation are the same; only the text based on the Nepalese manuscript differs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M, S</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Tibetan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following, variant readings found in the previous editions, namely K, M, S and T, are noted under every verse; since M and S — including remarks by de Jong 1991 — used the same Nepalese manuscript, if there are differences in reading, that of K is mentioned separately (otherwise those of M and S are mentioned).

**SYMBOLS USED:**

- F, F co: A copy of the manuscript used by Ferrari, probably of K22.
- G: *GBM* no. 57, a birch-bark manuscript, written in Proto-śāradā, one folio.
- K: A palm-leaf manuscript in the National Archives of Nepal (No. 5-145, microfilm A 39/2), written in Newārī script, 10 folios.
- M: Meadows’ Sanskrit text.
- S: Saito’s Sanskrit text.
- T: Tibetan translation of the *Pāramitāsamāsa* by Vairocanaraksita, see Saito 2005.
- ( ) restored aksara(s)
- [ ] damaged aksara(s)
- .. one illegible aksara
- . illegible part of an aksara
- / danda
- // double danda
- * virāma
- • punctuation mark

---

20. The first verse in Sanskrit has no equivalent in Tibetan; thus the corresponding Tibetan translation starts from the second verse in Skt.


22. In Meadows 1986, this material is called ‘F co,’ while Saito 2005 distinguishes two, namely ‘F’ and ‘Fc’. ‘F’ indicates ‘Sanskrit text edited by Ferrari’ and ‘Fc’ indicates ‘copy of manuscript.’ Cf. de Jong 1989: 235: “... the abbreviation F co. for the copy used by Ferrari is rather clumsy. Why not use a single letter such as C?”
[Pāramitāsāmaṇḥ Chapter 1: Dānapāramitāsāmaṇḥ]

**TRANSLITERATION:**

[2r1]yadā [ni]sṛṣṭo jagato mayāyam kāyo (')pi tattvāgakṛto (')pi dharmmah (/)
bāhye tadā vastuni saṅgacittam na me gajasānam ivānurūpam* (// 6 //)
   a: K tisṛṣto\(^2\), S yadātisṛṣto\(^2\); M, S jagate

māṃsārthino māṃsam idāṃ harantu mājjānam apy uddharatāṃ tadarthī •
ahaṃ hi lokārtham idāṃ bibharmini sārīrakaṃ kiṃ bata vastu bāhyam* (// 7 //)
   b: M uddharanāt\(^2\), KS uddharatāt, T brus te khyer\(^2\)

yathā hi bhaiśajyama[2r2]hiṛuhasya tvakpattrapuspādi janā haranti •
maḍiyam ete (')paharanti caivaṃ [na]naṃ vikalpāṃ samudācaranti • (// 8 //)
   a: M, S yathaiva for yathā hi, c-d: M, S ceti naivaṃ, d: M, S vikalpāḥ

tathaiva lokārthasamudyatena svalpo (')pi kāryo na mayā vikalpaḥ (/)
duṅkhе kṛtaphne satatāśucau ca dehe parasmaya upayuṣyamāne • (// 9 //)

āḍhyātmike caiva mahājālādyate bāhye m[
2r3]hābhūta[ga]ṇe ca tulye •
idāṃ mamedam na mameti ko (')yam aṭṭānapaṃkāṅkavidhir mmamāpi • (// 10 //)
   d: M, S mayāpi for mmamāpi\(^2\)

grhnīta gātṛāyi api me yathēṣṭāṃ mā kāṛṣur asmiṃ parakṣyabuddhim* (/)
yuṣmākam eva svam idāṃ hi sarvāṃ na svābhimāno mama kaścid attra : (// 11 //)
   c: M, S kim arthaṃ for hi sarvaṃ, K him arthaṃ\(^2\); d: M, S nāṃbhimāno for na svābhimāno

\(^{23}\) Verse number is not given in the manuscript.


\(^{25}\) See S’s textual note, p. 340, fn. 1; also cf. S, p. 79.


\(^{27}\) S’s textual note, p. 340, fn. 2.


\(^{29}\) See M p. 158, 11c; cf. S p. 325, 11.19) 11.1c.
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ity adbhutā yasya bhavanty abhiṣkṛṇaṁ saṁbuddha[2r4]bhāvānunā āvitraṅkāḥ (/)
taṁ bodhisatvātīṣayam vadanti buddhā mahāsatvarṃ aciṁtyasatvāḥ (/ / 12 //)
   a: K bhavantibhiṣkṛṇaṁ

evaṁ sa dānapratipattiśūraḥ karoti kāye (')pi na jātv apekṣām* /
tasyāprayatnād upayānti śuddhiṁ karmāṇi vākkāyamanamayāni • (/ / 13 //)

viśuddhakarmā ca hitaṁ paresām[2r5]m āyāsadūkhena vinā karoti •
ithaṁ ca ś/mantyāyam abhiprapanno nayānaye kauṣaṁlam abhyupaiti • (/ / 14 //)
   a: K vahitaṁ for ca hitaṁ, c: M, S sa sattvārthaḥ for ca śantyāyam; KS
   abhiprapanno, M abhiprayatno

bhūyastaram prāpya phalāṁ sa dānāt saddharmmadānena tataḥ karoti •
bhavānadhakāre bhramatāṁ jānāṇāṁ sūryodayāt spaśtataram prakāśām* (/ / 15 //)
   a: M, S balam for phalāṁ T 'bras bu T (= phalaṁ)

sādhāraṇā lokahitārtha[2r6]siddhis sarvajñābhbhāvābhyyadayapratisṭhā •
ato (')syā punyākṣayatābhyyudeti prabhīva bhānor udayasthitasya • (/ / 16 //)
   a: M, S sādhāraṇī for sādhāraṇā
ty adbhutā dānāmayā guṇauḥgā ye bodhisatvābharaṇībhavanti •
yasyāt tadvāyam parikarmma cittaṁ dānasya kārunyapurissarasya • (/ / 17 //)
   c: M, S tasmāt for yasmāt; S citraṁ, T rnam pa maṅ

āyu[2r7]hpātibhānabalādī bauddhaṁ nispādayeyam jagataṁ anena /
satvā mayā cāmiṣasamgrhiṭā saddharmmapāttrāny api me bhaveyuh (/ / 18 //)
   c: M, S -samgrhiṭāh for -samgrhiṭā
ty annāṇaṁ pratidāti vidvān na tas svasampattiparighāhya :
pānāy api kleśatṛṣaś śāmāya lokasya lokārthacaro dadāti • (/ / 19 //)
   a: M pradadāti for pratidātī, b: M, S vidvān na svarga- for vidvān na tas sva-, T raṅ gi
   phun sum tshogs pa (= svasya sampatti)

bauddhasya caiva[r8]cetṣtisaya nirvāṇasaukhyasya ca sarvalokah (/)
labhī kathāṁ syād iti lokānātho yāṇāṁ mahāyānamatīr ddadāti (/ / 20 //)

30. M notes [158, 12a]: "yat prabhavanty E; (F.co.)"; see also S’s textual note (p. 341, fn. 1).
31. See S’s textual note (p. 341, fn. 2).
32. de Jong [1991: 182]. See also S’s textual note (p. 341, fn. 3); also cf. S p. 330, 2.2.2) a) 1.14c (mn- / mm-).
33. See S’s textual note (p. 341, fn. 4); also cf. Seto 1991: 112, note on v. 15-1.
34. See S’s textual note (p. 341, fn. 5); also cf. S p. 326, 2.1. 117c.
35. M notes [160, 18c]: "rthasamgahināh, F.co."; cf. S p. 330 2.2. 2a) 1.18c.
36. See S’s textual note (p. 342, fn. 1).
a: M, S  "viceṣītasya, K  "viceṣītasya"37, d: M, S mahāyānaratīr for mahāyānamatīr38

saṃbuddhavarṇasya ca hemabhāso lajjāmayasyaiva ca bhūṣaṇasya39 (/)
nispattaye vastravidhīn udārām • satkṛtya kālānugunam dadāti (/ 21 //)
d: M, S kālānugunam for kālānugunām

saṃbodhimāṇḍāsanam āsanār29ni • sayāś ca sayāttrayam īkṣamānas (/)
sarvajñacakṣuhpratilabhdaye ca caityeṣu rathyāsu ca dipadānam (/ 22 //)
d: M, S dipamālām for dipadānam (T. reads: mar me dbul)

vādyāni divyaśrutisamgrahārtha[m*] saṃbuddhaśilāya ca gandhadānaṃ40 •
sabhāprapārāmavihārgeḥam ccharanīyadānābbhimuko dadāti • (/ 23 //)
d: M, S śaranyabhāvābhi- for ccharanīyadānābbhi-

dānaṃ rasānāṃ ca susamskṛtānāṃ [2v1] rasārasajñatvaparigrāhāya :
bhaiṣajyādānāny ṛṣajāmaratvam lokān imān prāpayi + + + (/ 24 //)
a: M, S tu for ca, b: M, S rasārasāgratva- for rasārasajñatva-41

d: M, S prāpayitum dadāti // 24 //</a>

+ .. + [u] tām ātmasamām n[ī]n. śuc ddās. kṛttān klesaṅgeṇa lokān* (/)
sa dāsādānāni sadā dadāti dāsaṅudāsan42 aparān karo . (/ 25 //)
a: M, S bhūjīṣyaṭām ātmasamām niniṣur, b: M, S dāsīṅkṛtān

c: M, S dāsādāṣyaḍi for dāsādānāni,43 d: M, S aparākārisyan for aparān karo(t)44

... ti putr. + + +45 [vi]dramādīn dadāti sallakṣāṇasampadartham* (/)
[2v2] ratnapradipānī ca bhūṣaṇāni cittrāṇy anuvyaṇjanasausthāvāya : (/ 26 // = M, S 27)
a: M, S v.26: dadāti putrān duhitṛḥ. M, S v.27: suvarṇamuktāmāni-.
c: M, S ratnapradipānī for ratnapradipānī (T. reads: sgron ma ‘lamp’46

37. M notes [162, 20a]: “... the K ms. reading of "viceṣītasya ...”; but her note is wrong as is pointed out by S [342, fn. 2].
38. Cf. M’s translation note on v. 20.3 (p. 269) says: The use of rati is somewhat unusual, ... .”
40. Cf. M notes [162, 23b]: “pānṭhadānām, F (F co.); S p. 329, 2.2. 1) c) 1.23b [gāndha°/pānṭha°] e) 1.23b.
41. See S’s textual note (p. 343, fn. 1).
42. For this word, see S’s textual note (p. 343, fn. 2).
43. Cf. M notes [162, 25d]: “dāsaṅadāsan K, F co. (dāsaṅudāsan F).”
44. Cf. S’s textual note (p. 343, fn. 2): “wie aparā<ś> dann zu emendieren ist: aparā<n>, amarā<n> oder ähnlich.”
45. Although verse 26 seems to start here, namely “(dadā)ti putrān)”, verse 27 intervenes; consequently the sequence of verses is different from present Sanskrit text: M, S25 = G25; M, S26 = G28; M, S27 = G26; M, S28 = G27 (sequence of G corresponds to that of the Tibetan translation, see S pp. 92-94; Sato 1991: 3, note 6).
46. See S p. 93.
dhyānārtham utpāda ya tapovanāṇī saddharmamakoṣāya ca vittakoṣaṃ* (/)
munindrarājyāya dadāty akhīno rājyāni cājñāpanamaṇḍitāni • (// 27 // = M, S 28)
   a: M, S  udvāna- for utpāda, d: M -maṇḍitāni, K -paṇḍitāni, S -paṇḍitāni (S notes [343, fn. 3]: brgyan T (= o′maṇḍitāni))

dadāti putrān duhitṛīḥ pryaś ca bodhipriyatvād anvadāyadānam* (/)
ekāntasaddharmaratiprasya ca kṛṣḍā[2v3]viśeṣān ratiḥetubhūtān* (// 28 // = M, S 26)
   a, c: M, S priyaś for pryaś

cakrāṅkitaḥbhyaṃ caraṇottamābhyaṃ sabodhimaṇḍākramaṇotsukatvāt* (/)
sa nirvicāraṣa caraṇapradānaṃ lokārthaniśpattikaro dadāti • (// 29 //)
   a: M, S nirvikāraś for nirvicāras⁴⁷

dulkhāpāgāyāṃ atiśīghragāyāṃ magnasya lokasya kathān nu dadyāṃ* (/)
saddharmmahastān iti sa pradatte⁴⁸ hastān vi kosēṃburuḥaprakāśān* (// 30 //)
   b: M, S kathāṃ na for kathan nu, c: M, S sampradate for sa pradatte

śraddhe[2v4]ndriyādeḥ paripūraṇārtham sa karṇanāsādi dadāty akhinnāḥ (/)
cakṣusu ca caksur vimalākarisyaśa lokasya sarvāraṇaprahāṇat* (// 31 //)
   a: M, S śraddhendriyādiprati- for śraddhendriyādeḥ pari-

utkṛṛta māṃsāni saṣoṇitāni dadāti kāruṇyavaśena nāthāḥ (/)
bhūmyagnivāyavambudva eva me syāl lokopajīvāḥ kathāṃ esa kāyaḥ // (32 //)

⁴⁷ majjānam apy adbhutavī[2v5]raceṣṭo dadāti lokasya kathāṃ na kuryāṃ* (/)
tāthāgataṃ vigrahām apradhṛṣyaṃ vṛṣṭyāpi va[j]rojvalayā patantyā • (// 33 // = M, S 34)

lokottamajñānasamāpanārtham sa uttamāṅgair api satkaroti •
abhyāgatasyārthījanasya yačnaṃ prāg eva gāttrāvayavais tadanyaiḥ (34 // = M, S 33)
   d: M, S dehāvayavais for gāttrāvayavais [deha = gātra, ‘body’] (T reads: lus)

ity evamādyam satatānavadyaṃ tad bo[2v6]dhisatvāmbdharapramuktam* (/)
prahlādyā dānāṃbhu jagat samagraṃ sarvajñatāsāgaram abhyupaiōti • (// 35 //)
   c: S praklādyā for prahlādyā⁴⁹
anviṣya bhogān viṣameṇa nāsau dadāti notpiṇḍanayā parasya
na tṛṣaḷalijjāpratikārahetor na daksiniyān parimāgamānāḥ (/// 36 ///)52

na ca pranīte na ti rūkṣadānam adaksiniyān i[2v7]ti vāvamanya :
vipākakāṅkṣākapāṅkṛtam vā satkāraḥhānam vijugupsitaṁ vā • (37 //</a
a: M, S sati for na ti53; b: M, S adaksiniyā iti for adaksiniyān iti

naiṇāntiṁ śilavate prayacchan viparyayaṁ gacchati netarasmai •
nātmanam utkarṣatī naiva nindam karoti so ('')nyasya samaprayogaḥ // (38 //</a
a: M, S naivonnatim for naivānatiṁ [T reads: nitho (mitho) Skt. unnati]54

na cāsya mithyāsaṭayadānam asti naivaśty anadhyaśayadānam asya (]
na krodhadosopa[2v8]hatam dadāti naivānutapāṃ kurute sa datvā • (// 39 //</a

na ślāghamāno vipulaṁ dadāti glāyaṁ na caivāvipulaṁ dadāti •
nā yācaṅkānām upaghātadānaṁ yadvā bhaved vipratipattiḥetuḥ (// 40 //</a
a: M, S ślāghyatamō55 for ślāghamāno, K ślāghamāno; b: M nāślāghyatamāno
'nyataram dadāti, K nāślāghamāno (')pataram dadāti, S nāślāghyatamāno 'pataram, T ūn
bar (= alpataram)56

nākāladānam sa dadāti kiṃcid dadāti kāle viṣame ('')pi naiva :
na devabhāvya na rājyaḥetor una hīnayānasprhāyālubhāvā • (// 41 //</a
d: M, S -bhāvā for -bhāvā

nāsau [v9] mukhālokana-yā dadāti • na kṛttaśabdāya na hāsyahetoh (]
paryāyam etac ca mamaiva naivaṃ • yadvā vihimsāsahitaṁ pareśaṁ (// 42 //</a
a: M, S mukhālokana-yā for mukhālokana-yā57

c: M, S paryāptam for paryāyam, M, S mameti for mamaiva; d: M, K
vihimsāsahitaṁ58 for vihimsāsahitaṁ, S vihimsāsahitaṁ59

sarvajñabhāvāparināmitaṁ vā • sadgarhitam vā sa dadāti naiva (]
tato ('')sya tat pāramitābhidhānām* parām viṣuddhiṁ samupaiti dānam (// 43 //</a

52. Verses 36-39 in T are differently composed, see S p. 99. G corresponds to M, S.
54. See S p. 102; see also Sato 1991: 111, note on v. 38-1.
56. See S's textual note (p. 345, fn. 2-3).
42-1.
58. Cf. de Jong [1991: 184] proposes to read vihimsāsahitaṁ instead of vihimsāsahitaṁ; also Sato 1991:
110, note on v. 42-2.
59. See S's textual note (p. 346, fn. 1); also cf. S p. 326, 2.1. 1.42d [*hasitam/*sahitam].
b: M, S sagarhitam for sadgarhitam

danodbhavam tasya ca punyarasisim · lokat samagr[2v10]n api pin[ditani (f)  
punyanai naivabhavanti yasmat* lokottamatvam sa tato (')bhyupaiti · (44 //)  
b: M, S samagr[äd] api for samagrän api

pamcasv abhij[nasu ca niscit[tm]a lok[ya yad var[si dänav[rsam* (f)  
samantatas tasya kutaḥ pramaṇ[am parikṣayo vā satataḥ pravr[teḥ (45 //</)  
a: M, S vini[scit]tm for ca niscit[tm]a, d: M, S satatapra[rv[teh for satataḥ pravr[teh

tad aksay[an[am jagat[am hit[ya j[nasya hetuś ca tad aksayasya ·  
traidh[aktu[ena kṣay[ṇa [2v10 ends] (na tac ca sam[lifyate vyomavad ambu[dena (46 //</)  
a: M, S y[ad for tad, b: M, S y[ad for tad
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Candrakīrti and the Pūrvaśailas:  
A Note on Triśaraṇasaptati v. 51

Peter Skilling (Bangkok) and Saerji (Beijing)

“Seventy Verses on the Three Refuges” (Triśaranasaptati, Gsum la skyabs su ’gro ba bdun cu pa) is a verse composition by Candrakīrti (600–650).¹ It survives only in a Tibetan translation done by Dipamkaraśriyāna (Atiśa, 980–1054) and Rin chen bzang po (958–1055), which has been critically edited and translated into English by Per Sørensen.²

Although Sørensen’s convenient edition and translation have been available for more than twenty years, the Triśaranasaptati does not seem to be well known to modern scholarship on Buddhism. There is sufficient evidence, however, to maintain that this short treatise by Candrakīrti was considered authoritative by Indian scholars like Atiśa and Abhayākaragupta (late eleventh century to early twelfth century),³ and by Tibetan scholars from Rin chen bzang po to Tsong kha pa Blo bzang grags pa (1357–1419)⁴ to ‘Jam mgon Kong sprul Blos gros mtha’ yas (1813–1899)⁵ to the present.

¹ The Sanskrit at the beginning of all versions consulted is Triśaraṇa-saptati (in a few cases -saraṇa- rather than -śaraṇa-). Cordier, whose catalogue is based on a Peking xylograph, the “red edition” in the National Library, Paris, gives Triśarana[-gamaṇa-]-saptati: see Palmyr Cordier, Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale. Troisième partie, Index du Bstan-hgyur (tibétain 180–332), Paris: Imprimerie Nationale/Ernest Leroux, 1915, XXXII, 9 (p. 333); XXXIII, 101 (p. 360). For the first, he notes that the original text reads śarana-saptati, while the “Index de Saint-Pétersbourg” (not available to us) gives śaraṇasapati; for the second he notes that both the original and the “Index de Saint-Pétersbourg” read śarana-sapatĭka, for which he suggestion a corrected form śaraṇa[gamaṇa]sāpatĭka (with a question mark). Modern catalogues like those of D and P also give Triśarana[-gamaṇa-]-saptati. We assume that Cordier was influenced by the Tibetan title, Gsum la skyabs su ’gro ba bdun cu pa, and that later catalogues were influenced by Cordier. The dates are after Leonard W. J. van der Kuijpp, “The Earliest Indian Reference to Muslims in a Buddhist Philosophical Text of Circa 700,” Journal of Indian Philosophy, vol. 34 (2006), p. 180 (full article, pp. 169–202). Sørensen gives 530–600: Per K. Sørensen (ed., tr.), Candrakīrti Triśaranasaptati, the Septuagint on the Three Refugees, Vienna: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 1986 (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde Heft 16), p. 7.

² See above: dates after Sørensen, p. 8.

³ Date after Hajime Nakamura, Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes, Ogura, Hirakata City: Kansai University of Foreign Studies, 1980, p. 335.

⁴ Lamrim Chenmo Translation Committee by Tsong-ka-pa (tr.), The Great Treatise on the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment: Lam Rim Chen Mo, Vol. 1, Ithaca: Snow Lion Publications, pp. 179, 204.

⁵ Kong sprul cites verses 56 to 58, which are the key verses on the Pūrvaśaila/Aparāśaila scriptures. See Kong sprul yon tan rgya mtsho, Shes bya kun khyab, Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1982, Bar cha, p. 561. For an English translation, see Jamgön Kongtrul Lodrö Tayé, The Treasury of Knowledge, Book Six,
Apart from the four verses (33, 45–47) cited in śāstras like Haribhadra’s (c. eighth century)\(^6\) Abhisamayālaṃkārāloka Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā, the text does not survive in Sanskrit.\(^7\) Verse 33 also occurs — again in connection with refuge — in the Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārāsansāṅgrahaṭīkā. This may be significant in terms of Candrakīrti’s school affiliation.\(^8\)

In verse 51, Candrakīrti addresses the question of why an arhat should pay homage to a bodhisatva. Sørensen reads the verse as follows:

\[
\text{shā ri'i lung las dgra bcom pas} || \\
\text{byang chub sens dpa' phyag byas nyid} || \\
\text{di dag dkon mchog gsum gzhan min} || \\
\text{sangs rgyas khongs su gtogs par 'dod} ||
\]

He records several variants:

51a  shā ri'i lung : shar ri'i lung  51b  phyag byas nyid : phyag 'tshal nyid

A fuller account of the variants is as follows:

---


\(^7\) As Sørensen notes, two verses (12, 13) are identical to Mālamadhyamakakārikā XV 1, 2; thereby they are not, properly speaking, by Candrakīrti or unique to the work.

\(^8\) Sanghasen Singh (ed., tr.), A Study of the Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārāsansāṅgrahaṭīkā, Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1983 (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series No. XXIV), p. 50.17; J. Duncan M. Derret (tr.), A Textbook for Novices: Jayarakṣita’s “Perspicuous Commentary on the Compendium of Conduct by Śrīghana”, Turin: Edizione Jollygrafica (Pubblicazioni di “Indologica Taurensia,” Collana di Letture diretta da Oscar Botto XV), p. 19. We will discuss this verse in a forthcoming article. For the school affiliation of the “Perspicuous Commentary,” see Giulio Agostini, “On the Nikāya Affiliation of the Śrīghanācārāsansāṅgraha and the Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārāsansāṅgrahaṭīkā,” Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies 26.1 (2003), pp. 97–114. Agostini concludes (pp. 111–112) that “the available evidence suggests that the author of the Śrīghanācārāsansāṅgraha and Jayarakṣita were not Mahāsāṃghikas, but belonged to a nikāya that was related to the Mahāsāṃghikas.”
|   | 1. shā ri’i lung las dgra bcom pas || byang chub sms dpa’ phyag byas nyid || | 2. shar ri’i lung las dgra bcom pas || byang chub sms dpa’ phyag byas nyid || | 3. shar ri’i lung las dgra bcom pas || byang chub sms dpa’ phyag tshal nyid || |   | G 3365$^9$ | N$_1^{10}$ | P 5366$^{11}$ | C$^{12}$ | TCRC$^{13}$ | D 3971$^{14}$ | G 3477$^{15}$ | N$_2^{16}$ | P 5478$^{17}$ | D 4564$^{18}$ |

For the first word, Sørensen has chosen *shā ri’i lung* over *shar ri’i lung*, following N$_1$ and P 5366. He translates the verse as:

In the scripture (āgama) of Śāri[putra] [it is maintained that]
Arhats [should] pay [their due] respect (namas krt) to Bodhisatvas;
[By this gesture] these [Arhats] are not at variance (ananya) with the Three Jewels,
[on the contrary they] are [even] maintained (mata) to be included (antargata) in the Buddha [category].

The citation from Śā ri’i lung, or Śāri-āgama, immediately attracts attention. In Śāstra usage, Āgama frequently refers to the texts deemed authoritative by a certain school, rather than one or the other of “the four Āgamās” equivalent to the Pali Nikāyas. Here one thinks immediately of Śāriputra and his connection with the Abhidharma. In his note (p. 79), Sørensen refers, with a question mark, to the Dharmaśāstra of the Sarvāstivādin Abhidharma, held by tradition to have been composed by Śāriputra. One might also wonder: could this be a reference to the Śāriputra Abhidharma? These intriguing questions are, however, based on the choice of the wrong reading, as we will show in this paper.

Another problem is Sørensen’s line 51b, byang chub sms dpa’ phyag byas nyid, which does not really make good sense grammatically. Here Abhayākaragupta and Gung thang pa III Dkon mcog bs tan pā’i sgron me (1762–1823)$^{19}$ read byang chub sms dpar

---

$^9$ Ganden Golden Tanjur, mdo ’grel, khi, 386a2.
$^{10}$ Narthang Tanjur, mdo ’grel, khi, 281b3.
$^{11}$ Peking Tanjur, dbu ma, khi, 294a1.
$^{12}$ Cone Tanjur, dbu ma, gi, 263b6.
$^{13}$ Bstan ’gyur dpe bsad ma, Beijing: Krung go’i bod rig pa’i dpe skrun khang, Vol. 65, 690.3.
$^{14}$ Derge Tanjur, dbu ma, gi, 252b6.
$^{15}$ Ganden Golden Tanjur, mdo ’grel, gi, 295a6–b1.
$^{16}$ Narthang Tanjur, mdo ’grel, gi, 232b4.
$^{17}$ Peking Tanjur, dbu ma, gi, 243b7.
$^{18}$ Here it is included in the collection of “minor works by Jo bo,” (Jo bo’i chos chung), that is, by Atiśa. Since this version is not available to us, we follow Sørensen’s readings. Cf. Krung go’i bod brgyud mtho rim nang bs tan slob dling bod brgyud nang bs tan zhib ’jug khang, Jo bo’i chos chung brgyua rtsa, Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2002 (Gang can rgya’i sgo ‘byed lde mig, no. 30), p. 532.
$^{19}$ Date after Dung dkar Blo bzang ’phrin las, Dung dkar tshig mdzod chen mo, Beijing: Krung go’i bod
phyag bya ste (see below), which makes much better sense: “should pay homage to bodhisatvas” (accusative).

To help us to understand the verse, we may turn to Dkon mchog bstan pa’i sgron me’s unfinished work, “Annotations on the First Chapter (Sarvākāraṇajñatā) of ‘Jam dbyang shes pa’ exegesis on the Prajñāpāramitā,” which cites and comments on the verse:

\[
\text{zla ba'i skyabs 'gro bdun cu pa las kyang |}
\text{shar ri'i lung las dgra bcon gyis |}
\text{byang chub sms dpars bya ste |}
\text{de ni dkon mchog gsum gzan min |}
\text{sangs rgyas khungs su gtogs par 'dod |}
\]

\[
\text{ces nyan thos dgra bcon gyis kyang phyag bya bar gsungs pa'i rtags kyis kun rdzob pa'i sangs rgyas su sgrub la | shar ri'i sde pa'i lung ni | bcom ldan 'das byang chub sms dpa' rnams kyi rdzul phul ji lta ba de liar yang | nyan thos dang rang sangs rgyas rnams kyi yul yang ma lags pas | byang chub sms dpa' la phyag 'tshal lo zhes abhyas drangs pa de yin nam snyam la | sde pa so so'i lung gis rang rang la byang chub sms dpa' rnams dgra bcon gyis kyang phyag 'os su sgrub snang ba der ltos.}^{21}
\]

Furthermore, according to Candra[kīrti]’s Triśaraṇasaptati:

The scripture of the Pūrvaśailas asserts
That an arhat should pay homage to a bodhisatva
Because they [the bodhisatvas] are not something apart from the Three Jewels
Since they are included under the “Buddha.”

That is, even a listener who is an arhat should pay homage [to a bodhisatva], because it is established by the word of the Buddha (gsungs) that [a bodhisatva] has the distinguishing marks (rtags, llinga) of a Buddha at the conventional level (*samvyrti-buddha). Abhayākaraṇagupta cites the Āgama of the Pūrvaśailas as follows, “Fortunate One, given that the nature of the magic power of bodhisatvas is beyond the scope of listeners and pratyekabuddhas, they [listeners and pratyekabuddhas] should pay homage to bodhisatvas” – it is apparent that the Āgamas of each of the schools (nikāyas) establish that it is appropriate for arhats to pay homage to bodhisatvas – please heed this [citation].^{22}


^{21} Ibid. 98b4–99a1.

^{22} For a similar citation from the Bodhisatva-pitaka of the Pūrvaśailas, spoken, however, to Mahākāśyapa, see Malcolm David Eckel, Bhāviveka and his Buddhist Opponents, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (Harvard Oriental Series 70), 2009, p. 349–350 (D 176b) (translation pp. 167–168).
Dkon mchog bstan pa’i sgron me’s version differs in lines a and b from the Triśaraṇasaptati of the Tanjur. There are further differences in Abhayākaragupta’s Munimatālāṅkāra, 23 which gives us an alternate translation of verse 51, as well as more context. 24

\[
\text{shar ri’i lung las dgra bcom gyis} \\
\text{byang chub sens dpa’ phyag bya ste} \\
\text{dkon mchog gsum las phyi rol min} \\
\text{sangs rgyas nang du ’dus par dgongs} 25
\]

...de nas yang gnas brtan rab ’byor gyis bcom ldan ’das la ’di skad ces gsol to || bcom ldan ’das byang chub sens dpa’ rnams kyi rdzu ’phrul ji lta ba de lta yang ryan thos dang rang sands rgyas rnams kyi yul yang ma lags pas byang chub sens dpa’ la phyag ’tshal lo zhes shar gyi ri la gnas pa’i byang chub sens dpa’i sde snod du’o. 26

[It is stated in] the Bodhisatva-piṭaka of the Pūrvaśailas: “Then, Sthavira Subhūti addressed the Fortunate One: Fortunate One, given that the nature of the magic power of bodhisatvas is beyond the scope of listeners and pratyekabuddhas, they [listeners and pratyekabuddhas] should pay homage to the bodhisatvas.”

The Bodhisatva-piṭaka is one of the seven piṭakas of the Pūrvaśailas and Aparaśailas listed by Candrakīrti in Triśaraṇasapatati verses 57–59.

Reading verse 51 as cited in Dkon mchog bstan pa’i sgron me and the Munimatālāṅkāra citation, and taking into account the variants listed above, we can propose a revised reading of Triśaraṇasapatati:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Munimatālāṅkāra</th>
<th>Triśaraṇasapatati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shar ri’i lung las dgra bcom gyis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byang chub sens dpa’ phyag bya ste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dkon mchog gsum las phyi rol min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sangs rgyas nang du ’dus par dgongs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dkon mchog bstan pa’i sgron me

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>shar ri’i lung las dgra bcom gyis</th>
<th>byang chub sens dpar phyag bya ste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>de ni dkon mchog gsum gzhan min</td>
<td>sangs rgyas khungs su gtogs par ’dod</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

23 D 3903, dbu ma, a, 73b1–293a7.
24 Apart from verse 51 in question, Abhayākaragupta also cites verses 1, 34, 54, 55, 67.
25 Ibid. 82b1.
26 Ibid. 84a2–3.
Here Shar ri'i lung indicates the Āgama of Pūrvaśaila school, and the verse may now be rendered as:

The scripture of the Pūrvaśailas asserts
That an arhat should pay homage to a bodhisatva
Because they [the bodhisatvas] are not outside of the Three Jewels
Since they are included under the “Buddha.”

The verse is yet another testimony to perennial debate in the Buddhist schools, discussed by Bhavya and others: whether an arhat should pay homage to a bodhisatva.\(^{27}\)

A Study of the Language of Early Chinese Buddhist Translations: A Comparison between the Translations by Lokakṣema and Zhi Qian

Seishi Karashima

Abstract:

There are seven Chinese translations of the Aṣṭasāhasrika Prajñāpāramitā, of which the Daoxing Banre jing 道行般若經, translated in 179 C.E., by Lokakṣema is the oldest, followed by the translations by Zhi Qian (fl. ca. 220~257 C.E.), Zhu Fonian (translated in 382 C.E.), Kumārajīva (translated in 408 C.E.) and so on. Being not well-versed in Classical Chinese, Lokakṣema used many vernacular words and expressions in his translations of Buddhist scriptures inadverently. In contrast to him, Zhi Qian, who was born in China and a master of Classical Chinese, seems to have just "sinicised" Lokakṣema’s translation. Zhu Fonian, however, merely copied Lokakṣema’s translation and just replaced old-fashioned, vernacular words and expressions in it. Therefore, in this respect, if we focus on how these translators modified Lokakṣema’s translation, we are able to trace the changes and developments of the Chinese language from the Eastern Han to the Jin Dynasty.

In 2010, I published A Glossary of Lokakṣema’s Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrika Prajñāpāramitā 道行般若經詞典, a glossary of the Daoxing Banre jing 道行般若經 by Lokakṣema (Lk). I selected approximately 1500 words from this translation, focusing on vernacular expressions, Middle Chinese words and usages, semantic peculiarities, Buddhist technical terminology and transliterations. Each entry word was then compared with its parallels in the Sanskrit (the Aṣṭasāhasrika Prajñāpāramitā, abbr. AS) and Tibetan versions as well as Chinese parallels found in the six later versions of the same scripture by five eminent translators, namely Zhi Qian 支謙 (ZQ), Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 (Zf)n, Kumārajīva =

* I am very grateful to Peter Lait and Ms. Liang Ye Tan, who went to great trouble to check my English and to Jonathan Silk, who read through my draft and offered many useful suggestions.
1 般若 (EH, pan nja), though pronounced in various ways such as bo re, ban rvo or ban re, should be pronounced ban re, due to its being originally a transliteration of the Gāndhārī form praṇa and not that of Skt. prajñā. It is probable that the pronunciation bo re was a later artificial one, invented in the Tang Period by a Sanskritist who had no knowledge of Middle Indic.
2 Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XI) (downloadable at the following website: http://iriab.soka.ac.jp/orc/Publications/BPPB/index_BPPB.html).
Jiumoluoshi 鳳摩羅什 (Kj), Xuanzang 玄奘 (Xz) and Dānapāla = Shihu 施護 (Sh). In this article, the translations are labelled with the abbreviations of the translators’ names. For example, Lokakṣema (Lk)’s translation is also designated as “Lk”.

Their translations of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāparamitā are:

Lk = Daoxing Banre jing 道行般若經 (T. 8, no. 224), translated by Lokakṣema in 179 C.E.
ZQ = Da Mingdu jing 大明度經 (T. 8, no. 225), translated by Zhi Qian 支謙 (fl. ca. 220~257 C.E.).
Zfn = Mohebanre chao jing 摩訶般若鈞經 (T. 8, no. 226), translated by Tanmopi 毘摩荼 or Dharmapriya and Zhu Fonian 墾佛念 during the Former Qin Dynasty 前秦 (351~394 C.E.)

Kj = Xiaopin Banreboluomi jing 小品般若波羅蜜經 (T. 8, no. 227), translated by Kumārajīva in 408 C.E.
Xz(I) = The fourth assemblage (第四會) of the Da Banreboluomi jing 大般若波羅蜜經 (T. 7, no. 220, pp. 763~865), translated by Xuanzang 玄奘 in 660~663 C.E.
Xz(II) = The fifth assemblage (第五會) of the above-mentioned translation by Xuanzang (T. 7, no. 220, pp. 865~920)

Sh = Fomu Chuseng Sanfazang Banreboluomiduo jing 佛母出生三法藏般若波羅蜜多經 (T. 8, no. 228), translated by Shihu 施護 or Dānapāla in 982~984? C.E.

As Lokakṣema and these Chinese translators were, in fact, all the foremost representative translators of their particular respective times, the glossary allows us to observe the changes and developments of the language in Chinese Buddhist literature from one age to the next. To cite just a few examples of such developments from the Glossary:

弊魔 “Māra, the Evil One”
Lk.434a11. 煩惑弊魔常索佛便, 常亂世間人。
    AS.39.20 = R.78.16 = AAA.243.22. Māra- pāpyās- (“Mara, the Evil One”);
    ZQ.484c7. 邪; Zfn.516a20.; Kj.544a11. 魔; Xz(I).778b27. 惡魔; Xz(II).875b28. 惡魔; Sh.599b9. 詔魔衆

本無 “nothingness; non-existence; non-existent; absolutely does not exist”
Lk.449c29. 本無阿緊知色之本無。如知色本無, 痛痒、思想、生死、識亦爾。
    AS.134.12 = R.271.3 = AAA.557.9. tathata (“Suchness”); ZQ.491c23. 本無; Zfn.-;
    Kj.558b10. 如; Xz(I).816c4. 真如; Xz(II).893c17. 真如; Sh.631b15. 如

當來 “future, in the future”
Lk.431c28. 過去、當來、今現在佛、天中天皆為人中尊, 悉於其中作佛。
    Zfn.514b7. 當來; Kj.542b12. 未來; Xz(I).774c6. 未來; Xz(II).873b8. (三世);

---

3 Jan Nattier (Nattier 2008: 136f.) has pointed out that both the vocabulary and style in the first chapter, Xingpin 行品, of the Da Mingdu jing differ considerably from those in the other chapters of the same text and other translations by Zhi Qian. Therefore, this chapter seems to have been translated by somebody else.

4 The Mohebanre chao jing is traditionally attributed to Dharmapriya and Zhu Fonian, an attribution questioned by many scholars. Some consider it to have been translated by Dharmarakṣa. However, the vocabulary and style in this translation do not agree with Dharmarakṣa's other translations. Further investigation is therefore needed to clarify its attribution.
Sh.595c22. 未来
都盧  “all, the whole; (not) at all” (This vernacular expression, being a rhyming compound (dulu), occurs twenty times in Lk, though the later translators replaced it with other expressions)
Lk.436b10. 釋提桓因言：“但行般若波羅蜜，不行餘波羅蜜耶？” 佛言:“都盧六波羅蜜皆行，菩薩、摩訶薩。般若波羅蜜於菩薩、摩訶薩最尊。.........”
AS.51.13 = R.100.21 = AAA.280.20. sarva~ (“all”); ZQ.485c11. 皆; Zfn.518a22. 悉; Kj.545c24. 皆; Xz(I).783a3. 具; Xz(II).878c11. 具; Sh.603a9. 皆

(1) Comparison between the Daoxing Banre jing 道行般若經 and the other translations of the same text

It is important to be aware of and pay proper attention to the fact that, in general, later Chinese Buddhist translators consulted pre-exiting Chinese translations and borrowed expressions from them with slight modifications. In the context of the present paper, I would like to focus on the fact that, in Zhi Qian’s Da Mingdu jing 大明度經, Zhu Fonian’s Mohebanre chao jing 摩诃般若若经 and Kumārajīva’s Xiaojin Banreboloumi jing 小品般若波罗蜜經, there are traces of Lokakṣema’s Daoxing Banre jing 道行般若經, the first Chinese translation of the same text.

