

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年報

平成24年度
(第16号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2012
Volume XVI

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2013・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo · 2013

Annual Report of The International Research Institute for
Advanced Buddhology at Soka University, vol. XVI (2013)

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報(第16号)

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年報

平成24年度
(第16号)

**Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University**

for the Academic Year 2012

Volume XVI

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2013・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo · 2013

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報
平成24年度（第16号）

Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism
(ARIRIAB)
at Soka University for the Academic Year 2012
Vol. XVI (2013)

目次/CONTENTS

● 研究報告 RESEARCH ARTICLES:

Oskar von HINÜBER:	
Again on the Donation made by the Vinayadhara Dhammasena and on Other Inscriptions from Phanigiri [8 figures]	3
Oskar von HINÜBER and Peter SKILLING:	
Two Buddhist Inscriptions from Deorkothar (Dist. Rewa, Madhya Pradesh) [16 figures]	13
Seishi KARASHIMA:	
Two Inscriptions in Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī [10 figures]	27
Petra KIEFFER-PÜLZ:	
Buddhist Nuns in South India as Reflected in the <i>Andhakaṭṭhakathā</i> and in Vajrabuddhi's <i>Anuganthipada</i>	29
Seishi KARASHIMA:	
Manuscript Fragments of the <i>Prātimokṣasūtra</i> of the Mahāsāṃghika(-Lokottaravādin)s (2) [75 figures]	47
Noriyuki KUDO:	
The <i>Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa</i> : A Transliteration of the Nepalese Manuscript A (5)	91
Harry FALK and Seishi KARASHIMA:	
A first-century <i>Prajñāpāramitā</i> manuscript from Gandhāra – <i>parivarta</i> 5 (Texts from the Split Collection 2) [2 figures]	97
Seishi KARASHIMA:	
Was the <i>Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā</i> Compiled in Gandhāra in Gāndhārī?	171
Seishi KARASHIMA:	
On the "Missing" Portion in the <i>Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā</i>	189
Peter SKILLING and SAERJI:	
The Circulation of the <i>Buddhāvataṃsaka</i> in India	193
LI Xuezhū and Jundo NAGASHIMA:	
<i>Maitreyavyākaraṇa</i>	217
YE Shaoyong:	
A Sanskrit folio of the <i>Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti</i> from Tibet [16 figures]	233
LI Xuezhū:	
Diplomatic Transcription of Newly Available Leaves from Asaṅga's <i>Abhidharmasamuccaya</i> —Folios 1, 15, 18, 20, 23, 24—	241
Noriyuki KUDO:	
A Newly Identified Manuscript of the <i>Pāramitāsamāsa</i> in the <i>Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts</i>	255

Peter SKILLING and SAERJI: Candrakīrti and the Pūrvaśailas: A Note on <i>Triśaraṇasaptati</i> v. 51	267
Seishi KARASHIMA: A Study of the Language of Early Chinese Buddhist Translations: A Comparison between the Translations by Lokakṣema and Zhi Qian	273
Seishi KARASHIMA: The Meaning of <i>Yulanpen</i> 盂蘭盆 — "Rice Bowl" on <i>Pravāraṇā</i> Day	289
Haiyan Hu-von HINÜBER: The Case of the Missing Author: Who wrote the anonymous Epilogue to Faxian's <i>Foguoji</i> ?	307
Tatsushi TAMAI: Tocharian <i>Udānālamkāra</i>	315
Isao KURITA: Gandhāran Art [57 figures]	337
Akira YUYAMA: A List of Writings With Brief Bibliographical Notes Appendix: Curriculum Vitae — <i>A succinct Autobiographical Record</i>	343

● 国際仏教学高等研究所彙報 *IRIAB BULLETIN*:

活動報告	IRIAB Activities	391
所長・所員の著作	List of Publications of the IRIAB Fellows	393
受贈受入図書	Books Received	394
受贈受入雑誌	Journals Received	396

● **EDITORIALS:**

執筆者紹介	Contributors to this Issue / Editorial Postscript	399
既刊案内	Back Issues [<i>ARIRIAB</i> , <i>BPPB</i> , <i>BLSF</i>]	

● **PLATES:**

1 Oskar von HINÜBER: "Again on the Donation made by the Vinayadhara Dhammasena and on Other Inscriptions ..."	PLATES 1-3
2 Oskar von HINÜBER and Peter SKILLING: "Two Buddhist Inscriptions from Deorkothar"	PLATES 4-11
3 Seishi KARASHIMA: "Two Inscriptions in Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī"	PLATES 12-13
4 Seishi KARASHIMA: "Manuscript Fragments of the <i>Prātimokṣasūtra</i> of the Mahāsāṃghika(-Lokottaravādin)s (2)"	PLATES 14-51
5 Harry FALK and Seishi KARASHIMA: "A first-century <i>Prajñāpāramitā</i> manuscript from Gandhāra – <i>parivarta</i> 5"	PLATES 52-53
6 YE Shaoyong: "A Sanskrit folio of the <i>Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti</i> from Tibet"	PLATES 54-57
7 Isao KURITA: "Gandhāran Art"	PLATES 58-77

No facsimiles are
available in this
PDF file.

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 [*pati*]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 *bhātūputenā budhinā* would be possible with a wrong long *-ā* in the ending of °-*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: Buddhi, Bodhā and Buddhā.

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

¹ O. v. Hinüber, "A Second Inscription from Phanigiri (Andhrapradesh): Dhammasena's Donation," in: *ARIRIAB XV* 2012, pp. 3-10.

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 Pāvajitīkā as assumed earlier: “and with the sister Dhaṃmasirī, 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 *akṣara* 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 *ṭhāpitaṃ*.

In line 10 the problematic *bha(sa)khula* disappears. Instead, an only slightly less problematic *bhaṃḍaphula* emerges now with an *anusvāra* placed above the line between *bha* and the following *ḍa*, which was hidden on the rubbing. Moreover, reading the rubbing only, it seemed as if the *ḍa* and the first half of *phu* formed one *akṣara*, a not very distinct *sa*, and the second half was, consequently, mistakenly taken as *khu*. However, *bhaṃḍa*, though certain, is also difficult to explain, perhaps as a crossing of *khaṇḍa* as in *khaṇḍa-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 *akṣara* 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 *akṣara* of line 14 is damaged but the reading is certain. The text at the end of this line is better comprehensible now: *bhikkhusaṃghena dātavā puphamolaṃ*, 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 °-*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 *akṣara 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 *sāṇikāyo* with a long first vowel, which is hardly visible. However, the right stroke of the *akṣara 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 *sāṇikā* 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 *sāṇa* “a weight of four *māśas*.”

³ It is perhaps even conceivable that *bhaṇḍa* also means “defective” given the meaning *chinnamūrdhā* listed in the much later *Deśināmamālā* 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 *sāṇikāyo* “4 *sāṇikās*, 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 6 *kāhāpaṇas* must be given annually by the community of monks and for oil for lamps 4 *śāṇikās* are to be given.”

Here, the verbal root $\sqrt{dā}$ is used as a simplex and with two different prefixes to describe the act of giving. First, Dhammasena uses *saṃpadattaṃ* when he “hands over” his 150 cows (and?) 150 *tarīdelas*.⁶ Then, six *kāhāpaṇas* are given by the monks which is expressed by *dātavā*, and finally the verb *paridātava* occurs in combination with the four *sāṇikās*.

By using the available lexicographical resources it seems impossible to precisely define the semantic nuances, by which *dātava*, *saṃpadatta* 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 arghena*, 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 saṃpadattaṃ*, 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 Ikṣvāku administration and in the *Arthaśāstra*.

Incidentally, *paridāna* also occurs twice in the *Arthaśāstra*, e.g., in *prajñāpana-ājñā-paridāna-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 *dātavā* and *paridātava* is perhaps that the monks are asked to actually pay the 6 *kāhāpaṇas* 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-vi-saṃ-vadamtena*, a syntactical device also found in Vinaya texts.⁸

⁶ There is no doubt now that the figure is “150,” and a reading “7” instead of 50 can safely be ruled out.

⁷ Keisho Tsukamoto, *A Comprehensive Study of the Indian Buddhist Inscriptions. Part I. Texts, Notes and Japanese Translation*. Kyoto 1996. *Part II Indices, Maps and Illustrations*. Kyoto 1998 [rev.: G. Fussman, *BEFEO* 88, 2001, p. 383-385], on the Gurzāla inscription cf. also *ARIRIAB* XIV. 2011, p. 9 note 7.

⁸ O. v. Hinüber, *Studien zur Kasussyntax des Pāli, besonders des Vinaya-Piṭaka*. Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beihefte. Neue Folge 2. München 1968 § 101; for a similar use of the locative case cf.

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[ṇa]* is perhaps not unlikely. Following a name the word *purāṇa* might indicate a former occupation of the *ācārya* Buddhisti such as *purā[ṇāmātya]*. This, however, is not more than a guess. As the instrumental case of the name Buddhisti is used, the missing verb must be a *participium necessitatis*, meaning something like “this must be executed by ...”

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

The segmentation of *sākanibaṃdhani* 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 *nibaṃdhani* “band, fetter” or *nibaṃdha* meaning perhaps “endowment” with the last *akṣara ni[* being the beginning of the next word. The expression *bhagavato sākanibaṃdhani* “bond, fetter to, of the *sāka* of the Buddha” remains incomprehensible, and it is uncertain that *nibaṃdhanī* is intended at all. Only a parallel might help to understand of 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./l./h + k./r. + + + + + + + + +
 - 2: vinayadharena dhammasenena [pati]
 - 3: thāpitā saha apano jēthabhātūhi
 - 4: budhisirinā dhammasirinā bhātupute
 - 5: na (n)ā (bu)dhinā bhagīnīya ca pāvajitkā
 - 6: ya dha(m)masiriya bhātuputihi bodhā
 - 7: ya budhāya ca evaṃ savehi nātimita
 - 8: baṃdhavehi sadhivihārinisavihāri(bh)i
 - 9: ekato h(ā)t(ū)na thāpitaṃ sasatakālikam
 - 10: imaṃ deyadhammaṃ bhaṃḍaphulasamthapasa
 - 11: ca anuvasikaṃ ca pavāraṇāmahe pupha
 - 12: chatanasa kāraṇāya gāvīnaṃ diyadhasa
 - 13: taṃ tariḍelānaṃ 100 50 saṃpadattaṃ tato anu
 - 14: (va)ssikaṃ bhikkhusaṃghe(na) dātavā puphamolaṃ
 - 15: kāhāpaṇā cha 6 dīpatelasa ca sāni(kā)
 - 16: yo paridātava etaṃ avisaṃvadaṃtena anu
- 4 (inserted between the lines)

17: *vaṭetavaṃ etaṃ ca mahānavakaṃmikenā mahā*

18: + + + *kena acariya budhisirin(ā) purā*

19: + + + + + + + + *bhagavato sākanibamdhani*

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 Vinayadhara 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 (*evaṃ*) 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 Pavāraṇā festival, one and a half hundred of cows, 150 Tariḍelas are handed over. Moreover, every year the community of monks must give as the price for flowers six 6 Kāhāpaṇas, and 4 *sāṇikās* (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 (*paṭiṭhāpitā*) more than one object, probably buildings and columns (*thambha*), because repairs and a builder (*navakammika*) 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 *pavajitīkā* 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 Buddhisiri being named first as the eldest brother, might also have been a monk, if he is identical with the Ācārya Buddhisiri 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 Saṃgha. 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,⁹ 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 *deyadhamma sasatakālika* seems to correspond to the expression *akṣayanīvi* also used in Ikṣvāku inscriptions¹⁰ and particularly by the Kṣatrapas.¹¹

In the second part cattle are handed over as property to the monks (?) to provide the means for future repairs¹² and for a flower-canopy during the yearly Pavāraṇā festival.¹³ The meaning of *taridela* remains obscure. It is, however, interesting that the number of both, cattle and *taridela* is 150, first expressed in words, then by a numeral. Therefore, it seems possible that *taridela* is a (Dravidian?) word for a specific kind of cattle: "one and a half hundred of cows, 150 (cows of the Taridela-variety?)."

Most interesting is the third part, because here money is demanded by the donor from the Saṃgha 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 Kāhāpaṇas 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.

¹⁰ In the inscription of Ehalava Cāntamūla, year 16: D. C. Sircar, "Two Inscriptions from Nagarjunikonda," *EI* 34. 1961/62, pp. 17-22, particularly p. 19, line 10 with a summary in P. R. Srinivasan and S. Sankaranarayan, *Inscriptions of the Ikshvaku Period*. Department of Archaeology and Museums, Government of Andhrapradesh, Hyderabad. Epigraphical Series no. 14. Hyderabad 1979, no. 44.

¹¹ H. Falk, "Money can buy me heaven. Religious donations in late and post-Kushan India," *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran und Turan*. 40. 2008, pp. 137-148, particularly p. 143 foll. — *deyadhamma sasatakālika* is not listed by K. Tsukamoto, as note 7 above.

¹² The family of Dhammasena was obliged to keep the buildings, which were constructed by using their donation, in good repair according to the *Samanapāsādikā* 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.

¹³ On this festival see *ARIRIAB XV*. 2012, p. 7. The Pavāraṇā festival is also mentioned by I-tsing, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practiced in India and the Malay Archipelago* translated by J. Takakusu. London 1896 (repr. Delhi 1966), p. 87, who explicitly mentions lamps and flowers; cf. also Gérard Fussman, *Monuments bouddhiques de Termez. Termez Buddhist Monuments I. Catalogue des inscriptions sur poteries avec une contribution de Nicolas Sims-Williams et la collaboration d'Éric Olivier*. [Collège de France. Publication de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne Fascicule 79,1,2]. Paris 2011 [rev.: C. Scherrer-Schaub, R. Salomon, S. Baums, "Buddhist Inscriptions from Termez (Uzbekistan): A New Comprehensive Edition and Study," *IJJ* 55. 2012, pp. 139-170; O. v. Hinüber, "Französische archäologische Forschungen in Afghanistan. Rückblick und Ausblick," *StII* 27. 2010, pp. 141-145], p. 41. — On Buddhist festivals cf. also Ulrich Pagel, "Stūpa Festivals in Buddhist Narrative Literature," *Indica et Tibetica. Festschrift für Michael Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern überreicht*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde Heft 66, Wien 2007, pp. 369-394.

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-saṃ-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 Saṃgha, 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.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 *etaṃ avisamvadamtena anuvaṭetavaṃ*, 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 Saṃgha.

