

SEISHI KARASHIMA

SOME FEATURES OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE  
*SADDHARMAPUṆḌARĪKASŪTRA*\*

1. MIDDLE INDIC FORMS FOUND IN THE  
LÜSHUN FRAGMENTS

In the Sanskrit fragments of the Central Asian manuscripts of the Lotus Sutra, preserved in the Lüshun Museum (abbr. Lü), of which photographs along with its transcription have been recently published by Prof. Jiang, we find some peculiar forms in prose parts as well as in verses. As these fragments are thought to date back to the fifth or sixth century based on paleographical evidence, they are much older than any extant Nepalese MSS. (not earlier than the eleventh century), the Gilgit MSS. (not earlier than the seventh century) and so-called the Kashgar Manuscript (later than the ninth century) of the Lotus Sutra.

Some examples of outstanding forms, found in these fragments are as follows:

1.1. *bhikṣave* (voc. pl.)

The only voc. pl. of the Skt. *bhikṣu*, which appears in the Nepalese, Gilgit and the Kashgar MSS., is the Classical Sanskrit form *bhikṣavaḥ* (“o monks!”), whereas in the Lüshun fragments the form *bhikṣave* is predominantly seen.<sup>1</sup>

K.156.5. *bhikṣavas* (= O etc.) / Lü (B-6.Recto 2). *[[[v]e*

K.157.2. *bhikṣavas* (= O etc.) / Lü (B-6.Recto 6). *bhikṣa(v)e*

K.200.6. *bhikṣavas* (= O etc.) / Lü (B-7.Verso 3). *bhikṣave*

Is *bhikṣave* a scribal error? I assume not. In the Pali Canon, we find quite often *bhikkhave* as the voc. pl. of Pā. *bhikkhu* along with another such pl. *bhikkhavo*, which corresponds to the Classical Sanskrit form *bhikṣavaḥ*. *Bhikkhave* is assumed to be one of Eastern forms, or “Magadhisms” as occasionally called, which are regarded as the remnants of the language used by the historical Buddha.

In the Pali Canon, *bhikkhave* occurs exclusively in addresses of the Buddha towards his disciples. This archaic form of the Buddha’s address, presumably representing Śākyamuni’s own accent, is retained even in some



Pali canonical and post-canonical texts, which were apparently composed after the Buddha's death.

We may assume that the archaic voc. form *bhikkhave* or its Sanskritised one *bhikṣave* was used in addresses of the Buddha in an earlier version of the Lotus Sutra presumably with the purpose of showing its authenticity as his own words, and that the Lüshun fragments retain this archaic form.

Presumably, redactors of the Sutra in a later period, who may have had a sound knowledge of Classical Sanskrit, could not overlook this dialectal form and, therefore corrected it to the classical form *bhikṣavaḥ*, which we, at present, find in the Nepal, the Gilgit and the Kashgar MSS.

It must be pointed out that the above cited occurrences of *bhikṣave* are all from the prose parts. When we read the manuscripts from Nepal, Gilgit and Kashgar, we soon notice that the prose parts of the Lotus Sutra are composed in a more Classical Sanskrit style than the verses, which contain many Middle Indic forms. Considering that the above mentioned Middle Indic form *bhikṣave* is from the prose parts of the Lüshun fragments, we may assume, therefore, that earlier recensions of the Sutra contained more Middle Indic features in prose parts as well as in verses than any of the extant manuscripts.

## 1.2. *sād-yathā, syād-yathā*

Middle Indic or quasi-Middle Indic forms which might retain linguistic features of earlier recensions of the Sutra, are not limited to *bhikṣave*.

For example, where other manuscripts read *tad yathā* ("namely, to wit"), the Lüshun fragments read *sādyathāpi nāma* or *syādyathêdam*; e.g.

K.156.5. *tad yathā* (= O etc.) / Lü (B-6.Recto 2). *sādyathāpi nāma*

K.239.7. *tad yathā* (= O etc.) / Lü (B-11.Recto4). *syā(dyathê)dam*

K.361.3. *tad yathā* (= O etc.) / Lü (B-14.Recto 1). *syādyathêdam*

K.398.4. *tad yathā* (the Kashgar Manuscript is broken here) / Lü (B-18.Recto 8). *syādyathê[da]ṃ*

K.401.2. *tad yathā* (the Kashgar Manuscript is broken here) / Lü (B-18.Verso 9). *(s)yādyath[th]êdam*

*Sādyathā* and *syādyathā*, which appear in the prose parts of these fragments, might be a Sanskritised form of a Māgadhism *seyyathā* (*se* + *yathā* < Skt. *tad* + *yathā*).<sup>2</sup>

The same Sanskritised form *syādyathêdam* is seen also in the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the *Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin* school.<sup>3</sup> Other Sanskritisations of the Eastern form *seyyathā* (+ *idam*, + *api*) are found in the *Mahāvastu* and *Bhikṣuṇīvinaya* of the same school, namely *sayyathêdam*, *sayyathāpi*, *saṃyathêdam*, *saṃyathêdam* and

*sadyathīdam*.<sup>4</sup> Apart from these texts, similar forms, namely *syādyathe-dam*, *saṃyyathīd[am]*, *saryathīdam* etc.,<sup>5</sup> are found in some *mantra* texts, being used as introductory phrases to *mantras*. Also, the form *saṃyathedam* with the variant *saṃyathīdam* is found in the *Mahāmāyūrī*.<sup>6</sup>

The above mentioned *sādyathā* and *syādyathā* are hyperforms, presumably produced by redactors who knew that *-dy-* sometimes developed into *-yy-*.<sup>7</sup> They, therefore, backformed from *seyyathā* to *sādyathā* and *syādyathā*. Alternatively, we could assume that *seyyathā* had once changed to *\*sejjathā* (or *\*sejjahā*)<sup>8</sup> and then redactors back-formed this to *sādyathā* etc. incorrectly.

We shall see, later, other similarities between Middle Indic features, found in texts of the *Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin* school and those of the Lotus Sutra.

### 1.3. *tāyām* (*loc. sg. fem.*)

Where other manuscripts read *tasyām velāyām* (“at that time”), the Lüshun fragments and a Central Asian one in the Hoernle Collection (abbr. H[1988]) read *tāyām velāyā(m)*:

- K.217.7. *tasyām velāyām* (= O etc.) / Lü (B-9 Verso 10). *tāyām velāyām*  
 K.303.2. *tasyām velāyām* (= O etc.) / Lü (A-12.Recto 6). *tāyām velāyā*  
 K.104.3. *tasyām velāyām* (= O etc.) / Lü (B-4.Recto 2). *tāyām velāyā*,  
 H(1988). *tāyām ve(lā)yām*  
 etc.

Also, one finds the form *tāya velāya* sporadically used in both the Kashgar and the Farhād-Bēg(abbr. F) manuscripts:

- K.69.14. *tasyām velāyām* / O. *tāya ca velāya*  
 K.108.14. *evam ca vicintayet* (v.l. *cintayet*) / O. *tāya ca velāya* *evam*  
*cintayet*  
 K.215.1. *tasyām velāyām* / O. *tasyām velāyām* . . . *tāya velāya ca*  
 K.106.4. *atha khalu sa gṛhpatiḥ svakān niveṣanād avatīrya* / F. *taṃ*  
*dṛṣṭbā paścāt{vā} ca tāya ca velā<ya>* . . .

The phrases *tāyām velāyā(m)* and *tāya velāya* might be related to the Pāli form *tāyaṃ velāyaṃ* (e.g. *Vinayaṭṭhaka*, I, 2.2, 12, 22).<sup>9</sup>

### 1.4. *ḍīṛṇa*~ (< *diṇṇa*)

Where the Nepalese, Gilgit and the Kashgar MSS. read *datta* (“given”), a fragmentary manuscript from the Lüshun Museum and that in the Hoernle Collection read *ḍīṛṇa*:

K.75.11. *alaṃ ma eṣāṃ kumārakāṇaṃ anyair* (D1, D3, Pk, etc. *nyūnair* = Tib.; cf. Krsh.67) *yānair dattair iti* (D3.-) (“I should not give other carts to these sons”)

O. *alaṃ ma eteṣāṃ kumārakānāṃ anyonyair yānair dattais* (“I should not give various sorts of carts to these sons”)

H(1988). *alaṃ ma eteṣāṃ*<sup>10</sup> *kumārakānāṃ khuddakebhir yyānebhi dīrṇebhis* (“Tiny, orn carts have no meaning to these sons of mine”)

Lü(B-1.V3). + + *teṣāṃ kumārak(ā)nā(ṃ) khudakabhir yānebhi dīrṇebhi* (“Tiny, orn carriages [have no meaning to] these sons [of mine]”)

The form *dīrṇa* here might be a hyperform of the Middle Indic *diṇṇa* (“given”, past participle of the root  $\sqrt{dā}$ ).<sup>11</sup> Probably, at an early stage of transmission, the form *diṇṇa* (“given”) had stood here, but later some redactors replaced it with the Sanskrit form *datta* (“given”), while others “corrected” the former wrongly to Skt. *dīrṇa* (“torn”, past participle of the root  $\sqrt{dṛ}$ ),<sup>12</sup> as its Middle Indic equivalent is also *diṇṇa*.