Since he was not well-versed in Classical Chinese, Lokakṣema used many vernacular words and expressions as well as transliterations in his translation in a fashion that reveals his less than total control. Also, we can find many examples where he translated the original Indian text, which was transmitted most probably in Gāndhārī, into Chinese, merely by following the order of the words in the original text. Thus, his translation is basically word-for-word, very literal and rudimentary. In contrast to him, Zhi Qian, who was born in China but had never been India, seems to have had a rather poor knowledge of Indian languages and therefore, there are many strange translations by him, providing evidence that he often mixed up Sanskrit, Gāndhārī and other Middle Indic or Prakrit terms. However, as he was born and educated in China, he was a master of Classical Chinese and could write in an intellectual manner, thus avoiding vernacular expressions and coarse transliterations. Therefore, the Chinese language in his translation is quite natural and readable. There are many cases which suggest that he did not always consult the original Indian text, but merely "sinicised" Lokakṣema’s translation. Zhu Fonian, in his turn, basically copied Lokakṣema’s translation, only replacing old-fashioned, vernacular words and expressions. For example, we may compare the following sentences listed in chronological order:

Lk.  正使是輩行菩薩道者，我代其喜，我終不牴功德法。我使欲取中正尊法，正欲使上佛。(No. 224, 429a23f.)
ZQ.  正使是輩求者，我代其喜，不牴功德也。悉使欲取經中極尊法，使上至佛。(No. 225, 482b14f.)
Zfn.  正使是輩人索菩薩道，我亦勸助之，不牴其功德。悉使取法中極尊，欲使極上佛。(No. 226, 511c26f.)
Kj.  是人若發阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心，我亦隨喜。終不牴其功德。所以者何？上人應求上法。(No. 227, 540a19f.)
Adapting or modifying pre-existing translations was quite a common practice in the history of Chinese Buddhist translations. I suspect that there are many such modified works, especially among Zhi Qian’s translations. For example, his translation of the Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra, the Weimojie jìng 維摩詰經 (T. 14, no. 474) is the oldest extant translation. However, according to the catalogues of the Chinese Tripitaka, namely the Lidai Sanbao ji 經藏三寶記 and Kaiyuan Shijiao lu 開元釋教錄, there was an older translation of the scripture by Yan Fotiao 嚴佛調 in the Eastern Han Dynasty, which is now lost. It is probable that Zhi Qian’s translation is none other than a modification of this older translation.6

A similar relationship is seen between the two oldest Chinese translations of the so-called Sukhāvatvīyāha, namely the (Da) Amituo jìng (大)阿彌陀經 (T. 12, no. 362)8 and the Wuliangqi jìng Pingdengjue jìng 無量清淨平等覺經 (T. 12, no. 361). When comparing these two translations, one soon notices that they are generally identical. While the differences between them are not very great, they are quite striking. For instance, where ji 即 is used throughout the former, ze 則 is used throughout the latter; transliterations such as Amituo 阿彌陀 (*Amitāha < Amitābha), Louyigenluo 楼夷巨羅 (Lokeśvara), Dharmākara (Dharmākara) are used in the former, while, in the latter, the translations Wuliangqi jìng 無量清淨, Shirawang 世饒王, Baozang 寶藏 are found; the former consists solely of prose, while the latter contains verses as well; the order of the vows made by Dharmākara in the former differs from the other versions, while, in the latter, this order is similar to the other

---

5 T. 49, no. 2034, 34a9, 54a14, 57a22f., and T. 55, no. 2154, 483a14, 429a5, respectively.
6 As the Older Weimojie jìng 古維摩詰經 by Yan Fotiao is neither referred to in the much earlier catalogues nor in earlier literature, some modern scholars doubt its existence, e.g. Lamotte 1994: xci. This argument is, in my opinion, far-fetched and not very convincing. In the Lidai Sanbao ji 經藏三寶記, 57a21f., Zhi Qian’s Weimojie jìng 維摩詰經 is described as follows: “Weimojie Suoshuo Busiyi Famen jìng 維摩詰所說不思議法門經, three juans. It is also entitled Foshuo Puruadoemen jìng 佛說普入道門經. Or (it consists of) two juans. This is the second translation (of the text), differing a little from the (first) translation by Yan Fotiao in the Later Han Dynasty. References to this are found in Zhu Daozu (竺道祖)’s WeiWulu 魏都疏 and Sanzangji 三藏記.” Therefore, as one can see, this account tells us that Zhi Qian’s translation of the Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra is a modification of Yan Fotiao’s translation of the same text.
7 I add “so-called”, because, as I have demonstrate elsewhere (Karashima 2010: 34f.), this sutra originally had the title Amitābhavyāha, Amitābhasya vyāha or the like in the original texts of the Chinese, Tibetan translations as well as in the older Sanskrit manuscripts, and the name Sukhāvatvīyāha, which appears only in the Sanskrit manuscripts, was added to it later as its subtitle.
8 The Chinese translation No. 362 goes by the title of Amituo Sanyesangfo Salou[fo]tan Guodu Rendao jìng 阿彌陀三耶三佛薩楼[佛]端遊渡道經 —— the second fo 佛 is to be deleted according to ancient catalogues ——, while some editions read Amituo jìng 阿彌陀經 instead. The original form of the longer title as well as its meaning are enigmatic. Now, I am inclined to agree with Prof. Chen Jinhua’s hypothesis (personal communication, May 2003) that the fo 聞 is a corruption of helōuqēn 遠樓耵 or 聞, which is an incomplete transliteration of Avalokitēsvāras. This title, then, may mean that “Amitā(bha) *samyāsanbuddha (and) Avalokitēsvāra save human beings.” This was probably not the original Indian title, but rather added by somebody in China, summarising the contents of the sutra —— according to this sutra (309a14f.), after Amitā(bha)’s parinirvāna, Avalokitēsvāra will succeed him as a Buddha and begin to rescue (guōdū 過度) human beings and other various sentient beings as Amitā(bha) does. The title Amituo jìng 阿彌陀經, as some editions read, might have been the original translation of the title of its underlying text, which was presumably *Amitātha(< Amitābha)-vyāha. Only after the appearance of the translation of the Smaller Sukhāvatvīyāha by Kumārajīva, which was eventually entitled Amituo jìng 阿彌陀經 (T. 12, no. 366) as well, was the character 大 “larger” added to the title of No. 362 in order to differentiate it from No. 366 and thus, the more familiar title Da Amituo jìng 大阿彌陀經 came into being. In this article, I shall, therefore, use the designation “(Da) Amituo jìng (大)阿彌陀經” for No. 362.
versions in Chinese, Sanskrit and Tibetan. Therefore, it is clear that one of these is a modification of the other. Although all the existing catalogues ascribe No. 362 to Zhi Qian (fl. ca. 220–257 C.E.) and No. 361 to Lokakṣema (fl. ca. 170–190 C.E.), it is apparent that the latter is a modification of the former and not vice versa. Frequent occurrences of transliterated words agree with Lokakṣema’s writing style, while changing transliterated words into Chinese was common practice with Zhi Qian. Therefore, I agree with Paul Harrison that No. 362 is Lokakṣema’s translation, while No. 361 is Zhi Qian’s.

Although adapting or modifying an existing translation may seem counter-productive, the translators of Buddhist scriptures were not scholars or professional translators who made their living out of translating. Rather, they were Buddhist monks or laymen who devoted themselves to the dissemination of Buddhism. If a translation is difficult to understand, even though it may be true to its original text, people will not accept it easily. Therefore, it is easy to hypothesise that Zhi Qian and others replaced old-fashioned, vernacular and unnatural words and expressions in these older translations with elegant, contemporary and more natural ones. Their purpose must have been to attract ordinary people as well as intellectuals, so as to introduce Buddhism to Chinese lay people. In this respect, I fully understand and praise their endeavours and achievements. From another point of view, that of the history of the Chinese language, their modifications offer us valuable material for research. As the example I focus on here, if we examine how Zhi Qian and Zhu Fonian modified Lokakṣema’s Daoxing Banre jing 道行般若經, while comparing their translations with the later one of Kumārajīva as well, we will find ourselves able to trace some of the changes and developments undergone by the Chinese language from the Eastern Han Dynasty to the Jin Dynasty.

Hereafter, I shall give some examples to demonstrate such changes and developments in Buddhist literature.

(1.1) From 點 to 慧, 智

The character 點 (xià) means not only “cunning” in a negative sense, but also “wise, clever; wisdom” in a positive meaning. While instances of the latter usage is quite rare in secular texts,10 Lokakṣema seems to have been fond of using this word. In his Daoxing Banre jing 道行般若經 (Lk), this word with its latter meaning occurs 46 times. Zhi Qian, however, replaced it with hui 慧 or zhi 智 in many places and as a result, in the latter five juans of his Da Mingdu jing 大明度經 (ZQ), the word xià 點 occurs only 10 times — as the first juan of this translation is apparently not his translation11, it is excluded from my calculations from here on. In Kumārajīva’s Xiaopin Banreboluomi jing 小品般若波羅蜜經 (Kj), this word does not appear at all.

E.g.:

Lk.447a14f. “瞥若男子得象，觀其腳。於須菩提意云何？是男子爲黠不？”須菩提

---

10 The Hanyu Dacidian 漢語大詞典 quotes examples from the Baopuzi 抱朴子 and the Houhanshu 後漢書 (HD.12.1363a[1]).
11 Cf. note 1.
言：“為不黠。”
ZQ.490c2. 黠(黠點); Kj.556a19. 智; Xz(I).810c16. 黠; Sh.625a22. 智
Lk.455c27f. 是菩薩住中正，在阿惟越致地，心不可移動 ……心大無有極，安隱堅住其地，無有能降之者。作是住，無有能過是黠者。
ZQ.495c13.- (無能過者); Zfn.528b17.- (無能過者); Kj.565c1. (不可壞)智慧; Xz(I).828b12. (無動無退轉)智 = Xz(II).902c9; Sh.643b24. (不壞)智
Lk.466c9f. 譬如工匠黠師(黠師l)。刻)作機關木人，若作雜畜。木人不能自起居，因對而搖。木人不作是念言：“我當動搖，屈伸低仰，令觀者歡欣。”
ZQ.501c13. 工匠黠師; Kj.576a16. 工匠; Xz(I).851a8. 巧劍 = Xz(II).915c7; Sh.661c18. 工巧師
Lk.467b23f. 諸天讚歎善之：“今作佛不久。當隨是法教立。既隨是法教立者，諸有困苦者皆得護；諸未得歸者為得自歸；為人故作法舍；無目者使得黠目。”
ZQ.502a22. 慧眼; Kj.576c7. 光明 = Xz(I).852c26 = Xz(II).916b8 = Sh.662c18
Lk.475b8f. 般若波羅蜜者，亦……(c4f.)亦入於好中，亦入於不好中，亦入於善中，亦入於不善中，亦入於黠中，亦入於不黠中，亦入於明中，亦入於不明中，…
ZQ.506c4. 智不智
Lk.476b21f. 所以作佛者，但欲使人得其福耳。不用一事成佛像，亦不用事成。有金，有黠人，若有見佛時人。
ZQ.507a27. 智(人)
Lk.477c7f. 諸所有經法，阿難！若千種所見相、種種所行、若千種根、若千種黠、若千種黠，若千種慧，人民輩所求盡，所求盡，何薩阿竭，悉都盧，阿難！悉從般若波羅蜜中出。
ZQ.508a1.
Lk.437a18f. 般若波羅蜜當黠慧學。其福倍益多。
ZQ.486a6. 景明; Zfn.518c27. 黠黠; Kj.546c10.-; Xz(II).879b20. 善知(義趣)
Lk.455c7f. 菩薩......(c17f.)從欲處、色處、空處，從彼間來生中國，常於善人黠慧中生，在工黠語、曉經書家生。
ZQ.495c6. 大明(譬將正訥)(...); Zfn.528a28. 黠黠; Kj.565b15. 善(於伎藝) = Xz(I). 828a24 = Xz(II).902b23; Sh.643b6. 明解(世間經書……)
Lk.476c18f. 賢者！欲知：佛身因緣所生。用世間人欲得見佛故。其人前世有功德，其人遠離七惡處生，其人黠慧信於佛。
ZQ.507b17. 慧(信於佛)

(1.2) From 昭 to 知

In the Daoxing Banre jing (Lk), the word xiǎo 昭, meaning “knows”, occurs 53 times, while in the Da Mingdu jing (ZQ; excluding the first juan), it occurs only 16 times. However, in the Xiaopin Banreboluom ji jing (Kj), it does not occur at all and, instead, its synonym zhi 知 is used. E.g.:
Lk.465a15f. 未得道者，愚獘，不昭是法，不見是事。
ZQ.500c27f. 未得道者，愚獘，不昭是法，不見其事。; Kj.574b7f. 凡夫不知不見一切法甚清淨相。
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(1.3) From 索 to 求
In the *Daoxing Banre jing* (Lk), the word *suō* 索, meaning “pursues, seeks after”, occurs 92 times, while in the *Da Mingdu jing* (ZQ; excluding the first *juan*), it occurs 56 times. In the *Xiaopin Banreboluomi jing* (Kj), this word, however, does not occur at all and, instead, its synonym *qiú* 求 is used. E.g.:

*Lk*. 470c 23f. 須菩提自佛言：“薩陀波倫菩薩本何因縁索般若波羅蜜？”

*ZQ*. 503c 4. 彼何因索明度？； *Kj*. 580a 5f. 薩陀波羅菩提菩薩云何求般若波羅蜜？；

*Sh*. 668a 24f. 常啼菩提摩訶薩作何方便，而能求是般若波羅蜜多？

(1.4) Lokakṣema 我 > Zhi Qian 吾 > Zhu Fonian and Kumārajīva 我
Throughout the *Daoxing Banre jing* (Lk), Lokakṣema used *wǒ* 我 as the first person pronoun, meaning “I”, while, in many places, Zhi Qian (ZQ) replaced it with *wú* 吾. In Zhu Fonian’s *Mohebanre chao jing* 摩訶般若鈞經 (Zfn) and Kumārajīva’s *Xiaopin Banreboluomi jing* (Kj), again, *wǒ* 我 is used. According to my calculations, the number of occurrences of the two words, meaning “I” are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>我</th>
<th><em>Daoxing Banre jing</em> (Lk)</th>
<th>375 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Da Mingdu jing</em> (excluding the first <em>juan</em>) (ZQ)</td>
<td>224 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mohebanre chao jing</em> (Zfn)</td>
<td>170 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Xiaopin Banreboluomi jing</em> (Kj)</td>
<td>432 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>吾</td>
<td><em>Daoxing Banre jing</em> (Lk)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Da Mingdu jing</em> (excluding the first <em>juan</em>) (ZQ)</td>
<td>20 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mohebanre chao jing</em> (Zfn)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Xiaopin Banreboluomi jing</em> (Kj)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E.g.:

*Lk*. 461c 19f. 使我無得生是惡心。一切使我心無暇賴。我設有是不善，疾使我棄。

*ZQ*. 499b 4f. 使我無生穢染惡心，使吾無生穢染惡心； *Zfn*. 534c 17. 使我無得生是惡心； *Kj*. 571b 13f. 我當如是懲修行精進，得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提時，無是惡； *Xz* (1). 839b 11. 我不應起如彼惡人所起過患 = *Xz* (2). 910a 18； *Sh*. 653c 18f. 願我當於一切時一切處遠離如是一切魔事

*Lk*. 473a 14f. 自念言：“我曹義不可於車上載。當下步入國耳。”

*ZQ*. 505a 28. 吾等義當下車步行入城； *Kj*. 583b 14f. 我等不應載車趣挍無竭菩薩；

*Sh*. 672c 12. 我等

*Lk*. 473b 10f. 薩陀波倫菩薩及五百女人…… (13f )為挍無竭菩薩作禮。遙八百匝已，作是言：“我曹亦當復速得尊經，亦當復如是。”

*ZQ*. 505b 13. 願吾等速行高行獲尊經； *Kj*. 583c 18f. 我等以是善根因緣於未未來世當得作佛；

*Sh*. 673b 12. 我

*Lk*. 474b 8f. 是時弊魔自念言：“未曾有是。未嘗見是。是薩陀波倫菩薩……得道者，出我界，度脫人不可計。今我且中道壞之(read 乎?)。”

*ZQ*. 506a 9. 吾當壞乎(←子)。

It is generally said that *wú* 吾 is a classical and formal expression, while *wǒ* 我 is a more casual term and that is perhaps why Zhi Qian modified it.
In other translations, ascribed to Lokakṣema with certainty, the first person pronoun

*wu* 吾, meaning “I”, never occurs:

No. 280: *Dousha jing* 鬼沙經: 吾(43 times); 吾(0)
No. 313: *Achufuoqiu jing* 阿闍佛國經: 吾(122 times); 吾(0)
No. 350: *Yiyue Monibao jing* 遵曰(一日)摩尼寶經: 吾(41 times); 吾(1 time)\(^\text{12}\)
No. 807: *Neicang Baibao jing* 內藏百寶經: 吾(3 times); 吾(0)

On the other hand, in Zhi Qian’s translations, *wu* 吾 occurs quite often:

No. 6: *Bannihuan jing* 殿泥洹經: 吾(87 times); 吾(42 times)
No. 185: *Taizi Ruiping Benqi jing* 太子瑞應本起經: 吾(85 times); 吾(39 times)
No. 281: *Pusa Benye jing* 菩薩本業經: 吾(4 times); 吾(1 time)
No. 474: *Weimojie jing* 維摩訶経: 吾(173 times); 吾(39 times)
No. 632: *Huiyi Sanmei jing* 慧印三昧經: 吾(44 times); 吾(12 times)
No. 198: *Yifu jing* 義足經: 吾(146 times); 吾(4 times)

Dharmarakṣa used *wu* 吾 more often than Zhi Qian.

No. 222: *Guangzan jing* 光讚經: 吾(255 times); 吾(89 times)
No. 266: *Aweiyezhizhe jing* 阿唯越致遮經: 吾(53 times); 吾(85 times)
No. 263: *Zheng Fahua jing* 正法華經: 吾(247 times); 吾(213 times)
No. 285: *Jianbei Yiyezhide jing* 晉備一切智德經: 吾(47 times); 吾(48 times)
No. 292: *Dushipin jing* 度世品經: 吾(32 times); 吾(46 times)
No. 381: *Dengjizhongde Sanmei jing* 等集衆德三昧經: 吾(38 times); 吾(26 times)

In contrast to Zhi Qian and Dharmarakṣa, Kumārajīva scarcely used *wu* 吾 as the first person pronoun.

No. 286: *Shizhu jing* 十住經: 吾(121 times); 吾(0)
No. 223: *Mohe Banreboluomi jing* 摩訶般若波羅蜜経:
吾(1186 times); 吾(9 times: all “吾” *atman*)
No. 382: *Ji Yiqie Fude Sanmei jing* 集一切福德三味経: 吾(76 times); 吾(1 time)
No. 1509: *Da Zhidu lun* 大智度論: 吾(3838 times); 吾(68 times: all “吾” *atman*)
No. 475: *Weimojie Suoshuo jing* 維摩詰所說経: 吾(215 times); 吾(9 times)\(^\text{13}\)

Cf. Zhi Qian’s *Weimojie jing* 維摩詰経: 吾(173 times); 吾(39 times)
No. 262: *Miaoфа Lianhua jing* 妙法蓮華経: 吾(621 times); 吾(11 times)\(^\text{14}\)

---

\(^{12}\) 吾, rendering of Skt. *atman* or *pudgala*, occurs in the following phrase: 無吾、無我、無人.

\(^{13}\) All the nine instances of *wu* 吾 in No. 475 (Kj) are none other than borrowings from Zhi Qian’s translation of the same sutra, namely the *Weimojie jing* 維摩詰経 (No.474; abbr. ZQ): T.14, No.475, Kj.541a27f. I.e. 吾言: “仁者！吾見此釋迦牟尼佛土三千大千世界如觀掌中螺拳耳。” 吾 T.14, No.474, ZQ.552c29f. 吾言: “仁者！吾見此三千大千佛國，如於掌中覩寶冠耳。”, Kj.542c13f. 吾言: “吾從道場來。” = ZQ.524a24f.; Kj. 544c7f. 一切衆魔及諸外道皆吾所也 吾 ZQ.525c23f. 一切衆魔皆是吾義，彼諸轉者亦吾義也; Kj. 546b17. 此座高廣，吾所不能 吾 ZQ.527b6f. 此座高廣，吾所不能; Kj. 548a10f. 解脫者無所言說。故吾於不知所云 吾 ZQ.528c7f. 真解者無所言取。故吾於不知所云; Kj. 548b1. 吾於不知二十有二 吾 ZQ.528c23f. 十有二年吾止此室; Kj. 548c10f. 佛化所生，吾如彼生 = ZQ.529a29f.; Kj. 555b18f. 吾居不起於座接妙喜地鐵、山川、溪谷、江河…… 吾 ZQ.535a4f. 吾居此師子座不起，為現妙樂世界鐵園、山川、溪谷、江湖……; Kj. 556a13f. 佛言: “善哉，善哉！天帝！如汝所說。吾助諸善。” 吾 ZQ.535b21f. 佛言: “善哉，善哉！天帝！吾代汝喜。”

\(^{14}\) Compared with the other translations by Kumārajīva, in which the word *wu* 吾 as the first person pronoun is hardly ever used, in his translation of the Lotus Sutra, namely the *Miaoфа lianhua jing* (T.9, No.262, abbr. Kj), the word occurs fairly frequently — 11 times. Also, among these 11 occurrences, only one is an apparent borrowing from Dharmarakṣa’s pre-existing translation of the same sutra (T.9, No.263, abbr. Dr), in which the
Cf. Dharmarakṣa’s Zheng fahua jing 正法華經: 我(247 times); 吾(213 times)

The distinction between the translators, who hardly used wū 吾 in such a way and those who preferred its use is so clear-cut that we can employ this as a criterion for identifying the translators of disputed translations. For example, there have been arguments over whether the Asheshiwang jing 阿闍世王經 (No. 626) and the Dun Zhentuoluo Suowen Rulai Sanmei jing 佛真陀羅所問如來三昧經 (No. 624) are indeed Lokakṣema’s translations, as the Chinese catalogues state. In these translations, the word wū 吾 occurs quite often.

No. 626: Asheshiwang jing 阿闍世王經: 我(132 times); 吾(20 times)
No. 624: Dun Zhentuoluo Suowen Rulai Sanmei jing 佛真陀羅所問如來三昧經: 我(66 times); 吾(18 times)

Therefore, we may conclude that they were not Lokakṣema’s original translations.

As another example, the Pusa Shizhu Xingdao pin 菩薩十住行道品 (No. 283) is ascribed to Dharmarakṣa 真法護 in the catalogues, while some modern scholars assume that it was translated by Lokakṣema. In this translation, the word wū 吾 occurs 12 times, while wū 吾 does not appear at all. Therefore, we may assume that this translation was not by Dharmarakṣa, who was fond of using wū 吾, but indeed probably by Lokakṣema.

At this point, we shall return to the argument concerning the translators of the two oldest Chinese translations of the so-called Sūkhāvatīvyāha.

No. 361: Wuliangqingjing Pengdengju jing 無量清淨平等覺經: 我(177 times); 吾(4 times)

No. 362: (Da) Amituo jing (大)阿彌陀經: 我(118 times); 吾(0)

The occurrences of wū 吾 in No. 361 reinforce the above-mentioned judgement that No. 362 should be ascribed to Lokakṣema, while No. 361 properly belongs to Zhi Qian. Also, it should be noted that all the four occurrences of wū 吾 in No. 361 are to be found in the verses15 which are wanting in No. 362 and, therefore, correctly believed to be a later

---

15 T.12, No.361, (translated by Zhi Qian?); abbr. ZQ(7): 2800b21. 吾誓得佛者 善得此事; 288b11. 吾等領得是德 謂此利益所為; 288b24. 佛授檀持巖決 今吾說善應聽; 288c02. 吾所願皆具足 從衆生來生者. These verses are wanting in the (Da) Amituo jing.
(1.5) Lokakṣema 汝 > Zhi Qian and Zhu Fonian 若 > Kumāraṇīva 汝

In the Daoxing Banre jing 道行般若經, Lokakṣema used rǔ 汝 and ruò 若 to mean “you” side-by-side, while Zhi Qian and Zhu Fonian altered rǔ 汝 in the Lk to ruò 若 in their translations of the same text. Therefore, as a result, the number of occurrences of rǔ 汝 in their translations is drastically reduced. Kumāraṇīva used rǔ 汝 again in his translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese Text</th>
<th>100 times</th>
<th>3 times</th>
<th>4 times</th>
<th>176 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daoxing Banre jing 道行般若經 (Lk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da Mingdu jing 大明度經 (ZQ; excluding the first juan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohebanre chao jing 摩訶般若鈔經 (Zfn)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaopin Banreboluomi jing 小品般若經 (Kj)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E.g.:

Lk.454c29f. 弊魔復化作其師被服，往到菩薩所，詫語：“若(“you”)前從我所聞受者，今悉棄捨！是皆不可用也。若(“you”)自悔過。若(←受)疾悔之，隨我言者，我日來問訊汝。不用我言者，終不復來視汝。若(“you”)莫復說事，我不復欲聞。

ZQ.495a10f. 若疾悔之，隨我言者，我日來問訊。不用我言，終不復來。莫復說此事，我不欲聞。; Zfn. 527b3f. 若疾悔之，隨我言者，我日日自來問訊若。設不用我言者，我終不復來相視。若(“you”)莫復說是語。; Kj.564b25f. 汝若捨棄，不復聽受，我當常至汝所。汝所聞者非佛所說

Lk.468c10f. 佛語阿難：“持是般若波羅蜜毘曇若。阿難！我為汝所說經，捨置般若波羅蜜，摩訶般若毘曇舍羅及諸摩訶般若毘曇所。我每所說餘經汝所受。……”

ZQ.502c16f. 持是明度毘曇若(v.l. 汝)，我所說餘經若所受; Kj.577c18. 我今以般若波羅蜜毘曇若汝

Lk.468c23f. 汝設有慈心於佛者，常受持般若波羅蜜，當恭敬、作禮、供養。……

汝慈孝於佛，恭敬、思念於佛，不如恭敬於般若波羅蜜。

ZQ.502c21. 若慈孝於佛; Kj.577c29. 汝若愛重不捨於我; Xz(I).855c17. 汝若愛樂於我不捨於我 = Xz(II).918a22

Lk.468c25f. 汝持且般若波羅蜜，以爲信，

ZQ.502c22. 汝持且; Kj.578a9. 以般若波羅蜜持累於汝

Lk.469a6. 汝日日教人。

ZQ.502c26. 若日(←日)教人; Kj.578a28. 汝若因小乘法所小乘人説; Xz(I).856a26. 假使汝為聞乘人説聞法 = Xz(II).918b28

However, Zhi Qian and Zhu Fonian used rǔ 汝 quite often in their translations of other texts.

Zhi Qian

No. 6: Bannihuan jing 殿泥洹經, 2 juans: 51 times
No. 68: Laizhaheluo jing 類吒和羅經, 1 juan: 31 times
No. 185: Taizi Ruiying Benqi jing 太子瑞應本起經, 2 juans: 32 times
No. 198: Yizu jing 百足經, 2 juans: 28 times
No. 474: Weimojie jing 維摩詰經, 2 juans: 49 times

Zhu Fonian

No. 212: Chuyao jing 出曜經, 30 juans: 394 times
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No. 309: Zuisheng Wen Pusashizhu Chugouduanjie jing

No. 385: Zhongyi jing 中陰經, 2 juans: 

No. 384: Pusa Cong Doushurian Jiangshen Mutai Shuo Guangpu jing

It is not clear why Zhi Qian and Zhu Fonian changed 𢄿汝 in the Lk to ruò若 so drastically.

In the (Da) Amituo jing (大)阿彌陀經 (No. 362, perhaps a translation of Lokakṣema?; abbr. Lk[?]), the word 𢄿汝 occurs 15 times, of which nine are altered to ruò若 in the Wuliangqingjing Pingdengjue jing 無量清淨平等覺經 (No. 361, by Zhi Qian?; abbr. ZQ[?]):

Lk(?).300a-2f. 有諸天神教汝，若諸佛教汝令（<-今）問我者耶？汝自從善意出問佛耶？
ZQ(?).279c14f. 有諸天來教汝？諸佛教汝令問我者耶？若自從善出乎？
Lk(?).300b7f. 汝所問者，甚深大快，多所度脫
ZQ(?).279c20. 若所問者，甚深善快，多所度脱。
Lk(?).300b12f. 汝所問甚深，汝乃慈心於佛所，……
ZQ(?).279c24f. 若所問大深，汝乃慈心於佛所，……
Lk(?).311a18f. 我皆語汝曹：諸欲往生阿彌陀佛國者，……
ZQ(?).293a7f. 我皆語若曹：諸欲生無量清淨佛國，……
Lk(?).312c15f. 我皆語汝曹（<-造），……汝曹熟思惟之。
ZQ(?).294c2f. 我皆語若曹，……若曹熟思惟之。
Lk(?).312c26f. 汝有疑意不解經者，復前問佛。為汝解之。
ZQ(?).294c12f. 汝有疑意不解經者，復前問佛。佛當為若解之。
Lk(?).317a7. 汝欲知者，明聽著心中。
ZQ(?).299a8f. 若欲知者，明聽著心中。
Lk(?).317c3f. 我義泥洹去後，汝曹及後世人，無得復言：“我不信有阿彌陀佛國。”
ZQ(?).299c6f. 我義泥洹去後有故，若曹及後世人，無得復言：“我不信有無量清淨佛國。”

There is, however, one place, where ruò若曹 occurs three times consecutively in No. 362 (abbr. Lk[?]) but is replaced by rúcáo汝曹 in No. 361 (abbr. ZQ[?]):

Lk(?).317c6f. 我具為若曹道說經戒、愼法。若曹當如佛法持之，無得毀失。我持是經以累若曹，若曹當堅持之。
ZQ(?).299c9f. 我具為汝曹道說經戒、愼(一順)法。若曹當如佛法持之，無得毀失。我持是經以累汝曹，汝曹當堅持之。

Except for the last instance which is contrary to the normal trend and, therefore, rather puzzling, the other examples clearly demonstrate that the translator of No. 361 replaced 𢄿汝 in No. 362 with ruò若. This modification agrees with that in Zhi Qian’s Da Mingdu jing 大明度經. From this and various other evidence mentioned above, we may conclude that the (Da) Amituo jing (大)阿彌陀經 was translated by Lokakṣema, while the Wuliangqingjing Pingdengjue jing 無量清淨平等覺經 is Zhi Qian’s modification of the former.
Above, I have introduced a methodology in order to survey the development of the Chinese language, focusing on ordinary words and expressions, those I have rendered “wise”, “seek”, “I” and “you”, in different translations of the same text. Such words may reflect the actual language of the translators rather than Buddhist terminology which was often continually reused. I believe it is possible to apply this method quite easily in a study of a broader range of Chinese translations.

(2) Noteworthy words in the Daoxing Banre jing: 慈 = 孝

In Lokakṣema’s Daoxing Banre jing 道行般若經, one can find quite a few noteworthy words and usages. The usage of 慈 is one such good example.

This word, which usually means “(a senior person) loves (a junior person)”, is used sporadically in the meaning of “filial piety and respect for one’s parents”. The Hanyu Dacidian 漢語大詞典 (HD.7.647) quotes the following instances from the Zhuangzi, the Li ji and Wang Yinglin’s Kuxuejiwen: 《莊子·漁父》: “事親則慈孝。”; 《禮記·內則》: “父子皆異宮，味爽而朝，慈以旨甘。”(Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 commented on the word as follows: “慈，愛敬進之也。”); 王應麟《困學紀聞·左氏傳》: “子之於親亦曰慈。” In the Chinese Classics and non-Buddhist literature, the instances of 慈 used in this specific sense are very rare.

In the Daoxing Banre jing (Lk) and in its "sinicised" version, namely the Da Mingdu jing (ZQ), however, we find many examples of 慈, cǐxiào 慈孝, cǐxīn 慈心 and so on, meaning “respect for (the Buddha or the Buddha’s Dharma).”

(2.1) 慈

Lk.434c5f. 不解於法中，諸天人適欲問法師，天神語之。用慈於法中故。其人卽自了知諸天不不解者，便自解。

AS.42.3 = R.83.21 = AAA.252.6f. dharma-gaurarena (“through respect for the Dharma”); ZQ.484c29. 用慈於經中; Zfn.516c6. 用慈(←茲)法故; Kj.544b22. 恭敬法故

Lk.477c13f. 佛語阿難：汝敬我所語，敬我法。若敬愛承事我。汝自敬身於佛。汝有慈於佛。汝有孝於佛，一切恭敬於佛所。汝持是慈孝敬於般若波羅蜜中。如是，阿難！汝恭敬於中，悉為供養諸佛已。……”

AS.260.23f. = R.528.12f. = AAA.990.13f. paricarito ’ṣmi ... tvayā maitreṇa kāyakarmanā manaṭpena maitreṇa vākkarmanā manaṭpena maitreṇa manahkarmanā manaṭpena ... tvayā mamaitarhi tisthato dhriyamānasva yāpavato ’ṣmin samucchaye prema ca prasaḍaḥ ca gauravam ca kṛtam (“You have served me with friendly and pleasing acts of body, speech and mind. you have given affection, faith and respect to me as I am at present in this incarnation”); ZQ.508a4f. 若敬我所說法，為敬事我。若自敬身，有慈孝於佛。; Zfn.-; Kj.586b23f. 汝以身口意業，於今現在供養、恭敬、尊重於我。

Lk.478a23f. 佛從袈裟中出金色臂，舉右手，著阿難頭上，摩阿難頭。持手著阿難肩上，語阿難言：云何，阿難！汝慈於佛不？” 阿難言：“佛、天中天！自

當知。”如是至三。佛復問阿難：“云何，阿難！汝孝於佛不？”如是復三。阿難言佛：“天中天！自當知。”佛言：“如是，阿難！汝有慈於佛，所以為報佛恩。阿難！汝極尊般若波羅蜜，致重敬慈於是句。心所念句當令了分明。心所念，餘悉棄之，……”
\[\text{ZQ.508a28f. 若慈於佛不？…… 若以弘慈報佛}^\text{Zfn.-; Kj.-}\]

\subsection{2.2} \textit{cǐxīn} \text{慈心}^{\text{17}}

Lk.468c19f. 今佛現在。有慈心佛恩德，欲報佛恩，具足供養者。汝設有慈心於佛者，當受持般若波羅蜜，當恭敬、作禮、供養。…… 汝慈孝於佛，恭敬、思念於佛，不如恭敬於般若波羅蜜。
\[\text{AS.228.15 = AAA.871.3. } \textit{hititasitaśā premato vā gauravato vā} \text{ (“with solicitude, affection, respect”); ZQ.502c20. (若有)慈心(於佛者); Zfn.-; Kj.577e25. (欲)以慈心(恭敬供養我者); Xz(I).855c5. (起)殷重心 = Xz(II).918a12; Sh.664b29. (於我生)歡喜心}\]

\subsection{2.3} \textit{cǐxiāo} \text{慈孝}^{\text{18}}

Lk.468c20f. 汝設有慈心於佛者，當受持般若波羅蜜，當恭敬、作禮、供養。……
\[\text{汝慈孝於佛，恭敬、思念於佛，不如恭敬於般若波羅蜜。}\]
\[\text{AS.228.22 = AAA.871.13. } \textit{vadi te ... aham privo manāpo parivyaktas tathāgatas} \text{ (If I, being the Tathāgata, am dear to you, and you do not abandon me”); ZQ.502c21f. 若慈孝於佛; Zfn.-; Kj.577c29f. 若愛重不捨於我; Xz(I).855c17f. 汝若愛樂於我不捨於我 = Xz(II).918a22f.; Sh.664c3f. 若人於我愛樂不捨者}\]

Lk.474c5f. 是時羅陀波輪薩薩及五百女人各自取刀，處處刺身出血，持用臘地。用慈孝於經法故。是時釋提桓因自念言：“世間乃有是人耶！精進，恭敬慈孝經師故。”
\[\text{AS.258.10 = AAA.984.5. } \textit{dharma-kāma} \text{~ (“love for the Dharma”); ZQ.506a16f. 用慈於法故…… 恭敬慈孝於師; Zfn.-; Kj.585c13. 愛法; Xz(I).-; Xz(II).-; Sh.675b28. 求法}\]

Lk.477c13f. 佛語阿難：“汝敬我所語，敬我法。若敬愛承事我。汝自敬身於佛。汝有慈於佛。汝有孝於佛，一切恭敬於佛所。汝持是慈孝恭敬於般若波羅蜜中。如是，阿難！汝恭敬於於中，悉為供養諸佛已。……”
\[\text{ZQ.508a5. 持是奉事明度}\]

Lk.477c28f. 佛語阿難：“是般若波羅蜜汝諦受，諦念。用慈孝於佛故。承用教故。都盧是過去、當來、今現在佛、天中天所施教。……”
\[\text{ZQ.508a11. 用慈孝於佛故}\]

\begin{center}
\textit{Cǐxiào} \text{慈孝 in the above-quoted sentences is a compound of two synonyms, meaning “(filial) respect”}. \end{center}

\subsection{2.4} \textit{zhòngjīngcé} \text{重敬慈}^{\text{19}}

Lk.478a29f. 阿難！汝極尊般若波羅蜜，致重敬慈於是句。心所念句當令了了分明。心所念，餘悉棄之，一切心於是中。

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{\textbf{17} Cf. Krsh 2010; 92–93.} \\
\footnote{\textbf{18} The \textit{Hanyu Dacidian} quotes the following example from the \textit{Guoyu} (《國語·齊語》): “於子之屬，有居處為義好學，慈孝於父母。……。” (HD.7.647). Cf. also Krsh 2010; 92.} \\
\footnote{\textbf{19} Cf. Krsh 2010: 650–651; T. 8, no. 221, 105a11f. 阿難！汝若恭敬慈於我者，當恭敬慈於般若波羅蜜.}
\end{footnotes}
ZQ.508b2f. 尊奉明法恭矣。受經義句，當令分明心所念
Zhòngjìngcí 重敬慈 in the above-quoted sentence is also a compound of three synonyms, meaning “respect”.

(2.5) cǐxīn 慈心, xiàocì 孝慈 and cǐxiào 慈孝 in the (Da) Amituo jing (大)阿彌陀經

Also, in the (Da) Amituo jing (大)阿彌陀經 (No. 362; abbr. Lk[?]) and the Wuliangqingjing Pingdengjue jing 無量清淨平等覺經 (No. 361; abbr. ZQ[?]), cǐxīn 慈心 and xiàocì 孝慈, both meaning “respect”, occur quite often.

(2.5.1) cǐxīn 慈心

This expression occurs 18 and 17 times in No. 362 and No. 361, respectively. E.g.: Lk(?).300b10f. 佛言阿難: “……汝所聞者甚深。汝乃慈心於佛所。……”
 ZQ(?).279c24f. 若所聞者大深，汝乃慈心於佛所
 Lk(?).313a2f. 我曹聽佛經語，莫不慈心歡喜踊躍開解者。= ZQ(?).294c18f.
 Lk(?).313a7f. 佛甚難得＜值，經道甚難得＞聞，我曹皆（＜比＞）慈心於佛所。
 ZQ(?).294c22f. 佛甚難得者，經道甚難得聞，我曹皆慈心於佛所。
 Lk(?).313a16f. 佛告阿難菩薩: “若言是實當爾。若於慈心於佛所者，大喜。實當念佛。……” = ZQ(?).295a2f.
 Lk(?).316c12f. 皆悉見阿彌陀佛光明，莫不慈心歡喜者。
 ZQ(?).298c16f. 皆悉見無量清浄佛光明，莫不慈心，歡喜作善者。

(2.5.2) xiàocì 孝慈

Lk(?).317c12f. 佛言: “師開導人耳目，智慧明達，度脱人，令得善。合泥洹之道。常當孝慈於佛＜如＞父母，常當念師恩，常念不絕，即得道矣。”
 ZQ(?).299c15. 常當慈孝於佛如父母

The expression xiàocì 孝慈 is a compound of two synonyms, meaning “filial respect for one’s parents”. The translator of No. 361, probably Zhi Qian, altered it to cǐxiào 慈孝, which we shall now consider.

(2.5.3) cǐxiào 慈孝

The expression cǐxiào 慈孝 occurs four times only in the so-called Wueduan 五惡段 or “the Paragraph of the Five Evils” in the (Da) Amituo jing (No. 362; abbr. Lk[?]). Some scholars consider this paragraph as not a translation from an Indian original but as composed in China. I, also, presume that this is not a translation by Lokakṣema, but a later interpolation probably from No. 361 (abbr. ZQ[?]).