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 bhikhu(saṃ)[ghena]
2. a]nuvasikaṃ dātavaṃ pavāraṇāma
3. he puphamaulaṃ kāhāpaṇa cha 6
4. gaṃthanasutasa palāni paṃca
5. [5] divatelasa ca kuḍo e(ko)
6. [1] + + + + (dh.rā/e) + + +

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

¹⁴ On the possible access of monks to money cf. Gregory Schopen, “On Monks and Menial Laborers. Some Monastic Accounts of Building Buddhist Monasteries,” in: *Architetti, capomastri, artigiani. ... Studi offerti a Domenico Faccenna ... a cura di Pierfrancesco Callieri*. Serie Orientale Roma C. Rome 2006, pp. 225-245, particularly p. 236, but cf. also the pertinent remarks by Jean-Philippe Vogel, “Epigraphical Discoveries at Sarnath.” *EI* 8. 1905-06, pp. 166-179, particularly p. 173.

meaningful interpretation. A segmentation]*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 *bhikhu(saṃ)[ghena /2/ a]nuvasikaṃ dātavaṃ pavāraṇāma/3/he puphamaulaṃ kāhāpaṇa cha 6* is very similar to the corresponding part in the Dhammasena inscription, but the syntax differs. Here, the *participium necessitatis dātavaṃ* refers to °-*maulaṃ*, unlike *dātavā* referring to the Kāhāpaṇas in the Dhammasena inscription. The word *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 *gamthana-suta* in line 4 corresponds to Sanskrit *granthana-sūtra* “a string for tying (a wreath of flowers).” There is no parallel to this gift in the Dhammasena inscription. In line 5 *kuḍa* corresponds to Sanskrit *kuṭa* “a vessel, a pot.” The expression “one pot of oil for lamps” helps to understand *sānikāyo 4* in the Dhammasena inscription as an either otherwise unattested word for a vessel or as a derivation from Sanskrit *sāṇa* “a weight of four *māsas*.” This measure might correspond to one *kuḍa*, because the sum of money mentioned in both inscriptions is also the same. The exact amount of oil cannot be ascertained.

The missing *akṣara* at the beginning of the line 5 should be the numerical sign for “5,” because *paṃca 5* would correspond to *cha 6* and later to *eko* [1].

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

Only the heads of three *akṣaras* are recognizable in line 6. The first is almost certainly *dha* (or, of course, *dhā* or *dhū* being equally possible) followed by what could be interpreted as *rā* or *re* and by the head of an *akṣara* allowing for *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 Saṃgha 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 *akṣaras mo* in *puphamolaṃ* or the *la* in *divatela* written *divatela* in the fragment are compared. Perhaps the lamps and the flowers were to be used to decorate two different buildings,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.

¹⁵ The Interim Report mentions two apsidal Caitya halls, two assembly halls, and six *vihāras* of various size 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](v)[ā]mi śrī cāntamūla
3. ṣayasya ripuyuvati
4. (go)sanasya svāmi

This fragmentary Sanskrit inscription is important, because the Ikṣvāku king Cāntamūla is mentioned. It is, however, impossible to guess if the inscription dates from the reign of Cāntamūla, 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 ghatādhivāsasya
3. varṣaśatā[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 Buddhapādas¹⁶ and one inscribed panel are shown on p. 25 in addition to the Rudrapuruṣadatta inscription.¹⁷ Unfortunately, the small size 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 e” is also available in the internet under “Important Discoveries in the Recent Past from Andhra Pradesh” (asi.nic.in/asi_epigraphical_sans_andhra.asp). Comparing both images, the reading suggested in the Interim Report p. 33 seems to be correct: *sidham bhaya[m]ta + + + sa (natu)kasa bodhikasa deydhamā pādasaghāḍa* “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 Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, no. 51 in Srinivasan and Sankaranarayan, as note 10 above, = *EI XXXIII*. 1960/61, p. 250: *pādasamghāḍā*.

¹⁷ O. v. Hinüber and P. Skilling, “An Epigraphic Buddhist Poem from Phanigiri (Andhrapradesh) from the Time of Rudrapuruṣadatta,” in: *ARIRIAB XIV*. 2011, p. 7-12, Plate 3–6.

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 Deonthar, 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.

¹ P.K. Mishra, 'Deorkothar Stūpa: New Light on Early Buddhism', *Marg* 52, no. 1, 2000, pp. 64–74; *Deorkothar (Barhat), Rewa. A unique, recently excavated Buddhist site in Central India* and *Discovering the Past. Bhojpur, Bhimbetka, Deorkothar* – both published by the Archaeological Survey of India, Bhopal Circle, Bhopal, 2001. The booklets were presented to P. Skilling when he visited Bhopal Circle in 2010. Reports on the excavations are published in *Indian Archaeology 1999–2000 – A Review* (ASI, New Delhi, 2005), pp. 100–102 and pl. 90, continued in 2000–01 [2006], p. 91 and 2001–02 (2008), p. 110. There have been no further reports from 2002–03 (2009) on. The neighbouring village is named Bharhat, but to prevent confusion, the site is called 'Deorkothar'. Literature on the site includes: Radhakant Varma, 'The Unknown Stupa Complex of Deur Kothar (Rewa), M.P.' *Bulletin of the Deccan College Post-Graduate & Research Institute*, Vol. 49 (Professor H.D. Sankalia Memorial Volume) (1990), pp. 427–430; P.K. Mishra, 'Excavations at the Buddhist site of Deorkothar, Madhya Pradesh, India', *Circle of Inner Asian Art (SOAS) Newsletter*, Issue 13, June 2001, pp. 3–13; Amrendra Kumar Singh, 'Eastern Vindhyas: A Crucible of Efflorescence of Buddhist and Saivite Edifices', *Arts of Asia* 38.5 (September–October 2008), pp. 134–145; A.K. Singh, 'Buddhist Stupa Complex at Deour Kothara and Dundhi Gadhi and the Monuments in its Neighbourhood', *Purātattva* No. 38 (2008), pp. 202–204 and Pls. 1–11, pp. 31–32 end of volume.

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).² 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 Vindhya, such as Sanchi, Murel Khurd, and Satdhara, where such platforms are a regular component of the ritual or residential complexes.³ Like other Buddhist sites in the Vindhya, 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 Brāhmī 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 Brāhmī 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 circumambulatory, 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 *aḥṣaras* 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*.

³ For these see Julia Shaw, *Buddhist Landscapes in Central India: Sanchi Hill and Archaeologies of Religious and Social Change, c. Third Century BC to Fifth Century AD*, London: The British Association for South Asian Studies/The British Academy, 2007; Michael Willis, with contributions by Joe Cribb and Julia Shaw, *Buddhist Reliquaries from Ancient India*, London: British Museum Press, 2000.

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 ‘Bhaṇḍu’ 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 dhamamitra dhamamitrassa*
ātevāsi]
2. utaramitro utaramitrassa (ā)[*tevāsi dhamamitra dhamamitrassa ātevāsi*]
3. bhaḍu bhaḍussa ātevāsi nā(m)di(nu)[*tara nāṃdinutarassa ātevāsi upasako*]
4. upasakassa ātevāsi savajayo (sa)va[*jayassa ātevāsinā*]
5. dhamadevena kokuḍikena bahusutiye(na) [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 *akṣaras* when complete, if they were of equal length. This can be inferred from line 3, where, the name Nandinu[ttara] 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 *akṣaras* 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 Bhaḍu, then both lines 2 and 3, and line 4, would have been longer by 9 *akṣaras*; if it was a longer name like Dhamamitra, it would have been longer by 13 *akṣaras*. 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 *akṣaras*. Line 4 was most likely shorter, if Inscription II discussed below is compared, and should have ended in (sa)va[*jayassa ātevāsinā*] /5/ *dhamadevena*. 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 Savajaya 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 *namo* or *sidhaṃ* to precede a name or title in the genitive case, or the two together as at Kanaganahalli on the pedestal of a Buddha image: *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 *paṭimā*, ‘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 *antevāsins*, a term which appears here in the form *ātevāsin*, which occurs occasionally in other inscriptions.⁴ The word expresses different forms of subordinate relationship.⁵ In a Buddhist inscription, one expects *antevāsin* to have the sense of the well-known technical term of Vinaya law, denoting a novice who lives together with his teacher (*ācārya* or *ācariya*, Vin I 60,26–29): that is to say, as a ‘pupil’. Therefore, this sequence of names of *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 *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 *akṣaras* is missing (or two names, if the longer variant is considered). This, however, still leaves a gap of about four *akṣaras*: following the example of the opening of the inscription quoted from Kanaganahalli, perhaps *sakamunisa* can be inserted here, giving a hypothetical text of line 1:

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, Bhaḍu, Nandinuttara, Upasaka, Sarvajaya and Dhammadeva. In lines 1–3, one or two names are

⁴ Keisho Tsukamoto, *A Comprehensive Study of the Indian Buddhist Inscriptions*, Part I, *Texts, Notes and Japanese Translation*, Kyoto 1996; Part II, *Indices, Maps and Illustrations*, Kyoto 1998 [rev.: G. Fussman, BEFEO 88, 2001, pp. 383–385], index s.v. *ātevāsin* etc. attested at Kanheri, Mathurā, and Kuḍā; cf. also O. v. Hinüber: *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*, Vienna, ²2001, § 12. The same lengthening of a short *-a-* before a nasal is found in *nā(m)dinū[tara]*: it is impossible to decide whether or not an *anusvāra* is visible above the *akṣara nā*. Note that *thabo*, *dhamadina* and probably *bhaḍu* are written without *anusvāra*.

⁵ The word *antevāsin* means ‘living near to someone’, but here the technical Buddhist usage in Vinaya law stands out. This is derived from Vedic, cf. M. Hara, ‘Hindu Concepts of Teacher, Sanskrit Guru and Ācārya’, in *Sanskrit and Indian Studies: Essays in Honour of Daniel H.H. Ingalls*, Dordrecht, 1980, pp. 93–118, p. 107, note 9. In Vedic and in Middle Indic, *antevāsin* may be used for other persons living together besides ‘pupil’ or ‘apprentice’, that is, for ‘attendant’ or even ‘son’. The rare meaning ‘son’ is explained in *puttā ca nām’ete atrajo khettajo, antevāsiko, dinnako ti catubbidhā santike sippuggahaṇako antevāsiko nāma*, Ja I 135,14’–17’; in Vedic, the word is used mostly in the sense of ‘pupil’. Cf. *An Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Sanskrit on Historical Principles*, ed. by V. P. Bhatta, Vol. VII, Poona, 2004–2007, s.v. *antevāsin*, where, strangely enough, the Buddhist technical term is not mentioned; on the meaning ‘son,’ s.v. 1Aiii.

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.⁶ 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(ṃ)ḍu, Bha(ṃ)ḍu's pupil Nāṃdinuttara. Nāṃdinuttara's pupil ... Upasaka, Upasaka's pupil Sarvajaya, [by] Sarva[jaya's pupil] Dhammadeva from Kokuḍi, a member of the Bahusutiya 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 °-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 *bhaṃḍu*, written without *anusvāra* (cf. note 4), which may be compared as a personal name with that of the monk Bhaṃḍu who is mentioned once in the Theravāda Tipiṭaka at *Samyuttanikāya* II

⁶ For the Bahuśrutīyas, see further below.

204,5,⁷ 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 Kokuḍi, of which the location is unknown, and who was a member of the Bahuśrutīya school. Most interesting is the word *bahusutiya*, which can be read with confidence. We can therefore state that this pillar fragment from Deorkothar gives us an important new reference to the Bahuśrutīya 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 Bahuśrutīyas on the map in Madhya Pradesh, it proves that the school is very old, it shows that the Bahuśrutīyas 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 (*bhaḍuno dāna[m]*, IV Sanc 397; *bhaḍuno pajāvatiya dānaṃ* IV Sanc 398); a monk named Bhaṇḍuka also made a donation (IV Sanc 293 *gotiputasa bhaḍukasa bhichuno dānaṃ*) (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. [bhagavato budhasa *sakamunisa*] (ā)tevāsi anurudho anurudhasa ātevāsi savanāṃdo
sa[vanāṃdasa ātevāsi *bhaḍu bha*
2. [*ḍusa ātevāsi bhaḍu bhaḍusa* ātev]āsi di(sā)giri disāgirisā ātevāsi bharāṇo
bha[raṇasa ātevāsi *dhamamitra dhamami*
3. *trasa ātevāsi dhamamitra dhamamitra*(sa) ātevāsi nātakadhamaguto
nātakadhama[*gutasa ātevāsi dhamamitra dharmami*
4. *tasa ātevāsi dhamamita dhamamita*]sa ātevāsi dhammadino dhammadinasa
(ā)[tevāsi dhamamita dhamamitasa ātevāsi
5. nā dhamamitena + + + + + + +] (ch.)dakena thabo kārāpito gimjaki(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)to* 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 *akṣaras* are lost. If it was some other name such as *Disāgiri* (4 *akṣaras*) or *Bharaṇa* (3 *akṣaras*), only five or four *akṣaras* stood at the beginning of line 1.

While the number of *akṣaras* 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 *akṣaras* 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 *akṣaras* at the end of line 1, which results in 45 *akṣaras* 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 *akṣaras* 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 *akṣaras* *](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 *akṣaras* 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 *akṣaras* 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 | The Buddha |
| 2. Lost [3. Lost] | Anuruddha |
| 3. Uttaramitra [4.] | Sarvānanda |
| 4. Lost [5, 6. Lost] | Lost |
| 5. Bhaṇḍu [7.] | Lost |
| 6. Nandinuttara [8, 9. Lost] | Disāgiri |

| | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 7. Upasaka [10.] | Bharaṇa |
| 8. Sabbajaya [11.] | Lost |
| 9. Donor: Dhammadeva [12.] | Lost |
| | 10. Ñātakadhammagutta |
| | 11. Lost |
| | 12. Lost |
| | 13. Dhammadinna |
| | 14. Donor (lost) from (?)]ch.da |

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 *torāṇa* was also constructed (*kato*), although the reading *torāṇa* 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.¹⁰ The inscription ends in line 6, because no traces of script are visible after *usāpito ca* and there is a wide space.¹¹

An exceptionally interesting word in inscription II is barely, but safely, readable: this is *giṃjaki(ya)*[at the very end of line 5. The rare word *giṃjakā* 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 amnuthitaṃ* ‘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 (?).

giñjakāvasatha at Nādika/Ñātika, a place in Magadha, e.g., in the *Mahāparinibbāna-suttanta: tatra sudaṃ bhagavā Nādike viharati giñjakāvasathe* (DN II 91,21 = II 94,15), ‘at that time the Lord was staying at Nādika in the *giñjaka* house’.¹² The commentaries explain the word *giñjakā* as *iṭṭhakāmaye āvasathe* (Sv 543,11 = Ps II 235,6 = Spk III 281,8 = Mp III 351,23 ≠ Spk II 75,3 ‘in a house made of bricks’. As Jules Bloch (1880–1953) noticed far back in 1951,¹³ the word *giñjakā* survives in new Indo-Aryan languages only in the language of the peasants of Bihar, meaning a kind of brick.¹⁴ 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 Deorkothar 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 *aggaḷa* ‘bolt (to close a door)’ or *tāḷa-chiggaḷa* ‘keyhole’ (which was soon replaced by *tāḷa-chidda* even in canonical Pāli). This technical vocabulary does not belong to any Indo-Aryan language.¹⁵ 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 *giñjakā* by the time the Sanskrit *Mahāparinirvānasūtra*, usually ascribed to the (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin school, was composed. Here by then incomprehensible word *giñjaka* is replaced by **kunjikā*, as the Tibetan transcript *kun-dzi-ka* shows.¹⁶ 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.