We can also assume, with greater probability, that *diṇṇa* was spelt as \**dirṇa* at a certain stage of transmission in North-Western India under the influence of Gāndhārī, in which a geminate was occasionally marked by the insertion of a non-historic *r* before an *akṣara*.<sup>13</sup> This Gāndhārī form was finally Sanskritised to *dīrṇa*.

In any case, we may assume that the hypersanskrit form *dīrṇa* in the Central Asian fragments partly retains an older linguistic feature of an earlier recension of the Sutra.

#### 1.5. tāvatrīśa–

Where other manuscripts of the Lotus Sutra read *trāyastriṃśa* (“the Thirty Three”), a Lüshun fragment reads *tāvatrīśa*:

K.159.8. *devais trāyastriṃśair* (v.l. *trāyastriṃśair*) *mahāsimhāsanam prajñaptam abhūt* (“the gods of the Thirty Three prepared a magnificent royal throne”)

O. *devebhis trayastriṃśebhi simhāsanam prajñaptam babhūva*

Lü(B-6.Verso 10). *(deve)hi tāvatrīśehi*<sup>14</sup> *mahāsimhāsana prajñaptam abhū(ṣ)[ṛ]*

I assume that *tāvatrīśa* is a partly Sanskritised form of the Ardhamāgadhī *tāvattīśa* or Pali *tāvatiṃsa*. These are Eastern forms of Skt. *trayastriṃśa*,<sup>15</sup> showing a phonetic development -y- > -v-, which is peculiar to that dialect.<sup>16</sup> Presumably, *tāvatrīśa* is one of the remnants of Middle Indic elements of an older recension of the Lotus Sutra.

## 1.6. bhāpa

Where other manuscripts read *tāta* (“daddy”), the Central Asian fragments of the Lüshun Museum and the Hoernle Collection read *bhāpa* (“papa”).

K.75.3~4. *dehi nas tāta tāni vividhāni krīḍāpanakāni ramaṇīyāni*  
 (“Daddy, give us those various toys to play with”)

O. *dadāhy asmākaṃ tāta dadāhy asmākaṃ tāta iti tāni vividhāni*  
 *krīḍāpanakāni ramaṇīyakāni* (“Give us, daddy! Give us, daddy, those  
 various toys to play with”)

H(1988). *dehi asmākaṃ bhāpa<sup>17</sup> dehi asmākaṃ tāta tāni vividhāni*  
 *krīḍāpanak(ā)ni* (“Give us, papa! Give us, daddy, those various toys  
 to play with”)

Lü(B-1.Recto 9). *(dehi asm)ākaṃ bhāpa de(h)i (a)s(m)ā(ka)ṃ (tā)ta tāni*  
 *vividhāni kkrīḍāpanakā(n)i III* (“Give us, papa! Give us, daddy, those  
 various toys to play with”)

The word *bhāpa* is found neither in the literature of Classical Sanskrit nor Middle Indic, but apparently it corresponds with Pkt. *bappa* (“papa!”).<sup>18</sup>

I assume that in earlier recensions of the Lotus Sutra the words *bhāpa* (“papa!”) *tāta* (“daddy!”) stood here side by side just like in the two Central Asian fragments. Presumably, redactors of the Sutra in a later period who could not overlook the dialectal form *bhāpa* or could not understand its meaning, either replaced it with the classical form *tāta* (like in the Kashgar Manuscript), or simply deleted it (like in the other manuscripts).

These examples, all cited from the prose parts, may aptly illustrate that the old fragments are much more Middle Indic in nature than other manuscripts.

As some of these show the peculiarities of Eastern dialects, I am inclined to agree with the hypothesis of H. Lüders and Prof. Ji Xianlin (or Dschi Hiän-lin) that “the original text of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka was written, if not in pure Māgadhī, in a ‘mixed Sanskrit’ which was based on that dialect”.<sup>19</sup>

## 2. PRESUMED MIDDLE INDIC FORMS IN EARLIER VERSIONS OF THE LOTUS SUTRA

Apart from Middle Indic forms, found in the old fragments of the Lotus Sutra, there are many discrepancies between the Nepalese/Gilgit and the Central Asian MSS., which might betray that the original version of the Sutra was transmitted in a much Middle Indic language.

## 2.1. khalu / bho / ho

Where the manuscripts from Nepal, Gilgit read *khalu*, Central Asian manuscripts quite frequently read *bhoḥ*, *bho*, *ho*: e.g.<sup>20</sup>

K.457.7. *tasya khalu punar / O. tasya bhoḥ punar / Otani Collection (Toda 1983: 261). tasya ho puna*

Presumably, the Middle Indic form *ho* stood here in an earlier version of the text, but later some replaced it with the Sanskrit form *khalu* (“indeed”), while others took *ho* for a dialectal form of Skt. *bhoḥ* (“O! Ho!”) and replaced it with the latter.<sup>21</sup> The old Central Asian fragment, however, retains the original Middle Indic form.

## 2.2. ārya / adya

We find some confusion between *ārya* (“noble”) and *adya* (“now”) in one of the Śloka verses.

K.70.5–6. *anumodāma mahāvīra (v.l. °modāmahe vīra = tib.) sandhābhāṣyaṃ maharṣiṇām / yathāryo vyākṛto hy eṣa Śāriputro viśāradaḥ // (= the Nepalese and Gilgit MSS.) (“We receive with gratitude, O great hero, the mysterious speech of the great Sages, such as this prediction regarding the self-possessed Ārya Śāriputra.”<sup>22</sup>)*

O. *anumodāma vayaṃ hy etat sandhābhāṣyaṃ maharṣiṇaḥ / yathā vyākṛta-m-eṣādyā Śāriputro viśāradaḥ // (“We receive with gratitude this mysterious speech of the great Sages, namely the self-possessed Śāriputra is now predicted.”)*

Presumably, the discrepancy resulted from different interpretations of the word *ajja*, which is a Middle Indic form of both Skt. *ārya* and Skt. *adya*.<sup>23</sup> I assume that *ārya* in the Nepal and Gilgit MSS. here is a wrong Sanskritism, considering the context.<sup>24</sup>

## 2.3. prasthita / prārthita

There are two examples of a discrepancy between *pra√sthā* (“advances towards, proceeds”) and *pra√arth* (“wishes for”) in the manuscripts of the Sutra.

K.303.12. *parivāro bodhisattvasya sarve bodhāya prasthitāḥ (O, Lü.A12. Recto9. prāsth°) (“All the suite of bodhisattvas set out for the purpose of enlightenment”)*

F. *parivāro bodhisattvasya sarve bodhāya prārthitā (“All the suite of bodhisattvas are longing for enlightenment”)*

and

K.38.6. *asmāḍṛśā dvādaś' ime śatāś ca ye cāpi* (v.l. *tatrāpi*) *te prasthita agrabodhaye* (“The twelve hundred, my equals, and those who set out for the purpose of superior enlightenment . . .”)

O, R<sub>2</sub> (No. 43). *asmadvidhā dvādaśa 'me sahasrā ye cānyī prārthent' iha agrabodhim* (“The twelve thousand, my equals, and others, who long for superior enlightenment, . . .”)

Presumably, at an earlier stage of transmission, the Middle Indic forms of (*p*)*paṭṭhita-* and (*p*)*paṭṭhenti* had stood in these verses, but later, some redactors Sanskritised them correctly to *prārthita-* and *prārthenti*, as we find now in the Central Asian manuscripts, while other redactors back-formed them wrongly to *prasthita-*.<sup>25</sup>

#### 2.4. *sūkṣma* / *sumukha*

In the prose parts of Chapter 17 of the Sutra, we find the following description of good merit acquired by hearing the scripture.

K.350.11. *api tu khalv Ajita sūkṣmasujātajihvādantōṣṭho bhavaty āyatanāsaḥ pranīta-* (v.l. *prīṇīta-*)*mukhamaṇḍalaḥ*. . . (“On the contrary, Ajita, his tongue, teeth, and lips will be delicate and well-shaped; his nose long; his face [*or* mouth] will be perfectly round. . .”<sup>26</sup>)

The Nepalese and Gilgit MSS. read in the same way, while the Kashgar manuscript has a slightly different reading:

O. *api tu khalv Ajita sumukho bhavati, sujātajihva-tanujihva-samasa-hitadanto bhavati, bimbōṣṭhaś ca bhavati āyatanāso bhavati . . . pariṇīnatamukhamaṇḍalo bhavati* (“On the contrary, Ajita, he shall have an excellent face [*or* mouth], a well-shaped tongue, a thin tongue, even teeth; his lips will be red like a *Bimba* fruit; his nose long; his round face will be smiling. . .”)