Lk(?).313c14f. 皆其前世宿命，為善，慈孝，布施恩德。
 ZQ(?).295c8f. 皆其前世宿命，為善，慈孝，布施恩德。
 Lk(?).315a12f. 如是曹人或子、或女，心意惱然違戾反逆，……不肯慈孝，惡逆天地。= ZQ(?).297a14f.
 Lk(?).315a25. 善人行善慈孝，從樂入樂，從明入明，……
 ZQ(?).297a27f. 善人行善，從善慈孝，從樂入樂，從明入明

---

20 Quoting the following instances of the compound from the Lunyu, the Yizhoushu and so on: (論語·為政): “臨之以莊則敬，孝慈則忠。” (Zhu Xi [朱熹] commented on the word as follows: “孝於親，慈於眾，則民忠於己。”); (逸周書·官人): “父子之間，觀其孝慈；兄弟之間，觀其和友。”; the Hanyu Daciidian (HD.4.201a) defines the word incorrectly as meaning “respect for elders, love for subordinates or the young” (對尊長孝敬，對下屬或後輩慈愛).
Cítìào 慈孝 in the above-quoted sentences probably means “affection (for the young) and filial respect (for parents)” and is not a compound of two synonyms, meaning “filial respect”.

In conclusion, the comparison of different Chinese translations of the same text, can shine a light on the development of various aspects of the Chinese language. I hope that students and scholars will pay more attention to early Chinese translations, which are very important materials not only for the study of Buddhism, but also for the research on the Chinese language.
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The Meaning of *Yulanpen* 孟蘭盆
—— "Rice Bowl" on *Pravāraṇā* Day

Seishi KARASHIMA

(1) *Yulanpen* 孟蘭盆, *Yulanpen jing* 孟蘭盆經 and *Yulan jing* 孟蘭經

*Yulanpen* 孟蘭盆 is the name of a widely-celebrated Buddhist Ghost Festival in East Asia, which takes place at the end of the rainy season retreat of the Buddhist community, namely on the fifteenth day of the seventh lunar month. The spirits of the deceased are believed to return home on that day and the living pay homage to them, by placing food before their family altars, burning incense, asking monks to chant sutras and so on. The name of this festival is based on the *Yulanpen jing* 孟蘭盆經 (T. 16, no. 685), translated allegedly by Dharmarakṣa (fl. 265–311 C.E.). The *Baoen Fengpen jing* 報恩奉盆經 (T. 16, no. 686), by an anonymous "translator", is clearly an adaptation of the previous text. The ascription to Dharmarakṣa as the translator of the *Yulanpen jing*, however, is in doubt as this text is categorised as an anonymous translation in an old catalogue, namely the *Chusanzangji ji* 出三藏記集, which was compiled in the Liang Tianlan Period (502–519 C.E.). The *Lidai Sanbao ji* 歷代三寶記 (597 C.E.) was the first to ascribe this text to Dharmarakṣa. Yutaka Iwamoto doubted both the ascription to him and the plausibility of its being a translation from an Indian text, because "strange" expressions such as *daoyan* 道眼, *xiaoshun* 孝順, *wenrushi* 閬如是 occur in it. However, these old expressions themselves, which are, in fact, found in pre-Kumārajīva translations, demonstrate that this text was translated (or composed) in the third or fourth century. The usage of *wu* 吾 as the first person pronoun, found in this text, also agrees with Dharmarakṣa’s preference for *wu* 吾 over *wo* 我.

---

* I am greatly indebted to Dr. James Apple, Ms. Susan Roach, Ms. Liang Ye Tan, Mr. Kazuhiro Iguchi and Rev. Peter Lait for carefully reading through the manuscript and making numerous valuable suggestions and corrections.

1. English translations of these texts are found in Teiser 1988: 49f.

2. T. 55, 28c2. 孟蘭經一卷.

3. T. 49, 64a28. 孟蘭經一卷.


5. The word *daoyan* 道眼 occurs nearly a hundred times in early Chinese translations from the Eastern Han Period. Dharmarakṣa also used this word in his translation of the Lotus Sutra: cf. Krsn(1998) 92. The word *xiaoshun* 孝順 is found more than two hundred times in pre-Kumārajīva translations. Also, most of pre-Kumārajīva translations begin with *wenrushi* 閬如是 instead of *worenrushi* 我聞如是. Thus, Iwamoto’s doubts concerning this sutra are groundless.

The sixth century onwards, various references to this text and the festival began to appear. Quotes from the former were used first in the *Jingliu Yixiang* 經律異相, a collection of Buddhist writings, which was compiled by the monks, Baochang 寶唱, Sengmin 僧旻 and others in 516 C.E. The festival itself is also mentioned in the *Yanshi Jiaxun* 顏氏家訓, written by the Northern Wei-period scholar, Yan Zhitui 顏之推 (531–591). A portion of this text is quoted as well in Du Gongzhan 杜公瞻, *fl. 600–7* ’s commentary on Zong Lin 宗林’s *JingChu Suishi ji* 荊楚歲時記 (A Record of the Seasonal Activities in the Jing-Chu Region; ca. 561 C.E.) . According to Zhipan’s *Fouz Tongji* 佛祖統紀 (compiled between 1258–1269), Emperor Wu of Liang (梁武帝) visited Tongtai Temple (同泰寺), which was constructed upon his orders, and held the Yulanpen (盂蘭盆齋) ceremony there in 538 C.E. These demonstrate the apparent popularity of the text and the festival on both sides of the Yangtze River from the sixth century onwards at the latest.

Based on the older catalogues and the *Jingliu Yixiang* 經律異相, the text appears to have been originally entitled *Yulan jing* 孟蘭經. The title *Yulanpen jing* 孟蘭盆經 appears only in relatively later catalogues and texts.

(2) English Translation of the *Yulanpen jing* 孟蘭盆經

The following English translation of this scripture is nothing other than my adaptation of those by Teiser (1988: 49f.) and Venerable Dr. Sri Dhammanand (http://www.buddhismtoday.com/english/texts/mahayana/006-Ullambana%20Sutra.html):

The Sutra of *Yulan* Bowls

Translated by Zhu Fahu (竺法護 Dharmarakṣa) in the Western Jin Period, the (master of) the Three *Piṭakas* from Yuezhī (月氏)

Thus have I heard. Once upon a time, the Buddha was staying in the garden of the Benefactor-of-Orphans-and-the-Lonely (*Anāthapiṇḍada*) in the *Jetavana* Park in the country of Śravasti.

Mahāmaudgalyāyana (大目乾連) had just obtained the six penetrations and wanted to save his parents in order to repay their kindness in raising him. He, then, surveyed the world with his divine eyes and found his deceased mother being born amongst hungry ghosts. Finding neither food nor drink, she was but skin and bones.

---

7 T. 53, no. 2121, 73c21–74a5.
8 《顏氏家訓·終制篇》“有時遊供，及七月半盂蘭盆，望於汝。”
9 An English translation is found in Teiser 1988: 56f.
10 T. 49, no. 2035, 35a126.
11 The *Chusanzangji* 出三藏記集 (502–519 C.E.), T. 55, 28c2. 孟蘭經一卷; the *Lidai Sanshao ji* 歷代三寶記 (597 C.E.), T. 49, 64a28. do.; the *Datang Neidianglu* 大唐內典錄 (664 C.E.), T. 55, no. 2149, 235a17. do. (= 242c15); the *Guja Yiying Tuji* 古今譯經圖記 (664 + C.E.), T. 55, no. 2151, 35a13f. do.; *Jingliu Yixiang* 經律異相 T. 53, no. 2121, 74a5. 孟蘭經 (“From *Yulan jing*”).
12 The *Dazhou Kanding zhongjing Mulu* 大周刊定衆經目錄 (695 C.E.), T. 55, no. 2153, 43c5. 孟蘭盆經一卷 (= 469b24); the *Kaiyuan Shijiaoluo* 開元釋教錄 (730 C.E.), T. 55, no. 2154, 494c2. 孟蘭盆經一卷亦云孟蘭經 (“*Yulanpen jing, one juan*”, also entitled “*Yulan jing*”) (= 685a23, 707b15); the *Zhenyuan Xinding Shijiao Mulu* 贊元新定釋教目錄 (800 C.E.), T. 55, no. 2157, 79c13. 孟蘭盆經一卷亦云孟蘭經 (“*Yulanpen jing, one juan*”, also entitled just “*Yulan jing*”) (= 928a15).
13 For example, the *Foshuo Yulanpen jing shu* 佛說盂蘭盆經疏 (A Commentary on the *Foshuo Yulanpen jing*) by Zongmi 宗密 (780–841 C.E.), T. 39, no. 1792.
14 聞如是：Many of the pre-Kumārajīva translators, incl. Dharmarakṣa, used this phrase.
15 道眼：This expression occurs often in pre-Kumārajīva translations, incl. Dharmarakṣa’s; cf. Krsh(1998) 92.
Maudgalyāyana (目連) became very sad and went to (往) her so as to give (餉) her his rice-filled bowl. Having received the bowl of rice, his mother gathered the rice up with her right hand, while shielding it with her left hand. However, before it could enter her mouth, the rice turned into burning coals and hence, she could not eat it. Maudgalyāyana shouted and cried in sorrow and returned to the Buddha to tell him what had happened.

The Buddha said: “As your mother’s transgressions are deep and firmly rooted, to save her is beyond your capacity. Although you are filial, and your voice moves heaven and earth, (even) the spirits of heaven and earth, Evil Mara (邪魔), heretics and ascetics\(^{17}\) or the Four Heavenly God-kings can do nothing to help her. You should resort to the supernatural power of the assemblage of the monks of the ten directions and then, she will be liberated. I shall tell you now, how to save her so that all her difficulties may leave her and her worries and sufferings may be eradicated.”

The Buddha said to Maudgalyāyana: “When the assemblage of the monks of the ten directions attends the Pravāraṇā (自恣) on the fifteenth day of the seventh month (i.e., the end of the rainy season retreat), one should, — for the sake of their ancestors of seven generations and their present parents, who are in difficulties, — prepare rice, food of a hundred flavours, five kinds of fruit, vessels (盂器) for drawing and pouring water, incense, oil, lamps, candles, mattresses and bedding; place the tastiest food in the world in bowls (盂); and offer these to the assemblage of the monks of the ten directions. On that day, all the saints, — those who meditate in the mountains; those who have attained the fruits of the four stages (of sainthood); those who walk up and down under trees; those who edify voice-hearers (聲聞) and those who awaken to causation (緣覺) by means of the six penetrations and sovereign power; those who are (in fact) bodhisattvas-cum-great men (大人 mahāsattva) of the tenth stage but manifest themselves provisionally as bhikṣus — receive, all with one mind, the Pravāraṇā food (鈞和羅飯) in the assembly. They hold the pure precepts and the way of the saints fully; their virtues are vast. If one makes offerings to these monks who attend the Pravāraṇā, their present parents and ancestors of seven generations, as well as the six kinds of relatives, will be able to escape from the sufferings in the three paths, be liberated immediately and will be clothed and fed spontaneously. If one’s parents are still alive, they will be happy and joyful for one hundred years. If they are already deceased, (they as well as) the ancestors of seven generations will be born in heaven. They are reborn as they like and enter the light of celestial flowers and receive limitless bliss.”

Then the Buddha ordered the assemblage of the monks of the ten directions to chant prayers (咒願 dakṣiṇā) at first for the parents of seven generations for the sake

---


\(^{17}\) 這士：This word was used frequently as renderings for brāhmaṇa, śramaṇa, tāpasa etc. in pre-Kumārajīva translations. Dharmarakṣa used this word many times as well, e.g. T. 14, no. 425, 30b24. 如號名聞梵志、道士大祠祀施.
of the donor’s family, practise dhyāna-concentration and then, receive the food. After receiving the bowls (盆; v.l. 食 “food”), they should first place them in front of the Buddha’s stūpa. When the assemblage of the monks finishes chanting the prayers, each of them may then receive the food.

At that time, the bhikṣu Maudgalyāyana and the assembly of great Bodhisattvas all greatly rejoiced and the sound of Maudgalyāyana’s lamenting and crying utterly ceased. At that time, on that very day, Maudgalyāyana’s mother attained liberation from one kalpa of sufferings as a hungry ghost.

Then Maudgalyāyana said to the Buddha again: “My parents were able to receive the power of the merit of the Three Jewels, thanks to the imposing, supernatural power of the assemblage of the monks. In the future, all disciples of the Buddha, who (wish to) practise filial piety, should also offer yulan bowls (to the assemblage of monks) (應奉盂蘭盆) in order to save their parents and the ancestors up to seven generations. Isn’t that thus possible?”

The Buddha replied: “Excellent! You have raised a very good question. You asked me about what I was just going to tell you. O good man, if bhikṣus, bhikṣuṇīs, kings, crown princes, princes, ministers, prime ministers, three ducal ministers, officials of all ranks, common and ordinary people wish to practise filial respect (孝慈), they should all, for the sake of their present parents who bore them (所生現在父母) as well as for the sake of their ancestors of seven generations, on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, (namely) the day on which the Buddha rejoices, the day of the Community’s Pravāranā (自恣), place food and drink of a hundred flavours in yulan bowls (以百味飲食安盂蘭盆中) and offer them to the monks, who are participating in the Pravāranā, wishing that their present parents will live for a hundred years without illness, without suffering from any affliction; that their ancestors of seven generations will leave the sufferings of hungry ghosts, be born amongst men and gods and be happy and joyful without limit.”

The Buddha said: “Good men and good women are disciples of the Buddha. If they (wish to) practise filial piety, they should, in thought after thought, think constantly of their present parents and their ancestors up to seven generations. Every year, on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, they should, out of filial respect.

---

18 應奉盂蘭盆 : The Koryo (or Korean) Canon and the Taishō Edition have 應奉盂蘭盆 instead, while the other editions read 應奉盂蘭盆. This is superfluous.
19 孝慈, in which 慈 means “respect”, is a very archaic expression (cf. Seishi Karashima “A Study of the Language of Early Chinese Buddhist Translations: A Comparison between the Translations by Lokakṣema and Zhi Qian”, § 2.5.2, in this volume). This usage also indicates that this scripture was translated (or composed) in the pre-Kumārajīva period.
20 所生現在父母 is also an archaic expression; cf. Krsh (1998) 437, s.v. 所生母.
21 告 means “said here without defining the person to whom the Buddha was speaking. From the context, however, it is clear that the Buddha was speaking to Maudgalyāyana and the other disciples. This usage of 告 is often found in other Buddhist translations, e.g.: T. 8, no. 225 (the Damingdu jing 大明度經 by Zhi Qian 支謙), 488b1、善篤問: “誡誡斷長者，凡用幾事。”佛告: “斷士、女無戒。為邪所中故。不樂深經。以是二事斷明度矣。…… 是為四事。”善篤白佛言: “不願深經少有信者。”
22 乃至: The Koryo (or Korean) Canon and the Taishō Edition have 乃至供養 instead, while the other editions read 乃至. 供養 is superfluous.
23 當 (常): 蔛, 常 as well as 書 interchange with one another through their common simplified form 商.
think of their parents who bore them (所生父母) and their ancestors up to seven generations and, for their sakes, prepare yulan bowls and offer them to the Buddha and the Community. (作孟蘭盆施佛及僧) and thus repay the loving kindness of their parents, who raised and nourished them. All the disciples of the Buddha should respectfully follow this teaching (法).”

At that time, upon hearing what the Buddha had preached, the bhikṣu Maudgalyāyana and the fourfold assembly of disciples rejoiced and practised it respectfully.

The Sutra of Yulan Bowls

(3) The Pravāraṇā Ceremony and offerings by the laity

What the Buddha taught in this sutra is that people, who wish to practise filial piety and save their parents and ancestors up to seven generations from sufferings, should on the day of the Community’s Pravāraṇā (自隠), namely on the fifteenth day of the seventh month (i.e., the end of the rainy season retreat), offer delicious food, placed in bowls, to the assemblage of monks of the ten directions who come to participate in the Pravāraṇā. Such food is termed Pravāraṇā food (鉢和羅飯). In addition, as this food is placed in yulan bowls (以百味飲食安盂蘭盆中), the food itself is also called “yulan bowls” (盂蘭盆).

Pravāraṇā (Pāli Pavāraṇa), zizi 自隠 and suiyi 隨意 in Chinese, is a ceremony held at the end of the three-month rainy season retreat by Buddhist monks. In Theravada Buddhism and in Nepal, it was and is still held on the full moon day of the seventh or eighth month, i.e. Āsvina (September-October) or Kārttika (October-November) respectively — the near begins in Caitra (March-April) in India and South Asian countries. In East Asia, the ceremony is held on the fifteenth day of the seventh or eighth month of the Chinese lunar calendar, where the new year begins in January or February. On this day, each monk comes before the assemblage of monks and atones for any offence, which he might have committed during the rainy season retreat and seeks absolution. Proceedings of the Pravāraṇā day are prescribed in various Vinaya texts.26

The Pāli Vinaya Piṭaka states that, on the Pavāraṇa day, local people came to a dwelling place of monks and gave gifts until the night was almost ended.28

24 孝順慈： Some editions have 孝慈. Both 孝順慈 and 孝慈 may mean “filial respect for one’s parents”; see note 19.
25 四輩弟子： This expression, which occurs in Dhammarakṣa’s translation, is of pre-Kumārajīva usage; cf. Krsh(1998) 425f., s.vv. 四輩, 四輩弟子; cf. also Krsh(2001) 422, s.v. 四輩弟子. Kumārajīva used 四衆 or 四部衆 instead; cf. Krsh(2001) 253, s.v. 四部衆.
27 Vin I 157–178; T. 22, no. 1421 (the Vinaya of the Mahāsāsakas), 130c–133c; T. 22, no. 1425 (the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghikas), 451a–452a; T. 22, no. 1428 (the Vinaya of the Dhammaputta), 835c–843b; T. 23, no. 1435 (the Vinaya of the Sarvastivādins), 165a–173a; the Pravāraṇāvastu of the Mūlasarvastivādins, of which the Sanskrit fragments, the Tibetan translation and the Chinese one by Yijing (T. 24, no. 1446) have been edited in Chung 1998.
28 Vin I 168.26f. tena kho pana samayena ahañatarasmiṁ āväse taddaha pavāraṇāya manussehi danañ dentehi yebhuyena ratti khepitā hoti.
The Tibetan and Chinese translations\textsuperscript{29} of the Mulasarvastivadins’ Pravaraṅa-vastu also say the following, concerning the laity who visit the Community with various offerings on that day:

Also, on the very day of the fifteenth, i.e. the Pravaraṅa day, the king, the queen, prince(s), minister(s), commander(s), city people and village people altogether come to the monastery (ārama). Then, the king also donates a great many robes and worldly things (zang zing gi rnyed pa = āmiṣa-lābha; 諸飲食 “food and drink”) to the Community, so do the queen, prince(s), minister(s), commander(s), city people and village people, donate a great many robes and worldly things to the Community. The monk, who preaches, also exhausts himself by preaching the whole night.\textsuperscript{30}

Also, the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghikas says:

If monks, who have spent the rainy season retreat in a village, hear that, in a city, various offerings are given and the preaching of Dharma is given the whole night long on the Pravaraṅa day, and all want to go (to the city), they should perform the Pravaraṅa on the fourteenth day and after that go there.\textsuperscript{31}

Also, the famous Chinese pilgrim Yijing 義淨 (635–713 C.E.), who travelled to and studied in India nearly at the end of the 7\textsuperscript{th} century C.E. for 25 years and later returned in China, translated many Vinaya texts as well as sutras, described the Pravaraṅa ceremony, which he witnessed, in detail in his Nanhai Jigui Neifa zhuan 南海寄歸内法傳 (A Record of the Buddhism sent Home from the Southern Sea; 691 C.E.). Takakusui translated it as follows\textsuperscript{32}:

33Chapter XV Concerning the pravaraṅa-day.

The day on which the summer-retreat ends and the season (lit. the year) closes should be the Sui-i\textsuperscript{34} (lit. ‘according to one’s wish’ or ‘indulgence’; Pravaraṅa), i.e. pointing out the faults of others, as one likes, according to the three points (i. e.

\textsuperscript{29} No Sanskrit fragment of this portion is found.
\textsuperscript{30} Chung 1998: 196f. ‘di lit yang ḍagag dbyes bco lnga pa de nyid la rgyal po dang | btsun mo dang | ghzhon nu dang | blon po dang | khrom gnyi ru ba dang | grol mi dang | yul mi dag dang thabs cig tu kun ḍga’ ra bar lhaqs la | l der rgyal pos kyang dge ‘dun la gos dang zang zing gi rnyed pa mang du phul | btsun mo dang | ghzhon nu dang | blon po dang | khrom gnyi ru ba dang | grol mi dang | yul mi dag gyis kyang dge ‘dun la gos dang zang zing gi rnyed pa mang du phul la sgrogs par byed pa’i dge slong gis kyang bsgrags pas nam ring zhig zad par gyur pa la (= Tib[P], no. 1030, 214b3f.; Tib[D], no. 1, ka 228a1f.). A German translation is found in ib. 241. T. 24, no. 1446, 1046b23f. 爲隨意事。若於住處，或有王來，或諸眷屬。或有大臣、宮屬、城内外人亦皆來集，諸施飲食及衣物等，奉施苾芻僧伽，令其呪願。苾芻競夜呪願，極大辛苦。
\textsuperscript{31} T. 22, no. 1425, 451b16f. 若比丘聚落中安居，聞城中自恣日種種供養，竟夜說法，衆欲往者，應十四日自恣已，得去。
\textsuperscript{32} Takakusui 1896: 86–88.
\textsuperscript{33} T. 54, no. 2125, 217b19–e10: 十五隨意成規。凡夏臘歲終之時，此日應名隨意，即是隨他於事事之中，任意舉發，誡罪除惡之義。舊云自恣日，是義翻也。必須於十四日夜，請一經師，昇高座，誦佛經。丁時俗士雲奔，法徒雲集，燈燭明燿，香花供養。明朝聽出，旋繞村域，各並虔心，禮諸諸佛。檀車興像，歌樂張天，幡蓋羅列，飄揚蔽日，名為三摩近遠，譯為和集。凡大齋日，悉皆如是，即是神州行城法也。нибудь始還入寺；日午方為大齋。過午威儀，各取鮮美可一把許。手執足踏，作隨意事。先乃苾芻，後方尼衆，次下三衆。若其衆大，恐延時者，應差多人，分受隨意。被他挾脅，則准法誅除。當此時也，或俗人行施，或僧僧自為，所有施物將至衆前。其大德應問上坐云：“此物得與衆僧為隨意物不？”上坐答云：“得。”所有衣服、刀子、針锥之流，受已均分。斯其教也。此日所以奉刀針者，意求聰明利智也。隨意既讫，任各東西。即是坐夏已周，無勞更經一宿。廣如餘處。此不詳言。
\textsuperscript{34} 隨意.
what one has seen, what one has heard, and what one has suspected). Then follows confession and atoning for faults. A former translation of Pravāraṇa was Sse-sse\textsuperscript{35}, i.e. ‘self-indulgence’ according to its sense.

On the night of the fourteenth day (the fifteenth day is the last day of the retreat), the assembly should invite a preceptor to mount a high seat and recite a Buddhist Sūtra, when lay devotees as well as priests throng together like clouds or mist. They light lamps continually, and offer incense and flowers. The following morning they all go out round villages or towns and worship all the Kaityas with sincere mind.

They bring storied carriages, images in sedan-chairs, drums, and other music resounding in the sky, banners and canopies hoisted high in regular order (lit. entwined and arranged), flattering and covering the sun; this is called Sa-ma-kin-li (Sāmagrī), which is translated as ‘concord’ or ‘thronging together.’ All great Upavasatha-days are like this day. This is what we call in China ‘Ceremony of going around a city.’ At the beginning of the forenoon (9 to 11 a.m.) they come back to the monastery, at noon they keep the great Upavasatha-ceremony, and in the afternoon all gather together, each taking in his hand a tuft of fresh rushes. Handling it with their hands or treading on it with their feet they do what they like, first Bhikshus, next Bhikshunīs; then the three lower classes of the members. If it be feared that the time should be too long owing to the largeness of the number, the Saṅgha should order several members to go together and receive the Pravāraṇa-ceremony. When any offence has been pointed out by another, one should confess and atone for it according to the Law.

At this time, either the laymen present gifts, or the Saṅgha itself distributes them, and all sorts of gifts are brought out before the assembly. The five venerable persons (one each from the five Parishads (?)) should then ask the heads of the assembly (i.e. Sthāviras): ‘Can these things be given to the members of the Saṅgha and made their own possession, or not?’ The heads of the assembly reply: ‘Yes, they can.’ Then all garments, knives, needles, awls, &c., are received and equally distributed. Such is the teaching (of the Buddha). The reason why they present knives and awls on this day is that they wish the recipients to obtain (sharp) intelligence and keen wisdom. When thus the Prāvarana ends, all go their ways (lit. to east or west). If they have fully kept their residence in the summer there is no need of passing a night there; this is fully explained elsewhere, and I shall not state it here in detail.

Thus, it is clear that in India, people made offerings on the Pravāraṇa day, as it is said in the Yulanpen jing.

In Theravāda Buddhism, the Pravāraṇa (Pāli Pavāraṇa) is still celebrated till this day. It is called Wan Ok Phansa (literally “the day of leaving the rainy season retreat”; phansa < Pāli vassa < Skt. varsa “the rainy season retreat”) in Thai and Boun Awk Phansa in Lao. It is also referred to as Mahāpavāraṇa. This day falls on the day of the full moon on the eleventh lunar moon (October). At dawn or later in the morning, the laity visits temples to offer food or other requisites to the community of monks in order to make merit, and the

\textsuperscript{35} 自感.
monks, in turn, reciprocate such offerings by delivering sermons on the Buddhist teachings. In the evening, either candlelight processions are held around the temples or people float small lit ‘boats’ made of banana stems or leaves, decorated with candles and flowers, down the rivers and streams.26

(4) Filial Piety, Rescue of Deceased Parents and Ancestors

The *Yulanpen jing* is often regarded as apocryphal. One of the reasons for this is that filial piety (孝順) is emphasised in this sutra. The idea that filial piety is characteristically Chinese traditional thought and alien to Buddhism is often found in books and articles on Buddhism. This, however, is not true.37 For example, the *Singalovāda-suttanta* in the *Dīghanikāya* of Theravāda, which has its counterparts in Sanskrit and Chinese of various schools38, prescribes the laity’s duties towards its parents as follows:

In five ways a child should tend his parents as the eastern quarter: — (The child should think:) “Once supported by them, I shall now support them; I shall perform my duties towards them; I shall maintain the family lineage; I shall regulate (properly) the inheritance; I shall give offerings to them when they are dead (*petānāṃ kālakatānaṃ dakkhiṇaṃ anuppadassāmi*). (DN III 189.5–9)

Also, we find some Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions from India and Pakistan which state that a monastery or statues were offered to the Buddhist Community on behalf of deceased parents.39 For example, a Kharoṣṭhī inscription, which is written on the pedestal of a Bodhisatva statue allegedly from Landi Kotal (a small town at the top of the Khyber Pass) in Pakistan, reads as follows:

A donation of the Communities (of the four directions). May it be an act of *pājā* for (our) deceased, dead parents! May it be an act of *pājā* for the deceased master *Saṃghārāma*.40

Rescuing deceased parents in the world of *pretas* has been sometimes regarded as alien to Indian Buddhism. However, as Takashi Irisawa (1990: 154) and Akira Fujimoto (2003) have pointed out, there are stories in Pāli and Sanskrit literature which describe that the Buddha’s disciples rescued *pretas*.

---

26 A similar festival can be found also at various places in Japan at the end of *Yulanpen*, i.e. on the fifteenth or sixteenth of August. Having held memorial services for the spirits of the deceased, people float paper lanterns and other offerings down in a river or on the sea, which is called *Tōrō Nagashi* (灯籠流し) or *Shōryō Nagashi* (縁緣流し).

37 Some Buddhist scholars have already pointed out that filial piety has been important in Indian Buddhism since very early times; cf. Schopen 1984 = 1997: 56–71 (I thank Dr. James Apple for reminding me of this article); Guang Xing 2005 (with further references).

38 E.g. T. 1, no. 1, the *Shansheng jing* (善生經) (Dharmaguptakas); various Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia belonging to the Sarvāstivādits; T. 1, no. 26, the *Shansheng jing* (善生經) of the same school; T. 1, no. 16, the *Shihilauyoe liufangli jing* 小迦羅越方禮經 of an unknown school affiliation, allegedly translated by An Shigao; T. 1, no. 17, *Shanshengzi jing* 善生子經 of unknown school affiliation, translated by Shi Fadu; two fragments of a folio from Afghanistan, which presumably belong to the Mahāśāṃghika-Lokottaravādins. Cf. Hartmann/Wille 2006: 3.


40 *soghana dānamukhe madapidaraṇḍā sa dvārdvi<da> na kālagadana puyae bhavatu* uṣyāyasā saṃgharamasa adhividaṣaj puyeq bhavatu! (= *samghaniṃ dānamukhe mātāpitānāṃ adhividhiṃ kālagatānāṃ pūjayai bhavatu! upāddhiyasya saṃghārāmasya adhyātasesya pūjayai bhavatu*!). See Seishi Karashima “Two Inscriptions in Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī” in this volume. Cf. also IBInsC I 961f. (Gandhāra I).
In the Petavatthu we find a story, which resembles our Yulanpen jing, namely the Sāriputtattherassa mātupetivathu (“The Elder Sāriputra’s Mother Petī Story”; Pv, no. 14), in which Sāriputta (Skt. Śāriputra) rescued his mother, who had become a female ghost (petī), being afflicted with hunger and thirst, and ate the pus and blood of animals and men. She asked her son, Sāriputta, to rescue her, saying: “Give, dear son, a gift for me and when you have given make it over to me (uddisāhī me) — surely then I will be freed from eating pus and blood”⁴¹. Having heard his mother’s words, Sāriputta “built four huts and he gave those huts together with food and drink to the Saṅgha of the four quarters and then dedicated that donation to his mother (mātū dakkhināya ādīsi). Immediately he dedicated this the result came into being, food, drink and clothing being the fruit of this donation (dakkhiṇāya). Thereupon she became pure, clad in fresh, clean clothes, wearing those more fine than those of Kāsi ...”⁴²

Also, Irisawa (1990: 154) has pointed out that stories in the Avadānaśataka, nos. 41–45 (= T. 4, no. 200, 222b–224c) have similar motifs as our Yulanpen jing. Especially no. 45 (Avś I 256f.) resembles greatly our sutra. The story states that Maudgalyāyana met five hundred pretas on his way to Rājagṛha, who explained to him how they had become pretas and asked him to convey to their relatives in Rājagṛha concerning the retributions of their evil deeds. They also asked him to request their relatives to make "freewill offerings" (chandakabhiṅṣanām)⁴³, to serve the community of monks with the Buddha as head with food, and to dedicate the merit from these gifts in their name (asmākaṁ nāmnā daksinādesanam kārayīvā)⁴⁴, so that they could be liberated from the existence of pretas⁴⁵. After agreeing to do so, Maudgalyāyana visited their relatives and got them to prepare "freewill offerings" and to invite the community of monks with the Buddha as head the next day. Having done so, he told both the pretas and their relatives that they would meet together the next day. On the following morning, when the food was prepared and the time had come, the pretas did not appear. Maudgalyāyana tried in vain to find them by means of his supernatural powers, but he could not see them anywhere in the whole world. Being troubled, he went up to the Buddha and told him that he could not see the donors (dānapati). The Buddha replied that they had been blown away by the wind of karman (karmavāyu) and that there were limitless numbers of worlds which were beyond the capacity of disciples and pratyekabuddhas to perceive. Then, the Buddha said that he would manifest his supernatural power and he ordered the gaṇḍī to be struck. As the gaṇḍī was being struck, the whole community of monks and the relatives of pretas gathered together. Then, through the supernatural power of the Buddha, the scene became visible in which the pretas were beholding the Buddha and the monks eating. The pretas also remembered that their relatives were serving the Buddha and the monks on their behalf. Then, the Buddha dedicated the merit of the donation (daksinām ādiśati) as follows: “The merit from this donation shall be

---

⁴¹ Pv-a(tr) 85; Pv 14-6.
⁴² Pv-a(tr) 87; Pv 14-8–10.
⁴³ Cf. BHSD, s.v. chandaka (1).
⁴⁴ Cf. BHSD, s.v. daksinādesanā.
⁴⁵ Avś I 257.8f. teṣām asmākināṁ karmaplothin nivedya chandakabhiṅṣanam kṛtvā buddhapramukhaṁ bhikṣusamgham bhajayītvā asmākaṁ nāmnā daksinādesanānām kārayīvā cāśmaiṁ pretayoner mokṣaṁ syād. Cf. Avś(tr) 175f.
dedicated to the *pretas! They shall leave the dreadful world of *pretas*!" Having embraced faith in the Buddha, those *pretas* died and were reborn into Trāyastriṃśat Heaven.

Thus, filial piety and the rescue of deceased parents and ancestors, as described in the *Yulanpen jing*, which are often regarded as alien to Indian Buddhism, are in fact well attested in its literature.

(5) Previous Interpretations of *Yulanpen 孟蘭盆*

(5.1) Xuanying’s Interpretation

The meaning of *yulanpen 孟蘭盆* has been largely discussed for more than a century and a vast number of articles and books, dealing with this mysterious word, have been published. I shall refrain from listing all those studies and instead, refer interested readers to Ashikaga 1951, Teiser 1988: 21-25 and Irisawa 1990: 159-166 for further readings. All the confusion surrounding the meaning of this word stems from Xuanying (玄應)’s misinterpretation of it in his *Yiqiejìng Yìnyì* 一切經音義 (“Sounds and Meanings in the Buddhist Canon”), which was published in 650 C.E. His explanation of the word is as follows:

*Yulanpen 孟蘭盆*. This word is corrupted. The correct form is *wulanponu 烏藍婆摰*, meaning “hanging upside down”. According to Indian custom, on the *Pravarāṇā* day of the community of monks, (lay people) prepare grand offerings and donate them to Buddhist monks in order for their deceased ancestors to be saved from the agony of being hung upside down. Accordingly, a secular book there (i.e. in India) says: “If a deceased ancestor had committed offences, and he/she has no descendant, and nobody holds a service to the gods in order to ask them to save him/her, then he/she will suffer the agony of being hung upside down in the ghost realm.” Although Buddhists follow such secular customs and perform the rites, they teach (people) to plant merits profoundly in the field of the Three Jewels. Traditionally, it has been said that *yulanpen* is a vessel, in which to store food. This explanation is wrong.46

(5.2) Modern Interpretations

In modern times, Buddhist scholars have been speculating for the last 130 years about the Sanskrit form of *wulanponu 烏藍婆摰* as well as *yulanpen 孟蘭盆*, starting with Bunyiu Nanjio (南條文雄) who reconstructed *烏藍婆摰* as *ullambana (< Skt. avalambana “hanging down”?)* in his famous catalogue of the Buddhist Canon.48 This reconstruction was followed by Pā. *ullumpana* (“saving, helping”) by other Japanese scholars. There have also been scholars who maintain that *孟蘭盆* might be Sogdian *urvan* (“soul”), Iranian *ulavān* (<

---

46 The manuscript reads 孟梵, which is presumably a scribal error for 孟蘭盆. In Huilin’s quotation, it reads 孟蘭盆 instead.

47 孟蘭盆：此言訛也。正言烏藍婆摰, 此譯云倒懸。案西國法, 至於眾僧自恣之日, 盛設供具, 奉施佛僧, 以救先亡倒懸之苦。以彼外書云: “先亡有罪, 家復絕嗣, 无人祭神請救, 則於鬼處受倒懸之苦。” 佛為順俗, 亦設祭儀, 乃救於三寶田中深起功德。舊云孟梵 (read 孟蘭盆)是貯食之器, 此言譯也。(Zhonghua Dazangjì 中華大藏經, vol. 56, no. 1163, 1014c19ff). This explanation is quoted in Huilin (慧琳)’s *Yiqiejìng Yìnyì* 一切經音義 as follows: 孟蘭盆：此言訛也。正言烏藍婆摰。此譯云倒懸。案西國法, 至於眾僧自恣之日, 云先亡有罪, 家復絕嗣, 亦無人祭賽, 則於鬼處中受倒懸之苦。佛為順於三寶田中, 俱奉施佛僧, 賜賢彼先亡, 以救先亡(>云)倒懸飢餓之苦。舊云孟蘭盆是貯食之器也, 此言譯也。(T. 54, no. 2128, 535b13ff).

48 Nanjio 1883: 78, no. 303.
artavān māḥ; a name of the Iranian first month of the year) or hufrawardān (“[festival] of the honourable deceased”).

(5.3) Xuanying’s Interpretations are not reliable

There are two basic mistakes which have caused such controversies surrounding the etymology of yulanpen 孟蘭盆. The first is that scholars trusted Xuanying (玄應)’s Yiqièjing Yinyi 一切經音義 too credulously. As Xuanzang’s assistant, he participated in translating Sanskrit Buddhist scriptures into Chinese and compiled the Yiqièjing Yinyi, consisting of 25 juans, by the royal order. In this vast glossary, he commented on 450 Chinese Buddhist texts by explaining difficult Chinese characters, expressions and transliterations. It is obvious that he had a very sound knowledge of Sanskrit. However, problem is, he most probably only knew Sanskrit and not Middle Indic, let alone Gāndhārī, which had for a time been used widely in many Buddhist scriptures but subsequently became disused long before his time. Therefore, his comments on older translations often miss the point, as I have indicated elsewhere⁴⁰. For example, his comments on manao 马脑 = 马脑 are as follows:

manao 马脑 : In Sanskrit 諱薩羅揭婆 (musalagarbha). 諱薩羅 (musala) means “pestle” in Chinese; 揭婆 (garbha) means “storehouse” in Chinese. It means also “embryo”, referring to its (i.e. manao’s) solidness. It was, in the past, also called 摩娑羅伽黎 (masāragalla) or 目薩羅伽羅婆 (musāragalva). It is translated as manao 马脑. I assume that it is called so, because the colour of this precious stone resembles, at times, that of a horse’s brain. However, in dictionaries, the radical shi 石 is added to these characters and hence, they are written as 碑石 in order to show that it is a kind of stone.⁴⁰

Thus, Xuanying interpreted manao 马脑 as a translation of Skt. musalagarbha (= musāragarbha, masāragarbha, musāragalva; amethyst?)⁴¹, and commented that it was called so, because its colour resembles a horse’s brain! This strange explanation is still used even to this day.⁴² However, in actual fact, manao 马脑 (“agate”) is a rendering of Skt. aśmagarbha (“emerald”) and its variant form aśvagarbha, found in older manuscripts.⁴³ An ancient Chinese translator probably interpreted this word as consisting of aṣva (“horse”) and garbha (“womb; the interior of anything; an inner room; embryo”) and so, translated it as manao 马脑, meaning literally “the brain of a horse”. He may have translated garbha as nao 髓 because the shape of the brain resembles an embryo in the womb.

Xuanying also interpreted cha 刺, the multi-storeyed disc-shaped structure above a stūpa, as the transliteration of Skt. kṣetra (“field”) and set out a detailed speculation about this word. However, as I have pointed out elsewhere, cha 刺 is a transliteration of Skt. chattrā (“parasol; a disc-shaped structure above a stūpa”)⁴⁴.

⁴¹ 马脑：梵言諱薩羅揭婆。諱薩羅，此譯云杵；揭婆，此言藏。或言胎者，取其堅實也。舊云摩娑羅伽黎，或言目薩羅伽羅婆。譯云馬腦。案此寶色如馬腦，因以為名。但諸字書旁皆安石作碲劑二 (read 字)。諱之類也。(Zhonghua Dazijing 中華大藏經, vol. 56, no. 1163, 905c11f).
⁴³ E.g. Fuguang Dacidian 佛光大詞典, pp. 5839, 6738.
Thus, Xuanying’s knowledge of Indian languages is quite doubtful. His interpretation of yulanpen 盂蘭盞 is also one of his many peculiar interpretations. As such, the above-stated modern theories concerning this term which are premised on his dubious reconstruction, are thus unfounded.

(5.4) Necessity of Reading the Text Itself

The second mistake, which has caused a great deal of confusion surrounding the meaning of yulanpen, is that most of the scholars have investigated the word yulanpen 盂蘭盞 out of its original context. If it means “hanging upside down”, “saving”, “soul”, a name of a month or a festival, then how can the phrase 以百味飲食安盂蘭盞中 “place food and drink of a hundred flavours in yulanpen” possibly be interpreted? As we shall see later, yulanpen clearly means a vessel in the original context.