¹³ J. Bloch, ‘Trois notes’, BEFEO 44 (1951), pp. 43–50 = *Recueil d’articles de Jules Bloch 1906–1955*, Textes rassemblés par Colette Caillat (Publications de l’Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Série in -8°, Fascicule 52), Paris 1985, pp. 401–408, particularly pp. 49 foll. = pp. 407 foll., cf. Ralph Lilley Turner, *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, London, 1966, no. 4156 **giñjakā*; Willem B. Bollée, Review of Margaret Cone: *A Dictionary of Pāli II: g–n*, Bristol 2010, WZKS 54 (2011–2012), p. 236 refers to Ananda Kentish Coomaraswamy, *Eastern Art* 1 (1931), p. 139, not accessible to the writers.

¹⁴ According to George Abraham Grierson, *Bihar Peasant Life*, Calcutta 1885, Patna 21926 § 1263 *pangñjā*.

¹⁵ O. v. Hinüber, *Sprachentwicklung und Kulturgeschichte. Ein Beitrag zur materiellen Kultur des buddhistischen Klosterlebens*, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jg 1992, Nr. 6, p. 25.

¹⁶ Ernst Waldschmidt, *Das Mahāparinirvānasūtra*. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der

Chinese translations of this paragraph point to other misunderstandings.¹⁷ A perhaps slightly earlier form of this misunderstanding is preserved in a text from the *Nidānasam̐yukta* in the *Sam̐yuktāgama: bhagavān nadikāyāṃ viharati guñjakāvasathe*.¹⁸ It is difficult to imagine what exactly the (Mūla)Sarvāstivāda redactors and others had in mind: *guñjaka* and *kuñjikā* 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 Buddha's] pupil Anuruddha, Anuruddha's pupil Savvananda, Sa[vvananda's pupil (two names lost)] pupil Disāgiri, Disāgiri's pupil Bharāṇa, Bha[rāṇa's pupil (two names lost)] [pupil] Nātaka-Dhammagutta, Nātaka-Dhamma[gutta's pupil (two names lost)] pupil Dhammadinna, by Dhammadinna's [pupil ... (name lost)] *ch.daka* the column was ordered to be made (together with/ set up beside) a brick ... A *torāṇa* 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 BAHUŚRUTĪYAS

The Bahuśrutīya school has been known previously from only four, or possibly five, records: three on pillars from Nāgārjunakoṇḍa and one from Kesānapalli, both in present-day Andhra Pradesh, as well as from one extremely doubtful, and indeed probably non-existent, record from Pālāṭū Dherī near Peshawar in the north:¹⁹

Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. I: Jahrgang 1949, Nr. 1. Berlin 1950; II: Jg. 1950, Nr. 2. 1951; III: Jg. 1950, Nr. 3. 1951 [Rev: F Edgerton, JAOS 77. 1957, pp. 227-232], p. 162 § 9.4 with note 3.

¹⁷ André Bareau, *Recherches sur la biographie du Buddha dans les Sūtrapīṭaka et les Vinayapīṭaka anciens: II, Les derniers mois. Le parinirvāṇa et les funérailles*. Tome 2. Publications de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient 77 (1971), Paris, pp. 86 foll.

¹⁸ Ch. Tripāthī, *Fünfundzwanzig Sūtras des Nidānasam̐yukta* (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden VIII), Berlin, 1962, p. 167 § 19.1; for parallels cf. Jin-il Chung: *A Survey of the Sanskrit Fragments Corresponding to the Chinese Sam̐yuktāgama*, Tokyo, 2008, p. 111, Sūtra 301. The word occurs again in a smaller fragment recorded in SWTF s.v. Guñjakāvasatha, cf. s.v. (Kuñjikāvasatha).

¹⁹ The following abbreviations are used in this table: L: Étienne Lamotte, *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien I*, Louvain 1958 = *History of Indian Buddhism, from the Origins to the Śaka Era*, Louvain 1988; CII:

- L 39. (1.) Jar, Pālāṭu Ḍherī; CII II.1, no. LVb, p. 122; Tsukamoto V PaDh 3
saṃghe cadudiṣe śamanana bah[ūṣuti]a[ka]na kaś[y]aviyana [parigrahe].
- L 40. (2.) Pillar, Nāgārjunakoṇḍa (Mātharīputra Vīrapuruṣadatta, 3rd cent.); EI XX 1929/30, p. 24; Tsukamoto II Naga 44
... imam viharo savajātaniyuto acariyānaṃ bahusutiyānaṃ patiṭhāpito ...
- L 41. (3.) Pillar, Nāgārjunakoṇḍa (Ehavala Cāntamūla, year 2); EI XX 1929/30, p. 62; Tsukamoto II Naga 42
... vihāro acariyānaṃ bahusutiyānaṃ patiṭhāpito ...
- L – (4.) Pillar, Nāgārjunakoṇḍa; (Ehavala Cāntamūla, year 2); EI XXI 1931/32, pp. 62f., Tsukamoto II Naga 43
... ayam Devīviharo savajātaniyuto ajariyānaṃ bahusutiyānaṃ patiṭhāpito ...
- L – (5.) Kesānapalli (Vāsethīputa Siri-Cāntamūla, year 13), EI XXXVIII 1964/65, p. 313–318; Tsukamoto II Kesa 16
... nigājasa bahusutiyānaṃ ...

The Deorkothar inscription fills a lacuna, by showing that the Bahuśrutīya school spread over a larger area than has been assumed, and adding to the map of schools a Vindhyan foothold for the Bahuśrutīyas in Central India (that is, in modern Madhya Pradesh).²⁰ 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 Bahuśrutīyas 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 Vindhya from the plains below. On one of the many feeders of the Dakṣiṇāpatha, 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.²¹ 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 Bahuśrutīya school are obscure. According to ‘the traditions of the Northwest’, the Bahuśrutīyas arose in the second century post-Nirvāṇa, directly from the Mahāsāṃghikas, or, according to the Theravādins and Sāṃmitīyas, from the Gokulikas. According to Paramārtha (499–569 CE) and Kuji (窺基: K’ouei-Ki, 632–682 CE), an *arhat* or *asaikṣa* named Yājñavalkya, a contemporary of the Buddha, formed the Bahuśrutīya school after he had spent two centuries in meditation in the Himālayas. 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 *Mahāprātihārya-sūtra* ‘of the Prajñaptivādin-Bahuśrutīyas’, implying a direct affiliation with the Prajñaptivādins, one of the earliest Mahāsāṃghika schools: see P. Skilling, ‘Citations from the Scriptures of the “Eighteen Schools” in the *Tarkajvālā*’, in Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann (eds.), *Bauddhavidyāsudhākarah: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, Swistal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica 30, 1997, p. 608 (full article, pp. 605–614).

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,²² 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),²³ 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 Bahuśrutīya lineage, established a significant centre here at the edge of the Vindhya. From here, their ideas and practices could have been carried southward to the Andhra country, including, perhaps, to Nagarjunakonda and Kesanapalli, where, as we have seen, among others the Bahuśrutīya 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,²⁴ 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 *Dīpavaṃsa*. 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 **Vinayamāṭṛkā*, survives.²⁵ From the eastern Vindhya we now have two teacher–disciple lineages, one certainly of the Bahuśrutīya school, the other by association presumably the same. But here too we know little about the school, unless the **Satya-*° or **Tatva-siddhiśāstra* indeed belongs to it.²⁶ In a broader perspective, these instances show how the memory

ancient routes from the Ganga plain to the Deccan, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 2005 (Rez. SAS 22 (2006)). See also Himanshu Prabha Ray, 'Bharhut and Sanchi – Nodal Points in a Commercial Interchange,' in B. M. Pande and B. D. Chattopadhyaya (eds.), *Archaeology and History: Essays in Memory of Sh. A. Ghosh*, Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan 1987, pp. 621–629.

²² Cf. A. K. Singh, 'Buddhist Stupa Complex at Deour Kothara and Dundhi Gadhi and the Monuments in its Neighbourhood', *Purātattva* No. 38 (2008), pp. 202–204 and Pls. 1–11, pp. 31–32 at end of volume (especially Pls. 7–11).

²³ See now Jason Hawkes, 'The Wider Archaeological Contexts of the Buddhist Stupa Site of Bharhut', Chap. 9 in Jason Hawkes and Akira Shimada (eds.), *Buddhist Stupas in South Asia: Recent Archaeological, Art-Historical, and Historical Perspectives*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press (SOAS Studies on South Asia) 2009.

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

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

²⁶ Bureau, *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 Vāṃsa literatures.

Two Inscriptions in Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī

Seishi KARASHIMA

Recently, Isao Kurita has kindly sent me photographs of two inscriptions written in Brāhmī 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.

Brahmī Inscription (Plate 12)

This inscription is written on the neck of clay jar, measuring 39 cm high and 36 cm in diameter, now preserved in Ryukoku Museum, Kyoto, allegedly from Haḍḍa. Its shape resembles the inscribed pots in the British Library Collection, investigated and published by Richard Salomon in his *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra: the British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments*, Seattle 1999: University of Washington Press, pp. 183ff., plates 22f.

The inscription reads as follows:

© siddham* ayaṃ ghaṭa saṅghilavihāre saṅghasya caturdiś[a]sya sarvvāsthīpādikānā dharmajñānā śāstrajñānā deśakālavi .. [ñ]. nā jayatu buddhaḥ

It can be reconstructed as follows:

© siddham* ayaṃ ghaṭa saṅghilavihāre saṅghasya caturdiś[a]sya sarvvāsthīpādikānā dharmajñānā śāstrajñānā deśakālavi(dhij)[ñ](ā)nā jayatu buddhaḥ

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

Sarvvāsthīpādika~ is a hyper-form of **Sarvāstivādika*; cf. BHS *Sarvāstivādin*; 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.

saghana¹ danamukhe madapidara[n]a adhvadi<da>na kalagadana puyae bhava(tu)
uajayasa sagharamasa adhvadida[sa] puya[e] bhavatu

It can be translated in Buddhist Sanskrit translation as follows :

saṃghānām² dānamukhe mātāpitṛṇām adhvātītānām kālagatānām 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[ṃ] 4 1 Phagunasa masasa di paṃcami Budhanadasa trepiḍakasa danamukhe
madapidarana adhvadidana puyaya bhavatu³

“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.

² Cf. *Ratnamālāvadāna: A Garland of Precious Gems or a Collection of Edifying Tales, Told in a Metrical Form, Belonging to the Mahāyāna*, ed. Kanga Takahata, Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 1954 (Oriental Library Series D, 3), p. 176, l. 20f. *saṃghānām bhajānaṃ kṛtvā cinu puṇyaṃ samāhitāḥ; ib.* p. 391, l. 4f. *tatas tat puṇyapākena saṃghānām śaraṇaṃ gatāḥ.*

³ Gérard Fussman “Documents épigraphiques kouchans”, in: *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 61 (1974): 54, pl. 31; fig. 27.

Buddhist Nuns in South India as Reflected in the *Andhakatṭhakathā* and in Vajirabuddhi's *Anugaṇṭhipada*

Petra KIEFFER-PÜLZ (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 *Andhakatṭhakathā*, Vajirabuddhi's *Anugaṇṭhipada*, the *apare* quoted therein, the *Vajirabuddhiṭṭhikā* and, perhaps, the *Kāṅkhāvitaranīpurāṇaṭṭhikā*. 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/Therīya 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: § 173f., § 123.

² Golzio 2010: 30ff.

³ Kāñcīpuram, Kāverīpaṭṭanam, Nāgappaṭṭinam, etc.

The earliest of our sources, the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*, 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 *Samantapāsādikā* attributed to Buddhaghosa by tradition (4th/5th century AD), seventeen in the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā*, the oldest *Vinaya* subcommentary (second half of the tenth century AD⁷), and one in the anonymous and undated *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇīpurāṇaṭikā*, the oldest subcommentary on the *Pātimokkha*, which is younger than the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā*, but probably older than Sāriputta's *Sāratthadīpanī* (after 10th, and before 12th century AD).⁸ The distribution of these quotations proves that the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* was in use up to the 10th or 11th centuries AD.

The quotations preserved in the *Samantapāsādikā* are directly quoted from the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*. 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 offences in other categories than the Mahāvihārin.¹¹ Furthermore, the *Samantapāsādikā* takes a critical stand on the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*, indicating that the tradition represented by the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* was some minority for the author of the *Samantapāsādikā*.¹² One of the quotations renders it probable that the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* originated in Andhakarāṭṭha, identified with Andhra Pradesh,¹³ since the specific

⁴ Life time of Mahāsūma Thera, an authority quoted in the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*.

⁵ Date of the completion of the *Samantapāsādikā*.

⁶ Kieffer-Pülz 1993; Kieffer-Pülz 2010.

⁷ See Kieffer-Pülz 2013: A II 2.

⁸ Four seemingly first hand quotations in *Vajirabuddhiṭikā*, *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇīpurāṇaṭikā* and *Sāratthadīpanī* have in effect literal parallels in the *Samantapāsādikā*. They are partly marked as quotations, but without a source being named. Although the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* 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-Pülz 2010: Vjb [5], [18], Kkh-pt [4], Sp-t [5].

⁹ *sīmāmaṇḍalaṃ sambandhati* for *sīmaṃ bandhati* (Kieffer-Pülz 1993: [10]); *jagatī* for *vattu* (Kieffer-Pülz 1993: [5]; Kieffer-Pülz 1994).

¹⁰ Kieffer-Pülz 1993: [7], [8].

¹¹ Kieffer-Pülz 1993: [2], [4], [6], [9], [15].

¹² It rejects eleven statements, declares twice that what is said in the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* is unnecessary, but not wrong, does not take a position in five cases, and values only one as being well said (*suvuttam*), see Kieffer-Pülz 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 (*aparikkhitta*), does not commit an offence—a statement which according to the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* is quoted from the *Sīhaḷaṭṭhakathā*—, has been said with respect to a terrace (*pamukha*) on the earth (*bhūmiyaṃ*) without a base (*jagatī*). The author of the *Samantapāsādikā* relates this explanation to the specific monastic architecture in *Andhakarāṭṭha* where rows of cells (*gabbhapāḷiyo*) join separate domiciles (*pāṭekkasannivesā*) under one roof (*ekachadanā*). Coḷiya Kassapa's *Vimativinodaniṭikā*, 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-Pülz 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 Rāmatīrtha (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 *Andhakatṭhakathā* 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 Kāñcī and Kāverīpaṭṭanam (to which more below).

The *Andhakatṭhakathā* quotations in the *Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā* stem from four different sources. Fourteen are penned by the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā*. Five or six are transmitted in Vajirabuddhi's *Anugaṇṭhipada*,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 *apare*¹⁶ which are quoted thirty-four times in Vajirabuddhi's *Anugaṇṭhipada* are probably the oldest. They can be located in Kāverīpaṭṭanam and Kāñcī,¹⁷ are at variance with the Pāli *Vinaya* and *Dīghanikāya*,¹⁸ reject an opinion of the Mahāsāṃghikas as not acceptable for *thāvaris* (probably Sthaviras),¹⁹ and once or twice quote the *Andhakatṭhakathā*.²⁰ Twice their statements are not completely intelligible,²¹ because their language seems not to be standard Pāli. *Apere*-statements paralleled in the *Sāratthadīpanī* are marked there by *keci*, *apere*, *vadanti*, and where Sāriputta takes a position, he and his Sinhalese *Gaṇṭhipadas* differ from them, indicating that the *apere*-tradition was considered a minority by the mainstream Mahāvihāra.²² Since Kāverīpaṭṭanam flourished till to the 4th century and again from the 6th century onwards, and since the *apere* 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 (*gaṇa*). Since Dhammasiri Thera

¹⁴ Such a monastery has been excavated in Kāverīpaṭṭanam, 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 *apere* references belong to one and the same group, because of the exclusiveness with which the author of the *Anugaṇṭhipada* quotes them (but no *keci*, *eke*, etc.) and the uniform manner in which he does so, and because two quotations of the *apere* refer directly to Kāverīpaṭṭanam and Kāñcī.