*Sūkṣma* (“delicate”) in the Nepalese and Gilgit MSS. corresponds to *sumukha* (“an excellent face [*or* mouth]”) and *tanu* (“thin”) in the Central Asian MS. It is rather difficult to tell which of the *sūkṣma* or *sumukha* is closer to the original reading and which is secondary. If *sūkṣma* (Pkt. *suhuma*, Pā. *sukhuma*) retains the original meaning, then we may assume that *\*su(k)huma-sujātajihvā-* (“delicate, well-shaped tongue”) had stood here at a certain stage of transmission instead of the present reading *sūkṣmasujātajihvā-*, then *su(k)huma-* changed to *sumu(k)ha-* by a metathesis of consonants, and finally someone Sanskritised it to *sumukha*. On the contrary, if *sumukha* (Pkt. *sumuha*) stood here first, then the process of change is in reverse: *sumukha* (> *sumuha*) > *su(k)huma-* > *sūkṣma*.

In any case, the discrepancy between *sūkṣma* and *sumukha* reveals that the Middle Indic word *su(k)huma* stood here in the original text or at a certain stage of transmission.

### 2.5. mama / mahat

Verse 37 of the *Stūpasaṃdarśanaparivarta* reads as follows in the Nepalese and Gilgit MSS.

K.255.13. mahat (v.l. *mahā*) *priya* (D2. *vayaṃ*) *kṛtaṃ bhoti lokanāthāna sarvaśaḥ* /

*durādhāraṃ idaṃ sūtraṃ dhārayed yo muhūrtakam* (“If one would keep for a moment this Sutra which is difficult to keep, he gains great affection of all the Lords of the world.”)

The Kashgar and Farhād-Bēg manuscripts read in the first half-verse as follows instead:

O. mama *pṛya kṛtaṃ bhavati lokanātheṣu sarviṣu* / (“He gains affection of mine [*i.e.* the Buddha] and all the Lords of the world.”)

F. mama priyaṃ kṛtaṃ bhavati lokanāthe{na}ṣu sarvasu / (“He gains affection of mine and all the Lords of the world.”)

Where the Nepalese and Gilgit MSS. read *mahat* or *mahā* (“great”), the Central Asian ones read *mama* (“to me, mine”).<sup>27</sup> Presumably, what stood here in the earliest stage was neither *mahat*, *mahā* nor *mama*, but *maha(m)*. Middle Indic *maha(m)* corresponds both to Skt. *mahat* (“great”) and to Skt. *mahyam* (“to me”).<sup>28</sup> Considering the context, presumably *maha(m)* was used here originally to mean “to me”, but later someone Sanskritised it to *mahat* (“great”) or *mahā* (*do.*) incorrectly. Another redactor, interpreting *maha(m)* correctly as a genitive-dative form of the personal pronoun in the first person, replaced it, not with the Classical Sanskrit dative form *mahyam* because of metrical requirements, but with the genitive *mama*, which is the reading we find now in the Central Asian manuscripts.

### 2.6. -d-ugra / durga

We find some confusion between *ugra* (“formidable, dreadful”) and *durga* (“impassable”) in this Sutra’s manuscripts:

K.195.7. *yathāṭavī ugra bhaveya dāruṇā* (= R, B, T2, 6, 7, 8, N1, 2, A1)  
 (“Suppose there were a dreadful, terrific forest . . .” .)

D1, D (Toda 1988), K’, C3, 4, 5, 6. *yathāpi* (K’. *’ha*) *ṭavī bhavi* (D1. *°e*)  
 *ugra dāruṇā* (“Suppose there were a dreadful, terrific forest . . .” .)

Pk. *yathāpi ṭavī bhavi-d-agra dāruṇā*

O. *yathâpi aṭavī bhavi durga dāruṇā* (“Suppose there were an impassable, terrific forest . . .”)

As *durga* is more suitable to this context than *ugra*, one may assume that the wording *\*bhavi dugga* (< Skt. *durga*) had stood here at an earlier stage, which some redactor in a later period, misunderstanding the consonant *d-* as a sandhi-consonant, back-formed to *bhavi ugra*, after which other redactors in a much later period, who presumably wanted to avoid resolved syllables,<sup>29</sup> rearranged the wording, and consequently the reading *yathâṭavī ugra bhaveya dāruṇā* was formed.

## 2.7. *jñāna* / *yāna*

As I have discussed in detail elsewhere,<sup>30</sup> there are at least seventeen instances in which the Nepal and Gilgit manuscripts read *jñāna* and (*buddha-*, *tathāgata-*, *sarvajñā-*)*jñāna*, while the Central Asian ones read *yāna* (*buddha-*, *tathāgata-*, *sarvajñā-*)*yāna* instead, e.g.:<sup>31</sup>

K.45.11. *upāyam etat kurute svayambhūr bauddhasya jñānasya prabodhanârtham* (“The self-born one uses such means to manifest Buddha-knowledge”<sup>32</sup>)

O. *upāyam etat kurute svayambhur bodhasmi yānasmī praveśanârtham* (“The Self-Born One uses such means to lead to the Buddha-vehicle”)

And

K.198.5–6. *janetha vīryaṃ paramaṃ udāram / sarvajñajñānasya kṛtena yūyaṃ* (“Rouse to the utmost your lofty energy for the sake of the knowledge of the all-knowing”<sup>33</sup>)

O. *janetha vīryaṃ paramaṃ hy udāraṃ sarvajñayānasya kṛtena yūyaṃ* (“Rouse to the utmost your lofty energy for the sake of the vehicle of the All-Knowing”)

I have assumed that, in the earliest stage of transmission of the Lotus Sutra, Middle Indic form *jāna* or *\*jāna* (= Pkt. < Skt. *jñāna*, *yāna*)<sup>34</sup> had stood in these places, and that later some redactors back-formed it to *jñāna* (“knowledge”), while others Sanskritised it to *yāna* (“vehicle”).

I have also assumed, further, that the Mahāyānist terms ‘*buddha-yāna*’ (“the Buddha vehicle”), ‘*mahāyāna*’ (“the great vehicle”), ‘*hīnayāna*’ (“the inferior vehicle”) meant originally ‘*buddha-jñāna*’ (“buddha-knowledge”), ‘*mahājñāna*’ (“great knowledge”), ‘*hīnajñāna*’ (“inferior knowledge”) respectively.

Also, one can see a word play between *jñāna* (“knowledge”) and *yāna* (“vehicle”) in the *Aupamyaparivarta* of the Lotus Sutra, especially in the famous parable of the burning house, found in this chapter. In the parable,

the master of the burning house, after having promised his children to give them three different sorts of carts (*yāna*) in order to coax them out of the burning house, gave each of them excellent bullock-carts (*yāna*) of one kind, as they came out safely (verse 71–84). The Buddha said: “Employing an expedient device, I have formerly told people, who were suffering in the triple worlds, of the three vehicles, but now I am showing the single Buddha-vehicle (*eka-buddha-yāna*) to my disciples, *pratyekabuddhas* and *bodhisattvas* who are equally my sons. That (*tad*) knowledge of buddhas (*buddhāna jñānaṃ* [O. *yānaṃ*]) is most excellent, most exalted in the world” (verse 85–92). In the prosal parts of the parable, the word play between *jñāna* and *yāna* is obvious. For example, *bodhisattvas* who are desirous of the knowledge of the All-Knowing (*sarvajña-jñāna*), the Buddha-knowledge (*buddha-jñāna*), the knowledge of the ‘Self-Born One’ (*svayambhu-jñāna*) and the knowledge without a master (*anācāryaka-jñāna*) and long for the great vehicle (*mahāyāna*; O. *tathāgatayāna*), are likened to sons who fled from the burning house desiring to get cow-carts (*go-ratha*) (K.80.11–81.6). Also, the Buddha, likening himself to the father who decided to give all his sons great vehicles (K.76.3. *mahāyānāni*) equally, thought: “I am the father of these sentient beings. I must save them from suffering and give them the immeasurable, inconceivable bliss of the Buddha-knowledge (*buddha-jñāna*; but O, H<sub>5</sub> [283]. *buddha-yāna*), with which they shall enjoy themselves” (K.78.6–9).