(6) The Meanings of Yulan 盂蘭 and Yulanpen 盂蘭盞

As we have seen above, this scripture had been entitled Yulan jing 盂蘭經, while the name Yulanpen jing 盂蘭盞經 appeared first no earlier than 695 C.E. in the Dazhou Kanding zhongjing Mulu 大周刅定衆經目録55. This fact indicates that we should not interpret this expression as a single term but as a compound word comprising yulan 盂蘭 and pen 盞.

As mentioned earlier, the word yulanpen 盫蘭盞 occurs three times in the text, namely:

1. 應奉盂蘭盞 “(Those who wish to practise filial piety,) should also offer yulan bowls (to the assemblage of monks).”
2. 以百味飲食安盂蘭盞中 “(Those who wish to practise filial piety, should) place food and drink of a hundred flavours in yulan bowls”
3. 作盂蘭盞施佛及僧 “(Those who wish to practise filial piety, shoud) prepare yulan bowls and offer them to the Buddha and the Community.

From the second phrase, it is evident that 盂蘭盞 is a sort of vessel in which food is placed. Therefore, pen 盞 in this compound means simply “bowl” as in the usual Chinese usage. From the phrases (1) and (2), it is clear that a bowl with food in it, offered to the Buddha and the community of monks on the occasion of the Pravaraṇa, is called “a yulan bowl” (盂蘭盞).

It is most probable that yulan 盂蘭 is a transliteration.56 As, except for yulan 盂蘭, there are no examples of the character yu 盂 (EH ɟjwo > MC ju), used as a transliteration in the whole of the Buddhist Canon, it is, therefore, difficult to presume its underlying original form. However, there is a character which, like yu 盂, belongs to the yu 魚 category in Old Chinese and to the yu 處 rhyme in Middle Chinese, namely qu 瞑 (also pronounced as ju; EH gj(w)ə, kj(w)ə > MC gju, kju). Dharmarakṣa and other earlier translators used this character qu 瞑 to render Skt. go and ko; e.g. 瞑鳥 (Pā. Gotami, Skt. Gautami; T. 9, no. 263 by Dharmarakṣa; 286 C.E.), 瞑摩 (Pā. Gotamā, Skt. Gautama; T. 1, no. 1, 107b15 etc.;

55 Cf. note 12.
56 Although Irisawa (1990: 164) maintains that 盂蘭 may be related to a Chinese word 干藍, meaning a stilt house, seen amongst the ethnic minorities in South-west China, this theory seems rather difficult to accept.
412~413 C.E.), 瞿舍利 (BHS. Gośālī; ib. 107b15), 瞿夷 (Skt = Pā. Gopika; ib. 63c3), 瞿波梨 (BHS. Kokālika; ib. 126a16). Consequently, from yulan 盂蘭, one may assume *olān(ā), *olāṅ(ā), *orāṅ(ā), *orāṅ(ā) as its original form. Unfortunately, there is no such Indian form which makes sense in this context. As we have seen above, yulan 盂蘭 is an attribute to pen 盆, a vessel. It can be an adjective like “excellent, great, wooden, iron” and so on or a noun which denotes a place or opportunity (such as a name of a festival). It is also possible that it means the content of a vessel, such as “water (bowl), curry (bowl), rice (bowl)” and so on and the content must be an offering to the Community on the Pravāraṇā day. The last choice seems, in my eyes, more suitable than other possibilities.

Then, the question that follows is this: what was and is still offered in such bowls on the occasion of the Pravāraṇā day in India, Theravāda Buddhist countries and East Asia? The most popular was and is probably cooked rice, which is called odana in Sanskrit and Pāli. Odana is what is given when monks are invited. For example, in the Prātimokṣasūtra or the Pātimokkhasutta in Pāli, dating back to the earliest times of Buddhist history, odana, meaning “boiled rice”, is referred to together with sūpa (“sauce”) and vyaṅjana (“condiments”) as being offered to monks as alms. Odana as alms appears everywhere in Pāli and Sanskrit literature. Odana is boiled rice without fluid, though it is defined sometimes as “rice-porridge”.

In Middle Indic, including Pāli and Gândhārī (Gā), -d- sporadically changes to -l-61, e.g. Skt. ādīpayati > Pāli ālimpeti; Skt. kumuda > Gā. kumula. There are also quite a few old Chinese transliterations which indicate this development in the underlying languages, such as 拐文羅 (EH. kou[k]ou mjan la; Gā. kumula < Skt. kumuda) in Lokakṣema’s translation (179 C.E.) of the Astasahasrikā Prajñāparamita62. The following are examples from the Chinese translation of the Dirghāgama (T. 1, no. 1; 413 C.E.): 伽伽ına(MC. là)(13a13, 34b8), 伽拘羅(MC. là) (128a1) < BHS Kakuda, Skt. Kakudha; 那羅(MC. là) (34c27) < Pā. Nādikā; 伽藍(MC. làm)漢(15b26) < kadamba; 波那擇(MC. lwo) (80a11) < Pā. Panādo, Skt. Pranādaḥ; 布吒婆樓(MC. lo) < Pā. Potthapādo63.

In early Chinese translations, the last vowel of a word was generally not transliterated, e.g. 阿含 (EH. ʔa gəm) < Skt. Āgama; 阿難 (EH. ʔa nan) < Skt. Ānanda; 泥洹 (EH. n(o) wən) < Skt. nirvāṇa; 安般 (EH. ʔa pan) < Skt. anāpāna etc.

It is, therefore, probable that yulan 盂蘭 (MC. ju lān) is a transliteration of a Middle Indic form *olana (not attested) from Skt. odana, and yulanpen 盂蘭盆 may mean “a bowl for boiled rice”, i.e. “a rice bowl”64. Odana in this compound was probably transliterated in order to designate that this was no ordinary rice bowl but one specially used for the ceremony. Consequently, the original title of this scripture, Yulan jing, might mean

---

62 Pātim 84.13, 96.14, 96.18; PrMoSū(Sa.v.Si.) 236.10, 247.2, 249.10, 250.1, PrMoSū(Mā-L) 29.27, 33.1, 33.4.
63 Cf. CPD, s.v. odana; DP, s.v. odana; SWTF, s.v. odana; GeiGER 1960: § 34.
64 Cf. Vism 70.18. odana-piṅga (“a lump of boiled rice”); Harivaṃśa 60.16. prakāśaudana-parvata (“a mountain of shining cooked rice”; my thanks are due to Ms. Hiromi Oikawa for drawing my attention to this reference).
68 In the Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ, we find a word odana-mānikā (“a vessel for boiled rice”); cf. Abhis II 370, n. 4.
“Odana Sutra” or “The Sutra of Boiled Rice”, while Yulanpen jing could be “The Sutra of Rice Bowl”.

(7) The Yulanpen jing 墨蘭盆經 is not apocryphal

Although, this sutra has often been regarded as apocryphal, the contents and ideas in it are well rooted in India as we have seen above. In addition to that, the vocabulary and usage of Chinese words are more archaic, compared with those of Kumārajiva’s corpus (401–413 C.E.), while they resemble greatly the translations by Dharmarakṣa (fl. 265?–311 C.E.). Moreover, the transliteration 鉢和羅 (EH pat ɣwa la > MC pwât ɣwâ lá) of Skt. pravâra(ṇa), which occurs only in this sutra and its adaptation, i.e. the Bauon Fengpen jing 報恩奉盆經 (T. 16, no. 686, 780a20), indicates clearly that this sutra is not apocryphal but a genuine translation, because only somebody who knew the original Indian form was able to transliterate it thus correctly into Chinese.65

In conclusion, I assume that this sutra is not apocryphal, but a translation from an Indian text translated by Dharmarakṣa or somebody else in pre-Kumārajiva times.
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The Case of the Missing Author:  
Who wrote the anonymous Epilogue to Faxian’s *Fuguoji*?  

Haiyan Hu-von HINÜBER (Freiburg)  

§1.1 The two versions of the *Fuguoji*

In two previous articles I attempted to determine the meaning of “border” in Faxian’s *Fuguoji* (法顯) *Fuguoji 記佛國* (A Record of Buddhist Kingdoms) as well as to re-interpret several of its ambiguous expressions and passages. The focus of this article is the anonymous epilogue of the *Fuguoji*, a highly controversial passage and somewhat of an unsolved riddle in research on Faxian.

In comparison to the later travel records of Xuan Zang (玄奘 600-664) and Yi Jing (義淨 635-713), Faxian’s *Fuguoji* is characterized by its simple and familiar style and short but precise descriptions. The very personal style is probably related to the fact that the transmitted version of the *Fuguoji* (which according to the epilogue dates from 416) is based on oral additions Faxian made to the first version written two years previously. Even though we only have access to the later version, one can assume that there were two versions of the *Fuguoji* in circulation between 414 and 416:

(a) Faxian’s 414 written edition, to which he himself wrote the conclusion (see §1.2).  
(b) The completed 416 version with an anonymous epilogue.  

---

1 The eminent Buddhist monk and scholar Faxian (approx. 342-423) set forth on travels with four fellow monks from Chang’an 長安 in 399. He reached central India over central Asia (today Afghanistan and Pakistan), where he studied Sanskrit for three years. During his travels he visited almost all Buddhist pilgrim sites and gathered Sanskrit texts of various Buddhist schools. It took three more years before Faxian found his way back to China in 412 by sea, passing by Sri Lanka and Sumātra. During his 14 year long travels, Faxian visited almost 30 countries. The account of his extraordinary travels through India and other mostly Buddhist countries form the basis of the *Fuguoji*.


4 Citations from the *Fuguoji* are taken from the Taishō edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon 大正新修中文大藏經, No. 2085, vol. 51, p. 857-866:《佛國記》Fuguoji or《高僧法顯傳》Gaoseng Faxian Zhan (Biography of the eminent Buddhist monk Faixan).

According to 《出三藏記集》 Chu Sanzang Ji ji 頻 one can assume that both the first and the second version originated from the Daochang monastery 道場寺 in Jiankang 建康, the contemporary Nanjing 南京). Faxian himself does not explicitly mention the Dao-changsi in the Fuguoji, but recounts his decision to travel southwards to what was then the capital. He did this instead of returning to Chang'an as originally planned, from where he had said farewell to the other Buddhist scholars 14 years previously at the start of his journey to India. The joint translation project with the Chan master (Buddhabhadra 佛陀跋陀羅/覺賢) seemed to be of great significance, because translating Buddhist texts into Chinese was Faxian’s principle aim for his difficult journey to India.

§1.2. Faxian’s conclusion in the first version of the Fuguoji

There is no reason to doubt that the first version of the Fuguoji dates from 414, two years after Faxian had already returned to China. Fortunately, the version that has survived to today carries Faxian’s own testimony of the original edition of his travel record:

“After (I) Faxian set out from Chang’an, it took (me) six years to reach the country in the centre (Central India), where I stayed (other) six years and (then) started the homeward journey. Three (more) years passed until I arrived in Qingzhou. The countries through which I passed were almost thirty. From the desert westwards on to India, the sublime dignity and internalization of the

---

6  See 懷祐 Sengyou, 《出三藏記集》 Chu Sanzang Ji ji [112b16-20] 顯曰：貧道投身於不返之地，志在弘通。所期未果，不得久停。遂南造京師，就外國僧行佛陀跋陀於道場寺譯出六巖泥洹、摩訶僧祇律、方等泥洹經、毘舍離、雜阿毘癡心。On the same note 慧皎 Huijiao, 《高僧傳》 Gaoseng Zhuan (Faxian 附傳): 338b14-17.
7  In Fuguoji Faxian first mentions his southward journey [866b16: 遂南下向都] and then the date of the first version of his travel report [866b23: 是歲甲寅].
8  See Fuguoji 866b14-17: 到青州諸法顯一冬一夏。夏坐訖，法顯離諸師去，欲趣長安。但所營事重，遂南下向都，就禪師出經律藏。Deeg (2005: 576) misunderstood 他 chu (here abbreviated for 譯出 yichu) to mean “show”: “(Faxian) zeigte ihm (Buddhabhadra) die Sutras und Vinayas”.
12 On Vinaya terms majjhima-desa (Sanskrit madyhama-desa) and paccantimeses janapadesa (Sanskrit praty-antima-desa), which correspond to 中國 zhongguo and 邊地 biandi in the Fuguojia, cf. Hu-von Hinüber 2011: 231-236.
13 Zhang (1985: 177-78, n. 3) lists 28 till 29 countries which are named by Faxian.
14 This refers to the land 赫善 Shanshan on the western side of the Lop desert, see Hu-von Hinüber
Dharma in all Buddhist communities\textsuperscript{15} is so wonderful that it cannot be described with words. Because I feared within me that the (Buddhist) dignitaries (in China) would not know of all this, I have neglected my humble existence and attempted the (dangerous) sea route towards (my) native country. The difficulties and dangers faced were almost insurmountable. Fortunately, I was protected by the transcendent power of the three jewels\textsuperscript{16} saving me from distress. It is for this reason that I wrote out an account of my experiences, in order to let worthies take part in what I heard and saw (during my journey through India). The year of Jiayin (414).”

On the basis of the passage 故寫記竹帛疏所經 历 we can assume that the first version of the Fōguoji from 414 was recorded in writing by Faxian himself. This version was extensively completed two years later through Faxian’s orally recounted stories (see below: 顯復具敘始末). This means that the current version of the Fōguoji is clearly formulated in a narrative manner. This has to be taken into account when analyzing the text.

\section*{§2. Text and structure of the anonymous epilogue}

The anonymous epilogue starts immediately after the above quoted last sentence by Faxian and is structured into three sections. Because my interpretation sometimes differs largely from that of Legge (1886:115-118) and Deeg (2005:576-577), the original Chinese text of the epilogue is quoted here and should be compared to my translation:

\textbf{Paragraph 1}

(Invitation extended to Faxian and plea for his completion of the Fōguoji)

晉義熙十二年，歲在壽星。夏安居末，逢法顯。道人既至，留共冬齋。因講集之余，重問游歷。其人恭順，言語依實。由是，先所略者，勸令詳載。顯復具敘始末。[866b23-27]

“In the twelfth year of the reign (called) Yixi of the Jin-Dynasty, the year-star

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{15} 中僧 \textit{zhōngsēng} includes more than “monkhood” (Legge 1965: 116); that is \textit{catuspariṣad}, “the fourfold Buddhist communities”, which consist of the order of monks and nuns as well as the assembly of male and female laity.

\textsuperscript{16} 三尊 \textit{sanzūn} corresponds to tri-ratna in Sanskrit, see Hirakawa 1997:25a s.v.; this means Buddha, his community \textit{(sāṅgha)} and his teachings \textit{(dharma)}. Zhang’s understanding (1985: 178, n. 9) is the same: 三尊同三寶，即佛、法、僧也. Deeg (2005: 576, n. 2530) confuses 三尊 with 三敬 and also the power of the Samgha with that of the Avalokiteśvara.
being in Canopus\textsuperscript{17}, Faxian was cordially welcomed\textsuperscript{18} at the close of (the period of) the rains retreat\textsuperscript{19}. On the arrival of the wise monk, he was asked to stay (with us) during the winter fasting period.\textsuperscript{20} Taking advantage of the pauses in between (Faxian’s) lectures on the collection of (the Buddhist scriptures), (we) again asked him about the travels. Faxian’s character was polite and complaisant; (his) utterances were simple and genuine. That is why (I) requested him to complete the abridged parts of his previous record with further details. Thereupon Faxian retold at length (his whole journey) from the beginning to the end.”

**Paragraph 2**

*Insertion of a declaration by Faxian*

自云：顧尋所經，不覺心動汗流。所以乘危履險、不惜此形者，蓋是志有所存、專其愚直，故投命於必死之地，以達萬一之冀。[866b27-29]

“(After his additional stories Faxian) himself said: (still today,) when I look back at passed adventures, my heart involuntarily beats faster and I sweat laces my forehead. Why did I encounter danger and rush into such an adventure without regard for my own life? It must have been due to the fact that I had a definite goal in mind on which I was concentrating in an unflinching and almost monomaniacal way. That is why I exposed my life where death seemed inevitable in the hope that I could be the only one of ten thousand who would survive.”\textsuperscript{21}

**Paragraph 3**

\textsuperscript{17} On 星 shouxing see Rüdenberg & Stange s.v. (No. 5257, p. 404): “Stern des langen Lebens, Canopus”; as well as Matthews s.v. 5846 (p. 826b). Cf. Zhang 1985:179, n. 1: “壽星”为十二˙星次之一，列十二支中为辰。義熙十二年（公元416年）為丙辰載，故云“載在壽星”；see also Lüders 1933 “Zur Geschichte des Ostasiatischen Tierkreises”, especially p. 740. Deeg (2005: 577) translated the astrological term with “Waage” (Libra), although Canopus is only one star in the Libra constellation. The translation of Legge (1965: 117) is also inaccurate: “the year-star being in Virgo-Libra”.

\textsuperscript{18} 迎 ying could also mean that Faxian was far-fetched from one station on his journey to Jiankang or even from the monastery where he stayed previously. This was often practiced in the Buddhist monastic life; cf. Hu-von Hinüber 2011: 241 with n. 49: tair Úpáli bhikṣubhiḥ śūtraravinayadharāmāturkadhāraṇāṁ bhikṣuṣām arthāya ardhākṣītiiyāni chaṭradhvajapatakābhīhiḥ pratyugstantayam/ saccet sampadyate ‘ty evam kuśalam/ nocet sampadyate paṃcak krośāni chaṭradhvajapatakābhīhiḥ pratyugstantayam/ saccet sampadyate ʿty evam kuśalam/ nocet sampadyate itiṇ krośān ardhākroṣām antataḥ parīsanḍām api chaṭradhvajapatakābhīhiḥ pratyugstantayam. See also Huijiao in Biography of Shi Chaojin, Taishō vol. 50: 374b7-9, 《高僧傳》釋超進傳: 時無平孟顒守在會稽，藉其風醖，遂遣使迎接，安置山陰靈嘉寺。

\textsuperscript{19} 夏安居 xia anju is the Chinese translation of the Sanskrit term versāvāsana “retreat during the rainy season”. This is the prescript for Buddhist monks in India, stating that while they are hindered from their journey as mendicants during the monsoon season, they should move into a residence for three months.

\textsuperscript{20} A “winter fasting period” is not a tradition of Indian Buddhism, instead this is probably a reference to a local tradition. Legge (1965: 117, n. 1) misunderstood 冬齋 to mean “winter study or library”.

\textsuperscript{21} The phrase 以達萬一之冀 yi da wanyi zhi ji was clearly misunderstood by Legge (1965: 117 “if I might accomplish but a ten-thousandth part of what I hoped”) and Deeg (2005: 577 “weil ich mein Leben dahin geworfen hatte, wo es unweigerlich nicht zum natürlichen Ende kommen [konnte]”).
(Admiration for Faxian and moral instruction according to his exemplary character)

於是感歎：斯人以為古今罕有！自大教東流，未有忘身求法如顯之比。然後知：誠之所感，無窮否而不通，志之所將，無功業而不成。成夫功業者，豈不由忘夫所重、重夫所忘者哉！[866b29-c5]

“Deeply affected (by Faxian’s words I) said to myself full of admiration: Such a person (as Faxian) is rarely found from ancient times to the present. Since the dissemination of the Great (Buddhist) Doctrine to the East (i.e. China), there has no one to be compared with (Fa)xian who risked life and limb in search of the Dharma. Through Faxian’s story I do know that if one carries sincere faith, there are no hopeless situations which cannot be overcome; with steely resolve, success will surely come whatever one undertakes. Does not the success lie in disregarding what usually considered as important, and valuing that which the (common) people treat with indifference?’’

§3. The author of the epilogue

The anonymous epilogue is an unsolved mystery in the research on Faxian. It begs the question of who wrote it and why the author’s name was not passed down. What follows is an attempt to pursue this mystery. Several facts are known about the author:

- He invited Faxian to come to Jiangkang from Qingzhou;
- He convinced Faxian to spend the winter of 416 at the Daochang monastery;
- He requested Faxian to complete his first version of the Fōguoji;
- He praised Faxian’s exemplary character as a guarantee for the success of any undertaking.

Deeg refers to the epilogue as the writings of an “unknown monk”\(^\text{22}\) without justifying this assumption. I agree with Zhang\(^\text{23}\) that it is much more likely to be the work of a Buddhist lay supporter or benefactor (檀越 tanyue, dānāpāti) of Faxian, not least because of the literary style. Zhang could not however suggest any concrete name for this supposed benefactor.

During the Eastern Jin dynasty (東晉) there were two well-known Buddhist centers in southern China. One of those was the Lushan mountain (廬山) and the other center was the Daochang monastery (道場寺) in Jiankang. As mentioned above (§1.1), it was because of the translation project with Buddhahadra that Faxian decided to accept the invitation of the Daochang monastery. He probably ended up staying there for five years, during which he translated a number of Buddhist texts.

\(^{22}\) See Deeg 2005: 577; in n. 2533; he discusses Zhang on the reading 聲遠迎法願 which only occurs in the Kamakura manuscript (鎌倉本). As to the name Huiyuan, Zhang (1985:24 and 180, n. 3) actually believes it to be improbable that Huiyuan personally received Faxian in Jiankang, but rather acted as an intermediary: 此所迎者，非親迎，特為之安排，促成其事耳.

\(^{23}\) Zhang 1985: 8 and 179 with n. 1.
When searching for reports on the founders or benefactors of the famous Daochang monastery, there are several hints to be found in the canon, e.g. in Sengyou's 僧祐 (approx. 445-518)《出三藏記集》Chu Sanzang Jiji. In 卷九 (Scroll 9) 《華嚴經記第一, 出經後記》(Colophon of the Avatamsakasūtra):

以晉義熙十四年歲次鶴火三月十日, 於揚州司空謝石所立道場寺, 請竺禪師佛度跋陀羅, 手執梵文, 譯胡為晉。沙門法業親從筆受。時, 吳郡內史孟頤, 右衛將軍褚叔度為檀越。24

According to this passage, the Daochang monastery was built by Xie Shi 謝石,25 the building minister 司空 (sikong) of province Yangzhou 扬州. The benefactors 檀越 of this monastery mentioned for 418, the year during which Faxian is sure to have stayed there,26 were Meng Yi 孟頤, the chief 內史 (neili) of the administrative district Wu 吳郡, and Chu Shudu 褚叔度, the general for right wing defense 右衛將軍 (youwei jiangjun). Put this way, the benefactors of the Daochang monastery were two high-level officials, one civil and the other military.

The style of the epilogue points to someone with public authority or who is in charge of the affairs of the Daochang monastery. We are dealing with an elevated personality who retains enough authority for moral instruction of his subordinates the likes of “If one carries sincere faith, there are no hopeless situations which cannot be overcome; with steely resolve, success will surely come whatever one undertakes. Does not the success lie in disregarding what usually considered as important, and valuing that which the (common) people treat with indifference?”

While scarcely anything is said about the general Chu Shudu 褚叔度 (378-424) in the Chinese Tripitaka, there are many references to Meng Yi 孟頤 (384-432) as a generous and tireless patron of Buddhism.27 During his lengthy term in various high offices, Meng

25 謝石 (327-388) was the fifth younger brother of the influential chancellors 謝安 Xie An (320-385). The Daocheng monastery was also named 謝寺 or 謝司空寺. On 謝石 Xie Shi, 謝安 Xie An, 褚叔度 Chu Shudu and 孟頤 Meng Yi see Zang 1921 s.v.
26 Faxian returned to China in 412. In autumn of 413 he arrived in the Daochang monastery in Jiankang where he wrote the first version of the Fugouji in 414 (是歲甲寅). Here, he completed the Fugouji in 416 (晉義熙十二年). In the Colophon of the Avatamsakasūtra from the year 418 (晉義熙十四年) Meng Yi and Chu Shudu are mentioned as dānapati of the Daochangsi. Faxian left Jiankang probably in 419.
27 Huijiao’s 《高僧傳》Gaoseng Zhan contains many references to Meng Yi as a devote lay follower highly dedicated to the support of Buddhist scholars, see Taishō vol. 50: 335c5-8 (佛駙駙陀羅傳): 至義熙十四年，吳郡內史孟頤，右衛將軍褚叔度即請為譯匠，乃手執梵文，共沙門法業、慧嚴等百餘人於道場譯出。337a17 (僧無譯傳): 初出彌勒、觀音二經敘，丹陽尹孟頤見而善之，深加賞接。343a6-8 (豐摩密多傳): 會稽太守平昌孟頤深信正法，以三寶為己任。素好禪味，敬心殷重。343c19-21 (善見等舍傳): 平昌孟頤承風欽敬，資給豐厚。頤出守會稽，固請不去。369c17-18 (釋僧詮傳): 後平昌孟頤於餘杭立方顯寺，請詮居之。374b7-9 (釋超通傳): 時平昌孟頤守在會稽，籍其風猷，適遣使迎接，安置山陰靈
Yi was renowned as an unfailing benefactor of Buddhism. The fact that he preferred to remain anonymous could point to his modesty and the extent of his reverence of Faxian.

It is on these grounds that I suspect the epilogue to be written or inspired by the civil servant Meng Yi as dānapati in charge of the Daochang monastery. At any rate the author of the epilogue should be searched in the closed circle under his influence.
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The Tocharian *Udānālaṃkāra*

Tatsushi TAMAI (Tokyo)

There are already excellent studies concerning the present topic by H. Lüders (1926), S. Lévi (1933), Sieg/Siegleng (1933; 1949), Kogi Inoue (1972) and G.-J. Pinault (1990) that are useful for Tocharology, and thus I will begin by commenting on these works, in order to further our understanding of Tocharian literature.

I. The characteristics of the *Udānālaṃkāra*

The *Udānālaṃkāra* is a Tocharian commentary (alaṃkāra) of the *Udānāvarga*. First it is necessary to look into the format of this text. It was found in manuscripts of the Kuchi language (Tocharian B) housed in Berlin. The events associated with the Buddha in the *Udānāvarga* are narrated in Toch. verses (one pāda in Skt. is not necessarily translated as one pāda in Toch. because of the difference of the languages). Generally the Buddha himself explains the contents of the strophes, and these comments are written metrically, the meter changing in several instances.

One example is the verses to *Udānāvarga* X.2 (about a miser, THT 23 v3–v8), which include:

i) the story of Ājivika’s disciple opposing Ānanda’s alms (Toch. meter\(^2\) 5/8 in pāda a, b, c and 8/8/5 in pāda d),

ii) the Buddha’s speech contained in Udv.X.2 (Tocharian translation of the Skt. text, almost word by word) and

iii) the aim of the verses.

This format can be summarised as follows: “prelude – main theme – postlude”.

Occasionally we witness the title of the chapter at the end, for example: dharmasomāṇe udānālanākārne mārgavārgānte garvēssē pāke “the first part of the Mārgavarga in the Udānālaṃkāra of the Dharmasoma (version)” (THT 28 a4).

This method of metrical commentary evokes the language of the *Vāsavadatta* of Subandhu (cf. Lévi, BEFEO III, 45 sq. and Mahāyāna-Sūtrālaṃkāra II, Introd. 15 sq.), in which we read bauddhasamagatiṁ ivālaṃkārabhūṣitaṁ. Lévi suggests that -samgatiṁ could stand for -samgūtiṁ in connection with the Mahāyānasamgūti of Dharmakirti or the Mahāyānaḥhīdhamrasamgūtisāstra of Asaṅga. Narasimha cited one half-strophe, in which alaṃkāra means bauddhaśāstra. Subandhu states that the bauddhasamgūti is adorned with an alaṃkāra, i.e. alaṃkāra is an addition to the bauddhasamgūti. Therefore, alaṃkāra can be

---

* I should like to express my thanks to those who corrected my undidiomatic English, to Prof. Karashima and Prof. Gippert for some significant suggestions. Needless to say, any errors that remain are my own.
1† Prof. Kogi Kudara (Inoue) had kindly given me his article. I am very grateful for his kindness.
2 The Toch. verses are composed with syllable numbers. There is no difference between long and short vowels.
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correlated with a certain class of Buddhist scriptures, and Dharmasoma’s *Udānālaṃkāra* is a representative of this class.

II. *Udānālaṃkāra* manuscripts in Paris

Lévi wrote about the *Udānālaṃkāra* (1933, p. 40) “un commentaire versifié sur les stances de l’Udānavarga, à la fois narratif et exégétique, puisqu’il raconte les circonstances où chacun des vers a été prononcé par le Buddha”. This is almost the same as Lüders’ description. Lévi also features transcriptions and translations of 4 folios: A1 (M 500.2) and A2 (M. 500) which contain “cittavarga XXXI, vers 9 et suivantes” (p. 73), A3 “Douldour Aqour, angle O. de la grande cour, du même manuscrit que M. 500.2” which contains “fin du cittavarga et début du bhikṣuvarga” (p. 75), including a3 *udānalankārane cittavārg(g)ā(nt)s(e)* and A4 “Douldour Aqour 29. En marge du feuillet, les chiffres LX.IX.” (p. 76).


Then he lists all the manuscripts of the *Udānālaṃkāra* in Paris with PK numbers, verse numbers, and Udv.numbers (also corresponding to Lévi’s A1~4) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Udl.</th>
<th>Udv.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PK AS 6A</td>
<td>str. 9-15</td>
<td>XXXI. 6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B = A1</td>
<td>76-82</td>
<td>XXXI. 11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C = A2</td>
<td>82-88</td>
<td>XXXI. 11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D = A4</td>
<td>102-107</td>
<td>XXXI. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS 22 = A3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXXI. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 6E</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>XXXI. 33-34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here concerning PK NS 22 (=A3):

i) According to Lévi this is “manifestement du même manuscrit que M. 500.2 (= A1)”, but it is sorted in another group, “NS”.

ii) There is a figure “14” in the beginning of a3 (Lévi 1933 p. 75), but according to Pinault it is 114 (because of 102-107 of PK AS 6D?). There is no number figure that is written separately in Toch. manuscripts, i.e. “100” is not written in the end of a2.

iii) After this number “14” and a double *danda*, we read *udānalankārane cittavārg(g)ā(nt)s(e)* without *dharmasongghāhe*, which is attested in the Berlin collection. Lévi thinks that this indicates the end of the Cittavarga (“Fin du cittavarga et début du bhikṣuvarga”).

iv) Pinault, however, denies it and states “on peut reconnaitre en b6 la citation de la strophe 28 du Cittavarga”, which is Udl. 1-6 after Udl. 114 (with intervening ....... in his table supra), but I find a problematic point in Pinault’s argument as follows:

A3 b6 (according to Lévi): *krent pelaikne s3 mā ykemanentse lanse*

---

3 Lévi’s convention could mean a kind of punctuation (vertical double-point), but I need to check it in the
III. *Die Udānālaṅkāra-Fragmente* by E. Sieg and W. Siegling

This book contains the transcriptions and translations of THT 1–70 by Sieg/Siegling. I offered my transliterations in 2011. After World War II, the important folios were regrettably lost; in these cases I have used the transcriptions of Sieg/Siegling. The following numbers are those of THT.

The lost folios are: 3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 14, 15, 17, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 41, 42, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 66, 67.

The Berlin *Udānālaṅkāra* collection contains five different groups of manuscripts (A, B, C, D and E with THT numbers). A, B and C came from the *Stadthöhlle* in Šorcuq, D from Qizil, and E from the *Nakṣatra-Höhlle* in Šorcuq.

A: 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 23, 24, 32, 42, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63.

B: 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 41, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68.

C: 2, 4, 5, 47, 69.

D: 19, 34–40.

E: 10.

THT 43 is Hoernle Collection No. 149. 317 in London (exact location is unknown), the content is the same as No. 42.

A, B and C came from *Stadthöhlle* in Šorcuq, but not from the exact same spot in *Stadthöhlle*, i.e. they represent different series.

Sieg/Siegling arranged these manuscripts according to the sequence of the *Udānāvarga*. The same method was applied in F. Bernhard’s *Udānāvarga* (1965), i.e. an arrangement not based upon a diachronic, synchronic and palaeographic point of view, but upon a content.

Our *Udānālaṅkāra* manuscripts from Šorcuq are paleographically similar to each other (the shape of akṣaras in group B is a little square), but do not represent one ordered series.

---

4 Tamai 2011b pp. 81-125, 2011.
5 See for example *Abweichung von der Strophenanordnung des Udānāvarga* (Sieg/Siegling 1949 p. 81).
Moreover, the manuscripts are mostly fragmentary and it is difficult to find the corresponding Sanskrit text, especially after THT 37 (THT 9-10, 30, 41 and 299-303 will be discussed below).

IV. Bruchstücke eines Udānavarga-Kommentars (Udānālaṃkāra?) im Tocharischen by Sieg/Siegling (A-Toch. 217-218)

When Tocharische Sprachreste (Sieg/Siegling 1921) was published, the volume contained only Tocharian A texts, and Tocharian B was established later because of the linguistic difference.

A-Toch. 217-218, now catalogued as THT 850-851, contain the episode of the mendicant Upaga. He met the Buddha and discussed with him his personality, his teacher, his doctrine, and the aim of his wandering, via strophes that coincide with Ud.1, 1-7. Another resource is a commentary on the Udānavarga, namely, the canonical episode of Upaga in the Tibetan canon.

The text of A 217-218 is metrical, composing 4x25 (5/5/8/7) syllables. This makes it apparent that our text in A-Toch. is parallel to the Udānālaṃkāra in B-Toch.

The verses uttered by the Buddha to Upaga (THT 850) can be found in Mahāvagga I.6.8:

Sabbābhībhi sabbavido (')ham asmi Sabbesu dhammesu anupalitto,
Sabbāṇjaḥo tanhakkhayeva vimutto sayam abhiññāya kamuddiseyam

Mahāvastu III.326: sarvābhībhū sarvavido (')ham asmi sarvehi dharmehi anopalipto |
sarvajñō (')ham tṛṣṇāksaye vimukto aham abhiññāya kim uddiseyam ||

and at the same time parallel with Udānavarga XXI.1:

sarvābhībhūḥ sarvavidā eva cāsme sarvaiś ca dharmaiḥ satataṁ na liptāḥ |
sarvanjñāh sarvabhayaṁ vimuktaḥ svayam hy abhiññāya kam uddiseyam ||

In the light of the original Skt. and Pāli texts, the A-Toch. translation of THT 850v6-v7 is assumed to have been as follows:

\[ ptāṅkaḥ kāṣṭi we \] ṛuk. ly(utā) r (nāṃtu pūk knāṃmāṁ śkaṃ) nasaḥ* pūkya sne lo[p] /june wra[m]nny[fo] \]
\[ (: puk lek tākoraṣ g) p(o) p(ra)s[k]i(n)wāc(s) [ma]t[tā]k nī [jn]e(s) [k]arso[r]aṁ \] śgrāṁiṇī* slok we muna[k] || 12 || ām

THT 850v7 ṣa[r]jī / would be (ām) ṣa[r]jīrṇīn* ) for Skt. kam uddiseyam in the beginning of Udānavarga XXI.2, and the rest (including THT 851r1) is lost or not readable.

Pa[ñ]c[ā]m in THT 851r2 would stand for Pa[ñ]c[ā]m slok we “he spoke the fifth strophe” as skāśām slok we “he spoke the sixth strophe” in the next line. Following Pa[ñ]c(ām slok we), the Toch. text contains the translation of Udānavarga XXI.5:

jīnaḥ hi mādrśā jīneyā ye prāptā hy āsravā kṣayam |
jīta me pāpakā dharmāṁ tato aham upagā jinaḥ ||

---

7 Now the manuscript is lost, but we find photographs in Sieg/Siegling 1921 Tocharische Sprachreste I. Band, B. Tafeln, (Taf. 29).
8 The beginning “Buddha, the teacher, spoke” and the end “he spoke again” is not a narrative, but part (the first 5 syllables of 5/5/8/7) of the third group and the end of verse 12 in the Toch. version. This entails that the metrical style is an important characteristic of Toch. Buddhist literature.
Skt. jinā hi mādrśā jñeyā would be translated by Toch. (y)uk(o)š ni (t)skm(ām) kṛṣṇ(ā)j[lyj(e) “men” like me are to be known (as) conquerors” in THT 851r2.

Not in the part of Udv., but in the commentary it reads // (t)āpārk yāt. āśank* “now you go, oh venerable!” (THT 851r3), it should have contained tāssī or tā ma for “whither actually” (Sieg/Siegling 1933 p. 171 fn. 2), which is the question of Upaga, because it needs two more syllables (8 of 5/5/8/7).

Then Udānarga XXI.6 reads:

bārānasāṁ gamisyāmi hanisyē (’)mrtaudumbhīm ||

dharmacakram pravartayisyē lokeś aprativartitam ||

The A-Toch. translation for this is found in THT 851r3-r4:

(bārānas)yaḥ yām kośatam*. onkara[ci] ku[m]pac. ||

(markampali wārkant spārtwam sōsyam mā ne)š sāspaṭwśūṃ* : 14

Immediately thereafter the Toch. translation for Udānarga XXI.7 reads:

na hi santah prakāśyante vidītvā lokaparāyām |

ādesavyanto virajah padām śaṃti maniśīṇaḥ ||

The A-Toch. translation for this is (in THT 851r4):

mā nā kras pgkinc– ārkaśoṣṣis(] f]jm(e) karsorjas⁹

mā ākṣissamāṃ sne tve tame knām[ā]j[ā]s,—knāmāṅgaś.¹²

The following is an explanation of its matter (in THT 851r5–v7, the figures are the verse numbers of the Toch. version, which are put at the end of the verses):

5 /// weṇam tāpārk sāk assī wraṃ*, kosne ime kalkaṣñī :

“I will say now the strophe matter actually, as far as my memory would go (= work)”

ptāṅkast tarkoras* xamsāram wraṣṣag p.kaṣ. (lyūtar nasam)

“leaving aside the Buddhas (= except for former Buddhas) I am the furthest from (= in) all the living beings in Samsāra”

6 /// pruccamṇeyo āpave : sārīm, try asamkhdaṃ kant* kalpaṃ krope el pāpśine

-traṣṣūneyntu knāmāṃcertyntu sny āk. pūṁntu 15)

“by excellence, oh Upaga! The cause (is as follows): in the three asamkhdaya (-periods and) hundred kalpa 1 gathered the generosity (dāna), the morality (śila), the energies (vīrya) and the knowledge (prajñā, that constitute) endless merits. 15”

7 /// yo spantāwe⁶ śwarāmīṣ. śmoṣhresyo pe tṛi vākna : tsopatsam kārum oktuk

yelwesyo taryāwe-pel laksamṃdavya

“(by ... forms of) four trust (vaiśāradya) and also by the places of perception (smṛtyupasthāna) in three ways: (by) great compassion, by eighty adornments

---

⁹ Two syllables should be omitted here, as the meter is 5/5/8/7 (syllables), but ku[m]pac “drum” could not be omitted semantically, or belongs to pāda c, if the Toch. translation of Skt. dharmacakram is written in 4 syllables in stead of 6 syllables, for example kāswe wārkant “good wheel”.

¹⁰ The verse number is written additionally under the line with the cross over the line.

¹¹ karsorgas corresponds to Skt. vidyāvā in pāda b, but it belongs to pāda c in Toch. version.

¹² This is a correction of Sieg/Siegling (cf. 1933 p. 171, fn. 5). This word is a translation of the Skt. maniśīṇaḥ (nom. pl. m.), but there existed no pl.-form of the present middle participle in Toch. In fact, mā ākṣissamāṃ stands for the Skt. nom. pl. ādesavyanto (ā- should be privative a). Therefore I prefer knāmāṃ, and in the photo it can be seen as knām[ā]j. Although nī is not normal usage, I recognize a cross inside the āksara for Toch. nā.

¹³ There is no phonological difference between u and ū in Toch. Originally the language had no ēu/ in its phonological inventory, but only ēu/. Later ū emerged by influence of Sanskrit.