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

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 *apere* the *Andhakatṭhakathā* quotation proves that it is allowed to use requisites given to the Saṅgha 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 *apere* of the Mahāsāṃghika who declare that one might kill an embryo with magical strength developed by meditation. The *apere* 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 *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* (twenty-eight times), the *Anugaṇṭhipada* (eight times), the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇīpurāṇaṭikā* (three times), and, probably once in the *Sāratthadīpanī*.²³ He is considered the leading authority by the *Anugaṇṭhipada* once,²⁴ probably also used the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*,²⁵ and definitely is no Abhayagirivāsīn.²⁶

(3) The *Anugaṇṭhipada* by Vajirabuddhi²⁷ is a commentary on the *Vinaya* lost, except for 281 quotations in the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā*, and more than fifty quotations in the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇīpurāṇaṭikā*. It often critically refers to Dhammasiri Thera, mostly because Dhammasiri's insufficient consideration of the *Vinaya* led to contradictions with it. In distinction to Dhammasiri's *Gaṇṭhipada*, the *Anugaṇṭhipada* has no parallels to the Sinhalese *Gaṇṭhipadas* used by Sāriputta, and where its opinions are found in the *Sāratthadīpanī* they are given without a source or are characterized as the statements of some minority with the words *vadanti* or *keci vadanti*.

Regarding its localization the author of the *Anugaṇṭhipada* 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 (*cinasātakam*), 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 *Anugaṇṭhipada*, the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* and the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇīpurāṇaṭikā* form one group which is clearly distinguished from the *Sāratthadīpanī* and its *Gaṇṭhipadas* representing the Sri Lankan *gāma*vāsīns on the one hand, and from the *Vimativinodanīṭikā* representing the South Indian *araññavāsīns* on the other (Kieffer-Pülz 2005). Although *Anugaṇṭhipada* and *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* criticize Upatissa Thera on and off, and even though there exists one Upatissa statement which accords to the three Sinhalese *Gaṇṭhipadas* of Sāriputta (in another case his opinion is mentioned in the *Sāratthadīpanī* as from the *keci*) Upatissa Thera does not belong to the mainstream Mahāvihāra tradition as represented by the *Sāratthadīpanī* and its sources.

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

²⁶ Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 241].

²⁷ This Vajirabuddhi is not the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā*, because the latter criticizes the former with such statements as *taṃ sabbam ayuttaṃ, taṃ na sundaram, na taṃ sārato paccetabbaṃ*, etc. (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 157]), *ayuttaṃ* [Z 171], *duvuttaṃ* [Z 174] *apare* quotation [Z 215], or he declares that something had been *papañcitam*, *atīva* or *bahudhā/bahuṃ papañcitam* or that something has not to be accepted as the best (*na taṃ sārato paccetabbaṃ*) or simply is not good (*na sundaram*). For details, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 43ff., 213ff.

²⁸ He mentions the “small *pavāraṇā*” (*cūlapavāraṇā*) in Sri Lanka, but characterizes this notice by the word *kira*, which shows that this has been common knowledge.

²⁹ Given that in the 7th to 10th centuries there existed lively commercial relations between the Coḷa area and China such a reference would be easily comprehensible for a South Indian reader of the *Anugaṇṭhipada*, but perhaps less for one in Sri Lanka. The *Sāratthadīpanī* and *Vimativinodanīṭikā* also refer to this type of cloth, but omit the comparison with the Chinese cloth, Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 176].

Kāverīpaṭṭanam and Kañcī thirty-four times which amounts to around twelve percent of the *Anugaṇṭhipada* quotations preserved. Even though the designation *apare* shows that the author of the *Anugaṇṭhipada* considered them a tradition distinct from his own,³⁰ 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 *Anugaṇṭhipada* to give attention to it, and thus that the *Anugaṇṭhipada* was written for South Indian readers.³¹

(4) Regarding the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā*, the identification with a Vajirabuddhi is relatively late. The examination of the quotations from Vajirabuddhi's *Anugaṇṭhipada* clearly has proven that this Vajirabuddhi and the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* cannot be identical. It may be that the identification of the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* 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 *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* most likely lived in the second half of the tenth century, that he used sources which originated in Sri Lanka, namely, Dhammasiri's *Khuddasikkhā* (5th/6th century AD), Dhammasiri's *Gaṇṭhipada*,³² and Upasena's commentary on the *Niddesa* (after the 9th century AD).³³ He shows knowledge of the Sinhalese language,³⁴ has first hand knowledge of habits and customs in Sri Lanka,³⁵ is the only author of a Pāli text who names *dīpavāsino*,³⁶ *tambapaṇṇivāsino*,³⁷ or *jambudīpavāsino* as sources of variant

³⁰ This is corroborated by his criticism 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 *Anugaṇṭhipada* did neither belong to the Abhayagirivāsini nor to the mainstream Mahāvihāra tradition, as represented by the *Sāratthadīpanī*. This is indicated by the position the *Anugaṇṭhipada* takes with respect to the rule which prohibits the consumption of alcohol, Kieffer-Pülz 2005.

³² With about 340 quotations it is one of the main sources of the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā*. Identification as a Sri Lankan product results from the roughly eighty quotations for which there are parallels in the Sinhalese *Gaṇṭhipadas* used by Sāriputta in his *Sāratthadīpanī*. See Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 202-205.

³³ The *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* shares a large portion of its introduction with this text, see Kieffer-Pülz 2009.

³⁴ He explains the Pāli word *vasa* to mean “poison” via the Sinhalese forms *vasa* and *visa*, deduced from Skt. *viṣa*. The regular Pāli form is *visa*. He possibly also is the source of the single verse from a work by Mātṛceṭa (Vjb 15,15–16 ≠ VAV 2.10 + 2.13) handed down in medieval Sinhalese literature from the 12th century onwards. See Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 100f.

³⁵ This is shown when he states that even at his time monks in Sri Lanka advance the *mahāpavāraṇā* to the 14th (instead of the regular 15th), or when he mentions details of the *cūlapavāraṇā*.

³⁶ “Inhabitants of the island (i.e. Sri Lanka)”; Vjb 106,1–2 (*uppalagandhā uppalabhāvā*); Vjb 116,24 (reading *vediyā vā* where the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* has *vediyi vā*); Vjb 466,3–4: *Mahā-aṭṭhakathāyam pi “saṅkāsayissantī” ti pāṭho, dīpavāsino “saṅkāpayissantī” ti paṭhanti kira*.

Furthermore, Vajirabuddhi twice quotes the content of some of the *dīpavāsins'* sayings, Vjb 496,21–497,1 (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 365]: “*evaṃ sante corikāya katasadisam hoti tasmā na vaṭṭatī” ti dīpavāsino vadanti kira*. Vjb 530,24–25: “*corikāya gahitattā na pāpuṇātī” ti vacanato “kuṭisodhanam vaṭṭatī” ti ca dīpavāsino vadanti kira*. In all these cases, however, Vajirabuddhi uses the word *kira* (skt. *kiḷa*) after the verb, indicating that he tells this from hearsay or that this is well known at the 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 Kieffer-Pülz 2012: I 105f.

³⁷ “Inhabitants of Tambapaṇṇi (i.e. Sri Lanka)”; Vjb 186,20–21: *Tambapaṇṇivāsino itthirūpaṃ likhitam, kaṭikapataṇ ca na chupanti kira. ākarato muttamatto*.

readings,³⁸ and who compares an *andhakapotthaka* with various *sīhaḷapotthakas*³⁹ with respect to the reading of a *kammavācā*.⁴⁰

On the other hand he uses the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*, on which he takes a positive stand. Furthermore, the *Anugaṅṅhipada* is his second most important source after Dhammasiri's *Gaṅṅhipada*, and, unlike the author of the *Samantapāsādikā*, the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā* 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.⁴¹ In addition he shows knowledge of features special for South India when he states that a certain perfumed powder was favored in *ariyadesa*,⁴² here probably referring to South India,⁴³ or quotes Tamils,⁴⁴ or refers to the park in the town Kāñcī⁴⁵ or a custom of the *bhikkhus* in Kāverīpattanam.⁴⁶ He is aware of other Buddhist schools, especially the Mahāsaṃghikas⁴⁷ prevalent in South India, and besides Sinhalese knew Tamil.⁴⁸ He thus betrays knowledge of Sri Lanka and South Indian cultures, and therefore could well have been a native of Andhra Pradesh who lived for some time in Sri Lanka (Anurādhapura)⁴⁹ and for some time in Kāñcī and/or

³⁸ "Inhabitants of India"; Vjb 384,7–8: "sikkhamānan" ti pāṭham dīpavāsino rocenti kiriyākiriyaṭṭā, jambudīpavāsino "sikkhamānā" ti. tassattho sikkhādhammānanato 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: "yassāyasmato khamati etissā sīmāya samānasaṃvāsāya ekūposathāya samugghāto, so tuṅhassā" ti *Andhakapotthake*, *Sīhaḷapotthakesu ca kesuci pāṭho atthi. kesuci "samugghāto etissā sīmāya" ti pāṭhamaṃ likhanti, kesuci "etissā sīmāya samugghāto" 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-Pülz 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-ṭ, Ud-a) and once in the *Sāratthadīpanī* 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 (Ramchandran 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 Kāñcī.

⁴⁶ Vjb 468,11–15: *nimantito yeva nāma hotī* ti (Sp 1070,1) *ettha upāsakehi "imasmim nāma divase dānādāni karoma, sabbe sannipatantū" ti katāya pi katikāya gantum vaṭṭati. pavāraṇāya navamito paṭṭhāya paṃsukūlikacīvaram pariyesitum Kāvīrapattane viya sabbesaṃ gantum vaṭṭati anusaṃvaccharaṃ niyamato upāsakehi sajjitvā ṭhapanato.* 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 *Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā* is that he mixes up languages in his commentary (*bhāsantarehi sammissaṃ likhitaṃ*, Sp-ṭ I 2,10). The *Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā* in fact shows that its author had also access to Sanskrit texts, and it contains Sanskrit words not or not properly transferred into Pāli. *pratyavajjānaṃ* (Vjb 14,7) instead of an expected **paccavajjānaṃ*; formation *gri* for *giri* (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; *vivākya* (Vjb 9,17) (for *avivākya?*), etc. See Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 129ff.

⁴⁹ This presupposes that the Mahāvihāra still lived there, and thus leads to a date before the 11th century.

Kāverīpaṭṭanam, or a native of Sri Lanka who spent some time in South India.⁵⁰

| Date | Vinaya | Pātimokkha |
|---|---|--|
| 1st cent. BC–4th/5th cent. AD | <i>Early Sthalaṭṭhakathā:</i>
<i>Kurundī</i>
<i>Mahāpaccarī</i>
<i>Mahā-Aṭṭhakathā</i> | |
| 1st cent. BC–4th/5th cent. AD | <i>Andhakaṭṭhakathā</i> | |
| 4th/5th cent. AD | Samantapāsādikā | Kaṅkhāvitaranī (after the Samantapāsādikā) |
| 5th/6th cent. AD | <i>Upatissa Thera</i>
<i>Dhammasiri Thera</i>
<i>Dhammasiri's Gaṇṭhipada</i> | |
| ca. 6th cent. AD | <i>apare in Vajirabuddhi's Anugaṇṭhipada</i> | |
| after 6th before 2nd half of the 10th cent. | <i>Vajirabuddhi's Anugaṇṭhipada</i> | |
| before 2nd half of 10th cent. AD | <i>no takko ti ācariyo</i>
(after the Anugaṇṭhipada) | |
| 2nd half of the 10th cent. AD | Vajirabuddhiṭikā | |
| after 2nd half of the 10th cent. AD before 12th century | | Kaṅkhāvitaranīpurāṇaṭikā |
| 2nd half of the 12th cent. AD | Sāriputta's Sāratthadīpanī | |
| 1st half of the 13th cent. AD | Coliya Kassapa's Vimativinodanīṭikā | |

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 *Aṭṭhakathā* 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 *bhikkhunīs'* sections, albeit sometimes a little less detailed. The author of the *Anugaṇṭhipada*, however, tells us that at his time (*etarahi*) 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 *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* informs us that at his time (*etarahi*) the nuns exclusively went to the monks' community on the

⁵⁰ For a more detailed discussion of the authorship of the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā*, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I A II 1.

fourteenth and asked when the *uposatha* should take place (*kadā ayya uposatho*).⁵¹ We do, however, not know whether this refers to Sri Lanka or South India.

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 *Vajirabuddhiṭkā*, but only to 1.5 percent in the younger commentaries by Sāriputta (2nd half 12th cent. AD) and Coḷiya 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 N⁵² and one to Pāc 7 N.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 *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* 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* rules⁵⁴
- 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 property⁵⁵
- proof that a rule against accepting raw grain did not exist for nuns only (Pācittiya 9 for nuns), but also for monks⁵⁶
- *sikkhamānā* training starts with twelve, ordination with fourteen at the earliest

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 Mahāpacarī the nuns go exclusively on the thirteenth and ask whether *uposatha* takes place on the fourteenth or fifteenth. Vjb 305,13–15: *ayaṃ uposatho cātuddasiko ti pucchitabban ti vuttam* (≠ Sp 794,16–17) *tam pi terasiyaṃ yeva, etarahi pana bhikkhuniyo cātuddasiyaṃ yeva gantvā “kadā ayya uposatho” ti pucchanti*. 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.

⁵² Kieffer-Pülz 2010: Vjb [9]–[10], Kkh-pt [3].

⁵³ Kieffer-Pülz 2010: Vjb [11].

⁵⁴ Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 15].

⁵⁵ Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 266].

⁵⁶ Kieffer-Pülz 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 *gāmūpacāra* 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 *ñatticatutthakamma* instead of the usual *ñattidutiyakamma* is required.⁵⁷ 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 asammata “one fully ordained, [but] not agreed upon”

anupasampanna sammata “one unordained, [but] agreed upon”

anupasampanna asammata “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 commentaries 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 asammata*, 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 *Samantapāsādikā* describes some formal course of action instead of the legal procedure requested in the *Vinaya*. A passage from the *Andhakatṭhakathā* quoted in the *Anugaṅṅhipada* in this context tells us that *upasampanna asammata* 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 *Andhakatṭhakathā*, with the only difference that in the *Andhakatṭhakathā* a *bhikkhunovādaka* as the one who installs is not mentioned. Whether or not this reflects some further development, we do not know.⁵⁸ The

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 *bhikkhunīs* (Vin II 265,4–5).

⁵⁸ Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 209].