I assumed, therefore, that the term *mahāyāna* namely *mahājñāna* (“the great knowledge”) meant originally “buddha-knowledge”, and what the Lotus Sutra in origin proclaimed was that everyone could obtain buddha-knowledge equally and should aim at obtaining it. Such a view must have been a complete antithesis of Nikāya Buddhism, in which knowledge of the Buddha, that of *pratyekabuddhas* and *śrāvakas* were strictly graded. In support of my assumption, we find a passage in the Central Asian MSS. and the Chinese translations of the Sutra, which proclaims that the Sutra is a scripture which shows equality of the great knowledge (*mahājñāna*):

K.240.3. *sādhu sādhu bhagavāñ Śākyamune* (= the Nepalese MSS. The Gilgit MSS. are missing here)

O. *sādhu sādhu bhagavāṃ cchākyamune{r} yad imaṃ bodhisattva-saṃgrrahaṃ mahājñāna-samatā-nirdeśaṃ sarvabuddha-pariṅhītaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ deśayasi saṃprakāśayanti* (read °*kāśayasi*) (“It is excellent, excellent, Lord Śākyamuni, that you show and expound this religious discourse which is a compendium for *bodhisattvas*, an elucidation of equality of the great knowledge, and which all *buddhas* embrace.”)

Lü(B-11.Recto 7). //[[v]āṃ Śākyamuniṃ ya imaṃ bo[dhi]satva[h  
suṃ]gṛahaṃ mahājñāna-samata[ni](rde)/// (“[It is excellent],  
O Lord Śākyamuni [that you show and expound this religious  
discourse which] is a compendium for *bodhisattvas*, an elucidation  
of equality of the great knowledge, . . .”)

Dharmarakṣa’s translation: *Taishō*, vol. 9, No. 263, 102c4. *shànzāi!  
shànzāi! shìzūn, ānzhù! xīrúsuǒyán. dàodé xuánmiào, chāojié wúlǚ.  
huì píngděngyī, yóurú xūkōng, shí wúyǒuyì!* (“Excellent! Excellent, O  
Śākyamuni, O Sugata! All what you have said is right. The virtues  
of the [Buddha-]Path are deep, subtle and surpass all. Like the  
sky, the wisdom is impartial and alone, completely free from differen-  
tiation.”)

Kumārajīva’s translation: *Taishō*, vol. 9, No. 262, 32b28. *shànzāi!  
shànzāi! Shìjiāmóuní-shìzūn! néng yǐ píngděngdàhuì jiāopúsàfǎ,  
fósuǒhùniàn Miàofǎhuājīng wèi dàzhòng shuō* (“Excellent! Excellent,  
O Śākyamuni, O World-Honoured One, that you teach the *bodhisattva-  
dharma* with impartial great wisdom, [and] preach the Lotus Sutra,  
which *buddhas* keep in mind, to the great assembly.”)

In spite of the importance of these passages, they are not mentioned in former studies of the Lotus Sutra, which is probably due to the fact that they are lacking in the Kern-Nanjio edition and consequently in all the modern translations of the Sutra.

## 2.8. -ebhis / -ebhyas / -eṣu

We find many cases in which the endings of the instrumental, ablative, locative plurals are confused amongst the Nepalese, Gilgit and the Central Asian manuscripts. Some of outstanding examples are as follows:

### 2.8.1. *instrumental* (-ebhis) / *locative* (-eṣu)

(1) Verse 34 of Ch. 3:

K.13.8. *paśyāmy ahu bodhisattvān . . . bālān sahāyān parivarjayitvā  
āryeṣu saṃsargaratān samāhitān* (“I see *bodhisattvas*, . . . after having  
avoided unwise friends, delight in intercourse with noble men and stay  
composed.”)

O. *paśyāmy ahu bodhisattvā . . . bālān sahāyān parivarjayitvā āryebhi  
saṃsargaratāḥ samāhitāḥ*

H<sub>3</sub>(265. Stein Collection). . . (ā)ryebhi saṃsargaratāḥ samāhitāḥ

Despite of the discrepancy of the case endings, there is no difference in the meaning of the sentences in these manuscripts.

(2) The later half of verse 66. of Ch. 2:

K.48.8. *te naiva śṛṅvanti su* (read 'mu < *imaṃ* with D3) *buddhaghoṣaṃ kadāci pi jātisahasrakoṭiṣu* (read with v.l. *jjāti*) (“They do not hear this Buddha-voice, not once in *koṭis* of births”)

O. *na ca śrutas te* (< Skt. *taiḥ*) *ima buddhaghōṣaṃ kadāci no jātisahasra-koṭibhiḥ* (“They have not heard this Buddha-voice, not once in *koṭis* of births”)

(3) The first half of verse 80 of Ch. 2:

K.50.7. *ye cāpi śaileṣu karonti stūpān ye candanānām agurusya* (v.l. *agarusya*) *kecī* (v.l. *cāpi*) (“Also, those who make *stūpas* from stone [*śaileṣu!*], those who [make *stūpas*] from sandalwood or Aloe-wood, ...”)

O. *ye cāpi śailebhi karinsu stūpān ye candanasya agarusya cāpi* (“Also, those who made *stūpas* from stone, those who [made *stūpas*] from sandalwood or Aloe-wood, ...”)

(4) The prose part of Ch. 3:

K.60.11~12. *teṣv eva vayaṃ bhagavan dharmeṣu niryātāḥ syāma* (“O Lord, we were adept in these teachings”<sup>35</sup>)

O. *tebhiś caiva vayaṃ bhagava dharmebhir niryā(yitā) bhavema* (“O Lord, we were presented with these teachings”<sup>36</sup>)

(5) The first half of verse 148. of Ch. 3:

K.99.3. *anyeṣu sūtreṣu na kadāci cintā lokāyatair anyataraiś ca śāstraiḥ* (“[He] never pays attention to other sūtras nor to books of the *Lokāyata* or other [schools]”)

Here, it is remarkable that the locative plural “*anyeṣu sūtreṣu*” and the instrumental one “*lokāyatair anyataraiś ca śāstraiḥ*” stand side by side as objects of *cintā* (“attention”). The Kashgar MS. reads here as follows:

O. *anyebhi sūtrebhi na tasya cintā, lokāyataṃ naiva kadāci cintayī* (“He does not pay attention to other sūtras. [He] never directs his attention to the *Lokāyata* at all.”)

(6) The latter half of verse 117. of Ch. 3:

K.94.10. *daṇḍeṣu samtrāsita tatra tatra kṣudhā-pipāsāhata* (D2. *-pipāsāya ca*) *śuṣkagātrāḥ* (= C1, C2, C3, C6, B, R, T4, T5, T7, T8, T9, A2, A3, N2, D2) (“Everywhere [they] are terrified with sticks, afflicted with hunger and thirst, and their bodies are emaciated.”)

O. *da[m]ṇḍena samtrāsita tatra tatra kṣudāpipāsā(ya) ca śuṣkagātrā(ḥ)* (≡ Pk, K', C4, C5, P1, P2, T2, T3, T6, A1, N1) (“Everywhere

[they] are terrified with a stick, hunger and thirst, and their bodies are emaciated.”)

The difference of construction between *daṇḍeṣu* and *daṇḍena* must have arisen from a Middle Indic instrumental plural form *daṇḍehi*, which some redactors misunderstood as a locative and replaced it with *daṇḍeṣu*, while others changed it to a singular form *daṇḍena*.<sup>37</sup>

(7) The first half of verse 46. of Ch. 2:

K.45.9. *ye bhonti hīnābhiratā avidvasū acīrṇacaryā bahubuddhakoṭiṣu*  
 (“Those who are ignorant, delight in inferior matters and have not pursued the course of conduct under many *koṭis* of *buddhas*, . . .”)

O. *ye satva hīnābhiratā avidvasā acīrṇacaryā bahubuddhakoṭibhiṣu* (read either “*koṭibhiṣu*” or “*koṭi{bhi}ṣu*”) (“Sentient beings who are ignorant, delight in inferior matters and have not pursued the course of conduct under many *koṭis* of *buddhas*, . . .”)

*Bahubuddhakoṭibhiṣu* in the Kashgar MS. shows an extraordinary mixture of an instrumental plural ending and a locative one. Presumably, redactors of the Central Asian recension consulted different manuscripts and in one, the instrumental form *bahubuddhakoṭibhi* stood, while in others, the locative *bahubuddhakoṭiṣu*. These redactors consequently made up this strange form as a compromise between the two readings. Such unusual endings are found in the Nepalese and Central Asian MSS. on occasions. We will see later one such example.

Some other examples of the confusion between the two cases found in the manuscripts of the Lotus Sutra are pointed out in Hinüber 1982: xii.

2.8.2. *ablative* (-ebhyas) / *locative* (-eṣu)

The following are examples of the confusion between the ablative plural ending and the locative plural one.

(1) The latter half of verse 30 of Ch. 1:

K.12.16. *abhyuddharanto narakeṣu satvāṃs . . .* (“[Others . . .] are saving sentient beings in the hells”)

O. *abhyudharamtī narakebhya satvās* (“[Others . . .] are saving sentient beings from the hells”)

The reading of the Kashgar manuscript agrees with those of the fragmentary manuscripts from Khadalik and Domoko (both now in the Stein Collection).