¹⁴ This word should be suffixed with -yo (inst.), but it could be seen as a group-inflection or metri causa.
(anuvayañana), by thirty-two characteristics (lakṣaṇa)

8 /// lkālo skam*, ylankaṃ ymeyo tkamaṃ nāktā yom tāluṇeyo luytār nasam pūk wrasas. : prüccamnēyo pe [p₁],kas(.): l.
   “by looking, by the path always in suspense and by the placement of (my) footprint on the earth-god, I exceed all living beings. Also by (my) excellence in all …”

THT 851v

1 /// y[o] p,kam šk(aṃ) šak lokadhātuntwam : «16» aisinga. lkālo wsokone tmaṃsām*, lhāssī okāk, ācośy okāk nēvām oko esa(m)tam (;
   “by … and in all ten world regions : 16 With not-satisfiable glance I generate the joy (of)
giving nirvāṇa-fruit for animals and embryos inclusively.”

2 /// [l]w[o]ntāp.15 lhāsī upage pī tiṃmaṇti16 kucyo ne yiṇe*, nāktasac. : koyās wresem śūng. îpaś hāktasac ni ṭarmeṇc. ykorē
   “Upaga creates for the animals his own(?) merit, with which they go to the gods : if breath (= uḍāna?) emerges from the mouth (= if I pray?) to high gods, they dismiss my negligence”

3 /// c paltṣak. cem. : mā ňi wāskhule mā rake paltṣak. paramāṇu kṣam yārmāṃ nas*. kusne ālu s.kac mā tās. «17» : pūk*, kmāṃfāmān
   “they … the thinking upon … There is no movement of mine, no word (and no) thinking in a measure of the smallest instant (= at all), which will not be for the happiness of others
17 All knowing …”

4 /// o sotreho syak*. sotreho lyāklyās. lykaly pūk. kākkānānu17 : pūk tri praśantwam sne āk
   samsāram pūk śū[ma]m(twam?)
   “together with … characteristic, with the finest characteristic, all known (= Buddha?). In
all three times, in endless samsāra, in all causes …”

5 /// o kmāmnune : pūk tri dhātuntwam pūk skam wrasaśi pūk*. cmol. indris ciñcroneytu
   lkām*. śi(’) āleyam wramm of[ki]
   “knowledge. In all three world regions I also see all birth(s), senses (and) the charms of all
living beings like an object in my palm”

6 /// [s]n(e) lopulne nasan*, śpage18 maṃnte ākāś wiskāṇcyo : (18) (ka)[l],p. mā [ka]l,p. kāsū
   mā kāsū īnom*, kl(yu) nāgg(m.)
   “I am fleckless, oh Upaga! Like the sky (untained) by dirt. Gain (or) no gain, goodness
(or) no goodness, fame (or) blame”

7 /// : ṅā(ktaṇ nap)eṇi okā[k] (sa)mśāraṣ [tsa]l(p)o ++ + + + + l.o. … + + … + + + + +
   “As far as the gods (and) human beings, released from samsāra …”

---

15 Here pāda b ends. Sieg/Siegling read this part as s wantās, which is incorrect. Possibly this word is a gen.
sg. of a nominal pp. of ‘wantu “to send”, but the context is unclear.
16 Here pāda c ends. The personal pronoun gen. sg. 1. pers. ňi “my” is incomprehensible. I cannot decide
whether this is suffixless or stands alone, and likewise the syntax is unclear. It can be a reflexive pronoun śi
“own”, if the 3. sg. ending -s and śi are fused (haplography).
17 The word kākkānānu is taken in TEB II p. 98 as a pp. of kān- (?) . In my opinion this is a pp. of ‘kān- “to
know” (pres. knā-nā-), which has a supplemental stem kān- for subj. and pret. /n/ and /n/ show an opposition
between pres. and subj./pret. The first vowel of the reduplicated prefix is the root-vowel ā. The second vowel ā
(diaeresis over kā-) shows the vowel-balance in A-Toch. and is written because of the normal k (also lykaly, kā
needs no diaeresis actually). The writing of kā is ditlographical in order to maintain the loss of voice of kā, and
nā could be an influence of the adj. suffix -nē or of kā.
18 The ŋ is not written syllabically (metri causa). Concerning u and ŋ, see fn.13 supra.
Not only the verses of the Udānavarga, but also the explanations or statements are written metrically. Our Udānaḻaṟkāra can thus be seen as a work adorned with verses.

V. Observation of the argument in K. Inoue 1972

1) The author Dharmasoma and the title Udānaḻaṟkāra in the colophons:

THT 8r7 (Ś 92.48, no photo) 40 || dharmasoma[ȵine] !!

THT 28r4 (Ś 68.30, no photo) 72 || dharmasom[ȵine] udañalaṟkārne mārgavāṟgāntse
parwesse pāke ||

THT 33r2 (Ś 87.3, no photo) 56? || dharmasom[ȵine] udañalaṟkārne satkāṟavāṟgāntse
parwe[ʃ]se pāke ||

THT 64b7 (Ś 80.29) 76 || dharmasom[ȵine] udā

THT 68r(?)3 (Ś 97 Frag.) !!!! [maʃʃiŋ(e) (udā)nañalāṁkārē] !!!!

PK NS1522r3 (Lévi A 3) 14 || udañalaṁkārē citta[vāṟg(g)ā(nt)s(e)] !!!!

We can read dharmasom[ȵine] only in THT 64 b7, because the other manuscripts are lost, and only ſe of [maʃʃiŋ(e) in THT 68r3 is legible. Thanks to Sieg/Siegling’s transcriptions, we can better understand the text.

Inoue argues that the author is definitely Dharmasoma (p. 39, 41), and this has become common opinion (cf. TEB I, p. 146). However, the Toch. suffix -niñe is used originally in order to build asjectives, and it is not suffixed to personal names. dharmasom[ȵine] (as a personal name with the possessive suffix -niñe) is found only here, in the Paris collection there is no such name. I propose to take dharmosom ( 개최 is anaptyxis) not as a personal name, but as a section-name or the name of a work of Dharmasoma, like riñe “people of the town” or pudñaktei “belonging to Buddha”. If a possessive adjective were required, it would have been dharmosom[ʃʃe], like pudñakte[ʃʃe] (-ʃʃe is attached to the obl.).

Skt. alaṁkāra means “adornment” and it translates into Chinese as 裝嚴 zhuāng-yán. The name alaṁkāra is used often for Buddhist texts deemed “commentaries”, but as far as I can see, there exists no Udānaḻamkāra in Sanskrit or Chinese20. Perhaps the Tocharians did not understand the original meaning “adornment”, but only “commentary”. Our Toch. Udānaḻaṁkāra was written in the 6th-8th c. A.D., judging from a palaeographical point of view21, and thus it is fair to wonder whether by that time the original meaning of the term had already been lost on Tocharian scholars.

2) Abhidharma annotations:

Sieg/Siegling mentions that THT 9-10 treats asubhabhavanā “die Meditation über die Abscheulichkeit des Körpers”, THT 30v3 dharmacakrapravartana “das Drehen des Gesetzesrades” and THT 41 ānāpānasṛti “das Achtgeben auf das Ein- und Ausatmen” (1949, p. 6). I would like to verify each section in hopes of determining whether they are

---

19 Pelliot Koutchéen Nouvelle Série in the Paris collection.
20 According to Inoue (op. cit. p. 42) there are some commentaries to the Udānavarga in Chin. 出曜经 (T. Nr. 213), in Tib. Udānavargaṇivaraṇa and the Mongolian translations of the Tib. text, but there is no relation with our Toch. Udānaḻamkāra.
Udānālaṃkāra associated with Udānavarga.

i) THT 9-10 asubhabhāvana

THT 9r (no photo, group A from Stadthöhle)

1 mā evi kāriṣṭaṁ ṭu śp. (pre)kare : bhavā²²

“no passion (or) ignorance, and they asked (about) it. The meditations”

2 me mākte camcer,²³ evinkaltse warḵsāl tantsi : śiwā(ra) ³³

“how can you hamper the power of passion? : Four ...”

3 (ke)ktseñe yāṃṣe ikāṣlya asubh. ṣek. waraṣṣa(l)ī[l]e ³³

“the body should be seen as an abomination, asubha(-meditation) should always be practiced.”

4 (spktā)nikeṁts dhatumma ṣkas yāknesa ikāṣlona ³³

“The base materials of servants (Skt. yogin) are regarded with six ways”

5 (wsa)śaṃ cewk. paṭaktne : śnume ṣak kaun ṭyaṣaṃ ³³

“(he dwells) only in the drop (of water). : For nine to ten days he lies ...”

6 (dhām)nma ṣesa tswanwa prutkauva po klokaśi : mātri śu(k.tar) ³³

“the base materials joined together, all pores closed. : The reproductive fluid for the mother ...”

7 ku wi pwārīne kłaẉ(uk)au (ra)mt. wsawaṃ iḳlessu 11 yeli ³³

“... like being situated between two fires, the misery dwells. 11 The worms”

8 [y]et[s]e[s]a lyel[y]. + + mīṣasa ost astāse : ³³

“the worms over the skin ..., within the flesh (and) bone house. :”

THT 9v folio Nr. 42

1 k(e)ktešī, ṑke śp[a]r(ta)sk(em) mākte ikāṣk[em] aisi[a]my aśc”. ³³

“They turn the body now, as if the wise men see the (head).”

2 sesinoṣo 13 kasons slakkari kauc āṇmo cemts naus, ³³

“oppressed. 13 They who are sorrowful ... their high(?) desire Early”

3 (pa)lsko pannatsiś, rupne yparwe : parwān(‘) epinkt ānte(ne) ³³

“In order to stretch the spirit at first within the shape. : Between the brows (on) the forehead”

4 kliye ranu trēnsate rāpn(‘) einwents : tū (y)pārwe ³³

“again the woman adhered to the man’s figure. : Thereupon”

5 wnolmi taryā yākne²⁴ weweños, yogācā(ri) ³³

“males, yogins are denominated in (= as) three subjects”

6 (per)nmeño : sementiṣ, aurtse ikātsy²⁵ āṇme af[ye](n)kants ³³

“glorious (pl.). : Some wish to see widely, others ...”

7 stastaukkauwa ḍempauwa sparkauw ere : ai ³³

“tired and rotted ..., elapsed appearance. : ...”

---

²² Sieg/Siegling have supplemented bhavā(nanta) meaning “meditations”. This is the Skt. bhāvana and Toch. pl. sign -ntā. Because of vowel-balance it became bhavānānta.

²³ 2. pl. pres./subj. I of ‘cāmp- “can, be able to”. Here p is omitted.

²⁴ According to Sieg/Siegling (1949 p. 15 fn. 13) these three yogins are ādikārmika, kṛtaparījaya and aṭikrāntamanaskāra (cf. Abhidharmakośa VI 10 and 11, La Vallée Poussin VI, p. 150).

²⁵ This infinitive could be a passive “to be seen”, cf. Krause 1952 p. 33-34.
8 cfwi pals[k]o kaskātriw waipta[r , auntr[d] maka[tsi] ///
   “his spirit is scattered apart (and) begins to run”

THT 10r (T III Š19.4, group E from Naksatra-Höhle)
1 /// .. .. .. k(ar)sts(i tom) yk(e po)sta 15 aśubh er[tsi]s[‘] , kr[e]nc[‘] , wn[o](omi) /// (= 9v5)
   “to know (them) step by step. 15 In order to evoke the Aśubha(-meditation), the good people ...”
2 /// (ā dikā)rm(i)k[i] taryā yākne māskentriw cai perneñico : semeñts , aurts[e] lktâsy âñme // // ( = 9v6)
   “Ādhikārmikas are (sorted out in) three ways, they are glorious. : Some wish to see
   widely, others ...”
3 /// (waipt)ār (kje(ts)enân‘, stastaukkauwa ḍampanva spārkauw ere : ai .. /// ( = 9v7)
   “separately tired (and) rotted bodies, elapsed appearance. ...”
4 /// cfwi palsko kq[s]j(kā(tryg waipt)ār , auntrā makatsi /// ( = 9v8)
   “his spirit is scattered (= torn) apart (and) begins to run (= flee)”
5 /// .e + .. + + + + + kq .[e] ///

THT 10v
5 /// [ā]ryāklām p .. + + + .k. ma[n]e : fyjak[e]ṃt[s]. ///
   “the snakes ... Of the yaksas ...”
6 /// .. + (e)pyac‘, klāṣe ente tem(e)ni‘ : sta[ṃ]gle antsa(nene)26 [k] .[s]e ///
   “he should remember he should stand consequently, who ... on/of the mass (?) ...”
7 /// (2)5 ce kl[auf]kesa yke postam āst(‘) āstāntsso s[ai]m . lktâsm tarne tantsi ///
   “25 With this action step by step he sees the bones (and) the protection of the bones up to
   the vertex”
8 /// .. au[c]a : [ru]pmeñ pal(sk)o [ta]la[s]sa[m]i ś[niw]âra y[m]ense smoñ[ñ]am .. .. .. // //
   “... : From form he uplifts the spirit (to) the four places of consciousness”

THT 10 overlaps with THT 9, the group being different (THT 10 is the only manuscript of
   group E from the Naksatra-Höhle). This could mean that this kind of literature, i.e. alaṃkāra-literature
   (commentary), was common in Toch., yet I cannot find a connection with
   the Udanaavarga, but rather with the Abhidharmakośa, and thus I would like to refrain
   from calling these manuscripts Udānaalāṃkāra.

ii) THT 30 (no photo, group B from Stadthöhle, Udv.XII.14-16)
1 (la)klentæ 21 te klyavāñche makāykne tu yparwre palsko kaum(←t)āmn(←t)e : mā ñeṣam
   laklentamenĕ tsalpâlhe poyknes(‘) emškete : cai toj , wrocØ riṣāki mā ilkentæ nautsar
   emškete : mā wat nai

26 Toch. āntse is a translated word of Skt. skandha “shoulder”, and Sieg/Siegling supplied -nene (locative
dual) with “(in die) Schultern” (1949, p. 17), but “(stand) on the both shoulder” is curious to the context.
Judging from -a-, this word would be on three syllables (accent on the second syllable), and it is better to see
the meaning of BHS “mass”. My hypothesis is antsonė (loc. sg.) or antsenė (gen. sg.), but it is too fragmentary to
determine the exact meaning and context.
“the sufferings 21 They heard it, (and) thereupon split the thought multiplicatively. : There is no release from sufferings (either) completely (or) in all manners (= forms). : These so (= very) great sages have not put out extinguished sufferings completely. : Or, however”

2 sā, tne nesam ytārye ksa lakle nautṣeṇca : 22 cets. ce, sīlhe palkontse lakle spa wikassi poyši : tom šlokanma wertsyaïne ākṣa cets. palko tśarwāssi. • (XII.14 begins) emške-
“there is no way here (that) extinguishes suffering : 22 In order to dispel their depression of spirit and suffering, the All Knowing One (= Buddha, the subject of the next pāda) : recited these strophes in (= before) the assembly in order to comfort their spirit(s).”

3 tse āratišcо yātatiš, astarheš, seko : sefjrke cmelhe srulhitents emšketskete nutalhe yāmtsi 23 snai keš, cmela karsatišcо spa tne ytārye sā śpālmem : šai-
Udv.XII.14ab: atyantaništḥaya damāya suddhaye samsārajātīmaranaṃkṣayāya |
Udv.XII.14cd: anekadhātupratisamvidhāya mārgo hy āyam lokāvidā prakāṣitā ||
“(Udv.XII.14) For the sake of ceasing permanently, for the sake of being able, and for (achieving) constant purification : in order to make (= making) continual evanescence of the cycle of birth and death 23 and in order to know (= knowing) countless births, this way is excellent here (tne is added metri causa)”

4 śhe [ka]rj[s]açaitsa apākṣartse yāmusa klyomīṅa (XII.14 ends) : (XII.15 begins) gankne kekmu ṃakte yai kuńki se[sa] reṣṣaṃ war. • samudṛampa taiknena ytārye sa(→ā) oktats(’) ākṣusa 24
Udv.XII.15ab: gangāgatan yangad aperatoṣaṃ samsyandate vāri tu sāgareṇa |
Udv.XII.15cd: tathaiva mārgha sugatapradeśitah samsyandate āyam hy āmṛtasya prāptaye ||
“by the connoisseur of the world, the noble (way) is made clear. : (Udv.XII.15) Just as the blameless water that came into the Gaṅgā flows together | with the ocean, thus, this way is recited eightfold 24”

5 (śesa reṣṣaṃ) onuwaṇhe yāṃmatiś, (Udv.XII.15 ends) ce wace ślok. : ṇāktets, ṇakte ākṣ(‘) omte tśarwāssi, cem wnolmem : te rants, śārsame reṣṣaṃ ytārye tne samsārmem
“(flows together) in order to attain immortality (Udv.XII.15 ends), the second strophe : the god of gods recited there in order to comfort these people. : He made them know (= understand) it as it is, there is a way here (to save the world) from samsāra.”

6 (śaṭṣe : emške)t[s]a laklentamen tsalpatis, oktatsa klyomīṅa 25 po klesanma nākṣeṇca po cmelatis, j āke yāṃṣeṇca : teki ktsaitishe srulkalhe cmelhe spa karstauca ra-
“in order to be saved from continual sufferings, the eightfold noble (way exists). 25 Wiping out all obscurations, making (→ bringing to) an end (of) all births : eliminating disease, old age, death and birth,”

7 (m no tetrikoṣ. ytāri wnolmi) [t[a]llāico wroccoli ra rṣāki : ankām ytāra(←i)sā mofkšs cai ṇāskentar, tu(sa) m[a] klpākṣem 26 ni no ytārye ākṣusa oktatsa cmela nautṣeṇca : sukṣ.
“like miserable people, the great sages also missed the way. : They seek a release with (= in) the wrong way; hence they do not obtain (it). 26 Now the eightfold way that I recite eliminates births. : Sevein”

8 (bodhyanānta) + + + + + + + + + + + yāṃmāśaṃ : ṇakte wranta ckentamen kārpaṃ kwri gā[nk]ne (a)itt(a)anka : po perrnema ṇāskentar, po yānem samudṛarśc aiwok, 27 mani, brahma-
“(aspects of cognition) ... he reaches : Like the waters, when (they) will descend from the rivers into the Gaṅgā, : all are shining, all go into the ocean, 27 (and) so (into) the
Brahma(-world) ...”

THT 30v (v3 dharmacārapravartana, v5-7 pāda 31c-32d, cf. Inoue p. 55)
1 (lokaš) /// [♀] n(e)vān[中级] po aiyocli maskestar, ln[中级] osta(m)en : puṇḍariktense kektēmne ḫāṣēm cai yetiṃ laksānta : keṣe aiksnar, wa-
   “(they) all direct (= turn) into nirvāṇa, (they) go out from the house : they saw on the
   body of the Buddha the adornments (and) the characteristics : (they saw) in the figure
   (which was surrounded) fathoms wide”
2 (māṣe, rupne swāṇcaintsa ye)(se) ysāṣse 28 śle were po klesanma yaik[中级] yukoṣ, śiver m(a)gram : sañ — kartse kce yāṃsate tu wnoṃli keklyaus, ṣeyem : k,ce (”)knesa ket ra
   “(beam) the golden (skīn), 28 (the Buddha who) with the odour wiped out all
   obscurations (and) conquered the four Māras. : People have heard about his own
   goodness, which he did (= performed), the that : by which manner (and) for whom”
3 (kartse yāṃsate) [f(e) sakk(e)hêne rṣāke : ceu, sklok, pkāte saissentse karstati ce šlok aksāme
   29 [k,le] peleaknēsse kren, ceu, yerkwantai enklyausacce nauṣ, ṣpyārtar po ono-
   Udv.XII.16ab: yo dharmacakrā hy ananuṣrutam purā prāvartayat sarvabhūtanukāmpī |
   Udv.XII.16cd: tam tāḍrśam devanārāgasvatām nityam namasyeta bhavasya pāragam ||
   “the sage of the Śākya-family (performed goodness) : (he) intended to eliminate the
   doubt of the world, (he) recited this (following) strophe for them. 29 (Udv.XII.16) The
   one who turned the good Wheel of the Law (= dharmacakra) that was not heard before,”
4 (lmeñ taiwa) fihēnica ket ra santāmne : ceu, tu yāṃsese ḫakteṃ sāmne spālmeñ
   onolme[ṇ] : sek, wināsī cmelse ceu, samudtar, totte ykuweso 30 pe-
   “(he was a lover) of all people in their sequence of births. : In this way, (he is) the
   excellent being among gods and humans : (One) may always adore him as (the one who
   crossed) over the ocean of birth. 30”
5 (lai)kn(es)i[中级] yerkwantai spāṛtīñesa tsaylpate wnołmep : sañ — sl(‘) ālynkats, kartse(ne) sperkkessu sek, sū wināsle : pelaknēsse yerkwantai27 k,se westar,
   “By turning the Wheel od the Law (= dharmacakra) he saved the people. : He is always
   striving in (= for) the good of himself and others; he should be adored. : The Wheel of
   the Law, which is said (= described as follows:)”
6 darsanamārķ, ēm.28 • sāk, piś, kṣanam”29 epinte piś āntsi20 dharmacākkar, ēm, 31 kauc

27 This word shows only the oblique case in its declension (oblique tantum). Here it functions as a nom. sg.,
   but Sieg/Siegling translate it as ”[Das Drehen] des Gesetzesrades, welches Darsanamârga heißt” (1949 p. 51,
   also Inoue 1972 p. 55) with gen. because of the obl. case of this word and spāṛtīñesa “by the turning” in line 3.
   However, [Das Drehen] (回転) has no connection with darsanamârga (見道). I suppose that pelaknēsse
   yerkwantai k,se westar, is one sentence or clause, and a new (nominal) sentence begins from darsanamārķ, up
   to āntsi.
28 This word is Skt. nāma and could mean “pretendedly (so-called)” (Edgerton p. 293), and here it could
   mean “namely” or perhaps even “means”. Darsanamârga could be developed with/from the concept of
dharmacakra in Tocharian Buddhism, but the relation between the five aggregates (五蘊) and fifteen moments
(十五刹那) is unknown. Sieg/Siegling (and Inoue also) translate this passage as “drehen sich”, which belongs to
   the next sentence.
29 kṣanam is pl. obl. of kṣaṇam (from Skt. kṣaṇa). -a (-ā) of pl. sign -ṇam is omitted metri causa.
30 āntsi “shoulders” corresponds to the pl. of BHS skandha “mass” (Edgerton p. 607), and the end of one
ette kluttankentar, tomt pwenca cakr ente spätaṃ³¹ : kaw (')tame kwac, tomt kluttankentar, kawmēm

"Daršanamārga, namely, the five aggregates (五蕴) among fifteen moments (十五刹那).
Dharmacakra, namely, 31 the spokes turn top down. While the wheel would be located (there), : which (= if cakra) would be (turning) downward, (while) those (= spokes) that are on top, (would) turn from the top"

7 unok, etteś, pelaiščepi śālīme cakkarnte se yerter yeksnar, • śwāra pwenca mārgānanta sem rama, ywārskane 32 pelaiščepi yerkantai taiknesa espiartce naufs, • pudhā-

"again downward. One rim-wheel of the excellent Wheel of the Law (turns) around. The four spokes (are) like an axis in the middle, (that is,) mārgānā (= members of a way).
32 The Wheel of the Law that is not turned and has not been heard formerly in such a manner, the Buddha"

8 kte eiklyauašce spartassām mā (')ilek, tu campam : tu yparwe ūakti śāmna tsgpāre piś tomt cmeleme : taikna sa ket ra kartes, paspārte poyi <wi>nāšle 33 aleyk, preke

"turns (that). Nobody (else) can (do) it. : Thereupon gods and people were saved from the five births. : The Sage (= the All-Knowing One) who turned (it) in such a manner for the goodness of everybody should be venerated. 33 In another time ...

Manuscript THT 30 is the last one in a series (from THT 27 until 30, group B) treating Udv.XII.9.16.

THT 27 treats Udv.XII.9-11 (verse 61-70), while THT 28 does not treat Udv., but only the commentary (verse 71-72 and 1-9), and contains the colophon in r3 after verse number 72: dharmasongāne udānālakārme mārgavārgānte parwešše pāke "the first part of Mārgavarga in the Udānālakāra of Dharmasoma (version)". THT 29 treats Udv.XII.12-13 (verse 9-21), and THT 30 treats Udv.XII.14-16 (verse 22-33). Here we can see the real Udānālakāra.

The problematic part, THT 30 v5-7, is argued by Inoue (1972 p. 55-56) to belong to the Dharmacakraϕrvartana. The translation of Sieg/Siegling (and Inoue's in Japanese) is also problematic, and I have tried to translate it for myself with the help of some commentaries (cf. fn. 27-32 supra).

Inoue tried to find a corresponding part in the Chin. "阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論" Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣa and others (1972 p. 56, 58). I quote one of them (T 1545 No. 27 p. 911c29-p. 912b4) in order to see whether the Toch. Udānālakāra has some of the characteristics of Abhidhāma as Inoue argued:

After the question 見道名法輸 "Does Darśanamārga mean Dharmacakra?" (p. 911c29), the answer 動轉不住義是輪義 "moving, turning and unsteadiness is the meaning of the wheel" 見道是速疾道 "Darśanamārga is the rapid way" 不起期心道於動轉不住 "the not decided way of mind does not stay in moving and turning" 最為隨順故獨名法輸 "only because of the biggest obedience it is called Dharmacakra" (p. 912a1-2).

---

³¹ The meaning of this word should be "sich befinden", not "sich drehen" as we find in Sieg/Siegling's translation.
³² tākam is a subjunctive 3. sg/pl. If it is a pl., the subject is pwenca, if it is a sg., the subject is cākr. Sieg/ Siegling and Inoue took it as a pl., because they thought that five skandhas turn, but can the aggregates turn? I think that the subject is cākr "wheel". It is natural to see that the spokes turn and the wheel would be face down.
The Toch. and Chin. are rather similar, for example 動轉 “moving and turning”, but the
reason is 随順 “obedience”, which is not mentioned in Toch. Therefore I think this Chin.
section does not correspond to the Toch. version, but presumably T 1545 No. 27 p. 912
a13-14 上下義 是輪義 “up-and-down is a meaning of the wheel” 如是車輪或上或下 “like
the wheel (moves) up or down” 如是見道緣境上下 “so the rim of Darsanamārga is up-and-
down” is closer to the Toch. Although the Toch. and Chin. versions are not exactly identical,
it is my supposition that the Tocharian writer knew this passage without grasping its exact
meaning. He would have quoted it only for the explanation of Dharmacakra without the
concept of Abhidharma.

iii) THT 41 ānapānasṛti (no photo)

This is the longest portion in Inoue’s article (1972 p. 44-55). He stated that the manuscript
comes under “UA (Udānālaṁkāra) XV Smrtivarga”, but such a name (or a title) is nowhere
mentioned. Udv.XV Smṛtivarga exists, where ānapānasṛti is given in pāda a of verse 1, but
there is no citation from the Udānavarga in THT 41.

Inoue changed the transcription of Sieg/Siegling into verse (Toch. Udl. 9a-22d) and
provided a Japanese translation. Then he went on to give the Chin. Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣā
『阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論』卷第二十六 雜蘊第一中補特伽羅息第三之四 (T 1545 No. 27 p. 132 sqq.)
underlining that corresponds to the Toch. versions.

Here I give my translation with the Sieg/Siegling’s transcription, because the manuscript
is lost, and also the corresponding Chin. with my underlining, which is somewhat different
from Inoue’s, because my point of view tied not to content, but rather to philological or
linguistical concerns.

THT 41r (T III Š87.1, Udv.XV Smṛtivarga, meter 14(7/7)/11(7/4)/11/11, no photo)
1 8 kektisnu palkoś sasaśu anāśaśhe satā(s)ñ(e : ) + + + + + + [1]m. [Na] .tw + [1]w.
mp(a) + + + + + .k. [m]. kāśw. + + + + +

“8 The inhaling (and) exhaling leaned on the body (and) the spirit (.) ... with ...”
2 no yneś yamōṣ. mā satāśam33 9 śarce dhyaṃ kse yneś yamtar. palko msketar. lyāṣk34
attsaik. • enenkaś. paspārau cwi mainp. palkw35 attsaik. • sgniṃsara26 ṣ. cwi k(ek)(ts(e)ne po
“now they made clear ... he does not exhale. 9 Who will make clear (= if one
accomplished) the fourth meditation, (and his) spirit surely becomes fine. His measure
and spirit (= discretion) surely approaches inwards, and (all) his body becomes stable
(?).”

33 This is a 3. sg., and the subject would be the next who-clause over verse number 9, as Sieg/Siegling and
Inoue have translated, but if this part corresponds to Chin. 雖有一事而闕三事故未轉, verse 9 ends here.
34 A scribal error for lyāṣk “fine, small”?
35 This is a binominal representing one concept by two words (main “measure” and palko “thought”), so the
predicate is sg. paspārau.
36 The meaning is unclear here. Sieg/Siegling “in Trance (?)”, Inoue “in silence (?)”. Prof. Yamabe suggests
in his article (p. 194 in 『唯識と瑜伽行』 “Idealism and Yogācāra” 2012 Tokyo) that 軽安 (Skt. prāśradhi)
“ease” could be possible, which is stated in Ālayavijñāna 3.7.2 by L. Schmithausen 1987 (2007) Tokyo. In the
Chin. text it is unclear, but possibly 身不動 “the body is not moving”. I would tentatively propose to use
“stable” following the Chin., but presumably it would be more accurately rendered “ease in a stable state”.

327
3 masket, • töm šarmnasa satāšiše mā cet, nesam 10 ngkece, 37 ykešša kektsehe tān, 38 kenasše satāšiše : naisyandik no sā, yente karsanalya : nesam yent aupacayik.

“with (= for) these reasons they have no exhalung (= do not exhale). 10 Which (body or heart)? The body (is) pertaining to the place. (With regard to) that, the exhaling (is) pertaining to the earth: Now naisyandika (等流 “outcome or result”) should be known as the (breath)-wind: The (breath)-wind is aupacayika (長養 or 慣養 “accumulation”)”

4 šlek, vipaka,
• mā no sā, satāšišene yam ša(ṁ)šalhe 11 aïsamāne tentse šaïne kšalamülše te pkarsa, • ime no maiya kalpau ce, kraupene: tu-

“the same as well of vipāka (異熟 或 果報 "maturation"), but she (= the wind) does not go on counting (= is not calculated) in (= for) the exhaling 11 The knowledge of it ( = breath) is the particular nature of the root of merit; (you all should) know that! Indeed consciousness obtains power in (= by means of) accumulation. :”

5 ntse sarmtu(’) ānapānasmrī westra : onwañentse se twere tikspendryets, 12 yšelmece ersnāssonto saïssempa se rittowo : yšelmece saïsše cwi 32 ste

“With (= For) this reason (it) is called Ānāpānasmrī. : This (is) the door of immortality for keen senses. 12 This is connected with the world (界) of desire (欲 kāma) and form (色 rūpa). : The desire-world (欲界) should be known for it (= by ānāpānasmrī) :”

6 aïsai yyamše : piq. bhûminta saïm yâm yûtam erti : upeṣindrintampa s(’) eri pont prekem 13 škas, yâkmesa se westar, anâsâlhe satâšiše : šamsâlhi ompo-

“One who sustained the five grounds (= Ānāpānasmrī) 35 would be able to be evoked: This would always evoke the (breath) together with the indifferent senses (捨根) 13 This inhaling and exhalung is said (= described) with (= in) six ways: (i.e.) counting (數)”

37 From the Chin. 何地繫 随身繫耶 随心繫耶 “Which field ties (the breath)? Does it tie (according to) the body? Does it tie (according to) the heart?” ngkece, is not a relative pronoun as Sieg/Siegling have translated it “Welchem Ort der Körper gehört” and Inoue “To the place, where the body belongs”, but an interrogative pronoun. This is an obl. sg. masc., while ykešša “place- (adj.)” is fem. correlating to kektsehe “body” (nom. sg. fem.). If ngkece, is a scribal error for ngktā, (fem.), it seems to be no problem, but I suppose that ngkece, alone is a single reduced sentence “which (body or heart)?” with obl.-function “with regard to”, and the answer is “(the body) to the place”.

38 tān, is a demonstrative pronoun obl. fem. correlating with kem “earth” fem., and kenasše is a nom. sg. masc. correlating with satāšiše “exhaling”: kem could be界 in 的視所欲界人出息.

-ŋk, of vipaka, is not -ja as Sieg/Siegling (1949 p. 60 with 46) and Inoue transcribed, but a particle for intensification. The antecedent ślek, contains also the same -ŋk. Phonomorphologically, the Skt. /i/ could not become the Toch. /k/, and if -ja is correct, then it should be vipākaj, like aupacayik, (the end of a3) for Skt. aupacayika (apocope). Likewise “one who is born from maturation” is unacceptable from the standpoint of semantics (Sieg/Siegling “Vergeltung der Taten” for Skt. vipāka).

40 I cannot find this passage in the Chin. text, but perhaps it corresponds to 持去者謂出息 “The carrying away is said to be the exhaling”. Here it could be confused with another topic, namely, “counting” (verse 14-17).

41 Sieg/Siegling “in dem Abschnitt (= Skt. varga)”, Chin. 此聚中 “in this group/gathering”. There are some corresponding Skt. words, and Sieg/Siegling’s varga is one of them, which is used in the Lankāvatārasūtra (cf. Nakamura p. 754). The Skt. rāsi “group, collection” is suitable, which is found in the Abhidharmaakosabhāṣya of Vasubandhu, ed. by P. Pradhan, p. 13 as rāsi-artha skanda-artha tr. Likewise from the context in our Toch. text, it is better to posit that this word indicates aupacayik, “accumulation”.

42 This is a gen. sg. masc. of the demonstrative pronoun “his”, and could be the subject of the gerund of ṣvām “to make” (aisai yyamše “it should be perceived”), if yšelmece saïsše is a theme. Another possibility is that it is a function of the dative “for it”. Given 有者欲令人出息 “various desires order to take breath”, and taking yšelmece saïsše as the subject, I prefer the latter.

43 Cf. Abhidharmaakośa VI 12a-c, La Vallé Poussin Tome IV p. 153 “L’ānapānasmrī est prajñā, appartient à cinq terres, a pour objet le vent, est pratiquée par des êtres du Kāmadhātu.”
7 stəm yalı (>-) etsin(-w)ai palkalåne : stamşalåne klautkåshiæ astargåne : šåskaš, klautkemไว nag going after (随行), looking outward (視), standing firmly (止), turning around (轉) and pureness (淨). This meditation is said (= explained) by means of sixteen manners.

14 Counting (數) is here explained with (= in) five ways, (i.e. right) counting (滿數), .”

8 sälne : menki olypo trwäšåshiæ astaråne spä : šamšalåne še wi træi štræ, piš, šak, tantsi muok alyä(-e)nikom satåšåše skår škår, šamšar. 15 menki no šamšalåne iñje šukå/

“less (減數), more (増數), mixing (亂數) and pureness (淨數). Counting one, two, three, four, five until ten, again (and) other (kinds of) exhalings is (= are) counted every ten (= in tens). 15 (There is) “less” counting now here, (in that there are seven”

Toch. B 41v

1 okt. šak, wat, satåsså<><m> : škas piš, (-şùkt.) īnu wat no šamšar, mà po solme : olypo no šamšalåne më kos satåssåm : menki(-olyapo) tumëni satåšåše keš yamatsar. 16 trå-

“eight or ten he exhales, : but he counts six, seven or nine, not all (= yet not) integrally.

Also, (there is) “more” counting here, how(ever) many (times) he exhales, : he counts (his) exhalings more than that (= beyond that). 16”

2 wäšåše54 koe satåssåm tu anäsåš enkatsar, • anäsåšm wat, satåšåše keš yamatsar, • astraråne piš, anäsåšm piš tu šamstri satåssåm wat, piš, lykvarwa tuk ş(-p)iš, šam-

The mixing: what he exhales, he takes that as inhaling, or (what) he inhales, he counts as exhaling. The pureness: he inhales five (times) and counts that as five, or he exhales five times, he counts that(?) as five.”

3 štar, 17 yen(t’) omposågm no yaltü ent(‘) anäsågm melentsa : yen(t’) enenka yopamme yam tw omposåm : im(‘)56 aisamñes(‘) omposåm yam su yente : korne kelen(‘) ärähcäš païne

“17 Well, the going after (= following 随) the wind, when one inhales through the nose, : the wind would enter into him and he would go (= follow) after it (wind) : the consciousness (= smṛti) would go with knowledge after (= following) the wind, : in the throat, in the navel, into the heart until (= down) to (his) feet,”

4 tantsi 18 emškê paiñe mokociš, äšgaš äme tumëni tøm : lnaskemanem makocmenem yenteš, lkaśašm : ywariså tána kwänçïtsai kwänçït, yarn wat : prări

“18 up to the big toe, the consciousness leads (them = winds). Then : one sees that the winds are going from the big toe, : a half sesame-corn or one sesame in measure : A finger.”

5 raso pokai wat, lauke ykarwa 19 koš, cwi maiyy(‘) aïsamñessa kos ïndrinta tøt, lkaśašm : tumëni no stamşalåne makte yentetş, • melëntsya yatïwa ye-

“a span or a cubit (wide they have) come from so far. 19 However much his power of

---

44 This is an obl. pl. meaning “by means of”, which demonstrates the function of the obl. case in Toch. We do not find this pāda d of verse 14 in Chin.

45 The explanation of the mixing (亂數) is different from that found in the Chin. Presumably there was another conception in the Chin., as we see here: 有餘師說 … 復有說者 “there is another teacher’s explanation … also there is (another) explanation”.

46 According to Sieg/Siegling this is obl. and shows group-inflection with -sa “Mit Bewußtsein und Wissen” (similarly Inoue). When Toch. ãme translates Skt. smṛti (TEB p. 169), it is better to see this word as the subject of the sentence, because the topic is anāpānasmiti. And thereafter Inoue’s translation – “he (the practitioner) goes after the wind” – is somewhat strange. Toch. su should be a demonstrative pronoun for ãme (masc.) and is written here metri causa.
知识，不过人类的许多（power of）感觉器官，他如此看。他对，
他站在（standing）在风的主体？风已经进入的（have entered）
6 ntem korne stamsam : ara.Parsec keles. pawne mokocne waq. 20 kawel. ykanwa yenten stamsam
tamen(') emske po yenten : kese smuwa ikasam prukauwa rami. wamer rami. serkanje sta-mu.>

“he makes stand at the throat, : in the heart, to (= in) the navel, or in the big toe. 20 The
winds, which have gone high (= moved up), he makes stand in the vertex. While he sees
that all stands wind in the body, as if (they are) closed off, he sees the body like a jewel
(which is) situated in a chain.”

7 sai ketsi. ikasam : ce tye:ksa stamsamhe yentet. pkarsa. 21 etskai palkalh yentem
melemnts enem yaipwa toma : korne kekmuwa ikasamme keles. ke(kmwa : ara.Parsec)

“: With (= In) this manner (you must) know the standing (standing) of the winds! 21 As for the
observance (obs): the winds that entered inside the nose : he sees come into the throat
(and) to the navel, : to the heart”

8. emske pawne mokoc: tantsi : turem c/wi mut. mas(k)e(tur). 1111

“as far as the big toe. Then for him it is so…”

『大毘阿毘達磨婆沙論』卷第二十六 雜論第一中補特伽羅納息第三之四

(T 1545 No. 2 p.132a9 ~ p.135a23; the punctuation marks in the Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō "

They are not always correct, but I follow them here.)