Andhakaṭṭhakathā 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 *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* 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.⁵⁹ The hurdle of agreeing upon a *bhikkhunovādaka* established in the *Vinaya* obviously was overcome at the time of the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* 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*.

| <i>Vinaya</i> | <i>Andhakaṭṭhakathā</i> | <i>Samantapāsādikā</i> |
|--|--|--|
| <i>sammata bhikkhunovādaka</i>
a nun's adviser is agreed upon | <i>ṭhapita bhikkhunovādaka</i>
a nun's adviser is installed | <i>ṭhapita bhikkhunovādaka</i>
a nun's adviser is installed |
| method:
<i>ñātticatutthakamma</i> | method:
installation by a monks' community | method:
installation by a monks' community
installation by a nuns' adviser agreed upon |

Agreeing upon or installing a *bhikkhunovādaka*

The *upasampanna asammatā* 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 *aṭhapita*, and that this is also the opinion of the Abhayagirivāsin.⁶⁰ 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 *Anugaṇṭhipada* rejects the maxime of the Abhayagirivāsin and accepts only the opinion of the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* which equates

⁵⁹ To be (1) virtuous and to keep to the *Pātimokkha*, (2) to be very learned (*bahussuta*), (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. Pārājika, 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 *Sāratthadīpanī* who nevertheless dropped the reference to the Abhayagirivāsin.

asammata with *ṭhapita*,⁶¹ arguing that nowadays (*etarahi*), i.e. at the time of the *Anugaṇṭhipada*, an adviser not agreed upon (*ovādaka asammata*) regularly functions as a *bhikkhunovādaka*. For this tradition Pāc 21 M therefore must have become obsolete with the introduction of the new method to make someone a *bhikkhunovādaka*.⁶²

| | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| Vajirabuddhiṭkā, Abhayagirivāsīn
Sāratthadīpanī | Andhakatṭhakathā, Anugaṇṭhipada |
| <i>asammata</i> = <i>aṭhapita</i> | <i>asammata</i> = <i>ṭhapita</i> |
| Pācittiya 21 for monks is applied to <i>asammata</i> and <i>aṭhapita</i> | Pācittiya 21 for monks is obsolete |

Interpretation of Pācittiya 21

Samghādisesa 3 for Nuns

Sgh 3 N makes it an offence for nuns to go to another village alone (*ekā gāmantaraṃ gaccheyya*), to go to the other side of a river alone (*ekā nadīpāraṃ gaccheyya*), to stay separated for one night alone (*ekā rattiṃ vippavaseyya*), and to stay behind the group of nuns alone (*ekā gaṇamhā ohīyeyya*). Most of the references to nuns in our texts are connected with Sgh 3 N: three quotations from the *Andhakatṭhakathā*, five from the *Anugaṇṭhipada*, 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 companion. 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” (*arañña*) or, more precisely, “wilderness without settlements” (*agāmaka arañña*). 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 *Samantapāsādikā* 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 *Porānagaṇṭhipada*, valued by the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* 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 Abhayagirivāsīn too accepted the new method of making *bhikkhunovādakas*, and that they applied Pāc 21 M to all but the *sammata* and *ṭhapita bhikkhunovādakas*. 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-Aṭṭhakathā* quoted by the *Samantapāsādikā* 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 *Samantapāsādikā*.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 *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* 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 *Anugaṇṭhipada* 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 *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* quotes the probably Sinhalese *no takko ti ācariyo*. He rejects the statement of the anonymous source that the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* ignored

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

⁶⁴ The *Samantapāsādikā* quotes the *Kurundī* and the *Mahāpacarī* 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: *aparikkhittassa gāmassa upacāro adinnādāne vuttanayen’ 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 *taṃ upacāraṃ paṭhamam pādamaṃ atikkamantassa*, whereas in all other instances the causative of *atikkamati* namely *atikkāmeti* is used in those cases.

⁶⁷ Vjb 358,20–21: “*aparikkhittassa gāmassa upacāraṃ okkamantiyā ti pi ekaccesu dissati, taṃ na gahetabban’ ti apare’ ti vuttaṃ*. “[In *Vajirabuddhi’s Anugaṇṭhipada*] 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-Pülz 2013: [Z 255].

the differentiation (between the readings *okkamati* and *atikkamati*) of the *Vinaya* with the argument that in some *Vinaya* manuscripts the reading *atikkamati* (instead of *okkamati*) is found in Pāc 85 M, and that this is accepted as the reading of the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*.⁶⁸ Thus the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* had the reading *atikkamati* 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 *atikkamati* (Sgh 3 N) and *okkamati* (Pār 2 M, Pāc 85 M), accepting the definition which equates *gāma* with *gāmūpacāra* only for Sgh 3 N.⁷⁰ The *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇipurāṇaṭīkā* in the commentary to Pār 2 M preserves an *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* 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: *gāmaparikkhepokāsa*). The *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*, therefore, is a possible source for the *Samantapāsādikā*'s *gāmūpacāra*-definition in this context.

The two contradictory definitions of *gāmūpacāra* preserved in the *Samantapāsādikā*⁷² may therefore go back to a South Indian (*Andhakaṭṭhakathā*) and a Sri Lankan (*Mahā-Atṭhakathā*) 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.

| source | <i>parikkhitta gāma</i> | | <i>aparikkhitta gāma</i> | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|
| | <i>gāma</i> | <i>gāmūpacā</i> | <i>gāma</i> | <i>gāmūpacāra</i> |
| <i>Vinaya</i> (Pārājika 2 M) | – | boundary = one stone throw from the village gate | – | boundary = one stone throw from the precincts of a house (<i>gharūpacāra</i>) |

⁶⁸ Interestingly the confusion of the readings *okkamati* and *atikkamati* 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 *Vajirabuddhiṭīkā* with respect to Pāc 85 M suggests to apply the definition which equates *gāmūpacāra* with *gāma*, and thus proposes to follow the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* tradition, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 37].

⁷⁰ Kieffer-Pülz 2010: Vjb [9].

⁷¹ Here the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇipurāṇaṭīkā* has a very interesting section, in which it deals with the various definitions of *gāma* and *gāmūpacāra* in the *Vinaya* (Kkh-ṭ 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 *Kurundī* and the *Mahāpaccaṛī* according to the statement of the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇipurāṇaṭīkā*, accorded to that of the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*. No such quotations are handed down. It cannot be excluded that the author of the Kkh-ṭ bases this opinion on the quotations from *Kurundī* and *Mahāpaccaṛī* handed down in the *Samantapāsādikā* in this context. To analyze the coincidence of these two Sri Lankan commentaries with the South Indian *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* 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-ṭ 33,3–5: *tasmā “gāmūpacāro ti parikkhittassa gāmassa parikkhepo, aparikkhittassa gāmassa parikkhepokāso” ti* (= Sp 1050,17–18) *Andhakaṭṭhakathāyaṃ vuttan ti vedibbaṃ. tathā Kurundiyaṃ, Mahāpaccaṛiyaṃ ca*. See Kieffer-Pülz 2010: Kkh-ṭ [4].

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| <i>Samantapāsādikā:</i>
Kurundī (Pārājika
2 M) | – | – | – | boundary = one stone
throw from the precincts of
a house (<i>gharūpacāra</i>) |
| <i>Samantapāsādikā:</i>
<i>Mahāpaccarī</i>
(Pārājika 2 M) | – | – | – | boundary = one stone
throw from the precincts of
a house (<i>gharūpacāra</i>) |
| <i>Samantapāsādikā:</i>
<i>Mahā-Aṭṭhakathā</i>
(Pārājika 2 M,
Pācittiya 85 M) | – | – | boundary = one
stone throw
from the <i>ghar-</i>
<i>ūpacāra</i> | boundary = another stone
throw from there (i.e. from
the village) |
| <i>Andhakatṭhakathā</i>
(Pārājika 2 M,
Pācittiya 85 M,
Saṅghādisesa 3 N) | – | – | – | boundary = space for an
enclosure |
| <i>Samantapāsādikā</i>
(Sīmā rules) | – | – | – | boundary = space for an
enclosure (<i>parikkhepokāsa</i>) |
| <i>Samantapāsādikā</i>
(Saṅghādisesa 3 N) | boundary =
enclosure
(<i>parikkhepa</i>) | – | – | boundary = space appro-
priate for an enclosure
(<i>parikkhepārahaṭṭhāna</i>) |

Definitions of *gāma* and *gāmūpacāra***The offence of staying behind a group**

One *apare*-quotation in the *Anugaṇṭhipada* 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.⁷⁴ 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-Aṭṭhakathā* handed down in the *Samantapāsādikā*. There we are told that a nun who remains outside the court of the Mahābodhi tree etc.⁷⁵ when the group of nuns enters it, commits the offence

⁷⁴ Vin I 399: *gāmato n' eva avidūre na accāsanne*.

⁷⁵ Sp 912,29–9137: *agāmake araṇṇe ti* (Vin IV 230,18) *ettha nikkhamitvā bahi indakhilā sabbam etaṃ araṇṇan ti* (Vibh 251,17–18) *evaṃ vuttalakkaṇaṃ eva araṇṇaṃ. taṃ pan' etaṃ kevalaṃ gāmābhāvena 'agāmaṇa' ti vuttaṃ, na Viñjāṭṭhāvisadisatāya. tādisa araṇṇe okkante dassanūpacāre vijahite sace pi savanūpacāro atthi, āpatti. ten' eva vuttaṃ Aṭṭhakathāyaṃ: sace bhikkhunīsu Mahābodhi-aṅgaṇaṃ pavisaṇṭīsu ekā bahi tiṭṭhati, tassāpi āpatti. Lohapāsādaṃ pavisaṇṭīsu pi parivenaṃ pavisaṇṭīsu pi es' eva nayo. Mahācetiyaṃ vandamānāsu ekā uttaradvārena nikkhamitvā gacchati, tassāpi āpatti. Thūpārāmaṃ pavisaṇṭīsu ekā bahi tiṭṭhati, 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 Viñjha-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-*]Aṭṭhakathā: **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” (*akappiyabhūmi*) for nuns, as we learn implicitly from the *Andhakatṭhakathā* (see above), and explicitly from the *Vinayavinicchaya* written by the South Indian Buddhaddatta (5th/6th century),⁷⁸ and from the *apare* quoted in the *Anugaṅṭhipada*. The latter refer to the Khandhadhammavihāra in Kāñcī and the Sārīdhammavihāra in Kāvīrapaṭṭana 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 suppose that at some time and in some region monks’ monasteries were built within 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 *akappiṇya* 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 Lohapāsāda or a Pariveṇa. 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.”

⁷⁶ Cf. Geiger 1986: pp. 58–59. See also the remark in Dhammasiri’s *Gaṅṭhipada* (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.

⁷⁷ 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 vāsūpagā honti, bhikkhunupassayo va kappiyabhūmi. yatha bhikkhuniyo ekarattam pi vasanti, ayaṃ bhikkhunupassayo ti* (≠ Vin IV 57,6–7) *vacanato tāsam samīpaṃ vā tāhi gahitavāsāgāraṃ vā “gacchāmi” ti gacchato yathāsukhaṃ gantuṃ vaṭṭati. na hi tāvatā taṃ gharaṃ antaragharasankhyaṃ gacchati no takko ti ācariyo.* “If nuns entered a habitation, only the nunnery is an allowable space. On account of the statement that **wherever a bhikkhunī 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.”

⁷⁸ Vin-vn, Vs. 2040: *bhikkhunīnaṃ 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.”

⁷⁹ Vjb 359,7–14, Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 256].

⁸⁰ From the *anāpatti* 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 *antaragāma*), i.e. a monastery within [a settlement], a *bhikkhunupassaya*, a *titthiyaseyya*, “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.

⁸¹ 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 *Ṭīkās* (Vin-vn-ṭ, Kkh-ṭ).

Anugaṅṭhipada which applies that rule not only to the “wilderness”, but even to the *gāma*. According to the *Anugaṅṭhipada*’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.⁸² The contradictions to the statements in the *Vinaya* caused by this interpretation are solved by the *Anugaṅṭhipada* in stating that the *Vinaya* speaks of *agāmaka araṅṅā* 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 araṅṅā* refers to the moment the decision is made.⁸³ Since none of the other commentaries discusses this case,⁸⁴ we, unfortunately, do not know how widespread this interpretation was.⁸⁵ 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 Abhayagirivāsin nor to the Mahāsāṃghika—in the time before and after the *Samantapāsādikā*, because our sources deal with nuns’ rules and in part slightly deviate from mainstream Mahāvihāra. 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 *Anugaṅṭhipada* 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 *Anugaṅṭhipada* 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 *Vajirabuddhiṅkā* rejects the justification of the *Anugaṅṭhipada*, but does not take a further opinion on the statement.

⁸⁵ In the same context the *Anugaṅṭhipada* 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-pt (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 259]).

Pāc = Pācittiya offence
 Pār = Pārājika offence
 Sgh = Saṃghādisesa offence

REFERENCES:

PRIMARY LITERATURE

Kkh = *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*

Kkh-pt = *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-purāṇaṭṭhā*, Rangoon, 1961 (Chs), 1–117.

Kkh-ṭ = Buddhanāga, *Vinayaṭṭhamañjūsā nāma Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-abhinavaṭṭhā*, Rangoon, 1961 (Chs), 118–489.

Sp = *Samantapāsādikā, Vinayaṭṭhakathā*, 7 Vols., ed. J. Takakusu, M. Nagai (and K. Mizuno in Vols. 5 and 7), London, 1924–1947 (PTS); Vol. 8: Indexes Hermann Kopp, London (PTS).

Sp-ṭ = Sāriputta [of Poṭṭannaruva], *Sāraṭṭhadīpanī*, 3 Vols., Rangoon, 1960 (Chs).

Vin = *Vinaya Piṭaka*, 5 Vols., ed. Hermann Oldenberg, London, 1879–1883.

Vin-vn = Buddhadatta, *Vinayavinicchaya*, in: *Buddhadatta's Manuals*, pt. 2: *Vinayavinicchaya and Uttaravinicchaya, Summaries of the Vinaya Piṭaka*, ed. A. P. Buddhadatta, London, 1927 (PTS), 1–230.

Vin-vn-ṭ = *Vinayavinicchayaṭṭhā (Vinayaṭṭhasārasandīpanī)*, 2 Vols., Rangoon, 1977 (Chs).

Vjb = *Vajirabuddhiṭṭhā*, Rangoon, 1960 (Chs)

SECONDARY LITERATURE:

BD = I. B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline (Vinaya-Piṭaka)*, 6 vols., London, 1938-1966 (SBB 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, 25).

Bollée 1985 = W. B. Bollée, [Review to] K. R. Norman, Pāli Literature, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 105/1, 178–179.

Cousins, L. S. 2010 = L. S. Cousins, “On the Vibhajjavādins. The Mahimsāsaka, Dhammaguttaka, Kassapiya and Tambapaṇṇiya branches of the ancient Theriyas”, *Buddhist Studies Review* 18, 2 (2001), 131–182.

Cousins (unpubl.) = L. S. Cousins, “Tambapaṇṇiya and Tāmraśāṭṭhiya”, [unpublished article; pdf www.ocbs.org/people/fellows-ocbsmain-152/157-lance-cousins; last access, 20.6.2012].