H<sub>3</sub> (265. Khadalik). *abhyoddaranti narakebhya satvā*

H<sub>4</sub> (269. Domoko). *abhyuddharant(ī) (nara)k(e)bhya satbās*

(2) The first half of verse 115 of Ch. 3:

K.94.5. *yadā ca narakeṣu cyutā bhavanti tatas ca tiryakṣu vrajanti bhūyaḥ*  
 (“And, as they vanish from the hells, they further become animals”)

O. *yadā ca narakebhya cyutā bhavaṃti tiryā(g)gatau te punar eva yānti*  
 (“And, as they vanish from the hells, they again further attain the animal state of existence”)

2.8.3. -ebhis, -ebhyas, -eṣu (fem. -ābhis, -ābhyas, -āsu) > -ehi(ṃ) (fem. -āhi[ṃ])

Why were the plural endings -ebhis, -ebhyas and -eṣu so often confused amongst the manuscripts of the Lotus Sutra?

In Middle Indic, both Vedic instrumental plural -ebhis (fem. -ābhis) and Sanskrit dative-ablative plural -ebhyas (fem. -ābhyas) become -ehi(ṃ) (fem. -āhi[ṃ]).<sup>38</sup> This instrumental plural in -ehi (fem. -āhi) is very common also in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit.<sup>39</sup>

The principal locative ending form in Middle Indic is -esu (fem. -āsu), besides which sometimes -ehi(ṃ) (fem. -āhiṃ) is found in Pali and Ardhamāgadhī.<sup>40</sup> Consequently, these three endings were sometimes identical in Middle Indic.

In Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, we find many instances of the locative plural in -ehi (fem. -āhi) in the literature of the *Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin* school, namely the *Mahāvastu*,<sup>41</sup> *Bhikṣuṇīvinaya*<sup>42</sup> and the *Ābhisamācārikā*,<sup>43</sup> apart from which we know just a single example in the *Lalitavistara*.<sup>44</sup>

Some scholars deem the locative plural in -ehi (fem. -āhi) as an Eastern form,<sup>45</sup> while others maintain that here we are handling the instrumental forms, used in locative functions.<sup>46</sup> Actually, various forms of instrumental, used for locative, are attested in epic and Upaniṣad literature.<sup>47</sup>

In any case, locative (or in instrumental in locative functions) in -ehi (fem. -āhi) was quite common in languages like Pālī Ardhamāgadhī, and that of the *Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin* school.

Presumably, also in the language of the original version of the Lotus Sutra, instrumental, dative-ablative and locative plural endings merged into -ehi (fem. -āhi), so that one could discern its sense only from the context.

As people in a later period felt the necessity to Sanskritise the version, filled with many Middle Indic elements, various branches of the tradition treated this ending in different ways. Some replaced it with -ebhis (fem. -ābhis), recognising it as an instrumental; others thought it was a dative-

ablative and replaced it with *-ebhyas* (fem. *-ābhyas*); others recognised it was a locative and replaced it with *-eṣu* (fem. *-āsu*). As a result, we find discrepancies of the case endings in the manuscripts, as we have just seen above.

Also, I want to draw attention to the similarity between the language of the supposed Urtext of the Lotus Sutra and that of the *Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin* school, which I have already noted at (1.2) concerning *sād-yathā*, *syād-yathā*.

#### 2.8.4. Verse 10 of the Tathāgatāyuspramāṇaparivarta

There is a remarkable verse which becomes understandable, only when one presumes that instrumental, ablative and locative plural endings merged in the Urtext. The 10th verse of the *Tathāgatāyuspramāṇaparivarta* of the Sutra reads as follows:

K.324.11. *sadādhiṣṭhānaṃ mama etad īdr̥ṣaṃ acintiyā kalpa-sahasrakotyaḥ / na ca cyavāmī itu (v.l. iha) gṛdhrakūṭāt anyāsu śayyāsanakoṭibhiś ca ||*

Burnouf and Kern translated this verse as follows, respectively:

“Ma bénédiction a toujours été telle que je viens de la dire, depuis un nombre inconcevable de milliers de kôṭis de Kalpas, et je ne sors pas d’ici, du sommet du Grīdhrakūṭa, pour aller m’asseoir sur des myriades d’autres sièges et d’autres lits” (Burnouf 1852: 197).

“Such has always been my firm resolve during an inconceivable number of thousands of koṭis of Æons, and I have not left this *Grīdhrakūṭa* for other abodes” (Kern 1884: 308)

It is hard to interpret the grammatical structure of the passage *anyāsu śayyāsanakoṭibhiś ca*, in which a locative word and an instrumental one stand side by side. The modern translators seem to have recognised both words as used in a dative sense. However, it is quite strange that Śākyamuni states he has spent all his life long only on Mt. *Gṛdhrakūṭa*, in spite of the fact that he had stayed also in many other lodgings or abodes (*śayyāsana*),<sup>48</sup> such as *Veṇuvana*, *Jetavana*, *Isipatana Migadāya* and so on. I think, therefore, we need to reconsider the meaning of the latter half of the verse.

We shall begin with an investigation on readings of the extant manuscripts.<sup>49</sup>

As to the reading of the second foot of the latter half-verse, the Kern-Nanjio edition agrees with the Nepalese MSS. K', C1, C2, C4, P1, P2, P3, T2, T3, T8, A3, N1, Pk and the Gilgit MS. D2, though the other Nepalese MSS. read differently.

T6. *anyāsu śayyāsanakoṭiṣū ca* (≠ A1, N2)

C5. *anyāsayyāsanakoṭiṣu ca*

C6. *anyāśayyāsanakoṭiṣū ca*

T4. *anyāsu śayyāsanakoṭiṣu*

These four readings show a locative construction of the foot.

The following three readings in the Nepalese manuscripts show a strange mixture of an instrumental plural ending and a locative one, just the same with the form *bahubuddhakoṭibhiṣu* in the Kashgar MS., as shown above (2.8.1.[7]).

R. *anyāsu śayyāsanakoṭibhiṣu*

T5. *anyāsu sayyāsanakoṭibhiṣu*

T9. *anyāsu śayyāsanakoṭibhiṣu*

Supposedly, this bizarre ending *-ibhiṣu* was made up by a redactor who was at a loss which reading to adopt, namely either “*anyāsu śayyāsanakoṭibhiṣ ca*” or “*anyāsu śayyāsanakoṭiṣū ca*”.

Then, how did the two different readings just mentioned originate? Presumably, the original reading was something like “\**anyāsu śayyāsanakoṭihīś* (or *°koṭihim) cā*”. The feminine ending *-ihīś* (or *-m*) could be taken as instrumental, dative-ablative or locative plural theoretically, just like its masculine counterpart *-ehi*. Here, in agreement with the preceding locative form *anyāsu*, the word *śayyāsanakoṭihīś* (or *-m*) must be a locative form. Its sense is, however, ablative, as it is combined with the verb  $\sqrt{c}yu$  (“falls from, falls away”) which is normally associated with an ablative. In a later period, some recognised correctly it was a locative and replaced it with *śayyāsanakoṭiṣū*, while others misunderstood it as an instrumental and replaced it with *śayyāsanakoṭibhiṣ*.

Therefore, the meaning of the verse is as follows:

“I possess always such supernatural power, that I shall not vanish from here *Grḍhrakūṭa* and other *koṭis* of lodgings during an inconceivable number of thousands of *koṭis* of *kalpas*”<sup>50</sup>

## CONCLUSION

In the first part of this paper, we saw that the Central Asian fragments, preserved in Lüshun, retain many Middle Indic forms, some of which are apparently earlier Eastern forms and they could not have been later inventions, produced in Central Asia or elsewhere.

The Nepalese, Gilgit and Kashgar manuscripts, on the other hand, are much more Sanskritised in appearance, but when we minutely compare readings in various manuscripts, their discrepancies reveal underlying Middle Indic forms from the original version, examples of which we have seen in the latter part of this paper.

Therefore, in conclusion, we may assume that the Lotus Sutra had been transmitted originally, if not in pure Middle Indic, in a Middle Indic-cum-Sanskrit which contained many Middle Indic forms including those of an Eastern dialect, but later these were gradually replaced by (Buddhist) Sanskrit ones.

### ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGNS

Abbreviations of the Sanskrit MSS. of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* are as in Krsh. 16–18.