入息出息當言依身轉應。依心轉應，乃至廣説。問何故作此論。答為令疑者得決定故。謂契經說。佛告長者。此入出息是身法身為本彌身依身而轉。施設論說。何緣者入出息不轉耶。謂入出息由心力轉。死者無心但有身故。此人入出息一說依身一說依心。或有生疑。如是說依身不了義。或依(132a16)了義。欲顯此二真義論故作論。

(132b12)雖有一事而闕事故息不轉。問何故在第四靜息無息不轉耶。率彼心細故。謂入出息依心轉。第四靜息以上諸地心極寂靜故息不轉。復次門轉故。謂息必依外心轉。第四靜息以上諸地心事轉故息不轉。復次極靜故。

謂息必依極動心轉。如人涉渇則動無動者琴動起入出息。第四靜息以上諸地心極寂靜故息不轉。尊者世友如是說。入第四靜息便得轉依。謂所依身。有第四靜息微妙大種令諸毛孔一切密含無際故非息所依。由此爾時息不復轉。大德説曰。入第四靜息心便不動。心不動故身(132b26)亦不動。身不動故息不復轉。

(133a5)問入出息。何地勤隨身繫耶隨心繫耶。有作是說。隨地勤。諸有欲令入出息隨心地繫者。彼說生欲界者若欲界心現在前。彼欲界心欲界人入出息隨欲界心轉。即此心所觀。即彼若初靜息心現在前。彼欲界心欲界人(133a10)息。隨初靜息心轉。即此心所觀。

(134a10)問此入出息為是長養。為是異熟。為是等流。答唯是等流。身中雖有異熟風及長養風。然入出息為是等流如契經說。佛告阿難。若如射箭篩管相續藕入出息不令者。應知彼名殊勝飲食。問何故。世尊說入出息飲食耶。謂無上妙飲食盈身。如有方便調人出息。亦無處惡飲食損身。如

無方便調入出息。是故世尊說為飲食。問如射箭篩管相續者為是義耶。答如以箭射於前箭後鵝箭為此中義。有說此中但順前後無間斷義。不說前箭射前篩義。又不定說如以箭射前篩義如契經說。有持來有持來有持來持時欲持時持去息。持中持來者。謂入息。持去者(134a25)謂出息如施設論說。吸風內名持來。引風外名持去。如鈔金師論。薙合風隨入出。此亦如是。有作是說。出息名持來。入息名持去有餘師論。煬息名持來。冷息名持去。復有說者。上息名持來。下息名持去。評此。此初說為善。能顯彼念名持時持去息。即於此念及此相應俱有諸法。若修若習若多所作。名修善持時持去息。問此持時持息生名。答慧為自性。然此眾中念力增故名以息。如四念住及住念住心性念慧為自性。然彼眾中念力增故名以息。如餘所習慧為自性。然彼眾中念力增故名以息。此亦如是。若於評

(134c26)復此持息念由六因故應知其相。一數二隨三止四觀五轉六淨。故有五種。一滿數二減數三增
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As far as I can see, there is no connection with the Udānavarga, but only with the 阿毘達磨婆沙論 (Abhidharmakośabhāṣā). In the examining Chin. version, we see that the Toch. version is abbreviated, i.e. a core description. But at the end of the Chin. text, it is almost identical (in my opinion, indeed almost word for word). This means that the Chin. version probably preceded the Toch., and that the Tocharian writer translated the Chin. in order to describe what he wanted to describe, namely, the breath.

If this is so, this is not an Udānālaṃkāra manuscript, but an Abhidharma text, like THT 9-10 supra.

VI. THT 299 ~ 303 (B-Toch.)

These manuscripts are fragmentary, but from the extant text we see a translation of the Udānāvarga and its commentary. Thus, these can be regarded as Udānālaṃkāra manuscripts. Paleographically they pertain to the same sequence and display a slightly older style of Murtuq.

THT 299r (T III M175.6, Udānāvarga XVI 9-24 Prakūṇakavarga, word to word Toch. translation, not bilingual, corresponding the Skt. text with underlines below, in meter 4x7/8)

1 /// (ke)fe yolo (yām)u yām-or*, krem-tsa ///
2 /// aiśaumye • srūkalhen-te āke(ne) ///
3 /// (mā) menṣtar, 12 kse saulne mā ///
4 /// (yaik)/ormen arkwēna piraṭ, 48 șa(mān)i ///

Toch.B 299v

1 /// onolmi • t(fus)/i(ā)ksa ///
2 /// yokaināsco • āyor*, nagh(sketra) ///
3 /// (we)str̥g 22 rīye no astāsśi po[tʃj] ///
4 /// (ce/)mā ikā(ske)mane su no causa ///

Udv.XVI.9ab: yasya pāpakrtam karma kuṣalena pithāyate |

---

47 According to Tamai 2011a, this manuscript belongs to level II-1 (p. 6). From the ¹⁴C-test of THT 367 (II-3), i.e. 737-773 A.D., this manuscript could have been written in the ⁶th – ⁷th c. A.D.
48 This is an imperative 2. pl. middle of Toch. ṣvār- “to make practice” (hapax) and is used for the causative of Skt. ṣbhū- “to effect” (Udv.XXVI.14ab bhāveya). This word represents a semantic translation of the Buddhist term. Cf. Tamai p. 208-209.
Udv.XVI.11cd: sa vai drṣṭa pado dhīra marañante na śocati ||
Udv.XVI.12cd: sa vai drṣṭa pado dhīraḥ śokamadhye na śocati ||
Udv.XVI.13ab: yo jīvite na tapate marañante ca sarvaśāḥ |
Udv.XVI.14ab: kṛṣṇāṁ dharmaṁ vipraḥāya śuklāṁ bhāvayata bhikṣavah |
Udv.XVI.20ab: ksetrāṇi trādosāṁ lobhadosā tv iyam prajā |
Udv.XVI.20cd: tasmād vigatalobhebhīyo dattam bhavati mahāphalam ||
Udv.XVI.21cd: tasmād vigataprabhebhīyo dattam bhavati mahāphalam ||
Udv.XVI.22cd: arakte virajā bhavati rakte bālo nirucyate ||
Udv.XVI.23ab: nagaram hi asthiprākāram māṃsāsonītalepanam |
Udv.XVI.24ab: hetuprabhavam sadā hi duhkham tad apāśyam sa hi tena tatra baddhah

Judging from the Skt., there may be four or five lines missing between the recto and the verso. Presumably there were eight lines in the original manuscript.

THT 300r (T III M146.12, Udv.XVIII 6-14, corresponding Skt. text with underlines below)
1 /// (mā yamash)k(e)/mJ(anen)/tJ/s(e) 6 makte ra(no) ///
2 /// (makte kroṣi)e pyāpyaimm ere were mā mī(yāsγm) ///
3 /// (āṃmantse) [n]o sāṃ, pal[k]joytṛga • sāṃ*, ///

THT 300v
1 /// [n](a)no makte pyāpyo no /poj// (commentary? See fn. 52 below)
2 /// n[fo] cmīlar*, astre were pal(s)(k)o ///
3 /// (aṅkāsγ)l[y]fi 50 (c)e(y⁺) 13 pyaŋyaim ///

Udv.XVIII 6cd: evam subhāṣīta vācā nisphalā (')sāv akurvātah ||
Udv.XVIII 7ab: yathāpi rucirām puspam varṇavat syāt sugandhavat |
Udv.XVIII 8ab: yathāpi bhramah puspād varṇagandhāv ahethayan |
Udv.XVIII 9cd: ātmanas tu samikṣeta samāni viśamāni ca ||
Udv.XVIII 10ab: yathāpi puspā?)raśībhyah kuryān mālāgunām bahūn |
Udv.XVIII 12cd: padmaṃ tatra tu jāyeta suciṣṭhandhi manoramam ||
Udv.18.13cd: praṇāyā vyātirocante samyaksambuddhaśrāvakāh ||
Udv.18.14ab: puspāny eva pracinvantam vyāsaktamanasāṃ naram |

I cannot find any obvious commentary in THT 299 and THT 300. Presumably these two manuscripts are a Toch. translation of the Udānavarga.

THT 301r? (T III M146.13, Udv. commentary?)
1 /// tanāṇa ///

49 Sieg/Siegling thought (1953, p. 191 fn. 5): “Da eine entsprechende Sanskritstrophe nicht vorliegt, dürfte es sich in dieser Strophe um den Rest des Kommentars zu den vorhergehenden Strophen handeln”, but if this strophe corresponds with Gândhāri Dharmapada 293a yada vi puspa-raśisa (Brough 1962, p. 165, Udv.XVIII 12), this part could be a translation of Udv.XVIII 10. Pāli version XVIII. 12 is our Skt. version XVIII 10. Judging from verse number 13, it could be verse 11, so the order could be changed. Sieg/Siegling’s fn. 6 (1953, p.191) also confused 10 and 12.

50 Sieg/Siegling mentioned in fn. 7 (1953, p. 191): “Udv.XVIII 13 schließt mit bhikṣavah”, but (akalṣg)iṣyij “students (ger. of vākl ‘to study’)” is a correct translation for the actual Skt. śrāvakāḥ.
2 /// .. r.m. ñśāsse ///
3 /// (pū)[i][a]nemmpa katāpūtanem., ///
4 /// .. || klā .. ///

THT 301v?
1 /// [d]urdume .. ///
2 /// e waṭ*, upāsakentse wa[t*], ///
3 /// yakṣaṇṇa wa[t*], ///
4 /// koyle wa[t*], ///

THT 302r? (T III M145.12)
1 /// kne : weṇa bhadrēṃś, ka[ru](ntsa) ///
2 /// (pa)[au]nasa makāykne : [p]. ///
3 /// .. main, pal[k]o i ///

THT 302v?
1 /// (is)p[e]k, l[y(a)ka [p]u(dṅakte) ///
2 /// (snai pā)rmanāk., kārstaū stām ra ///
3 /// sa : po ykentane iyakā[w](a) ///

THT 303 (Frgm.)
ar1 /// oṣsalem'em ///
ar2 /// rtse ts[m]etarne [w]i ///
av1 /// wa aįsāmñe .. ///
av2 /// kutspanem po trai ///
br1 /// ašēncai ya .. ///
br2 /// .. [li] ///
bv1 ..t..k ///
bv2 šaumosse [ā] ///

cr1 /// yknesa ///
cr2 /// .. stu .. ///
cr3 /// paįk*, yo .o ///
cv1 /// .. uwe [n]. ///
cv2 /// [o]nolmi ///
cv3 /// ..ş, a ///
dr1 /// .. mo pw. şş. [s]. ///
dr2 /// .. Ŧi, šşempta š.e ///
dv1 /// maiyyam • .. ///
dv2 /// .. warkānhe Ŧi ///

These manuscripts (THT 301-303) are too fragmentary to yield any information, although Sieg/Siegling sorted them among “Spruchpoesie (dictum-poetry)”. I find the word katāpūta
(301r3) in the Mahāvyutpatti (No. 4759), but not in the Udānavarga. Hence I would not count these manuscripts as reflecting either the Udānavarga or the Udānālāmkāra.

Conclusion:

According to Lüders alaṅkāra is a so-called embellishment for bauddhasaṅgīti, “the singing of the Buddha”. Therefore alaṅkāra would be correlated with a certain class of Buddhist scriptures, and Dharmasoma’s Udānālāmkāra in Tocharian would be representative of this class. The format can be summarized as follows: “prelude — main theme (Udānavarga) — postlude”.

We find similar contents in A-Toch. 217-218 (now THT 850-851), which contain the episode of the mendicant Upaga with some strophes of Ud.v.I. 1-7. The work includes only the verses of the Udānavarga, but also explanations that are written metrically, as in the case of the verse beginning with “the Buddha spoke”, that is then followed by a citation of the Udānavarga and ends with “the Buddha spoke this strophe”. The narrative parts are likewise written metrically. Hence I regard our Udānālāmkāra as a “work with verses” like other Toch. literatures, and the meaning of alaṅkāra “adornment” was lost in the Tocharian while the secondary meaning “commentary” remains.

We are sometimes given the title of a chapter at its end, for example dharmasomagāṇe udānālāmkārane mārgavārgāṃte parvese pāke (THT 28 a4) “the first part of the Mārgavarga in the Udānālāmkārā of the Dharmasoma (version)”. From this description the author could be Dharmasoma, as is the common opinion, but there is no such name in the Paris manuscript; we find this name only in the Berlin collection. Furthermore, the Toch. adjective suffix -āṇe is not attached to personal names, and thus I would like to suggest that this is a sect or school name in Tocharian Buddhism, or a work of Dharmasoma. The title is surely Udānālāmkāra, but this name is also found only in the Tocharian texts, and thus both of these names could presumably be autochthonous in Tocharian.

Sieg/Siegling have gathered all Udānālāmkāra fragments in the Berlin collection and published them under the title of “Die Udānālānkārā-Fragmente” (I find n before k not in THT, but in Lévi’s transcription), and found an Abhidharma annotation in THT 9-10 asubhabhāvana “die Meditation über die Abscheulichkeit des Körpers”, THT 30v3 dharmacakrapravartana “das Drehen des Gesetzessrades”, and THT 41 anāpānasmiṃ “das Achtgeben auf das Ein- und Ausatmen”. Inoue tried to verify this using the Chin. Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣā 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論 from a Buddhologic point of view, especially in THT 41, but I cannot verify Sieg/Siegling and Inoue’s opinion in the case of all manuscripts. We do not always find the characteristics of the Udānālāmkāra, i.e. “prelude – main theme (Udānavarga) – postlude”. THT 30 could be an Udānālāmkāra, but in my opinion THT 9-10 and THT 41 should be seen as an Abhidharma work. This means that the manuscripts treated in “Die Udānālānkārā-Fragmente” (THT 1-70) are not always Udānālāmkāra.

THT 299 and THT 300 are Toch. translations of the Skt. Udānavarga (not bilingual). THT 304-311 are Skt./Toch. bilingual manuscripts of the Udānavarga without commentary.

I have worked on the British Library Sanskrit Fragments in London and found many Udānavarga manuscripts written in a manner that is paleographically identical to Toch., writing, for example, OR 15009_663 for Ud.v.XXIII.20-XXIV.7, i.e. the writers were
Tocharian.

My hypothesis for the development of the Udānavarga within Buddhist literature is as follows:

pure Skt. → Skt. with Toch. translation (bilingual) → only Toch. translation → Toch. translation with commentaries (Toch. Udānalamkāra)\(^1\).

**Abbreviations and Symbols:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skt.</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THT:</td>
<td>Tocharische Handschriften aus Turfan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toch.:</td>
<td>Tocharian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ud.:</td>
<td>Udānavarga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ud.l.:</td>
<td>Udānalamkāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r:</td>
<td>recto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v:</td>
<td>verso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adj.:</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subj.:</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fn.:</td>
<td>foot note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.:</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.:</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl.:</td>
<td>oblique (case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp.:</td>
<td>past participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.:</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.:</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phoneme interpretation:</td>
<td>/ /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damaged akṣara(s):</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restored akṣara(s):</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correction:</td>
<td>( ← ) or ( → )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interlinear insertion:</td>
<td>« »</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omitted akṣara(s):</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superfluous akṣara(s):</td>
<td>{ }</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| lost akṣara: | "+"

---

\(^{1}\) The diachronical and synchronical standpoint of paleography (II-1 → II-3 or MQ → Murtuq) is shown in Tamai 2011a p. 82 sqq.
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Gandhāran Art*

Isao KURITA (Tokyo)

Nine years have passed since the publication of the second edition of my Gandhāran Art I, II. During that time, several important or interesting Gandhāran panels have appeared.

The Story of the Buddha’s Life (Figs. 1-21)

■ Fig. 1. The Dīparṃkara Story
   This story’s panel belongs apparently to the Swat school.
   On the left, we see the gate of the city of Dīpavatī, which is of the old Indian, Sanchi-style, found often in this school.
   In front of this gate, we would normally find a young girl, Gopā, selling flowers. However, here, instead of her, we see two worshippers standing.

■ Fig. 2. The Interpretation of the Prince’s Horoscope
   The ascetic, Asita, is holding the new-born prince in his arms in front of his father, King Śuddhodana, and predicting that he has all the auspicious signs of becoming a Buddha.
   This is a beautiful panel. The carving is very similar to that of the Mardan Group (e.g., Pl-IV of Gandhāran Art I) and probably was produced in the same atelier as well, possibly in Swat. Queen Māyā (or her sister, Mahāprajāpatī) is looking at him from the side. On the far left, a person can be seen who could be the brahmaṇa Naradatta, nephew of Asita.

■ Figs. 3, 4 and 5. A Celebration Banquet in honour of the Prince’s Birth
   The king is so happy to hear that the prince has all the auspicious signs of becoming a Buddha that he invites the ascetic to a banquet. Normally, in such a scene, we would expect to find only brahmaṇas having a meal, but in Fig. 3, only women, preparing and serving the meal, can be seen. In figs. 4 and 5, we see brahmaṇas eating with a woman serving. Presumably, she is the hostess of the banquet, i.e., Mahāprajāpatī.

* Professor Seishi Karashima of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University has kindly given me the opportunity to publish some of these in the Institute’s Annual Report, for which I express my heartfelt thanks. Also, I wish to thank Rev. Peter Lait for correcting my English.

Fig. 6. The Royal Chaplain introduces Yaśodharā  
There are not many panels of such a scene. This relief is beautiful and complete.

Fig. 7. Permission to Renounce the World  
On the left, we see the gate of the palace watched over by two guards, while on the right, inside the palace, there are 3 people seated and talking. It is possible that the person on the left, Siddhārtha, is asking his parents, who are seated on the right, permission to renounce the world. This is a very rare panel indeed.

Fig. 8. Muchilinda is protecting Śākyamuni  
The nāga king, Muchilinda, has coiled himself around Śākyamuni and has spread his head above Śākyamuni's to shelter him from the rain and wind. This relief is probably from Swat, whose carving is soft-toned and simple. 
On the left, 2 scenes tell the story of “The Buddha and the Black Serpent in the Fire Temple”.

Fig. 9. Offering of the Four Bowls  
Four lokapālas (the guardians of the four cardinal points) are offering stone bowls to the Buddha. One of them has already offered his. There are many reliefs depicting this scene, but this panel is one of the most beautiful. Its composition is almost the same as that in the Hirayama Collection (Vol. 1, no. 238). The first lokapāla, mentioned above, has a bird on his head, which is the same as found in the Hirayama Collection. Both reliefs are most probably from Sahri-Balol, though this a later work, i.e., the latter half of the 3rd century.

Figs. 10 and 11. The Buddha is Visiting his Family in Kapilavastu  
Śākyamuni returns to his palace—a dramatic scene—to meet his wife and son. There are only a few reliefs, which depict this scene, though two other panels have been found.  
Fig. 10. The Buddha is sitting on a chair, surrounded by cheerful-looking women. The one seated on his right is probably his wife, Yaśodharā. On the balcony, also seated, are King Śuddhodana and Mahāprajāpatī, who look happy to see their son at the palace, though Śākyamuni's son, Rāhula, is not present in this panel. This is a beautiful relief, possibly from Swat and if so, probably from Murgzar (Western Swat).
Fig. 11. The scene, on the left, shows the Buddha seated in the centre, while on the right, a woman (probably Yaśodharā) is standing hand-in-hand with a small child, who is probably Rāhula.

Fig. 12. The Buddha's First Sermon  
Often, a pillar with a wheel on it represents the Buddha. In this relief, the lions on top of the pillar support the holy wheel, i.e., the dharmacakra, which is the same as on the Aśoka pillar. Under the pillar, there are five monks, the three on the left are praying, while the two on the right are listening to the Buddha's first sermon.  
This is a unique and beautiful bas-relief with traces of gold leaf, probably from very
early Gandhāra.

Fig. 13. The Buddha, being invited by Śrīgupta (left) and an Offering of a Handful of Dust (right)

In nearly all such scenes, depicting the story of “the Buddha, being invited by Śrīgupta”, the Buddha and his attending monks are standing on lotus flowers, as stated in one sutra. Although we do not see this in the scene of the infant Buddha from Gandhāra, it is found often in the later period, for example from Borobudur.

Fig. 14. The Conversion of King Ajātaśatru (top) and the Buddha’s parinirvāṇa (bottom)

Professors Nakao Odani and Akira Miyaji speculate that this scene tells the story of the conversion of King Ajātaśatru, who imprisoned his father Bimbisāra and caused his death. After taking over the throne, he suffered great pain from his crime and so he converted to the Buddha’s teachings.

This is a very rare panel. One relief, depicting this story, is known from Bhārhut (Prof. Odani), though not from Gandhāra.

The Buddha’s parinirvāṇa

The disposition of the characters is almost the same as in other panels of this scene. However, one distinct point is that Māra and his daughter are depicted clearly on the right.

This is a very beautiful and significant panel. The carving is similar to or the same as that of the four panels in the Freer Gallery of Art (Vol. 1, nos. 31, 226, 280 and 483). Probably these reliefs were made in the same atelier.

Fig. 15. Guarding the Relics

The relics, which are on a draped table and covered with leaves, are enshrined in an arbour, supported by Corinthian pillars and housed in a Greek-style temple with Doric-Indian pillars and a triangle pediment. The heads of garuḍas are decorated on an acroterion.

The women in the temple are sobbing with sorrow. Two armed guards are standing outside the temple. In such scenes, the guards are always women.

The carving of the characters and their dress are typically of the Swat-style, though the temple structure is Greek.

Fig. 16. The Distribution of the Relics

The relics were equally divided into eight by a brāhmaṇa, whom we see in the centre, which was carried out in the palace. However, in this relief, we see a temple, the same as in fig. 15.

Figs. 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21. Panels from Buner

These five panels are probably from Buner, all in small pieces, around 15 cm. high. The stone is mellow green, peculiar to Buner. Nos. 55 and 137 (mistakenly stated as coming from Bajaur, are in fact from Buner). No. 162 (mistakenly stated as coming from
Zurumkot, is from Buner) and no. 289 in Vol. I and nos. 614 and 616 in Vol. II are of the same group. These bas-reliefs have been often referred to late (or so-called decadent) art. The carving is very primitive and simple and possibly one of the earliest in Gandhāran art.

**The World of the Buddha** (Figs. 22-56)

- Fig. 22. Music and dancing
- Fig. 23. Making and drinking wine, offering wine to a lion and flirting couples
- Fig. 24. Drunken people under a grapevine
- Fig. 25. A pedestal of the seated Buddha and a flirting couple
- Fig. 26. Bacchus (?)

- Figs. 27, 28 and 29. Animals
  - Fig. 27. Man and woman sitting on winged ketos, whose tails are like grapevines. Normally, in Gandhāran sculptures, we find a dragon fighting a man but here, they are friendly.
  - Fig. 28. Nara-Simha is a Hindu god. The stone is grey schist, the same as in Gandhāran sculptures. Also, the carving is similar to Gandhāran art. At times, we find early Hindu pieces like this similar to this genre.

- Figs. 30, 31, 32 and 33. Gods on lotus flowers
  - Fig. 30. The Buddha on water, with fire on his shoulders, a miracle story.
  - Fig. 31. A nāga, praying on a lotus.
  - Fig. 32. A woman with a mirror
  - Fig. 33. An angel

- Figs. 34, 35 and 36. Goddesses
  - Fig. 34 is one of the most beautiful sculptures of a goddess amongst Gandhāran art. She has a halo (broken) and is wearing a crown. She is also wearing a medallion, on which we see a standing figure similar to Heracles.
  - Fig. 35. As this woman, holding a lamp, has no halo, she is not a goddess but a layperson and is probably the wife of a ruler. It is said that this piece was found at the same site as a standing figure (Kushan ruler? Vol. II, no. 918). She is wearing elaborate earrings, which we see at times in gold.
  - Fig. 36. This seated goddess is holding a bowl in her right hand and a fish in her left. A wild boar (?) is eating at her feet.

- Figs. 37, 38 and 39. Stucco Bodhisattvas
  - Fig. 37. A well-preserved Avalokiteśvara, holding a crow.
Fig. 38. An almost complete Avalokiteśvara, whose colour is also well preserved.
Fig. 39. A very well-preserved and beautiful Maitreya with remains of red pigment. The head is probably from Kotera (Talbera), which is a village well known for beautiful stucco art.

■ Figs. 40～50. Unidentified

Fig. 42. This relief might depict the story of King Śuddhodana and the queen on an elephant, searching for Siddhārtha far from their palace.

Fig. 43. Two of the naked children’s heads have been retouched though the others are original. This is a strange and interesting relief from Swat.

Figs. 47 and 48. These are unfinished sculptures.

Fig. 49. This is just a fragment though quite a big and interesting one. The Buddha is surrounded by noblemen, dressed in Kushan robes. A similar panel exists (Vol. I, no. 592) but that one is of a Bodhisattva instead.

Fig. 50. A man with a moustache with a woman behind him.

■ Figs. 51～56. Seated Bodhisattvas and Buddhas

Here, we have late sculptures from northern Swat or Kashmir, which might not be Gandhāran.
A List of Writings
With Brief Bibliographical Notes

Appendix: Curriculum Vitae — A Succinct Autobiographical Record —

Akira YUYAMA

湯山明・略註付著作目録／附略歴

Prefatory: When I had reached the age of seventy-nine years, it occurred to me all of a sudden that I should perhaps prepare a list of writings and a biographical record — just for the sake of myself. In the course of preparation I found out that it was rather difficult even for myself to dig out the whereabouts of my writings scattered in the varied corners of the globe. Moreover, my memory might well be playing tricks on myself to recall an account of my past publications for the period of half a century. Furthermore, I realized that this task was much more difficult than I had thought.

Then I realized that most data of my publications I had made from time to time in the past might not be good enough, for it would become only a skeletal list of factual records. Thus I have decided to add some simple bibliographical remarks on my own writings — as brief and short as possible. I must confess in anxiety that my remarks may well be rather subjective, and therefore reflect unfair and unbalanced judgments. In principle the list follows the chronological order of publication.

On writing the so-called auto-commentary, I immediately found out again that it would not be that simple, in the first place as my private library collection is now far out of my reach in the midst of the metropolis Tokyo. Nevertheless, I thought that my notes must cover my personal comments or remarks on each item in addition, needless to say, to the comments or reviews published in the various periodicals.

To confess frankly, I am rather ashamed of myself, alas, that it was not easy to summarize my own writings in order to get to the real core of the problems. After all, I am also afraid that those data and records given below may well be of very little use for serious scholars in the related fields of study. I shall therefore only be too happy if in any case there be a little use from some of those items. To my regret, due to the lack of time and most probably of physical energy on top, I had to omit the originally planned indices to various names, topics and subjects. I wonder if I could do it in the foreseeable future.

Finally, therefore, I look forward to see every subject and topic concerned advance beyond my works for the future world of knowledge. I shall be thus delighted to receive your candid critical remarks. And very last but not the least, my heartfelt gratitude goes to my teachers, colleagues and friends in the past and to the present.

--- Hachioji, Tokyo, 28 January 2013
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0. **Abbreviations, including some unabridged short titles:**

1. **Proper Names, Organizations, Some Works, and the like:**
   - **ANU** = Australian National University (Canberra).
   - **BDK** = Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai 仏教伝道協会 (Buddhist Promoting Foundation, Tokyo-Berkeley).
   - **BHS** = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit.
   - **BN** = Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris).
   - **CAULLA** = Congress of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association.
   - **Chap.** = chapter.
   - **Chin.** = Chinese.
   - **CIABS** = Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies.
   - **CIAHR** = Congress of the International Association of the History of Religions.
   - **CISHAAN** = International Congress of Asian and North African Studies, formerly ICO.
   - **Dbbh.** = *Daśabhūmika-sūtra*, *Daśabhūmīśvara*-śruti.
   - **DNB** = Deutsche Nationalbibliothek (Leipzig & Frankfurt am Main).
   - **DOT** = Deutscher Orientalistentag (der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft).
   - **Dhp.** = *Dharmapada*.
   - **E** = East.
   - **Eng.** = English.
   - **Germ.** = Germanic, German.
   - **Gr.** = Greek.
   - **IABS** = International Association of Buddhist Studies.
   - **IAHR** = International Association of the History of Religions.
   - **ICO** = International Congress of Orientalists, later CISHAAN.
   - **IE** = Indo-European.
   - **IIIBS** = International Institute for Buddhist Studies/國際佛教學研究所 (*formerly*: RL, Tokyo).
   - **Ind.** = India, Indian, Indic.
   - **IRIAB** = International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University/創價大學國際佛教學高等研究所 (Hachioji/Tokyo).
   - **IsMEO** = Istituto per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente (Roma).
   - **ISSN** = International Standard Series Number.
   - **Jap.** = Japan, Japanese.
   - **JAIIBS** = Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Tokyo).
   - **KN** = Hendrik Kern & Bunyiu Nanjio (*SP*, ed. KN, St. Petersburg, 1908-1912).
   - **Lat.** = Latin.
   - **Mnd.** = Middle Indic.
   - **Mong.** = Mongol, Mongolian.
   - **MvAv** = *Mahāvastu-Avadāna*.
   - **NLA** = National Library of Australia (Canberra).
   - **PIE** = Proto-Indo-European.
   - **Pkt** = Prākrta(a), Prakrit.
   - **Pras.** = *Prasannapadā* of Candrakīrti.
   - **Rgs** = *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-samcaya-gāthā*. 
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RgsGr = Yuyama, A Grammar of the Rgs (Sanskrit Recension A) (= OMS, XIV) (Canberra 1973).

RL = The Reiyukai Library/霊友会図書室 (see IIBS, so renamed since 1982).

Skt = Sanskrit.

SP = Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra.

SUB = Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek (Göttingen).

Suv = Swatara(prajhāsottama-sūtra).

T or Taisho = Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō (大正新脩大藏經).

Tib. = Tibetan.


UL = University Library / University Libraries.

UP = University Press.

UvDh = Uṣṇīṣa-vijaya Dhāranī (佛頂尊勝陀羅尼).

Vkn = Vimalakirtinardeśa-sūtra.

2. Serial Publications:

AAWG = Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, III. Folge, Nr. ... (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

AICS = Anthem India-China Studies (London-New York-Delhi: Anthem Press).

BBSS = Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series, published under the auspices of the Group in Buddhist Studies and the Center for South & Southeast Asian Studies of the University of California, Berkeley, and the Institute of Buddhist Studies, Berkeley.

BCA = Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum (The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for UNESCO, Tokyo).

BIB = Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series (Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications - A Division of Indian Book Centre).

BIBPS = Bibliographia Indica et Buddhica: Pamphlet Series (IIBS, Tokyo).


BPPB = Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica (Hachijoji/Tokyo: IRIAB).


CSM = Corpus Scriptorum Mongolorum, Instituti Linguae et Litterarum Academiae Scientiarum Republicae Populi Mongoli (Ulaan Baator).


IT = Indica et Tibetica: Monographien zu den Sprachen und Literaturen des indoeuropäischen Kulturraumes, hrsg. Michael Hahn unter Mitwirkung von Jens-Uwe Hartmann et alibi (Swisttal-Edendorf – Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag).


OLA = Orientalia Lovaniensia, Analecta (Leuven: Departement Oriëntalistenk, Universiteit te Leuven).

OMS = Oriental Monograph Series (Centre of Oriental Studies / Faculty of Asian Studies in association with ANUP, Canberra).


RHA = Recherches sur la Haute Asie (Nanterre: Société d'ethnologie).

SASP = South Asian Studies Papers (Toronto: Centre for South Asian Studies, University of Toronto).

SBF = Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, hrsg. Heinz Bechert (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

SOR = Serie Orientale Roma (Rome: IsMEO).


SPS = Śārapiṭaka Series, ed. Rghu Vira and/or Lokesh Chandra (Nagpur – New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture).

ST = Studia Tibetica: Quellen und Studien zur tibetischen Lexikographie, herausgegeben für die Kommission für zentralasiatische Studien durch Herbert Franke (München: Kommission für zentralasiatische Studien, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften).


SVS = Samyag-Vāk Series (Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies).

3. Periodicals:

AARL = Australian Academic and Research Libraries (Official Organ of the University and College Libraries Section of the Library Association of Australia) (Melbourne).


ALB = Adyar Library Bulletin (Madras, renamed Chennai since 1996).


AO = Archiv Orientální (Warsaw).

AOH = Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae (Budapest).

ARIRIAB = Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Buddhology 國際佛教學高等研究所年報 (Hachioji, Tokyo).

ASRF = Annual of the Suzuki Research Foundation／鈴木學術財団研究年報 (Tokyo).

BBSANZ = Bulletin of the Bibliographical Society of Australasia and New Zealand (Melbourne).


BJSEAHS = 東南アジア学会会報・Bulletin of the Japanese Society of Southeast Asian Historical Studies (Tokyo).

BRI = Buddhist Research Information (Stony Brook, NY: Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions).


Chūgai Nippō = 中外日報, a newspaper specializing mainly in religious activities (Kyoto).

EB = The Eastern Buddhist (Kyoto).

EW = East and West (Rome).

HJIBS = 北海道印度哲学仏教学・Hokkaido Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Sapporo).

HB = Hokke Bunka 法華文化 (Institute for the Comprehensive Study of the Lotus Sutra, Rissho University, Tokyo／立正大学法華経文化研究所).

HBK = Hokke Bunka Kenkyū 法華文化研究 (Institute for the Comprehensive Study of the Lotus Sutra, Rissho University, Tokyo).

Human ヒューマン／A magazine published monthly by Ashita Shuppansha／Hotoke no Sekai-sha (Tokyo) [あした出版社・仏の世界社].

IBK / JIBS = Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies / 印度學佛教學研究 (Tokyo).


IJBS = Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies / 印度仏教研究
4. Commemoration Volumes:

Bagchi Volume = India and China: Interactions through Buddhism and Diplomacy: A Collection


Fujita Volume = 藤田宏達博士還暦記念論集・インド哲学と仏教 (京都・平楽寺書店, 平成元年) [Indian Philosophy and Buddhism: Volume in Honour of Dr. Kōtatsu Fujita on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1989)].

Hayashima Volume = 早島鏡正博士還暦記念: 仏教・インド思想辞典 (東京・春秋社, 昭和57年) [Dictionary of Buddhism and Indian Thoughts in Honour of Dr. Kyōshō Hayashima on the occasion of his 60th Birthday (Tokyo: Shunjū-sha, 1982)].


Hirakawa Volume = 平川彰博士古希記念・仏教思想の諸問題 (東京・春秋社, 昭和61年) [Problems in Buddhist Thought in Honour of Dr. Akira Hirakawa on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday (Tokyo: Shunjū-sha, 1986)].

Imanishi Volume = 今西順吉教授還暦記念論集・インド思想と仏教文化 (東京・春秋社, 平成8年) [Indian Thought and Buddhist Culture in Honour of Professor Junkichi Imanishi on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday (Tokyo: Shunjū-sha, 1996)].

Ishigami Volume = 石上善應教授古稀記念論文集・仏教文化の基調と展開 (東京・山喜房仏書林, 平成13年) [The Basis and Development of Buddhist Culture: Felicitation Volume in Honour of Professor Zen'ō Ishigami on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 2001)].

Katsumata Volume = 勝又俊教博士古稀記念論集・大乗仏教から仏教へ (東京・春秋社, 昭和56年) [From Mahāyāna Buddhism to Tantrism: A Volume in Honour of Dr. Shunkō Katsumata on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday (Tokyo: Shunjū-sha, 1981)].


Kumoi Volume = 雲井昭善博士古稀記念・仏教と異宗教 (京都・平楽寺書店, 昭和60年) [Buddhism and Heterogeneous Religions: A Volume in Honour of Dr. Shōzen Kumoi on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1985)].

Lienhard Volume = Sahnryyamāngalam: Studies in Honour of Siegfried Lienhard on his 70th


Mikasa Volume = Prince Mikasa Volume.

Mikogami Volume = 神子上恵生教授頌寿記念論集・インド哲学仏教思想論集 (京都・永田文昌堂, 平成16年) [Studies on Indian Philosophy and Buddhist Thoughts in Honor of Professor Esho Mikogami (Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō, 2004)].

Mizuno Volume I = 水野弘元博士還暦記念・新佛典解題辞典 (責任編集: 中村元・平川彰・玉城康四郎) (東京・春秋社, 昭和41年) [A New Bibliographical Dictionary of Buddhist Literature, ed. with responsibility by Hajime Nakamura, Akira Hirakawa & Kōshirō Tamaki (Tokyo: Shunjū-sha, 1976)].

Mizuno Volume II = 水野弘元博士米寿記念論集・パーリ文化学の世界 (東京・春秋社, 平成2年) [The World of Pali Cultural Studies: Volume in Honour of Dr. Kōgen Mizuno on the Occasion of his 80th Birthday (Tokyo: Shunjū-sha, 1990)].


Nakamura Volume = 中村元博士還暦記念論集・インド思想と仏教 (東京・春秋社, 昭和48年) [Indian Thought and Buddhism: Volume in Honour of Dr. Hajime Nakamura on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday (Tokyo: Shunjū-sha, 1973)].

Okuda Jio Volume = 奥田慈応先生喜壽記念論集・仏教思想論集 (京都・平楽寺書店, 昭和51年) [Buddhist Thought in Honour of Reverend Jō Okuda on the Occasion of his 77th Birthday (Kyoto: Heirakujī Shoten, 1976)].

Okuda Seio Volume = 奥田聖應先生頌壽記念・インド学仏教學論集 (東京・俊成出版社, 2013) [Essays in Indian and Buddhist Studies dedicated to Dr. Seiō Okuda in Celebration of his Longevity (Tokyo: Kōsei Publishing, 2013?/in press)]

Prince Mikasa Volume = 三笠宮殿下米寿記念論集 (東京・刀水書房, 平成16年) [Collected Articles and Essays in Honour of His Imperial Highness Prince Mikasa on the Occasion of His Eighty-eighth Birthday (Tokyo: Tōsui Shobō, 2004)].


Taga Volume = 田賀龍彦博士古稀記念論集・仏教思想仏教史論集 (東京・山喜房仏書林, 2000) [Essays on Buddhist Thought & Buddhist History Dedicated to Dr. Ryūgen Taga on the occasion of his 70th Birthday (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 2000)].
Takasaki Volume = 高崎直道博士還暦記念論集・インド学仏教学論集 (東京・春秋社, 昭和62年) [Essays in Indian and Buddhist Studies in Honour of Dr. Jikidō Takasaki on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday (Tokyo: Shunjū-sha, 1987)].
Watanabe Memorial Volume = 渡邉文雄博士追悼記念論集・原始仏教と大乗仏教 (京都・永田文昌堂, 平成5年) [Primitive Buddhism and Mahāyāna Buddhism in Memory of Dr. Fumimaro Watanabe (Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō, 1993)].
Yuyama Volume = see for details infra Id!

* * * * *

TB60AVolume = 財団法人東洋文庫・創立60周年記念特輯號／Collected Papers in Commemoration of the 60th Anniversary of the Toyo Bunko = TG, LXVI, 1-4 (March 1985).

5. Miscellaneous Words:
adj. = adjective.
adv. = adverb, adverbial(ly).
C = Central; Conference, Congress.
c = century.
comm. = commentary.
 cpd. = compound.
ed. = editor(s), edit(ed by).
facs. = facsimile.
f., fem. = feminine.
fig. = figure.
fn. = footnote.
fol. = folio.
ger. = gerund.
Hb, hb = hardback (or hardcover) edition.
hrgs. = herausgegeben (von).
ill., ills. = illustration, illustrations.
lit. = literature.
M = Middle (e.g. MInd., Middle Indic).
m. = masculine.
N = New (e.g. NInd., New Indic); north, northern.
n. = note.
nom. = nominative.
nt. = neuter.
num. = numerous.
O = Old (e.g. in OJap.).
opp. = opposite.
Pb, pb = Paperback edition.
prec. = preceding.
q.v., qv. = quod vide, “which see”.
Rec. = recension.
S = south, southern.
sg. = singular.
s.v. = sub voce, sub verbo, “under the word or voice”.
trsl. = translation, translated (by).
w. = with.
wt. = without.
I. Monographic Publications:

Ia. Monographies:


   [Contents: Catalogue References (Sanskrit Mss; Tibetan, Chinese, Mongolian and Hsi- hsia texts; Indic Mss (Cāṇaka-sāra-saṃgraha); a palm-leaf Ms in Oriyā); Chinese blockprints (non-Chinese texts from the collection of Hsū Ti-shan／許地山／1893-1941) - Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā, Samantabhadra-pranidhāna-rāja, Mañjuśrī-nāma-saṃgiti, Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā, Rgya-dkar-nāg rgya-ser kṣa-mi-ra bal bod hor-gyi yi-ge daṅ dpe-ris nam-granṣ maṅ-ba].


   [Contents: Catalogue References; Comparative Table of Chapters in Sanskrit and Chinese Versions; Part I: Sanskrit Texts of the SP – Editions, Modern Translations, Skt. Ms. from Nepal & Tibet, Chin. blockprint, Skt. Ms. from Central Asia and Gilgit; Part II: Appendices – Rāhulabhadra’s SP-stotra, Tib., Chin., Mongolian, Turkic & Hsi-hsia versions; Works on SP].

   · Reviews ·


   Friedrich Weller, OLZ, 70. Jahrgang, Nr. 2 (Berlin 1975), Sp. 180f.

   Giuseppe Tucci, EW, N.S., XXV, 3-4 (Roma 1975), p. 504f.