CPD = *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, begun by V. Trenckner, ed. D. Andersen, H. Smith, H. Hendriksen, Vols. 1–3, Copenhagen 1924ff.

Geiger 1986 = Wilhelm Geiger, *Culture of Ceylon in mediaeval times*, ed. Heinz Bechert, 2nd ed., Stuttgart.

Golzio 2010 = Karl-Heinz Golzio, *Die Ausbreitung des Buddhismus in Süd- und Südostasien: eine quantitative Untersuchung auf der Basis epigraphischer Quellen*, Frankfurt (Religionswissenschaft, Bd. 16).

von Hinüber 1996 = O. von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, Berlin (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies, Vol. 2).

Kieffer-Pülz 1993 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, “Zitate aus der Andhaka-Aṭṭhakathā in der Samantapāsādikā”, *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde. Festgabe des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde für Prof. Dr. Heinz Bechert*, ed. R. Grünendahl et alii, Bonn (Indica et Tibetica, 22), 171–212.

Kieffer-Pülz 1994 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, “Bemerkungen zu dem Wort jagatī”, *Festschrift Klaus Bruhn zur Vollendung des 65. Lebensjahres*, ed. Nalini Balbir et alii, Reinbek, 339–359.

Kieffer-Pülz 2005 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, “Die Klassifizierung des Alkoholverbots in der buddhistischen Rechtsliteratur der Theravādin”, *Im Dickicht der Gebote. Studien zur Dialektik von Norm und Praxis in der Buddhismusgeschichte Asiens*, ed. Peter Schalk, Uppsala (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum, 26), 153–223.

Kieffer-Pülz 2009 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, “The Ganthārambhakathā of Upasena’s Saddhammapajjotikā and Vajirabuddhi’s Vajirabuddhiṭṭhā”, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 52, 143–177.

Kieffer-Pülz 2010 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, “Zitate aus der Andhakaṭṭhakathā in den Subkommentaren”, *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* (2010), 147–235.

Kieffer-Pülz 2013 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, *Verlorene Ganthipadas zum buddhistischen Ordensrecht. Untersuchungen zu den in der Vajirabuddhiṭṭhā zitierten Kommentaren Dhammasiris und Vajirabuddhis*,

- 3 Bde., Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag (Veröffentlichungen der Indologischen Kommission, 1).
Proceedings and Transactions of the Second Oriental Conference: Calcutta January 28th to February 1st, 1922, Calcutta 1923.
- Ramchandran 1996 = A. Ramchandran, *The Cultural History of Lower Kṛṣṇa Valley: Its contacts with Southeast Asia*, Jaipur.
- Soundara Rajan 1994 = K. V. Soundara Rajan, *Kaveripattinam excavations 1963–73 (A port city on the Tamilnadu coast)*, New Delhi (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 90).
- VAV = Jens-Uwe Hartmann, *Das Varṇārhavarṇastotra des Mātr̥ceṭa*, Göttingen, 1987 (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden, 12; AAWG 160).

Manuscript Fragments of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the Mahāsāṃghika(-Lokottaravādin)s (2)*

Seishi KARASHIMA

In 2008, I published an article, dealing with 25 folios of a Sanskrit manuscript of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the Mahāsāṃghika(-Lokottaravādin)s, 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(-Lokottaravādin)s (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 Mūlasarvāstivādins.

(57)? : Plate 14

recto

missing

verso

1 /// + + + + + + +

2 /// + + + .[i]ka : 30 || + +

3 /// [sa]rgik[ā]h pā + +

4 ///¹[yuṣmaṃ](tānām) [pṛcchā]mi²kaś cātra pa5 /// +³.. .. [nām] paripṛcchāmi •

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 18.19~19.10. (*Nissarggikapācattika* 30) *yo puna bhikṣur jānan sāmghikam lābham saṃghe pariṇatam ātmano pariṇāmeya nissarggikapācattikam / ...⁴ uddiṣṭāh kho punar āyuṣmanto triṃśan nissarggikapācattikā dharmāh / tatrāyusmanto pṛcchāmi kacci (')ttha pariṣuddhāh? dviṭiyam pi āyuṣmanto pṛcchāmi kacci (')ttha pariṣuddhāh? tṛṭiyam pi āyuṣmanto pṛcchāmi kacci (')ttha pariṣuddhāh? pariṣuddhātrāyusmanto yasmāt tūṣṇim evam etaṃ dhārayāmi /*

ime kho punar āyuṣmanto dvānavati śuddhapācattikā dharmā anvardhamāsaṃ sūtre prātimokṣe uddeśam āgacchanti — (Pāc 1) samprajānamṛṣāvāde pācattikam / (Pāc 2) omṛṣyavāde pācattikam / (Pāc 3) bhikṣupaisūnye pācattikam /

(59) : Plate 15

recto

1 /// + + + + [r bhi]kṣur jān. + + + +

2 /// + + + +⁵.. .i «[t]āni [bh]. ///» ti vyupaś. + +3 /// + + + .. [d⁶ i]daṃ punaḥ karma .. +4 /// [t]ad eva pratyaṃ kṛtvā ananyaṃ i⁷ +5 /// .. ṭanāye[t⁸ p](ā)yattikā • 4 || yaḥ pu-⁹

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 19.11~14. (Pāc 4) *yo puna bhikṣur jānam saṃghasyādhikaraṇāni dharmeṇa vinayena vihitāni vyupaśāntāni punaḥ karmāya utkhoṭeya — idam punaḥ karma kartavyam bhaviṣyatīti — etad eva pratyaṃ kṛtvā ananyaṃ imaṃ tasya bhikṣusya utkhoṭanam pācattikam / (Pāc 5) yo pu-*

¹ [yuṣmaṃ](tānām) ... paripṛcchāmi : Cf. 93v5~94r2. āyuṣmaṃtānām pṛcchāmi kaś cātra pariṣuddhāh ... āyuṣmaṃtānām pṛcchāmi (= 97v2~3, 104r1~3, 105r5~v2). Cf. also note 362.

² kaś cātra : A hyper-Sanskritism of *kaccātra < *kacci atra < kaccid atra; cf. Ma-L, Pātim kacci (')ttha; Sa, Mū(HvH) kaccit sthātra. Cf. also notes 363, 369, 449, 454, 528.

³ [nām] : Probably (āyuṣmaṃtā)nām : Cf. Ma-L āyuṣmanto; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

⁴ PrMoSū(Ma-L) 18.21~24. // uddānam // (21) pātra (22) bandhanam (23) bhaiṣajyam (24) ācchedo (25) varṣāśāṅikā / (26-27) tantuvāyena dve (28) daśāhānāgatam (29) upavarṣam (30) pariṇāmanena // tṛṭīyo vargaḥ //.

⁵ .. .i «tāni [bh]. ///» ti : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 4) vihitāni; Pātim (Pāc 63), Sa (Pāt 4), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 4) -.

⁶ + .. [d] : (utkhoṭe)d?; cf. Ma-L utkhoṭeya; Pātim (Pāc 63), Sa (Pāt 4), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 4) -.

⁷ i : This akṣara is visible in the photograph of the verso, as the right edge of this line is folded underneath itself.

⁸ .. ṭanāye[t] : S.e.? Cf. Ma-L utkhoṭanam; Pātim ukkoṭeyya; Sa utkoṭayet; Mū(HvH) khotayet.

⁹ yaḥ pu : The visarga and the akṣara pu are visible in the photograph of the verso, because the right edge of this line is folded underneath itself.

verso

- 1 {pu}nar bhikṣuḥ aka[l](p)i(ya)kāarakasya¹⁰ mātrgrāmas[y]. + + ///
 2 ḥ paṃcābhīr vācābhi(r¹¹dha)[r](ma)[ṃ] djeśaye anyatra vijña ... ///
 3 + + + + + + + + + + [y](a)[ḥ] punar bhikṣuḥ a .. ///
 4 + + + + + + + + + + (r)[m](aṃ) vāceyā [pā] + ///
 5 + + + + + + + + + + [s]ampān. + + ///

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 19.14~17. na bhikṣur akalpiyakāro mātrgrāmasya dharmam deśeya uttari cchahi pañcāhi vācāhi anyatra vijñapurūṣapudgalena pācattikam / (Pāc 6) yo puna bhikṣur anupasampannam pudgalaṃ padaśo dharmam vāceya pācattikam / (Pāc 7) yo puna bhikṣur anupasampannasya

(60) : Plate 16

recto

- 1 + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
 2 + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
 3 + + + + + ○ + + [bh]ūt(a)bhāṣaṇā[y].¹² .. +
 4 tikā (•) 7 || yaḥ punar bhikṣur jānaṃ bhikṣu(s)y.
 5 dauṣṭhulya¹³ āpattim āpannā¹⁴ anupasampā[n].-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 19.17~20. pudgalasya santike ātmopanāyikam uttarimanuṣyadharmam alamāryajñānadarśanam viśeṣādhiḡamaṃ pratijāneya — iti jānāmi iti paśyāmīti bhūtasmiṃ pācattikam / (Pāc 8) yo puna bhikṣur jānaṃ bhikṣusya duṣṭhullām āpattim anupasampanna-

verso

- 1 sya pudgalasyāntike¹⁵ āroceyā¹⁶ anyatra kṛtāya¹⁷ pra-
 2 kāśana{ṃ}sa<ṃ>muttīye¹⁸ pāyattikā • 8 || yo
 3 (pu)[na]r bhi[k](ṣu)r jānaṃ¹⁹ sāmghikam lābham [bh]ā[ḥ]i ..
 4 + + + + .. [m]anujñā bhūtvā pa + + + + +
 5 + + + + + .. s[am]s(tu)tam e .. + + + + +

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 19.20~23. śya pudgalasya santike āroceya anyatra kṛtāye prakāśanā-sammūṭīye pācattikam / (Pāc 9) yo puna bhikṣur jānaṃ sāmghike lābhe bhāḡiyamāne pūrve samanujñō bhūtvā paścāt kṣiyādharmam āpadyeya — yathāsamstutam evāyuṣmanto,

¹⁰ aka[l](p)i(ya)kāarakasya : S.e. for °kārako?; cf. Ma-L (Pāc 5) akalpiyakāro = MaVin 336a16. (比丘)無淨人(爲女人); Ma.Ch 552a24 - (比丘爲女人); Pātim (Pāc 7), Sa (Pāt 5), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 5) -.

¹¹ (dha)[r](ma)[ṃ] djeśaye anyatra : ≠ Ma-L dharmam deśeya uttari cchahi pañcāhi vācāhi anyatra; = Pātim dhammam deśeyya aññātra; Sa, Mū(HvH) dharman deśayed anyatra.

¹² [bh]ūt(a)bhāṣaṇā[y]. : = MaVin 337a19f. 說實者; Ma.Ch 552a28. 說實(v.l. 實語)者; ≠ Ma-L (Pāc 7) bhūtasmiṃ; Pātim (Pāc 8) bhūtasmiṃ; Sa (Pāt 7) bhūtaṃ; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 8) bhūtāt.

¹³ dauṣṭhulya : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 8) duṣṭhullām; Pātim (Pāc 9) duṣṭhullam; Sa (Pāt 8) duṣṭhūlām; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 7) duṣṭhūlām. For these variant forms, cf. BHSD, s.vv. duṣṭhula, dauṣṭhulya; Wogihara 1908: 29f.

¹⁴ āpannā : No parallels in the other versions.

¹⁵ pudgalasyāntike : = Sa; cf. Ma-L pudgalasya santike; Pātim -; Mū(HvH) pudgalāya.

¹⁶ āroceyā : Ma-L āroceya; Pātim āroceyya; Sa, Mū(HvH) ārocayed.

¹⁷ kṛtāya : Ma-L kṛtāye; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

¹⁸ prakāśana{ṃ}sa<ṃ>muttīye : Ma-L prakāśanāsammutīye; Pātim bhikkhusammūṭīyā (v.l. °sammāṭīyā); Sa. samghasammatyā; Mū(HvH) samghasamvṛtyā. For the variation sammūṭī / sammāṭī / saṃvṛtyā, see Abhis I 98.

¹⁹ sāmghikam lābham : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 9) °ike °bhe; Pātim (Pāc 81), Sa (Pāt 9), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 9) -.

jānaṃ

(61) : Plate 17

recto

1 + + + + + + ... ta[m] pudgal. + + + + +

2 + + + + .. [t]tikā • 9 || yaḥ puna + + + + +

3 se²⁰ 21 prātim[o]kṣ[e] ○ sūtre uddiśyamā[ne] + + + +

4 kiṃ punar²² imebhīḥ āyuṣmaṃto «bahu»²³ bhīḥ²⁴ kṣudrānuṣudrebh[i]ḥ

5 śikṣāpadebhīr uddiṣṭebhīr yāvad eva bhikṣūnāṃ kaukr-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 19.23~27. *sāṃghikaṃ lābhaṃ saṃghe pariṇatam pudgalo pudgalasya pariṇāmayatīti pācattikaṃ* L (Pāc 10) *yo puna bhikṣur anvardhamāsaṃ sūtre prātimokṣe uddiśyamāne evaṃ vadeya — kiṃ punar āyuṣmanto imehi kṣudrānuṣudrehi śikṣāpadehi uddiṣṭehi yāvad eva bhikṣūnāṃ* (← °unāṃ [misp]) *kaukr-*

verso

1 tyāya vighātāya vilekhāya²⁵ saṃvarta<ṃ>te (°)ti²⁶ imaṃ ta-

2 sya bhikṣusya śikṣāvigaraṇatāyāi{ḥ}²⁷ pāyattikā : 10 (||)

3 bījagrāmabhūOtagrāmapātāpa + + + + +

4 + + + + .. kā : 11 ||²⁸ ajñāvāda[v]i + + + + +

5 + + + + + +²⁹ .. jjhayaṇa « .[i] /// » .e + + + + + +

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 19.27~20.7. *tyāya vighātāya vilekhāya saṃvartantīti. śikṣāvigaraṇe*

²⁰ + + + + se : Presumably (*anvardhamā*)se; cf. Ma-L (Pāc 10) °māsaṃ; Pātim (Pāc 72) -; Sa (Pāt 10) - (v.l. *anvardhamā[s]*.); Mū(HvH) (Pāy 10) *anvarddhamāsaṃ*.

²¹ prātim[o]kṣ[e] sūtre : Cf. Ma-L sūtre prātimokṣe; MaVin 338c17 = Ma.Ch 552b3. 波羅提木又經; Pātim pātimokkhe; Sa prātimokṣasūtrō(ddiśyamāne); Mū(HvH) prātimokṣasūtrō(ddeṣe).

²² imebhīḥ āyuṣmaṃto : Cf. Ma-L āyuṣmanto imehi; Pātim imehi; Sa ebhīḥ; Mū(HvH) āyuṣmanta ebhīḥ (v.l. *ebhir āyuṣ*°); Mū *ebhir āyuṣmantah*.

²³ «bahu»²³ bhīḥ : No parallels in the other versions.

²⁴ kṣudrānuṣudrebh[i]ḥ śikṣāpadebhīr uddiṣṭebhīr : Cf. Ma-L °ehi °ehi °ehi; Pātim *khuddānukhuddakehi sikkhāpadehi uddiṣṭehi*; Sa *kṣudrānuṣudraih śikṣāpadair uddiṣṭair* = Mū(HvH).