Other abbreviations:

{A} = A is to be deleted

A < B = the form A comes from B

A's = the language of the Inscriptions of Aśoka

BHS = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit

BHS(D, G) = Edgerton 1953

CDIAL = *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*

EWAia = *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen*

F = the Farhād-Bēg Manuscripts of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*

GDhp = Brough 1962

H<sub>1–6</sub> = Readings of the Central Asian Manuscript fragments romanized in Toda 1981: 261–320 (cf. Krsh. 18)

H(1988) = Toda 1988

K = H. Kern and B. Nanjio 1908–1912

Krsh. = Karashima 1992

Lü = Jiang 1997

O = Petrovsky Manuscripts of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* discovered in Kashgar

Pā. = Pāli

Pkt. = Prākṛit

PTSD = Rhys Davids, T.W. & W. Stede, eds., *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*, London, 1921–1925.

R<sub>1–7</sub>, R (1990) = Fragmentary Manuscripts of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* from the Petrovsky Collection. Cf. Krsh. 18

Skt. = Sanskrit

*Taishō* = *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō*, ed. J. Takakusu and K. Watanabe, 100 vols., Tokyo, 1924–1934.

Tib. = Tibetan

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

– = stem of a word, e.g. *dharmā*–.

- = (before or after a Sanskrit word) the word is a member of a compound, e.g. *dharmā*- (the first member of a compound), *-dharmā*~ (the last member of a compound), *-dharmā*- (the middle member of a compound).

## NOTES

\* This is a revised version of a paper delivered at the XIIth IABS Conference, Lausanne, 24th August 1999. Here I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Oskar von Hinüber, Prof. Boris Oguibénine, Mr. Peter Skilling, and other scholars for their valuable comments on this paper during the conference. Also, thanks are due to Mr. Peter Lait, who took the trouble to check my unidiomatic English.

<sup>1</sup> The voc. pl. *bhikṣavaḥ* occurs only once in the whole of the Lüshun fragments; K.157.1. *bhikṣavaḥ* (= O etc.) / Lü. B-6.Recto 5. *bhikṣavaḥ*.

<sup>2</sup> For the form *seyyathā*, cf. Lüders 1952: §2; Geiger 1916: §105, Bemerkung 2; cf. v. Hinüber 1986: §375.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Tatia 1976: 8. 20, 23 etc.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. BHSD, s.vv. *yathāpi*, *say-yathīdam*; Roth 1970: §36. IA.7.3. *sayyathīdam*; do. §46.BI.7.7. *saṃyathīdam* (= do. §62.2B1.4); do. §9.BI.3.1. *saṃyyathīdam* (= do. §10.BI.3.2).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Peter Skilling “The *Rakṣā* Literature of the *Śrāvakayāna*” in: *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, vol. XVI (1992), p. 152. I thank Mr. Skilling for having informed me of the existence of these forms at the conference in Lausanne.

<sup>6</sup> *Ārya-mahā-māyūrī Vidyā-rājñī*, edited by Shūyo Takubo, Tokyo: Sankibō, 1972, p. 44, l. 19.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. Skt. *udyāna* > Aśoka, Pā. *uyyāna*; Śaurasenī *uyyāṇa*; cf. v. Hinüber 1986: §249.

<sup>8</sup> The development of *-yy-* > *-jj-* was quite common in Middle Indo-Aryan, cf. v. Hinüber 1986: §213.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. also BHSG §21.23.

<sup>10</sup> Toda transcribed here *etaṣāṃ* wrongly.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Pāli *dinna*; BHS. *dinna* (cf. BHSG §34.16), Gāndhārī Dharmapada *dīna* (= *dīṇa*; cf. GDhp §45); cf. further CDIAL.6140.5. \**dinna*-; Emeneau 1988: 189; EWAia, p. 715.

<sup>12</sup> Presumably this hyperformation was influenced by the word *khud(d)aka* (“little, tiny”) which precedes it.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Salomon 1999: 122–123. I am grateful to Prof. O. von Hinüber for pointing this idea out to me and providing me with information on it.

<sup>14</sup> Dr. Jiang mistakenly divided the word into two: *tāva trīśehi*.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. BHS. *trāyastriṃśa*, *trāyatriṃśa*; Amg. *tāyattīsa*.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. v. Hinüber 1986: §214; Norman 1995: 135, 169.

<sup>17</sup> Prof. Toda transliterated *tāpa* wrongly here. I thank him here for having taken the trouble to check his own photo of the fragment and ascertained the reading *bhāpa*.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Ratna Chandra, *An Illustrated Ardha-Māgadhī Dictionary*, s.v. *bappa*; *Pāiasaddamahanṇavo*, s.v. *bappa*; CDIAL.9209 \**bāppa*- “father”.

<sup>19</sup> Hoernle (ed.) 1916: 162; Dschi, Hiän-lin 1944: 139–143.

<sup>20</sup> Some other examples are as follows:

K.189.8. *khalu* / O. *bho*

K.233.8. *khalu* / O. *ho*

K.436.12. *khalu* / Otani Collection. *ho*

K.457.9. *khalu* / O. *bhoḥ*

K.469.9. *khalu* / O. *bho*

K.483.5. *khalu* / O. *bhoḥ* etc. etc.

<sup>21</sup> Both Skt. *bhoḥ* and Skt. *khalu* developed to *ho* in Middle Indic in a following way:

Skt. *bhoḥ* > *ho* (= Pkt., BHS.); cf. Skt. *ho* (“ho!”)

Skt. *khalu* > \**kh<sup>a</sup>lu* > \**kkhu* > *khu* (= Pkt., BHS.), *kho* (= Pā., As., BHS.) > *hu* (= Pkt., BHS., GDhp.), *ho* (GDhp.)

The following example from the Lotus Sutra may illustrate that these words are easily confused.

K.97.6. *mā haiva tvam* (≠ MSS.)

C3, N1. *mā ho khu tvam*

C4, Pk. *mā ho khu tam*

D2, 4, C5, 6, B, T7, 8, N2, 3, A1. *mā kho hu tvam*

K'. *mā ho khalum*

T2. *mā kho khalu tvam*

O. *mā tvam ida*

Presumably, in an earlier recension, from which the Nepalese and Gilgit MSS. originated, the wording was something like *mā ho* (< Skt. *khalu*, Skt. *ho* or Skt. *bhoḥ*) *hu* ([m.c.] < Skt. *ho*, Skt. *bhoḥ*, Skt. *khalu*) *t(v)am*.

An example of the same confusion is found also in the Pali Canon: *Majjhima-Nikāya* I 16, 29–30. *durabhisambhavāni hi bho Gotama araṇṇe vanapatthāni pantāni senāsanāni* / *Aṅguttara-Nikāya* V 202, 4–5. *durabhisambhavāni kho* (v.l. *hi kho*) *Upāli araṇṇe vanapatthāni pantāni senāsanāni*.

<sup>22</sup> Kern 1884: 70.

<sup>23</sup> Skt. *ārya* > Pkt. *ajja*, Pā. *ayya*; Skt. *adya* > Pkt = Pā. *ajja*.

<sup>24</sup> The two Chinese translations read “now”, which corresponds with Skt. *adya*, cf. Krsh. 66, 296.

<sup>25</sup> Skt. *pra√arth* (“wishes for”) is often combined with Skt. *bodhi* (“enlightenment”) in a similar context, while *pra√sthā* is not used in such a way.

K.35.1. *pratyekabodhi prārthenti*

K.35.12. *prārthenti . . . agrabodhiṃ*

K.335.9. *prārthayed bodhiṃ*

K.70.10. *prārthanā bhotu bodhaye*

Though in Pali, Skt. *pra√arth* and *pra√sthā* developed separately to *pattheti* and *paṭṭhahati*, we find a phrase like “*abhisambodhiṃ patthayanto*” (*Jātaka* I 66) in Pali literature, which shows that *pra√arth* is combined with *bodhi* also in this language. Therefore, I assume that *prārthita-* and *prārthenti* in the Central Asian MSS. are correct backformations, while *prasthita-* is a hyper-Sanskritism.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Kern 1884: 333.

<sup>27</sup> The two Chinese translations go with the readings of the Central Asian MSS.: Dharmarakṣa’s translation: *Taishō*, vol. 9, No. 263, 105a16. *xūyú chí cǐjīng zé wéi fèngjìng*

*fó yīqièzhūdāoshī shìjīng nánzhíyù* (“If one would keep for a moment this scripture, then thereby he shall respect the Buddha [*i.e.* I] and all the Guides [*i.e.* *buddhas*]. The scripture is hard to encounter.”); Kumārajīva’s translation: *Taishō*, vol. 9, No. 262, 34b15. *cǐjīng nánchí ruòzānchízhě wǒ zé huānxí zhūfó yì rán* (“The scripture is hard to hold. If one would keep it for a moment, then I shall be delighted, as shall the other *buddhas*”). Cf. Krsh. 153.

<sup>28</sup> Skt. *mahyam* is dative, but the Middle Indic *maha(m)* is genitive as well as dative, cf. Pischel §418; Vaidya 1934: 51; Bloch 1965: 24, 144; v. Hinüber 1986: §366.