   Ernst Steinkellner, WZKS, XX (Wien 1976), p. 191f.


   Part II of the thesis in three parts submitted in 1970 for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the Australian National University in Canberra (degree conferred in April 1971).

   · · · Respectfully dedicated to Doctor Naoshiro Tsuji, Emeritus Professor of Sanskrit at the University of Tokyo by the author (on page 5). — [Naoshiro Tsuji (注直四郎: 18.XII.1899-24.IX.1979)].


   · Reviews ·


   Cf. infra II.22, a paper read at XXVIII ICO (Canberra 1971).

4. Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā (Sanskrit Recension A), edited with an Introduction, Bibliographical Notes and a Tibetan Version from Tunhuang (Cambridge /

Part I of the thesis in three parts submitted in 1970 for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the Australian National University in Canberra (degree conferred in April 1971).

To the Memory of the late Professor Dr. Franz Bernhard (on page v). — [Franz Bernhard (31.V.1931-05.IX.1971)].


[Contents: Introduction; Bibliographical Notes on Skt., Tib., Chin., Mong., Hsi-hsia texts; Modern translations; Rgs quoted by Candarakīrti; Commentaries; Rgs-Dhāranī; Skt. text (Recension A) with Pāda Index; Tib. Recension from Tunhuang; Bibliography: — Skt. text based on the single Ms. Kept in the Asiatic Society, Calcutta: No. 10736, dated 1174 CE*].

Reviews

Adelheid Mette, OLZ, 76. Jahrgang, Nr. 1 (Berlin 1981), Sp. 75f.


5. Vinaya-Texte (= SÜBSL, Teil I) (Wiesbaden 1979), XXIII, 54 p. — Said to have been reprinted several times.


[This series SÜBSL under the editorship of Heinz Behert (Göttingen) has been launched with the idea shown in my paper (1972) – cf. II.17 & 34 below!]

Contents in brief:- Vinaya der Sarvāstivādins, Mūla-°, Dharmaguptakas, Mahāśāsakas, Mahāśāṅghikas, Mahāśāṅghika-Lokottaravādins, Kāṣāyapiyas, Sammitiyas, & Vinaya unbekannten Schulen; Appendix – Ausgewählte bibliographische Angaben; Liste der chin. & jap. Personennamen]

Reviews

Charles S. Prebish, RSR, VIII, 1 (Hanover USA 1982), p. 98.


Dedicated to Dr. J. W. de Jong, Professor of South Asian and Buddhist Studies at the Australian National University of Canberra on the occasion of his sexagenarian anniversary – 15 February 1981 (p. vi). — [Jan Willem de Jong (15.11.1921-22.1.2000)]


[Contents: Introductory Remarks (p. 1-16); Skt. text reconstructed in comparison with the Tib. & Chin. versions & Eng. trsl. (p. 17-42); Table of Six Flavours (p. 43f.).] — cf. e.g. Chin. trsl. by Fa-hsien (p. 376: XII p. 868b21-c14 / Tib. e.g. Sde-dge 120: fol. 53a7-54a3; etc. etc.

— *A paper read at III CIABS – IAHR held at the University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, in August 1980.*

· Reviews ·


[Contents: Vorbemerkungen zu den Schildkröten-Erzählungen; Einleitung zu Skt.-Versionen in Vergleichung mit der chin. Version]. — *Cf. for further details II.26 below!*

· Reviews ·


· Reviews ·


· Review ·

— A digital edition available at BDK.

— BN n° FRBNF37090972 / Dewey Classification (22nd ed.) 294.3823.

À la louange d’Eugène Burnouf, le fondateur de la philologie bouddhique et des recherches sur l’histoire culturelle du bouddhisme (p. v).

To the Memory of Dr. Jan Willem de Jong (Leiden 15 February 1921 - Canberra 22 January 2000),
Professor Emeritus of South Asian and Buddhist Studies at The Australian National University in Canberra this humble work is dedicated by the author in Tokyo (p. vii).

[Contents: Burnouf as Father of Modern Buddhology; Louis-Mathieu Langlès and Alexander Hamilton; A Capital City of Skt. Learning; Oriental Studies in France & Germany; Creation of Chairs of Indology & Sinology in Paris; Arrivals of New Source Materials; The Lotus Sutra; detailed bibliographical notes on reference works (p. 79-188); Index to Personal Names]. — cf. infra II.61!

· Reviews ·


... I gratefully dedicate the present work to the late Professor Bernhard Kölver of Leipzig. ... I also wish to inscribe this book to Dr. Chi Hsien-lin, Permanent Professor of Oriental Philology at the University of Peking, pioneering scholar of serious philological research in the MvAv and ... ("Preface", p. x). — [Bernhard Kölver (02.IV.1938-27.XI.2001); Chi Hsien-lin (季漢林: 06.VIII.1911-11.VII.2009)]


Note: A lecture with special reference to the MvAv research was delivered at the workshop organized by Eshō MIKOGAMI (神子上惠生) on 25 September 1998 at the Institute of Buddhist Culture, Rikukoku University, Kyoto (龍谷大学仏教文化研究所) within the framework on a project (cf. infra II.79): A. YUYAMA, "A study on the MvAv" (with a handout in 3 pages distributed to the project members).
Ib. Monographic Pamphlets:

   — ANU Menzies Library: Pamphlet No. DSZ8456.598Y8; — IIBS-Library 180.323.


   A fragment brought back from Khadalik by Ellsworth Huntington (1876-1947), and now kept in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University, New Haven; cf. Ernst Leumann, "Bibliographische Noizen über zwei nordarische und zwei sanskritische Fragmente", ZDMG, LXVII (1913), p. 680; — now identified as the right end of folio 282 of the so-called Kashgar Ms: see Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka-Sūtra: Kashgar Manuscript, ed. Lokesh Chandra (= ŚPS, CCXXIX) (New Delhi 1976, re-impression in Tokyo 1977).


   * Review *


   In praise of Johannes Gildemeister (27 July 1812-11 March 1890), who published a useful bibliographical work: ... (on page viii).


   [The objective to provide with a series of A Bibliographical Guide for the Use of Students in Buddhist Sanskrit Philology is ‘to offer information about basic works of much importance and to facilitate and foster further research by serious students in the relevant fields’ (op.cit., p. v); — in my expectation that this series would continue further to various branches of Indian and Buddhist philology and be used by advanced students and/or fresh graduate students in the related fields of study.]


   Contents: Introduction, p. v-xi, Generalia, p. 1-4, Catalogue References, p. 5-15: Akhila Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad (Lucknow), Asha Saphur Kuthi (Kathmandu), Russian Academy of Sciences (Leningrad-St. Petersburg), Asiatic Society (Bombay, Calcutta & London), ANUL (Canberra), BN (Paris), Bir Library (Kathmandu), Bodleian Library (Oxford), British Library / India Office (London), Deccan College (Poona), Durbar Library (Kathmandu), Kaiser & Raj Collections (Kathmandu), Lalbhai Dalpathbhai Institute of Indology (Ahmedabad), Lü-shun Museum (Lü-shun 旅順), National Archives of Nepal (Kathmandu), National Library of Austria (Vienna), National Library of Nepal (Kathmandu), Ryūkoku University Library (龍谷大學: Kyoto), Société Asiatique (Paris), Tokai University Library (東海大學: Tokyo, now Hiratsuka), Universities of Cambridge, Kazan, Kyoto, Panjab (Lahore), & Tokyo, Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine (London); — Appendices, p. 16-28: Hodgson Collections, Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, Gigit Mss., Central
Asian Mss., Peking Blockprints, Rāhula Sāmkṛtyāyana Collection, Buddhist Skt. Ms. Fragments and traditional studies in Japan, Buddhist Skt. Ms. in Microform Collections.
— ISBN 4-906267-31-9 / LC Control No. 04168173, but LC Call Number information unavailable.

**Ic: Pamphlets Written and/or Edited Anonymously:**

1. *Rediscovering Our Heritage: Buddhism in Japan – a photographic exhibition*, organized by Lokesh Chandra & Akira YUYAMA, held at the Himachal Bhawan, New Delhi, in February 1985. 20 pages (with no pagination):

   Some contents: “Word from the Organizer”, by Dr. Lokesh Chandra, Director, International Academy of Indian Culture (p. 7); “Introduction”, by Akira YUYAMA, Director, International Institute for Buddhist Studies (p. 8 = A lecture delivered on 6 February 1985); “International Institute for Buddhist Studies” (anonymously written on p. 11-13).


   — An English version prepared in collaboration with the then Research Fellow, Dr. Tadeusz Skorupski: — ISBN 4-906267-26-2.


**Id: Commemoration Volume Received on the Occasion of the 65th Birthday:**


*Contents*

Paul Harrison and Gregory Schopen, “Preface”, p. vii-ix;

“Akira Yuyama: Major Publications”, p. x-xii;

“Contents”, p. xiii-xiv.


Helmut Eimer (*Bonn*), “The dKar chag to the ‘Supplementary’ (kha skong) Volume added to the Narthang Kanjur”, p. 23-32.


Yoshiro Imaeda (*Paris*), “À propos du manuscrit Pelliot tibétain 999”, p. 87-94.


Lewis R. Lancaster (*UC Berkeley*), “Narratives of Exemplars: Perspectives on Doctrine and
Practice in Early Buddhism”, p. 107-124.
Albrecht Wezler (Hamburg), “Medhātithi on the Role of Manu, the Prayojana of the Manusmṛti and the Incentive of the Brahmans to Study it”, p. 217-240.

Reviews
II. **Papers and Articles in Chronological Order:**


   A paper presented to the Academic Conference of the Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies, held at Ryukoku University, Kyoto, in 1962.

   The portion must doubtlessly have intended versified chapter as indicated in the colophon: *iti mahāvastu-avadāne niidāna-vastu-gāthā samāptā* (*MvAv* ed. Senart i.4.11). The question is how the portion could be reconstructed in verses.


   — Cf. further infra No. 76!

2. “*四天王寺見葉について*”, *Shitennōji, No. 278* (1963), p. 73-87.

   A paper on the palm-leaf fragment kept at the Temple Shitennōji, Osaka: - a Sanskrit fragment of the *Loka-prajñāpāti* (incl. the facsimiles of the manuscript fragment on p. 85-87).

   Published in the monthly journal of the Temple Shitennō-ji, named *Shitennōji, No. 278*, a special issue in commemoration of the completion of the principal buildings of the Shitennōji Cathedral (*Saṃghārāma*) system in Osaka [四天王寺伽藍再興特帳号]. — cf. also Nos. 32 & 44 below!


   An annotated Japanese translation of J. W. de Jong, “*Sanskrit Studies in The Netherlands*, *Indian Studies Abroad*, edited by The Indian Council for Cultural Relations, New Delhi (Bomay, etc.: Asia Publishing House, 1964), p. 60-64 (wt. n.). — Some information of the Utrecht school was made available on my visit through the kind offices of Professor Jan Gonda & his pupil Dr. Kiyoshi Yorō (陽淳) in 1965.


   Fragment SI\textsuperscript{152A} (A1-B6) = Kashgar Ms fols. 141b7-142b7 = *SP* ed. Kern-Nanjio 145.7-146.12.


   A bibliographical information related to the *MvAv*, such as bibliographical works, Skt. Mss., editions &
translations, varied studies on *MvAv.* — *Cf. supra* I.1.1ab; also *infra* No. 25!


Examples: *sambodhi-,* bodhi-,* ə- mêla-,* ə-samîpa-,* ə-maṇḍa-,* aśvâtha-,* vara-pâdapa-,* pâdapendra-,* vara-2,* simha-3,* druma-,* vara-3,* râja-,* varâ-pâdapendra-,* bodhi-druma-,* ə- drumottâra-,* ə-yasti-,* ə-vrksa-,* vrksa-mêla-,* ə-bodhi-.* — Much attention is paid to *sambodhi-.


A Spanish translation done by Fernando Tola and Carmen Dragonetti.


“The recent state of Southeast Asian historical studies at the ANU of Canberra”.


“The Vimalakirtinirdsâ’s quoted by Kamalaśīla in his Bhāvanākrama”:

In addition reference is made to the citation of the Vkn by Sântideva in his *Śīkṣāsamuccaya* (ed. C. Bendall, 6.10-11, 145.11-15, 153.20-22, 264.6-9, 269.11-270.7, 273.6-7, 324.10-327.4), by Candrakīrti in his *Prasannapādā* (ed. L. de La Vallée Poussin, 333.6-9) and in the *Ratnagotrabhāga Mahāyānottaratantarâstra* (eds. E. H. Johnston & T. Chowdhury, 67.1-2), observations are also made to Kamalaśīla’s citation of the Vkn in his Bhāvanākrama in comparison with the Tib. & Chin. versions, whenever available, e.g. Bhāvanākrama I (ed. G. Tucci, 194.8-11, 198.2-5) and Bhāvanākrama III (a single extant Ms, fol. 6a, cf. also 4a7-8 & 7a7-8). — *Cf. infra III.4!*


“The Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guna-samaçcaya-gāthā’s quoted by Candrakīrti in his Prasannapādā”.


“Remarks on the *Praṭīyasaumutpāda-gāthā*”: — in comparison with variant versions in Skt., Tib. & Chin., a verse found before the envoy of the *Ṛgs* Ms is to be reconstructed in an irregular Āryā-metre: ye dharma hetu-prabhavā hetum teśām tathāgato hy avadat / teśām ca yo nirdhā evam-vādi mahā-sramaṇaḥ //


Some peculiar readings from the text-critical & lexicographical viewpoints: *anu-* (of *anu-mātra-*, so Rec.B) for *anu-*1, so Rec.A; *Anovatapta-*, for the mythological lake *Anav*; *abhinirharate*, “attains”, *Āṭmarteṇapada; a-rānā*- “non-passion”; *en*, Mnd., always used with eva, for Skt. *eva eva*; a pejorative *ku-* in *ku-manyati*, “despisits”; *kuśala-*, for *s-mêla-*, “wholesome root”; *khet-,* “sálva, phlegm”; *gaṇthi-*, “knot”, a blend of Skt. *granthi- & ganda-; cudi-*, “crest, apex, top” (cf. Skt. *cûdikā-;* tâṅka-,”so much,


A shortened version of a paper read at the Special Meeting of the XIV CAULLA held in Dunedin, January 1971.


Miscellaneous notes on the Sanskrit texts of the Lotus Sutra including a detailed note on W. Baruch’s collation of SP Ms. then extant in Europe.


This article has become the starting point of my critical and systematic bibliographical works. Cf. e.g. Ia5: Vinaya-Texte (1979); also infra No. 34.


Rgs is composed exclusively in the metrical scheme Vasantatilakā (or also called Uddharpṣini, or Simhomattaa) in Skt. literature, with numerous variations mainly metri causa. Vasantatilakā is basically composed in 14 syllables: ta-bha-ja-ja-ga-ga-la. In this paper I have shown all the metrical variations on synoptic tables. This invites us eventually to Indic phonological questions.


A paper “Some Philological Problems in the Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā” read on 24 April 1971 at the seminar conference in Indian and Buddhist Studies at the University of Tokyo. — Cf. supra No. 14 ‘Introduction’!


— Dedicated in congratulation of his completion of the sexagenary cycle to Professor Chūbē Murata (村田忠兵衛, who passed away in 1982) at Osaka University of Foreign Studies, Osaka, Japan, who has always provided a stimulus to me with his wide and deep knowledge in Indo-Asian subjects.

“The Specific Characters of the Languages Used by the Indian Buddhists in Compiling their Scriptures”. — A revised version of a paper “The Languages Used by Indian Buddhists in Editing their Scriptures”, read before the study meeting on Asia at the University of Auckland in September 1973.

Discussing the characteristics of the Indic from the earliest stage to conclude that the Buddhists had tried to proclaim the teachings with the language in a specific area as the nucleus, trying to find the greater common measure of the surrounding dialects in harmony, so that it has become almost impossible to find the core of a specific dialect of the compiled texts. — Cf. infra No. 30!


“Topics on Indian and Buddhist Studies past & present in Germany”.


“The Tibetologist Alexander Csoma’s Study at Göttingen”: A hitherto unknown fact about the youth of Körösi Csoma Sándor: — Csoma’s dedicatory words inscribed on his books Tib grammar & dictionary to the University Library of Göttingen (written on 20 January 1835 most probably on his behalf by the then Secretary of the Asiatic Society of Calcutta, James Prinsep (1800-1840). This dedicatory word indicates that Csoma studied in Göttingen from 11 April 1816 at the age of 32 to the end July 1818. — cf. infra No. 49!


An annotated bibliography of the works on the Prajñāpāramitā literature by Edward Conze (1904-1979) compiled under my responsibility. This kind of bibliographical information is not given in the first edition (= Indo-Iranian Monograph Series, VI) (’s-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1960).


(b) Kuan-si-im Pusar, ed. W. Radloff, p. 40-42.

(c) Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā, ed. E. Obermiller, p. 74-76.

「仏教文庫」· 文献解題 (東京・名著普及会, 昭和53年): Supplementary volume to the Bibliotheca Buddhica, reprinted by the Meicho Fukyūkai (Association for Publishing Academic Masterpieces).


A paper read at the invitation symposium “Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung” held under the auspices of the Göttingen Academy of Sciences (4-7 July 1976), of which are participants: L. Aaldorf (Hamburg), H. Beichert (Göttingen), J. Brough (Cambridge), C. Caillat (Paris), P. H. L. Eggermont (Leuven), H. Härtel (Berlin), É. Lamotte (Louvain), K. R. Norman (Cambridge), G. Roth (Göttingen), G. von Simson (Oslo), E. Waldeeschmidt (Göttingen), A. Yuyama (z.Z. Göttingen). — Cf. supra No. 21.


Detailed text-critical remarks on the first two chapters of the Rgs., as Edward Conze has concluded that these two chapters represent the initial stage of the Prajñāpāramitā thought and may go back to 100 BCE. The two chapters both Indic & Tibetan are edited with critical apparatuses. — cf. supra I.4!


A full account of the palm-leaf manuscript once kept at the Temple Ganshōin – which is after all the so-called one preserved at the Temple Kōki-ji (高貴寺):- Texts in the Bongaku Shinryō (梵學津梁) of
Jiun Onkō (慈雲慈者・飲光: 1718-1804) with a photocopy (= 梵學津梁・巻第十一／本訳第一之五十一: 城州宇治田原戸松院所藏具葉); the text is also found in the Asharajō (阿叉羅帖／The Book of Ḍakṣaras) of Shimba (賢阿・宗源上人: 1786-1859). Textual analysis goes with reference to the *Suptasūryopama-sūtra: cf. Abhidharmacāṇḍikā-sūtra of Vasubandhu, ed. Pradhan (1936), p. 116.17-22; etc.

The text in facsimile available in Raghu Vira & Lokesh Chandra, Sanskrit Bijas and Mantras in Japan (= ŚPS, XXXIX) (1965), Facs. No. 2; — cf. also supra Nos. 2 & infra 45!


A lecture on the need for systematic bibliographies in Buddha. Skt. philology delivered at the Institute of South Asian Studies, University of Peking & Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, 28 May 1982: Translated into Chinese by Chang Jui-chih (張瑞芝). — cf. supra No. 17!


A report presented to the Plenary Session “The Progress of Academic Projects Concerning Buddhism” at the V CIABS (Hertford College, Oxford, 17 August 1982). — Reference is made mainly to the project of publishing the facsimile edition of the Derge Tanjūr, an exhaustive index to the SP in Skt.-Tib.-Chin. under the editorship of Yasunori Eima (江島惠教) in collaboration with others; an index made under the editorship of Musashi Tachikawa (立川武蔵) to the Tib. works in microfiche produced by the Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions at Stone Brook; a readable Eng. translation of the Chin. Tripitaka (Taishō edition) launched under the sponsorship of the Buddhist Promotion Foundation (= Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai, abbr. BDK), the founder of which is Rev Yehan Numata (沼田 惠範). — cf. infra IVc.II.2!

A report presented to the Plenary Session “The Progress of Academic Projects Concerning Buddhism” at the V CIABS (Hertford College, Oxford, 17 August 1982). — On some projects in this new academic institution carried out then, with a list of publications under my editorship: Studia Philologica Buddhica (Monograph Series & Occasional Paper Series), Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica (Series Maior & Series Minor). This institute has grown up to the present International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies (abbr. ICABS), now renamed International College for Post-Graduate Buddhist Studies, Also introducing in this short report the activities of the Department for Scientific Publications, Promotional Bureau, The Reiyukai, Tokyo, which has by then published:


Cf. also Suematsu’s introductory remarks on the inscriptions, *ibid.*, p. 319-324.

Deciphering and identifying the Skt. inscriptions on the bell — finitration of the inscriptions — critical reconstruction of the *UvDh* text — a Jap. trsl. of the *UvDh* with annotations — the Skt. versions of the *UvDh* found on the bells in Japan. — Skt. *UvDh* texts inscribed on the stones extant in the Jap. and the continental East Asia — *UvDh* texts published in the Chin. as well as Tīb. Tripiṭakas — Other *UvDh* texts preserved in other scripts — *Mantradhārāṇī* of the Temple Yeon-bog-sa bell.

— Cf. further *infra* Nos. 51, 66, 73, 95, 107-108, 113.


大乗仏教とその周辺 (平川彰・樫山雄一・高山直道編集) (= 講座・大乗仏教, 第10巻) (東京: 春秋社, 昭和60年).


“The Dawn of Indian and Buddhist Studies”. — Brief history with copious notes on such topics as inter-cultural exchange — Buddhist culture in Central Asia — Exaltation of interest in the Orient — after the opening of the Indian Ocean sealane — interest in Tibetan Buddhism — prehistory of the construction of Sinology — cf. infra No. 57!


“Two Ms fragments of the Chin. Text of Kumārajiva’s Version of the SP transliterated in the Tib. script from Tunhuang — Fonds Pelliot tibétain 1239 et 1269 à la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris”.

A brief description of the history of relevant studies — Chin. textual materials in transliteration - Two fragmentary Chin. texts from Chap. XXV (Samantamukha-partivarta: Avalokitēśvaravivaranaanirdeśa) transliterated in Tib. script; 1) the very beginning of the Chap. (2) only 42 characters (ed. Taishō IX: p. 56c17-20). — even such small fragments reflects various philological aspects in Asian studies.

A preliminary report was presented to the IV International Seminar on Tibetan Studies held in the Schloss Hohenkammer in July 1985, entitled “Bemerkungen zu dem in tibetischer Schrift transkribierten Fragment des chinesischen Lotus-Sutra aus Tun-huang (Fonds Pelliot tibétain 1239)”.


“A Block-print Skt Fragment of the Rgs from Turfan”. — On a fragment exhibited in the present Turfan Museum: - Examines the script, chronology, place of discovery; Text newly unearthed; Identification & reconstruction of the Skt. text in Laṅga script (fol. *11a1-b6 = Rgs. XIV:4-8). — Cf. for further details Nos. 65, 97, 99-100a below!


A revised version of a paper read at the University of Hamburg on 25 August 1986 on the occasion the XXXII International Congress for Asian and North African Studies.


A paper in Eng. read on 8 August 1981 at the IV CIBAS held at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, and a Jap. version on 26 August 1981 at the XXXII CIBAS held at Dōhō University in Nagoya.

The Kōkiji fragment transcribed with detailed reference to variant readings found in the manuscripts by Jin, Shūen, Lokesh Chandra and Oka, with further reference to the corresponding Tib. version in the editions Co-ne, Sde-dge, Peking & Stog, as well as the relevant texts from the Abhidharma-saṃbhāṣya (Skt. & Tib.) and the Saptasūryodaya-sūtra in Pāli (Aṣṭuttara-Nīkāya, LXII.8). — Cf. supra Nos. 2 & 32!


Serious text-critical — philological & philosophical — questions on the reading ... bodhisattvānām ca mahā-satvānām ca saṭ-pāramitā-pratisamyuktam ... (SP ed. Kern-Nanjio 17.15-18.1 / 18.12-14) — how to understand the passage in comparison with the variant readings, which lead us to varied
understandings from text-critical points of view, and thus how to reconstruct the original, if not impossible!


雑誌『ひゅーまん』(東京・あした出版社, 昭和62年8月号平～平成6年12月号／88回連載・挿絵多数), 総計362頁.

SP, trsl. from the Skt. into Jap. by Akira YUyAMA, Tsugumari KUBO & Katsuko KUBO. — Special attention was made to the Indic versions, particularly those found in CAsia. — cf. the next item 48!


An introductory essay in the form of Q & A on various aspects of the SP with special emphasis on the Indic versions as an appendix to the Jap. trsl. — cf. the prec. item No. 47!


— Supplementary notes on Csoma’s study in Göttingen: — cf. supra No. 24!


A paper read at the World Sanskrit Conference held at the Banaras Hindu University in Varanasi in October 1981. Serious text-critical questions on the reading ... bhagavān prabhūtaratnas tathāgato ‘rhan samyak-sambuddhaḥ simhāsanopaviṣṭaḥ paryankam baddhvā pariśūka-gātrah samghatita-kāya ... (SP ed. Kern-Nanjio 249.4f.): — how to understand the passage in comparison with the variant readings in Indic, Tib. & Chin. versions & the understanding of modern scholars beginning with the French translation done by Eugène Burnouf, the first translation in the European language.


The farthest eastern remnant of the Laṅ-tsha script — 開城 · 演福寺 (Yeon-bog-sa in Kaesŏng, Korea); — cf. for further details supra No. 39 & infra Nos. 66, 73, 95, 107-108, 113!


A detailed inquiry into the unique reading 逆路伽耶陀, found only in the ‘Sukhavihāra-Parivarta’ of Kumārajīva’s Chin. version of the SP, i.e. Taisho IX.37a24, to find out as corresponding to the Kashgar & Farhād-B.,g Mss reading vāma-lokāyata-, in comparison with other texts from Gilgit and Nepal. Many other text readings found in Indian religious traditions are also referred to.

With this article was awarded the Sakamoto Nichijin Prize (坂本日深学術賞) in 1991.


Complicated definition of ‘philology’ – Serious misunderstanding regarding ‘philology’ – Pitfalls of ‘philology’ – The need of fundamental works in pursuit of philological studies for the future.

— Cf. the next item No. 54!


A paper read on 8 February 1990. A revised version of this paper was presented as a keynote lecture entitled “Textual Criticism within the Framework of Buddhist Philology” to the symposium “Buddhist Studies: The State of the Art” held at the University of California, Berkeley, in celebration of the 20th

— Definition of ‘philology’ (Greeks, Romans & Babylonians; The term ‘philology’ in translation in other languages; — Background scenes of defining ‘philology’ (Explanations in encyclopaedias); Difference of nuance in philology (N. America, France & Germany); The root of variation in ‘modern’ philology (Sir William Jones: 1746-1794): An accumulation of intellectual energy brought to bear on ‘modern philology’ (Athanasius Kircher, Heinrich Roth, Paulinus a S. Brtholomeo, Johannes Grueber & Albert d’Orville, Papal envoy to the Empire of the Khans. After da Gama: Francesco Orazio della Penna; Ind. & Tib. alphabets; other figures in ancient times); Important figures in the earlier stages of modern Buddhist philology in the West: Pali studies (Rasmus Kristian Rask & Scandinavian scholars, Eugène Burnouf & Christian Lassen; Thomas William Rhys Davids & Pali Text Society; Wilhelm Geiger’s standard grammar; Pali studies after World War II); Sanskrit Buddhism (Brian Houghton Hodgson & Burnouf); Tibetology (Csoma Sándor & Isaak Jakob Schmidt); Sinology & Buddhology; Some present features & future perspectives in Buddhist studies (Area studies, Co-operation with Jain studies, Scientific embryo of Prakrit studies, American school of Indology: Franklin Edgerton & Buddhist Sanskrit philology); Misunderstanding of ‘philology’ (Examples of pitfalls in philological research); Importance of training in the relevant languages; Importance of Chin. Buddhist materials; Indo-Tibetan Buddhist studies; Systematic survey of Buddhist literature (computerized data systems — critical survey of primary & secondary materials); Basic steps to be taken in Buddhist philology; Co-existence of traditional/doctrinal & philological studies). — Cf. the preceding item No. 53!


Pāli Jātaka No. 215 “A Tortoise and Two Geese”; variations of the Kacchapa-Jātaka, e.g. in the Pañcatantra, Hitopadeśa, Kāthā Sarasīgara, Middle Javanese version of the Pañcatantra, etc.; cf. supra No. 147: Kacchapa-Jātaka (1983), p. xvi-xvii, for further details. — cf. the next item 55a!


A revised version of No. 55 translated into Spanish by Fernando Tola & Carmen Dragonetti (both in Buenos Aires).


The international conference of the dating of the historical Buddha held under the auspices of the Göttingen Academy of Sciences (Organizer: Heinz Bechert) in the ‘Haus der Heimat’ in Hedemünden in the middle of April 1985.

One may further refer to Gen’ichi Yamazaki’s article “Reconsidering the dates of historical Buddha — Retrospection of the history of controversy and criticism upon Bechert’s theory — ”, SBKN, XXXIII (2002), p. *1*-29* [[山崎元一, “仏滅年の再検討 — 論争史の回顧とベヒルト説批判 — ”]

The numeral pañcāśati- may well have meant originally “50” rather than “500”, in e.g. ... tathāgatasya parinirvātasya paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyēm pañcāśatvāyēm saddharma-vipraloṣe vartamāne ... (SP ed. KN 282.9-10 prose), etc., etc. Textual examples are also taken from the other literature, e.g. Prajñāpāramitā texts like the Vajracchedikā, Suvikranta-vikrāmī-pariprcchā, Aṣṭasāhasrikā, as well as the questions in the Lankāvatārasūtra; the number regarding the size of a bird; on the question when the Buddha taught the SP; on the varied length of time after the Parinirvāṇa, e.g. 700 years (Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvānasūtra); Mahāprajāpāti Gautami’s ordination and the duration of the true law (e.g. Bihksuni-Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins); antara-kalpa- with regard to the life-span of a Buddha; 50 or 500 in two non-Buddhist texts, e.g. Mahābhārata (Sāntiparvan, ed. S. K. Belvalkar, Poona 1954, p. 1349: XII.247.8 pañcāśatam, not m.c.) & pañcāśati- in the Rājatarangini (ed. A. Troy 1840, V71ab: dāsa-satī pañcāśatī-; trsl. Troy, II p. 205: “mille cinq cents”; but trsl. Aurel Stein, Westminster 1900, p. 195: “ten hundred and fifty!”).

“Miscellaneous notes on the materials for the study of the history of Indian & Buddhist studies”: — The beginnings of Indological bibliographies; increasing urgency of bibliographical work in Buddhist studies; bibliographical achievements in pursuit of the history of Buddhist studies; Indo-European comparative grammar & Indian & Buddhist studies; indispensable works by E. F. K. Koerner, Holger Pedersen, Ernst Windisch, Walther Wüst, Kiyozi KAZAMA (風間喜代三), Thomas A. Sebeok, Vilhelm Ludvig Peter Thomsen, Niels Ludvig Westergaard, Valentina Stache-Rosen, Dieter Schlingloff, Jan Willem de Jong, et alib. — cf. supra No. 41!


Treated are some topics as “Kūkai, his predecessors and successors”, “Fa-hsien (法顯), Hsüan-tsang (玄奘), I-ching (義浄)”, “Saichō (最澄) & the Tendai School”, “Textbooks written by Chih-kuang (智廣) & Fa-hu (法護)”, “Contributions of Takakusu (高楠順次郎) to the history of Sanskrit studies in Japan”, “Jiun (慈雲), Shūen (宗潤), Jōgon (浄巌), Donjaku (巌寂), Jakugon (寂巌)”, “Ind. — Chin. — Jap.”.


Some topics from the paper: The beginnings of Indology in USA — Whitney’s Skt. Grammar — E. W. Hopkins — Adolf Holzmann — The oldest Middle Indic elements — Charles R. Lanman — Maurice Bloomfield — Studies in narrative literature – folk literature — W. Norman Brown — Franklin Edgerton — Murray B. Emeneau, with an appendix on the reviews of Edgerton’s *BHSGrammar* etc.”.

— Cf. infra No. 86!


A keynote lecture “The characteristics of Kumārajīva’s Chin. translation of the SP as seen from the acceptance of Buddhist scriptures in Central Asia”, read at the conference entitled “The Gigantic Achievement of Kumārajīva’s Work in the History of Buddhism” held in Kyoto on 17 October 1993.

The acceptance of Buddhism, in other words, the understanding of Buddhist scripture was much wider and deeper than has been thought by now. This has been clarified as a result of archaeological research as well as various documentary materials. Kumārajīva must have acquainted himself with varied aspects of Buddhist tradition by promoting himself through his linguistic talent. Thus, the interpretative or commentarial soil has grown up in Central Asia. The most important thing of all is that he knew the tradition of the Lotus Sutra among others. — Cf. the next items 60a-b & also 64!


The above article No. 60 reprinted in the Newspaper *Chūgai Nippō*, No. 25072.


— cf. “Abbreviations”, under *Kumārajīva Anniversary Volume*!


Topics on Eugène Burnouf, the founder of modern Buddhist studies; private library collection catalogues of Burnouf & Langlès; Burnouf’s papers & letters; Paris as the capital of Skt. studies in the neo-humanistic era; Burnouf, Father & Son and Bopp; Burnouf & Max Müller; Hamilton, Schlegel & German Indology, Oriental studies in France & Germany; Additional remarks on Göttingen; Hodgson in Nepal & Burnouf; Burnouf, Father & Son; On & around the Asiatic Society of Paris & the Collège de

— A lecture “Some Historical Backgrounds of Burnouf’s Research into the Lotus Sutra” delivered at the regular research meeting held at the Institute for the Comprehensive Study of the Lotus Sutra, Ritsubo University, Tokyo, under the direction of the Institute, Professor Ryūgen Taka, in June 1992.


Loanwords brought to Japan via various routes: e.g. Buddhist technical terms via Chinese (e.g. dhāranī/陀羅尼, ‘darani’), those used by lay people (e.g. naraku, ‘hell’/奈落, ‘naraku’; stage-cellar, trapdoor); proto-J. words via Malayo-Polynesian (e.g. hamsa/‘秋沙, ‘akissa, euphonized *aisa* of *kamo*; goose’ (cf. supra No. 20); Indic of non-IE origin via Chin.? (e.g. kapāla, ‘cup, skull’/瓦, Olap. *kapara, kowara = roofing tile’; MInd. and/or CAsian Pkt. (e.g. Skt. upādhyāya/和上・和尚, kasho, wajō); NInd. via Anglo-Ind. (e.g. bungalow, ‘パンガロー’), etc. — Cf. supra No. 20!


The lecture of a seminar offered in the winter semester 1995-1996 at the University of Hamburg (*Institut für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibet*) together with Professor Lambert Schmithauser.

The lecture on the topic was delivered on 14 June 1996 at Göttingen (*Seminar für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde der Georg-August-Universität Göttingen*) under the chairmanship of Professor Heinz Bechert.


Seeking Kumārajīva’s ‘interpretative’ attitude towards his Chin. translation of the SP (406 CE), taking Chapter V: *Oṣadhi-parivarta* 藥草喫活 (as a significant example. — Cf. supra Nos. 60, 60a & 60b


Detailed text-critical examination of Rgs XXVII.3, as holding the canonical status, which has been regarded as the source material of the thought of ژي-byed-pa School led by Pha-dam-pa from SInd. in the 12th c.-Tibet. Also examines the transmission of variant Rgs versions in Asia. — cf. also supra No. 43 & infra Nos. 97, 99-100a.


“Philological Problems in the Lotus Sutra” — Magnetism of the SP - A page of the history of studies in the Skt. texts — Needs for philological & bibliographical work — What are the ‘original’ texts — Discovery of Skt. Ms.s and the beginnings of Buddhist philology — Willy Baruch’s collation of Skt. Mss. — Some notes on the Romanization of Skt. Ms.s.


“Notes on Buddhist Narrative Literature: (1) ‘Remarks on the Chākōsen (注好選), III-10: ‘A Pair of Geese Flying with a Tortoise’”. — With reference to the relevant narrative stories in various versions as far as known to us in various languages — one of the most beloved stories — transmission of the story to other cultural areas — discovery & various versions of the Chākōsen — varied similar stories. — cf. infra No. 112!


“Notes on Buddhist Narrative Literature: (2) ‘Two Geese and a Tortoise’: An Annotated English Translation: ‘Two Geese Flying Away with a Tortoise’ (Chākōsen, III-10)”.


“Notes on Buddhist Narrative Literature: (3) ‘Additional Remarks on ‘A Pair of Geese Flying with a Tortoise’ (Chākōsen, III-10)”.


“CPD — A Research into Its Background History”. — Traditional Danish interest in the Orient — Tradition of Pāli studies in Denmark — A brief survey of Pāli lexicography — Universal value with distinctive characters — Present state and future problems of the CPD.


— Cf. supra Nos. 69, 69ab & infra No. 112!

A text found in the Kāraṇḍavyūha and other texts: Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal, reproduced by Lokesh Chandra from the Collection of Prof. Raghubirā (= ŚPS, CCLXVIII) (1981), Ms fol. 11a-13a = Funs. fol. 332-336 (numbered by Lokesh Chandra):

A text-critical study in comparison with the versions at Chu-yung-kuan (居庸關) & Yeon-bog-sa (演福寺), and of Tz’u-hsien (慈賢). — Dedicated to Āryavyūha (聖嚴法師): श्रमभवन्त्वाधिशः !

Cf. supra Nos. 39, 51, 66 & infra Nos. 95, 107-108. 113!


Philological examination of the usage of the Mahāvastu and Mahāvastu-Avadāna. — cf. supra No. II.1ab!


Philological questions regarding the Fan-yü Tsa-ming (梵語雑名) of Li-yen (利言) in the T’ang period: Taisho No. 2135: Vol. LIV, p. 1223a21-1241b4. — A revised version of the paper read before the XXXIV CISHAAN, held in Hong Kong in August 1993, and dedicated to Gadjin M. Nagao (長尾雅人: 1907-2005) on the occasion of his 88th Birthday.


A paper for revisiting the Nidāna-vastu-gāthā of the MvAv: cf. supra No. 1 for further details.


A report on the Project: ‘Philological Studies of Skt. Mss.’, written by Eshō MIKOGAMI, Akira YUYAMA & Kazunobu MATSUDA: a research project undertaken with the financial aid of the Promotion and Mutual Aid Corporation for Private Schools of Japan, — cf. supra Ia.11b.


“Introduction of Eugène Burnouf’s trsl. of ‘The Herb’, Chapter V of the SP, onto the North American Continent — In search of the earliest stage of Buddhist philology — "- Buddhism spread eastward & westward; Burnouf’s trsl. work of the SP, and its publication; Edward Elbridge Salisbury (1814-1901) at Yale & Burnouf (1801-1852) in Paris; Introduction of Burnouf’s trsl. of the SP to NAmerica by Henry Thomas Thoreau (1817-1862). — Cf. supra No. Ia.10, No. II.61, & infra No. II.98!


But further reference may have to be made to an enlightening article by Tadeusz Skorupski, “An Analysis of the Kriyāsamgraha”, Yuyama Volume (1998), p. 181-196!


Topics on Bagchi in his motherland, Bagchi’s scope beyond the subcontinent, Bagchi & China, Bagchi & French scholarship, Sino-Indian scholarly friendship. — A brief note on Bagchi was written at the request of the Bagchi Commemoration Volume editor but no reaction had been received from him or publishers (cf. infra No. 110 note). — For my additional remarks see ARIRIAB, VI: 2002 (2003), p. 342.

N.B. This article has been reprinted in the Bagchi Volume (2011), p. 231-243.


Attention is drawn with copious notes to the texts cited by the Madhyamaka masters in brief: e.g. Pitāputra-samāgama-sūtra quoted by Kamalaśīla in his Bhāvanākrama I, Śāntideva in his Śīksāsamuccaya and Prajñākaramati in his Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā (cf. MvAv, ed. Senart, III.90.11-125.4); Svārurvaprabhāsottama-sūtra, ed. Nobel, p. 251-27.5, may be referred to Śāntideva’s Śīksāsamuccaya, ed. Bendall, p 160 n. 5; Bhikṣu-prakīrṇaka of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins, cited by Śāntideva in his Śīksāsamuccaya, ed. Bendall, p. 154.17-155.2 (cf. infra No. 85); Rgs cited by Śāntideva in his Prasannapadā, ed. de La Vallée Poussin, p. 166.11-167.2, p. 167.4, p. 353.8-354.2, and p. 524.1-4. — cf. supra Nos. 10-11, 28 & infra No. 97!