²⁵ saṃvarta<ṃ>te (°)ti : Cf. Ma-L *saṃvartantīti*; Pātim *saṃvartantīti*; Sa *saṃvartantīti* (v.l. *saṃvartante ... (iti)*); Mū(HvH) *saṃvartante ... iti*.

²⁶ imaṃ tasya bhikṣusya : No parallels in the other versions. Apparently, *imaṃ tasya* was "corrected" to *imaṃti* sya by a later scribe, which does not make much sense.

²⁷ śikṣāvigaraṇatāyāi{ḥ} : Probably a hyper-form of °tāye (Inst. fem.); cf. BHS § 9.34; cf. Ma-L *śikṣāvigaraṇe*; Pātim *sikkhāpadavivaṇṇake* (v.l. °ṇṇanake); Sa *śikṣāvidandaṇāt*; Mū(HvH) *śikṣāvibhaṇḍanāt* (Mū *śikṣā-vilaṃghanaṭ* [s.e]); cf. also Mvy 8429. *vitaṇḍanam*.

²⁸ ajñāvāda[v]i + + + : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 12) *anyavādaviḥsaṇake* = MaVin 340b27 = Ma.Ch 552b7. 異語惱他; Pātim (Pāc 12) *aññāvādake vihesake*; Sa (Pāt 13) *any(a)vādaviḥṭhanāt*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 13) *ājñāviviḥṭhanāt* = Mvy 8433; cf. also BhiVin(Ma-L) § 183, 6A4.4. *anyavādam*. Probably, *ajñā* and *ājñā* are hyper-Sanskritisms, based on Ml. *añña* < *anya*; cf. BHS, s.v. *anyavāda-*.

²⁹ .. jjhayaṇa] « .[i] /// » .e : Presumably (o)jjhayaṇa(ks)ī(yanak)e. As the margin at the bottom of the folio, upon which the inserted *akṣaras* must have been written, fell off through time, we have no means of knowing, with certainty, how many were supplemented there. Probably (o)jjhayaṇa- is a scribal error for (o)jjhāyana-; cf. Ma-L (Pāc 13) *odhyāyanakṣīyanake*; Pātim (Pāc 13) *ujjhāpanake khīyanake*; Sa (Pāt 12) *avadhyāna-kṣipānāt* = Mū; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 12) °kṣepaṇāt; cf. also BhiVin(Ma-L) § 183, 6A4.4. *odhyāpana*. The verbal form *o-jjhāya-* (Pā. *ujjhāyati*, BHS. *avadhyāyati*) occurs several times in the Abhis., cf. Abhis I 2, n. 3, III 171, s.v.

*pācattikaṃ / ...*³⁰ (Pāc 11) *bījagrāmahūtagrāmapātāpanake pācattikaṃ /* (Pāc 12)
anyavādavihimsanake pācattikaṃ / (Pāc 13) *odhyāyanakṣīyanake pāca-*

(62) : Plate 18

recto

- 1 + + + + + .. bhikṣur jāna[m]³¹ s[ām] + + + + +
 2 + + + + ś. maṃcaṃ vā pīṭhaṃ vā biṃb. [dh].³² + + + + +
 3 vā kurcaṃ vā b[i]ṃbopadhānaṃ³³ vā pra[j]ñ. + + + + +
 4 vā praññāpayitvā vā tato p<r>akkrameyā³⁴ ³⁵noddhare noddha-
 5 rāpaye vā anāmaṃtritāṃ³⁶ vā prakrameyā³⁷ pāya-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 20.7~11. *ttikaṃ /* (Pāc 14) *yo puna bhikṣuḥ sāmghike bhikṣuvihāre abhyavakāṣe mañcaṃ vā pīṭhaṃ vā viśikaṃ vā caturaśrakaṃ vā kurcaṃ vā bimbohanāṃ vā praññāpetvā vā praññāpayitvā vā tato prakramanto na uddhareya vā, na uddharāpeya vā, anāmantrayitvā vā prakrameya pāca-*

verso

- 1 ttikā : 14 || yo punar bhikṣuḥ sāmghike bhikṣuvihāre aṃ-
 2 tośayyāṃ ³⁸praññāpayitvā vā praññāpayitvā vā tato
 3 prakramen³⁹ [n]od[dh]are⁴⁰ noddhar[ā]
 4 + + + + nāmaṃtritāṃ⁴¹ vā prakrame .. + + + + +
 5 + + + + + .. r (bh)ik(ṣu)ḥ bhikṣusya .. + + + + +

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 20.11~15. *ttikaṃ /* (Pāc 15) *yo punar bhikṣuḥ sāmghike bhikṣuvihāre antośayyāṃ praññāpetvā vā praññāpayitvā vā tato prakramanto na uddhareya vā na uddharāpeya vā anāmantrayitvā vā prakrameya pācattikaṃ /* (Pāc 16) *yo punar bhikṣu bhikṣusya duṣṭo doṣāt kupito anāttama-*

³⁰ PrMoSū(Ma-L) 20.1~4. || *uddānaṃ* || (1) *mṛṣā* (2) *omṛṣya* (3) *paśūnyam* (4) *utkhoṇam* (5) *dharmadeśanā* / (6) *padaśo* (7) *viśeṣaṇam* (8) *ārocānā* (9) *yathāsaṃstuta* (10) *vigarhaṇena ca* || *prathamo vargaḥ* ||.

³¹ *jāna[m]* : This word, lacking in the other versions, is superfluous.

³² *biṃb. [dh]* : Probably *biṃb(o)dh(ānaṃ)*. As the word *biṃbopadhānaṃ* is found in the next line, *bisim* or its like is expected here. Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 14) *viśikaṃ*; Pātim (Pāc 14) *bhisim*; Sa (Pāt 14) *brisim*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 14) *vṛsikāṃ*; Mū *vṛsiko* (s.e.?). For *bisī* (< Skt. *brsi*; cf. Pā. *bhisi*, Pkt. *bisī*, *bhisī* “bolster, cushion”), cf. Abhis I 120, § 14.14, n. 3; III 404.

³³ *b[i]ṃbopadhānaṃ* : Cf. Ma-L *bimbohanāṃ*; Pātim, Sa -; Mū(HvH) *bimbopadhāna-*; cf. BHSD, s.v. *bimbopadhāna* (“pillow, cushion”), Abhis I 132, § 17.10, n. 4; III 403, s.vv. *bimbohana-*, *bimbohanaka*.

³⁴ *p<r>akkrameyā* : Cf. Ma-L *prakramanto*; Pātim *pakkamanto*; Sa, Mū(HvH) -. Cf. also 62v3. *prakramen*.

³⁵ *noddhare noddharāpaye vā* : Cf. Ma-L *na uddhareya vā, na uddharāpeya vā*; Pātim *n'eva uddhareyya na uddharāpeyya*; Sa. *nōddharen nōddhārayed vā*; Mū(HvH) *anuddhṛtyānuddhārya vā* (v.l. *anuddhṛtām*^o).

³⁶ *anāmaṃtritāṃ* : Cf. Ma-L *anāmantrayitvā*; Pātim *anāpucchaṃ*; Sa -; Mū(HvH) *santaṃ bhikṣum anavalokya*.

³⁷ *prakrameyā* : Cf. Ma-L *eya*; Pātim *gaccheyya*; Sa. *prakramen*; Mū(HvH) *viprakrāmet*.

³⁸ *praññāpayitvā vā praññāpayitvā* : S.e.? Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 15) *praññāpetvā vā praññāpayitvā* (Ms. *°pāyetvā*); Pātim (Pāc 15) *santharitvā vā santharāpetvā*; Sa (Pāt 15) *saṃstūrya vā saṃstārayed*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 15) *saṃstūrya saṃstārya vā*; Mū *saṃstūrya vā saṃstārya*. Cf. also 70r3. *vijñāpitvā vijñāpayitvā vā*.

³⁹ *prakramen* : = Sa; cf. Ma-L *prakramanto*; Pātim *pakkamanto*; Mū(HvH) -. Cf. also 62r4. *p<r>akkrameyā*.

⁴⁰ *[n]od[dh]aren* : Cf. Ma-L *na uddhareya vā*; Pātim *n'eva uddhareyya*; Sa *nōddharen*; Mū(HvH) *anuddhṛtya*.

⁴¹ *+ nāmaṃtritāṃ* : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 16) *anāmantrayitvā*; Pātim *anāpucchaṃ*; Sa -; Mū(HvH) *santaṃ bhikṣum anavalokya*.

(63) : Plate 19

*recto*1 + + + + (k)ṣu [v](i)[h]āre⁴² nikad[ḍh]e + + + + +2 + + + .. [n]. hi bhikṣu tti⁴³ vā vad[e]yā⁴⁴ .. + + + +

3 y[o] punar bhi[k]ṣuḥ ○ sāmghike bhikṣuvi[h]. + + + +

4 ⁴⁵prajñaptāya śayyāya paścād āgatv[ā] madhy. +5 yyām ⁴⁶prajñāpaye + ⁴⁷+ syodvādho bhaviṣya ..

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 20.15~19. *no sāmghikād bhikṣuvihārād bhikṣum nikaddheya vā nikadḍhāpeya vā antamasato nēha bhikṣū ti vā vadeya pācattikaṃ* | (Pāc 17) *yo puna bhikṣuḥ sāmghike bhikṣuvihāre jānan bhikṣūnām pūrvaprajñaptāhi śayyāhi paścād āgatvā madhyeśayyām prajñāpeya yasyōdvahisyati*

*verso*1 so (')nyena⁴⁸ prakramiṣyati⁴⁹ • etad eva pratyayaṃ .. + +2 nānyam⁵⁰ imam ta[s]ya bhikṣusya udvādatāye⁵¹ ⁵²pāy. + +

3 17 || yaḥ [p](u)onar bhikṣuḥ sām[gh]. + + + +

4 + + + ⁵³[vih]āyasā sapādikāye + + + + +5 + + + .[e] .[m] .e⁵⁴ vā pīṭhe vā abhi .. + + + + +

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 20.19~23. *so prakramiṣyatīti / etad eva pratyayaṃ krtvā, ananyam imam tasya bhikṣusya udvāhana pācattikaṃ* | (Pāc 18) *yo puna bhikṣuḥ sāmghike bhikṣuvihāre uparivaiḥāyasakuṭikāye āhatya pādake mañce vā pīṭhe vā abhiniṣideya vā abhinipadyeya*

⁴² (bhik)ṣu [v](i)[h]āre : Cf. Ma-L *bhikṣuvihārād bhikṣum*; Pātim (Pāc 17) *bhikkhum ... vihārā*; Sa (Pāt 16), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 16) *viharād bhikṣum*; MaVin 343b8 (Pāy 16) 僧房內, Ma.Ch 552b13 (Pāy 16) 僧房內(率)比丘(出).

⁴³ *tti* : Cf. Ma-L *ti*. For the form *tti*, see Abhis III 278, s.v.

⁴⁴ *vad[e]yā* : Cf. Ma-L *vadeya*; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

⁴⁵ *prajñaptāya śayyāya* : Ma-L (Pāc 17) *prajñaptāhi śayyāhi*; Pātim (Pāc 16) *pubbupagataṃ (bhikkhum)*; Sa (Pāt 17) *pūrvopagatāṃ (bhikṣūm)*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 17) *pūrvvopagatānām (bhikṣūnām)*.

⁴⁶ *prajñāpaye* + : Probably *payeyā*; cf. Ma-L *prajñāpeya*; Pātim *kappeyya*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *kalpayed*.

⁴⁷ + *syodvādho bhaviṣya ..* : Probably, (*ya*)*syodvādho bhaviṣya(ti)*. *Udvādho* is s.e. for **udbādho* (< Skt *ud + √bād*); cf. Pā *ubbādhati* ("harasses, troubles, vexes, pains" [DP, s.v.]), *ubbālha* ("harassed" etc.). Cf. Ma-L *udvahisyati*; Pātim *yassa sambādho bhavissati*; Sa *yasya sambādham bhaviṣyati*; Mū(HvH) *yasya sambādho bhaviṣyati*.

⁴⁸ (')*nyena* : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH), MaVin 344b13 (Pāy 17), Ma.Ch 552b16 (Pāy 17) -.

⁴⁹ *prakramiṣyati* : Probably s.e. for *ṣyati* = Ma-L, Sa; Pātim *pakkamissati*; Mū(HvH) *viprakramiṣyatīti*.

⁵⁰ + *nānyam* : S.e. for (*a*)*nanyam?* = Ma-L; cf. Pātim *anaññam*; Sa *nānyathāt*; Mū(HvH) -.

⁵¹ *udvādatāye* : A hyper-form of **udbādhatā*~ (< Skt *ud + √bād*; see note 47)?; cf. Ma-L *udvāhana*; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

⁵² *pāy*. + + + : Probably *pāy(attikā)*.

⁵³ [*vih*]āyasā *sapādikāye* : ≠ Ma-L (Pāc 18) *uparivaiḥāyasakuṭikāye*; , MaVin 344c17 (Pāy 18) 在閣屋上; Ma.Ch 552b17 (Pāy 18) 閣屋上; Pātim (Pāc 18) *uparivehāsakuṭiyā*; Sa (Pāt 18) *uparivihāyasakuṭikāyām*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 18) *uparivihāyasi krtāyām kuṭikāyām*.

⁵⁴ ..[*m*] .e : Probably (*ma*)*m*(*ce*).

64 : Plate 20

recto

- 1 + .. + + .t. kã⁵⁵ • 18 || yaḥ + + + + +
 2 saprā[ṇa] .. [n]odakena ṛṇaṃ vā mṛ[tti] + + +
 3 [v]ā⁵⁶[siṃce]d vā [s]. ○ cāpayed vā pāy[a] .. + +
 4 mahallake⁵⁷ bh[i]kṣuṇā vihāraṃ cchādā«pa»yamāṇ. +
 5 yāva⁵⁸ dvārakośārgaḍaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayamāṇena

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 20.23~27. *vā pācattikaṃ* / (Pāc 19) *yo puna bhikṣur jānan sapr(am)āṇakenodakena ṛṇaṃ vā mṛttikāṃ vā siñceya vā siñcāpeya vā pācattikaṃ* / (Pāc 20) *mahallakam bhikṣuṇā vihāram chādāpayamāṇena yāvad dvārakośārgalapratiṣṭhānam*

verso

- 1 ālokaśaṃjñiparikarmam⁵⁹ upādāya⁶⁰ dvaye traye
 2 cchādanaparyāyena⁶¹ adhiṣṭhihitavyāḥ⁶² alpāha[r]i-
 3 te⁶³ sthitena taḍuttaram⁶⁴ 65 adhiṣṭhihe .. + + +
 4 rite sthite⁶⁶ pāyattikā «:» 20 || yo pu .. + + + +
 5 saṃ[ma](t)o bhik[ṣ](u)ṇī ovadeyā⁶⁷ pā .. + + + +

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 20.27~21.5. *ālokaśandhiparikarmam upādāya dve vā trayo vā cchādanaparyāyā adhiṣṭhihitavyāḥ alpaharite sthitena / taduttarim adhiṣṭhiheya alpaharite sthito 'pi pācattikaṃ / ...*⁶⁸ (Pāc 21) *yo puna bhikṣu asammato bhikṣuṇīm ovadeya pācattikaṃ /*

⁵⁵ .t. kã : Probably (pāyat)(i)kã.