<sup>29</sup> The fourth syllable in *yathâpi aṭavī bhavi ugra dāruṇā* is resolved.

<sup>30</sup> Karashima 1991, 1993. Cf. also Boucher 1998: 491–492. Prof. Boucher is now preparing an English translation of Karashima 1993.

<sup>31</sup> Other instances are as follows:

Instances in verses:

K.12.2. *buddhajñāna* / O. *buddhayānaṃ*

K.46.2. *varadasya jñāne* / O. *varabuddhayāne*

K.46.13. *bauddhasya jñānasya* / O. *boddhasya yānasya*

K.49.2. *yāna* (= O etc.) / C3. *jñāna*

K.53.2. *bauddhasmi jñānasmī* / O. *boddhasmi yānasmī*

K.90.12. *buddhāna jñānaṃ* / O. *buddhāna yānaṃ*

K.147.10. *buddhajñānaṃ* / O, H<sub>5</sub> (298). *buddhayānaṃ*

K.152.7. *jñānaṃ* / O. *yānaṃ*

K.198.7. *sarvajñajñānaṃ* / O, R<sub>2</sub> (No. 55, p. 133). *sarvajñayānaṃ*

K.198.10. *sarvajñajñāne* / O. *sarvajñayānaṃ*, R<sub>2</sub> (No. 55, p. 133). (*sarvajña*)*yāna*

It must be pointed out that the consonant group *jñ-* does not make position in these verses.

Instances in the prose:

K.66.8. *buddhajñāna-* / O. *buddhayāna-*

K.78.8. *buddhajñāna-* (= Lü etc.) / O, H<sub>5</sub> (283). *buddhayāna-*

K.189.1. *ekam eva buddhajñānaṃ* / O. *eka eva buddhayānaṃ*

K.189.2. *buddhajñānaṃ* / O. *buddhayānaṃ*

K.189.9. *tathāgatajñānaṃ* / O. *tathāgatayānaṃ*, H<sub>6</sub> (306).\*\*\**gatayānaṃ*

<sup>32</sup> Kern 1884: 45.

<sup>33</sup> Kern 1884: 189.

<sup>34</sup> As to the antiquity of the change *y- > j-*, cf. Norman 1993: 55; *do.* 1997: 68f. We find an example of this development in the *Patna Dharmapada* (I am grateful to Prof. Hiromichi Hikita of Aichigakuin University for the information concerning this):

*Patna Dharmapada* 92ab. *na hi tehi jānajātehi* (read: *etehi jānehi?*) *tāṃ bhūmim abhisamḥhave*

*Dhammapada* 323ab. *na hi etehi yānehi gaccheyya agataṃ disaṃ*

*Udāṇavarga* 19.8a. *na hy tena sa yānena tāṃ bhūmim abhisamḥhavet*

As to the development *jñ- > j-*, cf. Pischel §276; Hemacandra II 83; BHSD, s.vv. *a-jānaka*, *jāna* (“wise”), *jānaka* (“wise”); MW, s.v. <sup>2</sup>*jānaka* (“Buddhists”; cf. also Bollée 1977: 75); Pkt. *ajjā* (< Skt. *ājñā*), *pajjā* (< Skt. *prajñā*), *savvajjo* (< Skt. *sarvajña*), *appajja* (< Skt. *alpajña*), *maṇojja* (< Skt. *manoña*), *paramatthajānaa* (< skt. *paramārtha-jñānaka*; Hamm / Schubring 1951: 30, vs. 240) etc. Cf. also the form *Jātisuta* in a Central Asian manuscript, corresponding presumably to skt. *Jñātiputra* (Schlingloff 1955: 114, vs. 52; fn. 4).

<sup>35</sup> *niryāta-* (“adept, perfected”) + loc.

<sup>36</sup> *niryāyita-* (“given, presented”) + instr.

<sup>37</sup> A similar confusion is seen between BHS. *akṣeṇa* and Pā. *akkhesu*, cf. Lüders 1952: §221 note 5.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Pischel §§368, 369, 376; Geiger §78; v. Hinüber §§316, 317.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. BHSG §§8.108, 9.102.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Pischel §371, 376; Ghatage 1937; Lüders 1952: §§220~225; v. Hinüber 1968: §307; Norman 1969: 260; Caillat 1982: 76f.; *do.* 1983: 237~238, fn. 8; v. Hinüber 1986: §321; Bollée 1988: 42.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. BHSG §§7.32f.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Roth 1966: §11.

<sup>43</sup> E.g.:

*Ābhisamācārikā* 31B4. *atha dāni deśakālo bhavati, saṃghārāmaṃ pravisiyāṇaṃ grāmāntikaṃ bhikṣuṃ pratisaṃmodiyāṇaṃ svakasvakehi āsanehi upaviśitavyaṃ*

12A4. *navakehi vṛkṣamūlehi caṃkramehi niṣadyāhi abhyavakāṣe vītināmayitavyaṃ*

32A5. *yadi tāva anukālyo bhavati, ārāmehi vṛkṣamūlehi caṃkramehi niṣadyāhi sthāna-caṃkrama-niṣadyānuयोगam anuyuktehi vītināmayitavyaṃ* (MS. °tavyā)

Cf. *Gaṇḍavyūha*, ed. T. Suzuki, H. Idzumi, Kyoto 1934–1936, 518.7. *teṣu ca caṃkrameṣu niṣadyāsv āsaneṣu ca asaṃkhyeyān bodhisattvān nānākāryaprayuktān apaśyat*

In the *Ābhisamācārikā*, there are many more examples of the locative plural in *-ehi* (*-āhi*). The present author is now preparing a critical edition with an annotated translation of the text, and has gathered and remarked such examples in notes there.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. BHSG §7.32.

<sup>45</sup> See Lüders 1952: §§220~225; Mehendale 1955–1956: 168; *do.* 1968: 44; Norman 1977: 17 = 1991: 17; Geiger / Norman §80.3; Norman 1995: 135.

<sup>46</sup> See Ghatage 1937; BHSG §§7.30f.; Caillat 1982: 77f.; Salomon 1981: 99; *do.* 1983: 104.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Salomon 1981: 99.

<sup>48</sup> As to the meaning of the word *śāyāsana*, cf. PTSD, s.v. *senāsana*, “dwelling, lodging”; Upasak, *Dictionary of Early Buddhist Monastic Terms (Based on Pali Literature)*, Varanasi 1975, p. 242, “residence, furniture, bed etc.”; Petra Kieffer-Pülz, *Die Sīmā; Vorschriften zur Regelung der buddhistischen Gemeindegrenze in älteren buddhistischen Texten*, Berlin 1992, p. 43, p. 124f. “Unterkunft”. Cf. also *Samantapāsādikā* 1229.18–23 (*ad. Vin II 167*). *cetiyaḥaramaṃ bodhiharamaṃ āsanagharamaṃ sammūñjaniatṭo dāruatṭo vaccakuṭī iṭṭhakasālā vaddhakāsālā dvārakoṭṭhako pāṇiyamālo maggo pokkharanī ’ti etāni hi asenāsanāni. vihāro adḍhayogo pāsādo hammiyaṃ guhā maṇḍapo rukkhamaṇḍalaṃ veḷugumbo ti imāni senāsanāni ’ti tāni gāhetabbāni*; *op. cit.* 1231.7–12. *thūpo nāma asenāsanam . . . bhojanasālā pana senāsanam eva.*

<sup>49</sup> It is regrettable that the Kashagar manuscript as well as other Central Asian fragments are lacking here.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Kumārajīva’s translation: *Taishō*, vol. 9, No. 262, 43c4~5. *shéntōnglì rúshì yú āsēngqí jié chángzài Língjiùshān jí yúzhūzhūchū* (“Such are my supernatural powers. For *asaṃkhyeyakalpas* I stay always on Mount *Gṛdhrakūṭa* and in the other dwelling places”; Tib. *Bya rgod phung po ’di las mi ’pho yang // gud na bye ba snyed kyi mal cha yod* (“I do not leave this *Gṛdhrakūṭa*. There are around ten millions of lodgings elsewhere.”).