One must distinguish restoration from translation and emendation, for example the Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa cited by Kamalaśīla in his Bhāvanākrama III, ed. Tucci, p. 137-9; Skt. words reconstructed in parentheses within translations. — cf. also supra No. 10 & infra 89!


Dedicated to Josef Korda (*06 August 1933), President, Oriental Institute, Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, in celebration of his seventieth birthday.


To Wilhelm Halbfass (1940-2000), who, with his feet set firmly on the American soil, making Philadelphia as his working base, has rendered great services to the cause of learning and opened a new era in academic circles all over the world, this humble prologue to the nectar-bearing BEEs is dedicated.

To this article are appended the “Bio-Bibliographical Source Materials” to particular personalities, i.e. Leonard Bloomfield (1887-1949), Maurice Bloch (1855-1928), William Norman Brown (1892-1975), Eugene Watson Burlingame (1876-1932), Hermann Collitz (1855-1935), Franklin Edgerton (1885-1963), Murray Barns Ebenezer (1904-2005), Edward Washburn Hopkins


The following topics written in Jap.: — Topics on the difficult international projects (e.g. ABIA = Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology; Bbl.boudhh. = Bibliographic boudhhique), Projects under the sponsorship of the European academies (e.g. SUBS = Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur), Projects under the umbrella of the Union Académique (e.g. CPD = A Critical Pali Dictionary, WTW = Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, CIS = Corpus Iuris Sanscriticum); “Werner Jacobsens Samling (Royal Danish Library, Copenhagen)”. — cf. infra No. 111 for the Royal Danish Library collections!


To the Memory of Ronald Eric Emmerick — Dedicated in memoriam to the late Ronald E. Emmerick (09.III.1937-31.VIII.2001).

I. Turfan fragment of the Suvannaprajabhāsottama-sūtra (abbr. Suv); II. Śāntideva’s citation of the Suv. III. Further on some other versions in Inner Asia; IV. Tibetan versions of the Suv.; V. Once again on the Turfan fragment of the Suv.; VI. Śāntideva’s yet another citation from the Suv.; VII. Indic fragments of the Suv. from Central Asia (Mannheim fragments, Hoernle Mss, St. Petersburg fragments, Otani fragments; VIII. Aftermath remarks. — Appendix: Table of Contents.


“Miscellaneous Notes on the Island of लङ्का”:: — तम्ब्रार्पणि (संस्क. tāmra-parṇi, *-varṇa-, *-vana-?) in the classical world of Europe – Prēpius Maris Erythraei - Dutch 'Adamsberg' in early modern Japan (e.g. 'Grāhakūta in Ceylon' by Shiba Kōkan 司馬江濤: 1747-1818) — variously meant tāmra-. A group of 500 merchants shipwrecked in the ocean, etc. — cf. infra Nos. 93 & 105!


Suṣṭrā on the Arabian Sea in the Yemen territory – Chʻian-chou (泉州) & Trades in the South Seas – Oceanic trades / 500 merchants shipwrecked around the island of Rākṣasas – *Fa-hsin-gala, a grotto dwelt by Fa-hsien (法顯) etc. – The Lankāvātāra-sūtra – Robert Knox in the Island of Lañkā (1659-1679); cf. supra No. 90 & infra No. 105!


Filling in the blank space with columnistic short notice on p. 269 (遊余白): Reflections on Siddham script in Japan with reference to some recent publications.


§1. Amoghavajra’s comm. on the UVdh — In search of the materials in dreamland on Skt. research in early modern Japan: 1) Amoghavajra’s text & comm. on it (佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・仏頂尊勝陀羅尼注義), Amoghavajra’s comm. in Ms preserved once in the Temple Shinnyo-in (真如院) at Ueno; Ryūin-ji Temple (靈雲寺) & Konjōin (根生院) at Yushima; a comm. ed. by Ryūkan (龍肝); — §2. Under the pretext of Hodgson in Nepal — The earliest stage of modern Buddhist studies and the future (— incl. such topics as Skt. Mss of good quality — Bibliographies on Nepal). — §3. Sde-dge Par-khañ (德格印經院).


To Ellis Gene Smith in Celebration of his 70th Birthday:— See ‘Prefatory’, p. 3-5.


This paper is a revised and enlarged version of the one written several years ago for the commemoration volume to Gene. I decided to rewrite it to express my deep gratitude and friendship to him, as I received no reaction to my queries into the felicitation volume either from the editors or publishers (either in Barcelona or Dharamsala). — cf. infra No. 99.


This article written for this commemoration volume has appeared without my notice after very long silence. I have thus made a revised and enlarged version (= No. 97). — cf. supra Nos. 42, 65, 97 & the next item 100/100a!


I had decided to present this humble piece of work to Dieter, who had contributed a great deal to the world of knowledge in particular in the most difficult time after the World War II: see my laudatory remarks on Schlingloff’s achievements.

To my great pleasure, I could decipher the unclear portions of the original blockprint thanks to the very clear facsimile of the fragment in a book edited by Li Hsiao, Hou Shih-hsin & Chang Yung-ping: 李謙編/侯世新 /張永兵副主編, 吐魯番文物精粹 / Selected Treasures of Turfan Relics (上海・上海辭書出版社, 2006), p. 189. The unclear portions are the serial numbers of verses of the Rgs in the letter numerals. — Cf. supra Nos. 43, 65, 97, 99!

100a. 再録・中国関係論語資料第五十号・第一分冊 (平成二十年分) (哲學・宗教・文化), 下巻 (東京・論語資料保存会, 2010), p. 157-160.

— No. 100 reprinted in this collection of articles on philosophy, religion and culture of China.


A revised English version of the item No. 100 above. — With a laudatory preface on Dieter.


“The development of the former Ōhashi Public Library as seen from the viewpoint of a Buddh. Philologist”. — The succinct background history of the Ōhashi Library, originally a ‘private’ public
library, an extremely rare case in Japan, now affiliated to the Sanko Research Institute for the Studies of Buddhism in the midst of the metropolitan Tokyo. — The Akira YUYAMA private library collection has been donated to it for the use of young students in Buddhist Philology from abroad & at home.


— To Lambert Schmithausen in Celebration of his Sixth Birthday in the Duodecimal Cycle —

“Eine erweiterte Version der Uṣṇīṣa-vijaya Dhāraṇī: Der in der Yüan-Zeit überlieferte Text”: The text critically edited in Devanāgarī script on the basis of the version recovered recently among the Hsi-hsia (西夏) in comparison with those found on the wall of the Chü-yung-kuan (居庸関) and the bell found in the Temple Yeon-bog-sa (演福寺) in Gaesong (開城) in Korea, and some others extant in China at present (永樂大鐘) and from among the Turfan findings in Berlin. — Cf supra Nos. 39, 51, 73, 95 & next No. 108!


To the above article 107 is appended in Jap.: “A personal laudatory remark on Lambert Schmithausen on the occasion of his 72nd birthday”.


§1. The UvDh transmitted among the Tanguts (Hsi-hsia 西夏). — §2. The UvDh inscribed on the Chü-yung-kuan (居庸關) & Yeon-bog-sa (演福寺). — §3. A block-print text found in Kao-ch’ang (高昌) in the Turfan area. — §4. The UvDh brought to Korea by Šūnishi (指空, or Dhyānabhadra/禅贤: 1236-1363) from Central India. — §5. The UvDh cast on the Great Yung-lê Bell (永樂大鐘). — §6. The UvDh found in the texts preserved in Chin. (Taiso Nos. 1319-1320). — cf supra Nos. 39, 51, 66, 73, 95 & the prec. No. 107!
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Introducing the splendid publication of the subtle catalogue of Skt. Ms preserved in the Royal Library of Copenhagen, ed. Hartmut Buescher (Copenhagen 2011).


113. “西夏流傳仏頂尊勝陀羅尼 — 黒水城・北京・開城間の伝播考”, 奥田聖應先生顕寿記念・インド学仏教学論集 (“The Uṣṇīṣa-vijaya Dhāraṇī Recovered Newly among the
— cf. supra Nos. 39, 51, 66, 73, 95 & 107!

III. **Reviews — Introducing New Publications — Short Notices:**


— *Published in the name of the Research Department of the Suzuki Research Foundation.*


IV. Articles to Dictionaries, Prefaces, Bulletins, Essays & Tripartite Talks:

A. Contributions to Dictionaries (either specific or bibliographic):*

1. Contributions of Articles to Mizuno Volume (1976):

a) “マーヴァストゥ / Mahāvastu (MAvH), ” p. 70a-71a.

b) “仏本行集経 / Fo-p'en-hsing-chi-ching”, p. 71a-b.

a') “Addenda” to the second edition (1986), p. 436b-437a “増補 (マーヴァストゥ)”.


b) “写本／Manuscripts”, p. 188b-189a.

c) “仏教文学／Buddhist literature”, p. 395b-396a.

3. Contribution of an Article to a dictionary on Buddhism:


4. Contribution of an Article to a dictionary on linguistics:


* A short period of editorial/compilatory collaboration, e.g.:


B. Prefaces/Postscripts to Academic Publications:


3a. “Preface” (in Jap.) to this item, p. 61-65.

[注: *はじめに* — 上掲書和文部：国際シンポジウム・仏教と自然].


5. “Greetings (written anonymously — on publishing the inaugural issue),” ARIRIAB, I: 1997 (1998),
[“編集後記”，創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報，平成9年度 (創刊号) (1998)].

**C. Bulletins: Reports of Academic Activities:**

I. Reports on the RL & IIBS academic activities published in the *Myōhō* [“衆友会の学術活動”]:


<Three pillars of academic activities: 1) Collecting research materials on internationally high standard. 2) Academic intercourse with domestic & overseas scholars & institutions. 3) Academic publications>


<Collecting research materials published not only at home but also from abroad – regardless of languages, Chi., Skt., Pāli, Tib., Mong., etc. – Those collections are shelved on single specified places regardless of languages>

— (3) *Academic Intercourse with Scholars and Research Organizations (1) [学者や研究機関との学術交流 (1)]*, *Bulletin*, 3 (Summer 1980), p. 57.

<World-wide contacts with academics – Yuyama, Regional Secretary for Asia, IABS – Kubo & Yuyama giving lectures in various universities in their special fields>


<Academic intercourse with not only renowned scholars but also young & promising scholars>


<Introducing among others an invited young scholar, Dr. David A. Utz, a specialist in Sogdian Buddhist literature>


<Introducing Professor Lambert Schmithausen of Hamburg University, a world-renowned scholar>

— (7) *ibid. (3) [同上 (三)]*, *Bulletin*, 7 (Summer 1981), p. 245.

<Introducing two invited young & promising scholars, Dr. Gregory Schopen, now Professor at UCLA & Dr. Paul M. Harrison, now Professor at Stanford University>

— (8) *ibid. (4) [同上 (四)]*, *Bulletin*, 8 (Autumn 1981), p. 120.

<Introducing a guest, Professor Michael Hahn, then at Bonn and now at Marburg Universities in Germany>


<Academic intercourse with the National Library of Royal Kingdom of Bhutan (est. 1967); Dr. A. Yuyama’s visit to Bhutan at their invitation, and introducing grand savant, Reverend Pemala, National Librarian of Bhutan, a guest of the Reiuyakai Library in November 1981>

— (10) *Establishment of the International Institute for Buddhist Studies: Receiving worldwide high appreciation and expectation [国際仏教学研究所が発足／世界的に高い評価と期待集めて]*, *Bulletin*, 10 (Summer 1982), p. 142f. (incl. a b/w ill.).

<Reference may be made to the Newspaper *Chūgai Nippō* (中外日報) published on 16 April 1982>
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<Special attention may be made to the Gilgit Mss of the SP, ed. by S. Watanabe (2 vols. 1972-1975) & Oskar von Hinüber (1982); Kashagr Ms, ed. Lokesh Chandra (1977); and many others>

“— (14) Deepening the interchange with the members of the IABS on the occasion of the CISHAAAN [「国際東洋学会議」を機に国際仏教学会員との交流深まる]”, Bulletin, 14 (Summer 1983), p. 158f.


<Special mention may also be made to the fact that Dr. A. Yuyama acted Local Secretary to 6th CIABS, and IIBS hosted a reception to which His Imperial Highness Prince Mikasa attended (2 September 1983)>


<Special attention drawn to the collections of the various editions of the Tibetan Buddhist materials>


<Attention may be drawn to varied activities and the list of publications in the pamphlets introducing IIBS (both in Jap. & Eng.):— cf. for further details supra loc:2-3!>

II. Reports of Some Other Academic Activities published in the BRI:

The following three reports were read on 17 August 1982 for the plenary session of the Vth CIABS held at Hertford College, University of Oxford, Oxford (16-21 August 1982):— cf. supra II.35-37!


D. Essays for the General Public (written in Japanese):


382
to each volume. — ISBN 978-4-26600024-0. — cf. infra VIII.

3. “Buddhism & Buddhist Research onto the International Stage [仏教と仏教学を国際舞台へ]”,

**E. Tripartite Talks for the General Public:**


   [久保能成・沼田明・浜武次郎: “シリーズ対談‘21世紀と法華経’／精神文化・行き詰まりの一側面”], 雑誌『ひゅーまん』(東京・あした出版社, 昭和61年〜62年初頃)]

**V. Articles / Essays either in press or gone astray:**

*Note: Regarding the first three, no reaction since the typescript for publication was sent to the editors.*


3. “In Praise of Prabodh Chandra Bagchi”, *Prabodh Chandra Bagchi Birth Centenary Commemoration Volume* (Calcutta), ca. 3 pages. (Written in ca. 1997 — cf. supra II.82!)

4. “パシャム教授を偲びつつ [In Memoriam the late Professor A. L. Basham]”, An essay to the separate bulletin of the second revised edition of a Jap. trsl. of his “The Wonder that was India”, ca. 6 p. (Written in 2005) ----- Tokyo: Sankibō BUSHORIN.

**VI. Editorships in chief of Serial Works:**


**VII. Advisory to some textual / philological works:**


— e.g. together with a bibliographical work — supra II.27: Conze (Tokyo 1978);

— e.g. together with photographic collaboration to Oskar von Hinüber, *A New Fragmentary Gilgit Manuscript of the SP* (Tokyo 1982).


**VIII. Books published under my supervision:**

湯山明監修・山内ジョー写: まんが・ジャータカ物語／仏教童話集／二巻: △人間編☆動物編△ (= いんなーとりっぷコミック) (東京・いんなーとりっぷ社, 1988).

Appendix:
Curriculum Vitae
- A Succinct Autobiographical Record -
(As of 1 January 2013)

Personal Records:
Name: Akira Yuyama／湯山 明.
      Fifth son of Takayoshi YUYAMA (隆吉: 1896-1981), an electric engineer, and his wife
      FUSA (ふさ: 1898-1997).
Date of Birth: 11 August 1933 [Eighth Year of the Shōwa Era／昭和八年八月十一日].
Place of Birth: Suganuma, Oyama Town, Suitō District, Shizuoka Prefecture, Japan
      [靜岡縣駿東郡小山町管治].

Educational Records:
April 1940: Entered Kawamura Primary School, Municipal School of Yamakita Town, Ashigara-
Kami District, Kanagawa Prefecture [神奈川縣足柄上郡山北町立川村小學校].
      As of April 1941 “Folk School・國民學校” according to the new system under the
      educational reformation.²
April 1942: Moved to Seibi Folk School, Municipal School of Oyama Town, Shizuoka
      Prefecture [静岡縣駿東郡小山町立美市民學校].
March 1946: Graduated Seibi Folk School.³
April 1946: Entered Kanagawa Prefectural Odawara Middle School, Odawara City, Kanagawa
      Prefecture [神奈川縣立小田原中學校].
      As of April 1947 “Middle School・中學校”, attached to Odawara High School under the new
      reformation.⁴
March 1949: Graduated the Middle School attached to Odawara High School [神奈川縣立小田原
      高等學校併設中學].
April 1949: Entered Odawara High School [神奈川縣立小田原高等學校].
March 1952: Graduated Odawara High School.
April 1952-March 1953: Attended some courses in a preparatory school in Tokyo, as well as
      Keio Foreign Language School [慶應義塾外國語學校] at Mita, Tokyo.⁶

1. Graduated in 1914 the Department of Electric Engineering at the Engineering School [工手学校] (later
   Kōgakuin University [工學院大學]), founded in 1888 by Kōki Watanabe [渡邊洪基: 1847-1901], the first
   president of the University of Tokyo.
2. The historical background is unknown to me.
3. On 1 March 1941 the Imperial Ordinance was issued (without the parliamentary motion) to introduce
   the eight-year compulsory education, six years (primary course) & two-year higher course, which came
   into operation on 1 April. One may easily recall the German Volksschule/Grundschule.
4. This started as Seibisha [成美舍] in 1874 and became Seibi Primary School [成美尋常小學校] in
   1889.
5. Based on the school of the Odawara Fiefdom, named Shūseikan [小田原藩校・成館 (established in
   1822)], Odawara Middle School started officially in April 1900 as the Second Middle School of Kanagawa
   Prefecture [神奈川縣第二中學校]. The inaugural principal was Kurazō Yoshida [吉田庫三: 1867-1922, in
   office: 1901-1904], a nephew of Shōin Yoshida [吉田松陰: 1830-1859]. In 1913 it was renamed Odawara
   Middle School of Kanagawa Prefecture [神奈川縣立小田原中學校].
6. To this school I tried to attend regularly with utmost interest in the English composition course offered
April 1953: Entered Department of Indic Studies, Osaka University of Foreign Studies [大阪外国語大学外国語学部インド語学科].

As from October 2007 Osaka University of Foreign Studies was integrated with Osaka University as the Faculty of Foreign Studies [大阪大学外国語学部].

March 1957: Graduated Osaka University of Foreign Studies with Bachelor of Arts [文学士].

April 1957: Entered Department of Indian Philosophy and Sanskrit Philology, Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo [Majoring in Sanskrit] [東京大学文学部印度哲学梵文学科／梵語梵文學専攻].

March 1959: Graduated the University of Tokyo with Bachelor of Arts [文学士].

April 1959: Entered the Master Course of the Graduate School of Humanistic Studies, University of Tokyo, specializing in Indian Philosophy [東京大学大学院人文科学研究科印度哲学専攻課程・修士課程].

March 1961: Graduated the University of Tokyo with Master of Arts [文学修士].

April 1961: Entered the Doctoral Course in Indian Philosophy, University of Tokyo [東京大学大学院人文科学研究科印度哲学専攻課程・博士課程].

October 1963 - June 1965: Entered the University of Leiden, The Netherlands: Instituut Kern (Indologisch Instituut), Rijksuniversiteit Leiden [オランダ国立レイデン大学ケルン研究所 (インド学研究所)].

[To study further under the guidance of Professors J. W. de Jong & F. B. J. Kuiper].

Academic Degrees:

March 1957: Bachelor of Arts (Osaka University of Foreign Studies) [文学士].

March 1959: Bachelor of Arts (University of Tokyo) [文学士].

by Professor Junzaburō Nishiwaki [西脇順三郎: 1894-1982], the inaugural school principal (1942-1945).

The second principal was Professor Nobuhiro Matsumoto [松本信廣: 1890-1981, in office 1945-1956].

Both Nishiwaki and Matsumoto had promoted to establish the Keio Institute of Cultural & Linguistic Studies (慶應大学言語文化研究所), in which Professor Naoshirō Tsui [松平四郎: 1899-1979] engaged after his retirement from the Chair of Sanskrit at the University of Tokyo in 1960. Professor Toshihiko Izutsu [井筒俊彦: 1914-1993] had also joined it. This institute seems to have developed from the former Institute of Languages (語学研究所) at Keio University.

Osaka School of Foreign Languages (大阪外国語学校) was established in 1921 with the fund amounting one million yen donated in 1920 to the Government of Japan by Chōko Hayashi [林蝶子 1873-1945], widow of Takesaburō Hayashi [林竹三郎], the marine transportation tycoon, in accordance with her deceased husband's wish. This fund was large enough to persuade the ministry to found a second foreign language school in Osaka. The emphasis of the School was placed on Asian languages and cultures in contrast to the School of Foreign Languages (外国語学校), established in Tokyo in 1897 in affiliation with the Higher Commercial School (高等商業学校). The founding principal of the School was appointed Junjiro Takakusu [高橋順次郎: 1866-1945], Professor of Sanskrit at the University of Tokyo. The first principal of Osaka School of Foreign Languages was Akira Nakano [中野: 1874-1959].

The University of Leiden was established by Duke of Orange on 8 February 1575 in reward for the citizens of Leiden upon their wish after having attained freedom from Spain during the so-called 80-year independence war (1568-1648). Instituutte Kern (Indologisch Instituut) was established in April 1925 in honour of the inaugural professor of Indology, Johan Hendrik Caspar Kern (1833-1917, in office 1865-1903), at the time of the third Professor Jean Philippe Vogel (1871-1958, in office 1914-1939), who succeeded Jacobus Samuel Speijer (1849-1913, in office at Leiden 1903-1913). Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus Kuiper (1907-2003) succeeded Vogel in 1939 and stayed in office until his retirement at the age of 65. The chair of Tibetan and Buddhist Studies was installed in 1956 for Jan Willem de Jong (1921-2002).

8 With a thesis on the egalitarianism in the earliest period of Buddhism.

9 With a thesis on the phonological study of the Aṣokan inscriptions.
March 1961: Master of Arts (University of Tokyo) [文学修士].
April 1971: Doctor of Philosophy in South Asian and Buddhist Studies (Australian National University, Canberra).

Postgraduate Scholarships:
April 1959-March 1964 (5 academic years): The Japan Scholarship Society Scholarship for Graduate Courses [日本育英會・獎學金].
October 1963-June 1965 (2 academic years): The Netherlands Ministry of Education.

Academic Award:
November 1991: The Nichijin Sakamoto Academic Prize [坂本日深學術賞]
(In recognition of the academic achievement in the field of Lotus Sutra studies from the Institute for the Comprehensive Study of the Lotus Sutra at Rissho University in Tokyo [立正大學法華經文化研究所]. — cf. supra II.52.

Academic Honour:
March 2007: Professor Emeritus, Soka University, Tokyo [創價大學・名譽教授].

Academic Posts Held:
• Permanently Employed or Full-time Posts:
July 1965-December 1966: Research Assistant in the newly founded Department of South Asian and Buddhist Studies, Faculty of Oriental Studies, Australian National University, Canberra (abbrev. ANU). — Head of Department: Professor J.W. de Jong.
[オーストラリア國立大學・東洋學部印度學佛教學科・研究助手]
January 1966-June 1971: Lecturer in Sanskrit at ANU [同上・梵語學・講師].
June 1971-May 1973: Senior Lecturer in Sanskrit at ANU [同上・上級講師].
June 1973-April 1974: University Post-Doctoral Fellow in Asian Languages and Literatures, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand [ニュージランド國立オークランド大學・アジア言語文學科・特別研究員].
[西ドイツ／アレクサンダー・フォン・フンボルト財団・(上級)研究員／ゲッティンゲン大學・印度學佛教學研究室・配屬].
January – March 1997: Professor in the Institute for Comparative Cultures at Soka University, Hachioji, Tokyo [創價大學・比較文化研究所・教授].
April 1977-March 2007: Professor of Buddhist Sanskrit Philology in the International Research

---

11 With a thesis of a text-critical editorial study on the Mahāvastu-Avadāna in comparison with the readings in the six manuscripts used by Emile Senart (Editio princeps: Paris 1882-1890-1897), as well as three Mss collected by Ekai Kawaguchi [河口慧海; 1866-1945] and preserved in the University of Tokyo Library: Nos. 297, 173 & 266 (old nos. 134, 132 & 118 respectively).
Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University — Inaugural Director: Professor Yüichi KAJIYAMA (梶山雄一).

Temporary / Part-time Appointments:

I. Guest Professorships:

April-September 1985: Vertretungsprofessor für Indologie (Buddhismuskunde) am Institut für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibets an der Universität Hamburg [Vertreter für Professor Lambert Schmithausen während seines Erforschungsurlaubes] (Gastprofessur zugunsten der Unterstützung der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft, Bonn, West Deutschland) [西ドイツ国ハノルク州立・ハノルク大学・インド学(仏教学)・代任教授] (西ドイツ国・學術振興會支援招聘教授／ラムペルト・シュミットハウゼン教授／研究休暇中代任]

Fall Session 1988: Numata Professor of Buddhist Studies in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Calgary (Calgary, Canada) [カナダ国アルバータ州立カルガリー大学・宗教学科招聘／沼田佛教學教授]

Fall Session 1989: Numata Professor of Buddhist Studies in the Department of South and Southeast Asian Studies at the University of California (Berkeley, California, U.S.A.) [米国カリフォルニア州立カリフォルニア大学 (バークリー校)・南東南アジア学科招聘／沼田佛教學教授]

August 1995-July 1996: Gastprofessor für Indologie (Buddhismuskunde) am Institut für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibets an der Universität Hamburg (Gastprofessor zugunsten der Sonderunterstützung der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft, Bonn, Bundesrepublik Deutschland) [ドイツ聯邦共和國ハンブルク州立・ハンブルク大学・インド学(仏教學)擔當・招聘教授] (ドイツ聯邦共和國・學術振興會特別支援招聘教授)

October-December 1997: Numata Professor of Buddhist Studies in the Indological and Japanological Institutes at the University of Leiden (Leiden, The Netherlands) [オランダ國立レイデン大學・印度學／日本學科招聘／沼田佛教學教授]

[Conducted classes in Buddhist Sanskrit philology at the Institute Kern (Indological Institute) and Medieval Japanese Buddhist narrative literature at the Institute for Japanese and Korean Studies]

II. Part-time Lectureships in Japan:


1979 & 1988: Lecturer in Buddhist Sanskrit Philology at Kyoto University [京都大學 (佛教梵語文獻學)].

1980, 1984 & 1987: Lecturer in Indo-Asian Languages and Cultures at Hokkaido University (Sapporo) [北海道大學 (札幌)／講義: インド・アジア圈の言語・文化].

1988: Lecturer in Buddhist Sanskrit Philology at Tohoku University [東北大學 (仙台) (佛教梵語文獻學)].

1989: Lecturer in Buddhist Tibetan Philology at Hokkaido University [北海道大學 (札幌)／西藏佛教文獻學].

1989: Lecturer in Buddhist Sanskrit Philology at Hiroshima University [廣島大學 (佛教梵語文獻學)].

1991: Lecturer in Buddhist Sanskrit Philology at Kyushu University [九州大學 (福岡) (佛教梵語文獻學)].

III. Guest Research Fellowship:

November 1984-January 1985: Alexander von Humboldt-Stipendiat (Dozentenstipendium), zugewiesen am Seminar für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde an der Universität Göttingen, Göttingen (West Germany) — Gastgeber: Professor Heinz Bechert. [西ドイツ國・アレクサンダー・フォン・フンボルト財團招聘・(上級)研究員再訪／ゲッティンゲン大學・印度
IV. Honorary Memberships of Academic Institutions and Learned Societies:

* N.B. Question marks on the dates indicate that the suspension was not made known.

1972-1981: Resident Fellow (Canberra) / Research Fellow at The Toyo Bunko (Tokyo) [東洋文庫・在外研究員 (モリソン文庫関連)/研究員(帰国後)].

1978-?: Extraordinary Member, Institute for the Comprehensive Studies of the Lotus Sutra at Rissho University (Tokyo) [立正大学・法華経文化研究所・特別所員].

1978-1995: Regional Secretary for Asia on the Board of Directors of the International Association of Buddhist Studies (incorporated Madison, WI, U.S.A.) [國際佛教學會・アジア地區代表理事].

1981-1983: Member of both the Academic and Steering Committees of the XXXI International Congress of Humanistic Studies of Asia and North Africa (CISHAAN) held in Tokyo-Kyoto (1983) [第三十一回國際アジア・アフリカ人文學會・學術及運營委員會・委員], and simultaneously:

Local Secretary to the VI Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies held in conjunction with XXXI CISHAAN held in Tokyo-Kyoto (1983) [第六回國際佛教學會・學術大會・事務局長].

1987-2007: Member on the Board of Directors of the Japanese Society for the Study of Pali and Buddhist Culture [パーリ學佛教文化學會] (Administrative Office: Aichi Gakuin University, Nagoa; et alibi).


1995-?: Member on the Board of Directors of the International Association of Buddhist Studies (Administrative Offices: Freiburg/Germany – Lausanne/Switzerland) [國際佛教學會・理事].

1990-?: Member on the Selection Committee of the BDK Fellowships for Foreign Students to promote Buddhist Research in Japan (BDK/Buddhist Promoting Foundation, Tokyo) [佛教傳道協會・外國人奨學留學生・選考委員會委員].

2001-2007: Member on the Board of Councilors of the Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies [日本印度學佛教學會・評議員].

V. Memberships on Editorial Boards of Academic Publications:

* N.B. Question marks on the dates indicate that the resignation or the cessation of publications was not made known.

1978-?: Member on the Editorial Advisory Board of the Asian Religious Studies Information under the Editorship-in-Chief of Richard A. Gard (Stony Brook, N.Y.: The Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions, affiliated to the State University of New York at Stony Brook) [アジア宗教研究情報・編集顧問].


2) Buddhist Research Information (Stony Brook: The Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions, 1979-?).


1982-ca. 2010?: Member on the Standing Editorial Board of the BDK English Tripitaka (Tokyo-Berkeley: Bukkyō Dendo Kyōkai [仏教伝道協会], or Buddhist Promoting Foundation) [漢譯大藏經英譯委員會 (常任委員)].
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1988-?: Member on the Editorial Advisory Board of the *Buddhica Britannica* (Editor: Tadeusz Skorupski / Tring-London 1989-2002) [大英佛教叢書・編集顧問].

1988-2000: Member on the Advisory Board of *A Critical Pali Dictionary*, begun by Vilhelm Trenckner, continuing the work of Dines Andersen, Helmer Smith, Ludwig Alsdorf, Kenneth Roy Norman, and then Ole Holten Pind & Oskar von Hiniüber, and contributions by numerous other scholars (Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy) [『批判的パーリ語辞典』・編集顧問].


2000-?: Member of the Committee of Scientific Patronage of the *Studia Asiatica*, under the editorship of Eugen Curtin (Bucharest: Centre for the History of Religions, University of Bucharest, Bucharest, Rumania) [『アジア研究誌』・学術奨励委員会委員].

2000-2011: Member of both the Steering Committee and the Advisory Board of *A Critical Pali Dictionary* (Copenhagen: Institute of Asian Studies, University of Copenhagen) [『批判的パーリ語辞典』・運営委員／編集顧問].

— The final issue (Vol. III, 8, published in 2011) as edited by Oskar von Hiniüber & Ole Holten Pind, under the auspices of the Union Académique Internationale, & sponsored by the Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur (Mainz), Kungliga Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien (Stockholm) & Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Wien).


Publications: बौद्ध अध्ययन की भारतीय अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय पत्रिका II / *Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies*.

* * * * *

**Addendum**

In the springtime of 2007 I donated my whole private library collection including more than 13,000 monographic volumes to the Sanko Research Institute for the Studies of Buddhism (三康文化研究所) in the midst of Tokyo metropolis. It is now kept as the Collection Yuyama (湯山文庫) separately shelved in the Sanko Library affiliated to the Institute (三康文化研究所附属三康図書館).

brāhmī purā vāg daivī ca  
  saṃskṛtam iti ghoṣitam /

mānuṣyāpīti ca punah  
  paṇḍitā eva jānate // 1 //

vidvān vadati dharmaṁ hi  
  yam grhnīte janaḥ sukham /

jānāti vākyam aparām  
  kuśalaṁ svam ca bhāṇakaḥ // 2 //
  iit bauddhasaṃskṛtabhāṣāstutiḥ //

佛教梵語讚頌
サスクリット語は、古来、梵天の言語であり、
また天界のものと、聴高に宣告される。
しかし、また、人間のものであると、
まさに賢者たちは知る。一 壹 —
智者は、實に、法を説き語る
— 人びとが容易に理解するように。
説(法)者は、巧みに、知る
— 他の言葉を、そしてまた、自らのものも。一 貳 —

— In Praise of the Buddhist Sanskrit Language —
Since the ancient times Sanskrit is said to have been
  The heavenly language as well as that of Brahman,
And it is nevertheless the language of the humans
  — Exactly thus know the wise men. // 1 //
Indeed the learned expounds the Law,
  That the people grasp with ease.
And the preacher knows skillfully
  The word of the others as well as his own. //2//

活動報告（平成24年2月以降）

「研究所運営委員会」を年に2、3回の割合で開会。
「国際仏教学高等研究所所員会」を月2回の割合（夏季・冬季休暇中を除く）で開会。
以下、主に実の活動について記す

平成23年度
3月24日(土)-25日(日) 辛嶋 靜志教授、工藤 順之准教授
（財）東洋哲学研究所 第27回学術大会参加
3月24日：工藤「ギルギット仏教写本研究概観」として発表

平成24年度
5月1日(火)-11日(金) 辛嶋教授 フランス、ドイツ出張
5月4日：フランス学士院（碑文・文芸アカデミー）にて、“Nouvelles recherches sur
manuscrits sanscrits bouddhiques provenant d’Asie Centrale”（中央アジア出土梵語仏典写本
の新研究）と題して講演(http://www.nlb.fr/seances-et-manifestations/les-seances-du-vendredi/
5月8日-9日：ハノルク大学アジア・アフリカ研究院(Asia-Africa-Institut)にて、 “Vehicle
(yāna) and Wisdom (jñāna) in the Lotus Sutra—the Origin of the Notion of yāna
in Mahāyāna Buddhism”, “On Avalokītasya and Avalokiteśvara” と題して講演

5月26日(土) 辛嶋教授 京都出張
京都・光華女子大学真宗文化研究所第42回光華講座にて「言葉の向こうに開ける仏教の原
風景——経文に見える浄土、阿弥陀、観音、一乗、大乗の本当の意味——」と題して一般講演

6月30日(土)-7月1日(日) 工藤 日本印度学仏教学会 第63回学術大会に参加（於：鶴見大学）

7月15日(日) 辛嶋教授 京都出張
龍谷大学、科研「ガンドゥラ美術の資料集成とその統合的研究」主催の国内シンポジウ
ム「美術と文献から見るガンドゥラの仏教」にて「阿弥陀・観音・般若経—大乗仏教とガ
ンドゥラ」と題して発表

7月31日(火)-8月5日(日) 辛嶋教授 中国出張
8月2日-4日、中国チベット学研究センター (The China Tibetology Research Center) で開催
された第5回北京チベット学国際セミナー（Beijing International Seminar on Tibetan
Studies）に参加、“How the Lotus Sutra was Translated into Tibetan: A Comparison of the
Languages in the Old Tibetan Translation of the Lotus Sutra from Khotan and the Kanjur
Version”（いかに「法華経」はチベット語に訳されたか：コンタン出土古チベット語訳
「法華経」とカンジュール所収訳の言語の比較）と題して発表

8月 研究所出版物発送
・『創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報』平成23年度(第15号) [3月31日付発刊]
・Seishi KARASHIMA, Die Abhisamācārika Dharmāḥ: Verhaltensregeln für buddhistische
Mönche der Mahāsaṃghika-Lokottaravādins, herausgegeben, mit der chinesischen
Parallelversion verglichen, übersetzt und kommentiert, unter Mitwirkung von Oskar von
Hinüber, Tokyo 2012: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka
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8月8日(水)～9月7日(金) フライブルク大学 オスカー・フォン・ヒューバー博士 (Prof. Emer. Dr. Oskar von HINÜBER, Freiburg University) 招聘研究員として滞在。ギルギット写本研究について討議。同大学孔子学院院長 ハイイェン・フー・フォン・ヒューバー博士 (Dr. Haiyan Hu-von HINÜBER 胡海燕博士, Freiburg University) 来所し滞在（8/5～9/4）

8月31日(金) 第60回 仏教学懇話会
講師：オスカー・フォン・ヒューバー博士
テーマ：古代インドの碑文と画像に表された仏教の教派 (Buddhist Schools as Represented in Inscriptions and Images in Ancient India)

9月17日(月)～21日(金) 辛嶋教授 韓国出張
金剛大学校仏教文化研究所にて「一闘提は誰か」「Vehicle (yāna) and Wisdom (jñāna) in the Lotus Sutra—the Origin of the Notion of yāna in Mahāyāna Buddhism」と題して講演

10月11日(木) 辛嶋教授 京都出張
大谷大学、真宗総合研究所にて「言葉の向こうに隠れる仏教の原風景 ——経文に見え る「净土」の意味——」と題して講演

11月3日(土)～5日(月) 辛嶋教授 京都出張
龍谷大学、科研「ガンドーラ美術の資料集成とその統合的研究」主催の国際シンポジウ ム「シルクロードの仏教文化」に出席

12月6日(木) 第61回 仏教学懇話会
講師：エリ・フランコ博士（ライプツィヒ大学）(Prof. Dr. Eli FRANCO, Institute for Indology, University of Leipzig)
テーマ：再論：ブッダの欲望について (Once Again on the Desires of the Buddha)

12月10日(月) 第62回 仏教学懇話会
講師：方一新博士（浙江大学）
テーマ：仏教語彙と一般語彙から『長阿含十巻法経』を検討する(從佛教詞語和一般詞語 看〈長阿含十秩法經〉)

12月16日(日) 辛嶋教授 京都出張
龍谷大学、科研「ガンドーラ美術の資料集成とその統合的研究」研究会に出席

12月16日(日)～1月13日(日) ロシア科学アカデミー東洋写本学研究所、サファラリ・シャマフマドー フ博士 (Dr. Safrafl Shomakhumadov, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, St. Petersburg) 招聘研究員として滞在。辛嶋教授と東洋写本学研究所蔵仏教写本の共同研究に従事。

平成25年
1月10日(木) 第63回 仏教学懇話会
講師：サファラリ・シャマフマドーフ博士（ロシア科学アカデミー東洋写本学研究所）
テーマ：ロシアにおける仏教学の歴史 (The History of Buddhology in Russia)
International Academy of Buddhist Studies
(List of Publications of the IRIAB Fellows)

辛崎静志 (Seishi KARASHIMA)


工藤順之 (Noriyuki KUDO)

* We should like to express our gratitude to those who have kindly sent us their publications. The following list of books and CD-ROMs, exclusively in the fields of Indology and Buddhism, is certainly by no means complete.


VETTER, Tilman, *A Lexicographical Study of an Shigao’s and his Circle’s Chinese Translations of Buddhist Texts*, (Studia Philologica Monographica Series, 28), Tokyo: Philosophy Faculty, Waseda University.


赤尾栄慶編集『浄土宗の文化と美術: 研究発表と座談会』 (仏教美術研究上野記念財団助成研究会報告書, 第38冊) 2012, 京都: 仏教美術研究上野記念財団助成研究会.

ウズベキスタン共和国科学アカデミー芸術院研究所, 創価大学シルクロード研究センター編 『ダルヴェルジン・パ仏教寺院跡』 2012, 東京: 創価大学シルクロード研究センター.

片山一良訳『相応伝（サンユッタニカヤ）』有間隆 2g (パーラ仏典, 第三期 2) 2012, 東京: 大蔵出版.


肥塚隆主編『環タイ湾地域におけるインド系文化の変容に関する基礎的研究』 (科学研究費補助金(基盤研究)研究成果報告書, 平成18年度-20年度) 2012, 大阪: 大阪大学文学部.
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Editorial Postscript

The 16th volume of this journal is now available. Since it is the 21st volume, it has been decided to present a new editorial postscript. This volume is dedicated to the memory of Professor Hiroshi Miyatake, who passed away in 2011. His contributions to the field of East Asian Studies have been significant, and his legacy will continue to be felt for many years to come.

The articles in this volume cover a wide range of topics, including the history of Chinese and Japanese thought, the philosophy of Buddhism, and the cultural exchange between East and West. Each article provides valuable insights into the rich and complex cultural heritage of East Asia.

We would like to express our gratitude to all the contributors for their hard work and dedication. We hope that this volume will continue to inspire and enrich the field of East Asian Studies for many years to come.
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