## REFERENCES

- Bloch, Jules: 1965, *Indo-Aryan from the Vedas to Modern Times*. English Edition Largely Revised by the Author and Translated by Alfred Master, Paris.
- Bollée, Willem: 1977, *Studien zum Sāyagaḍa: Textteile, Nijjutti, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*, Teil I. Stuttgart.
- Bollée, Willem: 1988, *Studien zum Sāyagaḍa: Textteile, Nijjutti, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*, Teil II. Stuttgart.
- Boucher, Daniel: 1998, Gāndhārī and the Early Chinese Buddhist Translations Reconsidered: The Case of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 118(4): 471–506.
- Brough, John: 1962, *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. London (London Oriental Series, vol. 7).
- Burnouf, Eugène: 1852, *Le Lotus de la Bonne Loi, traduit du sanscrit, accompagné d'un commentaire et de vingt et un mémoires relatifs au Bouddhisme*. Paris.
- Caillat, Colette: 1982, Notes sur les variantes grammaticales dans la tradition du Dasaveyāliya-sutta. In L. A. Hercus et al., eds., *Indological and Buddhist Studies, Volume in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*. Canberra, pp. 69–94.
- Caillat, Colette: 1983, The Recent Critical Editions of the Jain Āgama. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Suppl. V: 234–240.
- Dschi, Hiän-lin: 1944, Die Umwandlung der Endung *-am* in *-o* und *-u* im Mittelindischen. *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, Phil.-Hist. Klasse. Nr. 6: 121–144. = Ji 1982: 188–222.
- Egerton, F.: 1953, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, 2 vols. New Haven.
- Emeneau, M. B.: 1988, *Sanskrit Studies of M. B. Emeneau, Selected Papers*, ed. B. A. van Nooten. Berkely.
- Geiger, Wilhelm: 1916, *Pāli, Literatur und Sprache*, Strassburg (*Grundriß der indoarischen Philologie und Altertumskunde* I, 7).
- Geiger / Norman: 1994, *A Pāli Grammar*, by Wilhelm Geiger, translated into English by Batakrishna Ghosh, revised and edited by K. R. Norman. Oxford: PTS.
- Ghatage, A. M.: 1937, Instrumental and Locative in Ardha-Māgadhī. *Indian Historical Quarterly* 13: 52–58.
- Hamm / Schubring: 1951, *Studien zum Mahānīṣha: Kapitel 6–8*, Frank-Richard Hamm und Walther Schubring, Hamburg: Cram, de Gruyter (*Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien* 6).
- Hinüber, Oskar von: 1968, *Studien zur Kasussyntax des Pāli, besonders des Vinaya-piṭaka*. München.
- Hinüber, Oskar von: 1982, *A New Fragmentary Gilgit Manuscript of the Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*. Tokyo: The Reiyukai.
- Hinüber, Oskar von: 1986, *Das Ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*. Wien.
- Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf: 1916, *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan*, ed. by A.F. Rudolf Hoernle. Oxford.
- Ji Xian-lin: 1982, *Yīndù Gǔdàiyǔyán Lùnjí* [Collected Papers on Ancient Indian Languages], Beijing (Zhōngguóshèhuìkēxué Chūbǎnshè).
- Jiang, Zhongxin: 1997, *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Fragments from the Lüshun Museum Collection, Facsimile Edition and Romanized Text*, ed. by Jiang Zhongxin, Dalian and Tokyo 1997 (Lüshun Museum and Soka Gakkai).

- Karashima, Seishi: 1991, “Fāhuājīng zhōng de Shèng(yāna) yǔ Zhīhuì(jñāna)” [Vehicle (yāna) and Wisdom (jñāna) in the Lotus Sūtra]. In Li Zheng et al., eds., *Papers in Honour of Prof. Dr. Ji Xianlin on the Occasion of his 80th Birthday* (I). Nanchang, pp. 607–643.
- Karashima, Seishi: 1992, *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra – in the light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions*. Tokyo.
- Karashima, Seishi: 1993, “Hokekyō ni okeru jō (yāna) to chie (jñāna) – Daijō Bukkyō ni okeru yāna no gainen no kigen ni tuite” [Vehicle (yāna) and Wisdom (jñāna) in the Lotus Sūtra – On the Origin of the Concept of Yāna in Mahāyāna Buddhism]. In R. Taga, ed., *Hokekyō no Juyō to Tenkai* [The Acceptance and Development of the Lotus Sutra]. Kyoto, pp. 137–197.
- Kern, H.: 1884, *The Saddharmapuṇḍarīka or the Lotus of the True Law*, Oxford (= *The Sacred Books of the East Series*, vol. 21) (repr. 1965, 1980, Delhi).
- Kern, H. and Nanjio, B.: 1908–1912, *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, St. Petersburg (Bibliotheca Buddhica X).
- Lüders, Heinrich: 1952, *Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanons*, aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben von Ernst Waldschmidt, Berlin (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1952, Nr. 10).
- Mehendale, M. A.: 1955–1956, Some Remarks on the Language of the Original Buddhist Canon. *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute* 17: 157–171.
- Mehendale, M. A.: 1968, *Some Aspects of Indo-Aryan Linguistics*. Bombay.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred: 1992, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Heidelberg.
- Norman, K. R.: 1969, *The Elders’ Verses I, Theragāthā*. London (The Pali Text Society).
- Norman, K. R.: 1977, Kāvīliyaṃ: A Metrical Analysis of the Eighth Chapter of the Uttarādhyayana-sūtra. In *Mahāvīra and His Teachings*, Bombay, pp. 9–19 (= Norman 1991: 9–19).
- Norman, K. R.: 1991, *Collected Papers II*. Oxford (The Pali Text Society).
- Norman, K. R.: 1993, *Collected Papers IV*. Oxford (The Pali Text Society).
- Norman, K. R.: 1995, *The Group of Discourses (Sutta-Nipāta)*, volume II, revised translation with introduction and notes, Oxford, Pali Text Society (Pali Text Society Translation Series No. 45).
- Norman, K. R.: 1997, *A Philological Approach to Buddhism: the Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai Lectures 1994*, London: School of Oriental & African Studies, University of London (The Buddhist Forum; v. 5).
- Pischel, Richard: 1900, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*. Strassburg.
- Patna Dharmapada = Margaret Cone “Patna Dharmapada. Part I: Text”. *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, XIII (1989): 101–217.
- Roth, Gustav: 1966, “Bhikṣuṇīvinaya and Bhikṣu-prakīrṇaka and Notes on the Language”, in: *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 52: 29–51.
- Roth, Gustav: 1970, *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya, including Bhikṣuṇī-Prakīrṇaka and a summary of the Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*, ed. Gustav Roth, Patna (TSWS 12)
- Salomon, Richard: 1981, A Linguistic Analysis of the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 25: 91–105.
- Salomon, Richard: 1983, The Buddhist Sanskrit of Aśvaghoṣa’s Saundarananda. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 27: 97–112.
- Salomon, Richard: 1999, *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra: the British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

- Schlingloff, Dieter: 1955, *Buddhistische Stotras aus ostturkistanischen Sanskrittexten*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 1).
- Tatia, Nathmal: 1976, *Prātimokṣasūtram of the Lokottaravādimahāsāṅghika School*, ed. Nathmal Tatia, Patna 1976 (TSWS 16).
- Toda, Hirofumi: 1981, *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra, Central Asian Manuscripts, Romanized Text*. Tokushima.
- Toda, Hirofumi: 1988, Central Asian Fragments of the Hoernle Collection, Romanized Text. *Tokushima Daigaku Kyōyōbu Rinri Gakka Kiyō* [Proceedings of the Department of Ethics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, University of Tokushima] 15: 20–23.
- Turner, R. L.: 1966, *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London.
- Udānavarga = Udānavarga*, hrsg. von Franz Bernhard, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965–1968 (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 10) 2 vols.
- Vaidya, P. L.: 1934, *A Manual of Ardhamaṅgadhī Grammar for the Use of University Students*, Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Poona.

### LIST OF CHINESE CHARACTERS

*xūyú chí cǐjīng zé wéi fèngjìng fó yīqièzhǔdǎoshī shìjīng nánzhíyù*

須臾持此經 則為奉敬佛 一切諸導師 是經難值遇

*cǐjīng nánchí ruòzànchízhě wǒ zé huānxǐ zhūfó yì rán*

此經難持 若暫持者 我則歡喜 諸佛亦然

*shànzāi! shànzāi! shìzūn, ānzhù! xīrúsuǒyán. dàodé xuánmiào, chāojié wúǐ.*

*huì píngděngyī, yóurú xūkōng, shí wúyǒuyì!*

善哉！善哉！世尊、安住！悉如所言。道德玄妙，超絕無侶。慧平等一；  
猶如虛空，實無有異！

*shànzāi! shànzāi! Shìjiāmóuní-shìzūn! néng yǐ píngděngdàhuì jiāopúsàfǎ, fósuǒhùniàn*

*Miàofǎhuājīng wèi dàzhòng shuō*

善哉！善哉！釋迦牟尼世尊！能以平等大慧教菩薩法，佛所護念《妙法華經》為大眾說

*shéntōnglì rúshì yú āsēngqí jié chángzài Língjiùshān jí yúzhūzhùchù*

神通力如是 於阿僧祇劫 常在靈鷲山 及餘諸住處

**IRIAB**

*Soka University*

*Tokyo*