⁵⁶ [siṃce]d vā [s]. cāpayed : Probably siṃced vā s(e)cāpayed; cf. Ma-L (Pāc 19) *siñceya vā siñcāpeya*; Pātim (Pāc 20) *siñceya vā siñcāpeya*; Sa (Pāt 19) *siṃcet secayed*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 19) *siñceta* (v.l. *siñcet*) *secayed* (v.l. *sevayed*, *siṃcayed*, *siṃ[c]e+cayed*).

⁵⁷ mahallake : S.e. for °llakam = Ma-L (Pāc 20), Pātim (Pāc 19), Sa (Pāt 20); cf. Mū(HvH) (Pāy 20) *mahāntam*.

⁵⁸ dvārakośārgaḍaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayamāṇena : Cf. Ma-L *dvārakośārgalapratiṣṭhānam*; Pātim *dvārakośā* *aggaḷa-ṭṭhapanāya*; Sa *dvārakośārgaḍasthāpana*; Mū(HvH) *dvārakośārgaḍasthānād*.

⁵⁹ ālokaśaṃjñiparikarmam : Cf. Ma-L *ālokaśandhipo*; Pātim *ālokaśandhiparikammāya*; Sa *ālokaśaṃ(dhi)-bhūmipari(karm) / /* (v.l. *āloka[saṃ] + + mipari / /*; *ālokaśamtabhū[mi] / /*); Mū(HvH) *ālokaśaṃjñinā bhūmiparikarmopādāya*; MaVin 345c2, Ma.Ch 552b20. 施(戶)闍.

⁶⁰ dvaye traye : Cf. Ma-L *dve vā trayo vā*; Pātim *dvatti* (v.l. *dvitti*); Sa *dvau trayo*; Mū(HvH) *dvau trayo vā*.

⁶¹ cchādanaparyāyena : Cf. Ma-L °paryāyā; Pātim (dvatti)cchadanassa *pariyāyam*; Sa *ācchāda(na)pathāḥ*; Mū(HvH) *cchandanaṃparyāyāḥ*; Mū *chedanaṃparyāyāḥ* (a misprint; Ms. *cchandana*°).

⁶² adhiṣṭhihitavyāḥ : S.e. for *adhi*°.

⁶³ alpāha[r]ite : S.e. for *alpa*°.

⁶⁴ taduttaram : Cf. Ma-L °ariṃ; Pātim *tato ce uttari* (v.l. *uttariṃ*); Sa *tata uttara(m)*; Mū(HvH) *tata uttary*.

⁶⁵ adhiṣṭhihe .. + + + rite : Probably *adhiṣṭhihe(ya alpaha)rite* = Ma-L.

⁶⁶ sthite : Cf. Ma-L *sthito 'pi*; Pātim (Pāc 19) *pi ṭhito*; Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

⁶⁷ ovadeyā : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 21) °deya; Pātim (Pāc 21) °deyya; Sa (Pāt 21), Mū(HvH) (Pāt 21) *avavaded*.

⁶⁸ PrMoSū(Ma-L) 21.1~4. // *uddānaṃ* // (11) *bijam* (12) *anyavādaṃ* (13) *odhyāyanam* (14) *mañca* (15) *śayyā* (16) *nikaḍḍhanam* / (17) *pūrvopagataṃ* (18) *vaiḥāyasam* (19) *udaka* (20) *cchādanena* // *dviiṭyo vargaḥ* //.

65 : Plate 21

recto

- 1 ++ ... [bh](i)kṣuḥ bhikṣuṇī ovad. + + + + +
 2 gate sūrye anohate⁶⁹ aruṇe pā + + + + +
 3 yo punar bhiḶkṣuḥ ovādā«[na]»prekṣo⁷⁰ .. (k)ṣu[ṇ]. ..
 4 upāśrayaṃ upasaṃkkrame⁷¹ 72 saṃtiṃ bhikṣuḥ anāmaṃ-
 5 trayitvā anyatra samaye pāyattikā : 23 ||

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 21.6~9. (Pāc 22) *sammato vāpi bhikṣuḥ bhikṣuṇīm ovadeya vikāle astamgate sūrye anūhate aruṇe pācattikaṃ* / (Pāc 23) *yo puna bhikṣu ovādaprekṣo bhikṣuṇī-upāśrayaṃ upasaṃkrameya santam bhikṣum anāmantrayitvā, anyatra samaye pācattikaṃ* /

verso

- 1 tatrāyaṃ samayo gilān{{o}}ā⁷³ bhikṣuṇī ovaditavyā{ḥ}
 2 bhavati anuśāsitavyā{m*}⁷⁴ ayam atra samayo
 3 yo punar bhiḶkṣuḥ bhikṣusya⁷⁵ eva<ṇ> vade⁷⁶ āmiṣa-
 4 heto āyuṣmaṃto⁷⁷ bhikṣuḥ bhikṣuṇī ovadeyā⁷⁸ pā-
 5 yat[t]ikā • 24 || yo punar bhik[ṣ]uḥ (bhi)kṣ(u)ṇyā⁷⁹ sārđhaṃ

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 21.9~13. *tatrāyaṃ samayo* — *gilānā bhikṣuṇī ovaditavyā anuśāsitavyā bhavati / ayam atra samayo* / (Pāc 24) *yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣum evaṃ vadeya* — *āmiṣahetor āyuṣman bhikṣu bhikṣuṇīm ovadatīti*⁸⁰ *pācattikaṃ* / (Pāc 25) *yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣuṇīya sārđham*

66 : Plate 22

recto

- 1 ⁸¹ek(o) ekā<ya> raho niṣadyāṃ kalpaye⁸² pāyattikā •
 2 25 || ⁸³yo punar bhikṣur bhikṣuṇīye sārđhaṃ saha-
 3 gāraśayyāṃ ○ kalpaye pāyattikā • 26 ||
 4 yo punar bhikṣuḥ bhikṣuṇīye sārđhaṃ saṃvidhāyādhva-

⁶⁹ anohate : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 22) *anūhate*; Pātim (Pāc 22), Sa (Pāt 22), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 22) -.

⁷⁰ ovādā«[na]»prekṣo : Or °«[ka]»°? S.e.?.; cf. Ma-L *ovādaprekṣo* (Pāc 23); Pātim (Pāc 23) -; Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

⁷¹ upasaṃkkrame : Cf. Ma-L °*krameya*; Pātim (Pāc 23) *upasaṃkamtivā*; Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

⁷² saṃtiṃ bhikṣuḥ : S.e. for *santam bhikṣum* = Ma-L; Pātim (Pāc 23) -; Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

⁷³ gilān{{o}}ā : The sign for *o* was erased and that for *ā* was added by the scribe.

⁷⁴ {m*} : Presumably s.e. for “*” or “.”.

⁷⁵ bhikṣusya : Cf. Ma-L °*kṣum*; Pātim (Pāc 24) -; Sa (Pāt 23) -; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 23) °*kṣum*; Mū °*kṣum*.

⁷⁶ vade : Cf. Ma-L *vadeya*; Pātim *vadeyya*; Sa (*va*)*ded*; Mū(HvH) *vaded*.

⁷⁷ āyuṣmaṃto : Cf. Ma-L °*ṣman**; Pātim *therā* (v.l. -); Sa, Mū -; Mū(HvH) *āyuṣmanto*.

⁷⁸ ovadeyā : Cf. Ma-L *ovadatīti*; Pātim *ovadantīti*; Sa (*avavad*)*antīti*; Mū(HvH) *avavadantīti*.

⁷⁹ (bhi)kṣ(u)ṇyā : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 25) °*ṇīya*; Pātim (Pāc 30) *bhikkhuniyā*; Sa (Pāt 28), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 29) *bhikṣuṇyā*.

⁸⁰ ovadatīti : The manuscript reads thus, while Tatia transcribed *te ovadatīti* by mistake.

⁸¹ ek(o) ekā<ya> : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim *eko ekāya*; Sa *ekāki* (v.l. *ekaikayā*); Mū(HvH) *eka ekikayā*.

⁸² kalpaye : Cf. Ma-L *kalpeya*; Pātim *kappeyya*; Sa *kalpayet*; Mū(HvH) -.

⁸³ yo puna bhikṣur bhikṣuṇīye sārđhaṃ saha gāraśayyāṃ kalpaye pāyattikā • 26 || : The other versions, incl. Ma-L, MaVin (348a~b) and Ma.Ch (552c1), lack this rule.

5 mārḡam⁸⁴ pratipadyeyā aṃtamasato grāmā<ṃ>taraṃ pi •

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 21.13~16. *eko ekāya raho niṣadyāṃ kalpeya pācattikam /* (Pāc 26) *yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣuṇīya sārḡham samvidhāya adhvānamārḡam pratipadyeya antamasato grāmāntaram pi*

verso

1 anyatra samaye pāyattikā • 27 || tatrāyaṃ sa-

2 mayo mārḡo bhavati sabhayaḥ sapratibhaya sā-

3 {va}śaṃkasamma○to⁸⁵ «sasārthagamanīyo⁸⁶» ayam atra samayo • yaḥ

4 punar bhikṣuḥ bhikṣuṇyā⁸⁷ sārḡham samvidhāya ekanāvam⁸⁸

5 abhiruheyā⁸⁹ ūrdhvagāminam⁹⁰ vā adhogāminam⁹¹ vā anya-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 21.16~19. *anyatra samaye. pācattikam / tatrāyam samayo — mārḡo bhavati sabhayo sapratibhayo sāśaṃkasammato / ayam atra samayo /* (Pāc 27) *yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣuṇīya sārḡham samvidhāya ekanāvām abhiruheya ūrdhvagāminīm vā adhogāminīm vā anya-*

67 : Plate 23

recto

1 tra tiryutt[a]raṇāye⁹² pāyattikā : 28 ||⁹³ yo punar bhi-

2 kṣuḥ anyātikāye bhikṣuṇīye cīvaram dadyā anya-

3 tra parivartake○«na»⁹⁴ pāyattikā : 29 || yo punar bhikṣuḥ

4 anyātikāye bhikṣuṇīye cīvaram sīved⁹⁵ vā sīvā-

5 payed vā pāyattikā 30 || yo punar bhikṣuḥ

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 21.19~24. *tra tiryottaraṇāya pācattikam /* (Pāc 28) *yo puna bhikṣu anyātikāye bhikṣuṇīye cīvaram dadyād anyatra pallaṭṭhakena pācattikam /* (Pāc 29) *yo puna bhikṣur anyātikāye bhikṣuṇīye cīvaram sīveya vā sīvāpeya vā pācattikam /* (Pāc 30) *yo puna bhikṣur*

⁸⁴ *adhvamārḡam* : Cf. BHS, s.v. *adhvamārḡa*; Ma-L (Pāc 26) *adhvānamārḡam*; Pātim (Pāc 27) *addhānamāggam*; Sa (Pāt 24) *samānamārḡam*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 26) *adhvamārḡam*; Mū (Pāy 26) *adhvānamārḡam*.

⁸⁵ *sā{va}śaṃkasammato* : S.e. for *sāśaṃka*^o = Ma-L, Sa, Mū(HvH); cf. Pātim *sāśaṃka*^o.

⁸⁶ *sasārthagamanīyo* : Cf. Ma-L -; Pātim *satthagamanīyo*; Sa *sār(thagamanīyo)*; Mū(HvH) *sārthagamanīyo*.

⁸⁷ *bhikṣuṇyā* : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 27) *ṇīya*; Pātim (Pāc 28) *bhikkhuṇīyā*; Sa (Pāt 25) *bhikṣu(ṇyā)*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 27) *bhikṣuṇīsārtheṇa*.

⁸⁸ *ekanāvam* : = Sa, Mū; cf. Ma-L *ṇāvām*; Pātim *ekaṃ nāvam*; Mū(HvH) *ekāṃ nāvam*.

⁸⁹ *abhiruheya* : Cf. Ma-L *ruheya*; Pātim *ruheyya*; Sa *ruhed*; Mū(HvH) *adhirohed*.

⁹⁰ *ūrdhvagāminam* : Cf. Ma-L, Mū(HvH) *gāminīm*; Sa *g(āminīm)*; Pātim *uddhaṅgāminīm* (v.l. *uddhagā*^o).

⁹¹ *adhogāminam* : Cf. Ma-L, Mū(HvH) *gāminīm*; Pātim *gāminīm*; Sa (gāmi)nīm.

⁹² *tiryutt[a]raṇāye* : Cf. Ma-L *tiryottaraṇāya*; Pātim *tiriyantaraṇāya*; Sa *tiryakpārasamtarāṇāt* (v.l. *tiryak*^o); Mū(HvH) *tiryakpāra*^o.

⁹³ // : This sign is visible in the photograph of the verso, as the upper margin of this side is folded underneath itself.

⁹⁴ *parivartake«na»* : Cf. Ma-L *pallaṭṭhakena* (= Ms; ←*pallaṭṭha*^o) (Pāc 28); Pātim (Pāc 25) *pārivattakā* (v.l. *vaṭṭa*^o); Sa (Pāt 27) -; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 25) *parivarttakāt*.

⁹⁵ *sīved* : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 29) *sīveya*; Pātim (Pāc 26) *sibbeyya*; Sa (Pāt 26), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 24) *kuryāt*.

verso

- 1 jānaṃ bhikṣuṇīya⁹⁶ paripācitaṃ piṇḍapātaṃ paribhūṃjīyā⁹⁷
 2 anyatra pūrva⁹⁸ gr̥hasamārambhe⁹⁹ pāyattikā 31 ||
 3 ekāhapaṃamā¹⁰⁰ agilānena bhikṣuṇā āva-
 4 satha{ṃ}piṇḍapātaṃ¹⁰¹ paribhūṃjītavayaṃ¹⁰² <tad>uttari(ṃ)¹⁰³ paribhūṃ-
 5 jeyā pāyattikā 32 || paraṃpar[abh]ojanaṃ¹⁰⁴ anya-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 21.24~22.3. *jānaṃ bhikṣuṇīparipācitaṃ piṇḍapātaṃ paribhūṃjīyā. anyatra pūrve gr̥hasamārambhe pācattikā. / ...*¹⁰⁵ (Pāc 31) *ekāhapaṃamā bhikṣuṇā agilānena āvasathapiṇḍapāto paribhūṃjītavayo. taduttariṃ paribhūṃjīyā pācattikā. / (Pāc 32) paraṃparabhojane anya-*

68 : Plate 24

recto

- 1 tra samay[e] pāyattikā : 33 || tatrāyāṃ samayo
 2 glānasamayo¹⁰⁶ cīvarakālasamayo¹⁰⁷ ayam atra
 3 samayo • yo ○ punar¹⁰⁸ bhikṣu{h}«[r j]āna»<ṃ> {bhikṣur} bhuktivā«vī» pravāri-
 4 to utthito āsanāto¹⁰⁹ anātiriktaṃ kṛtaṃ khādanīyaṃ
 5 bhōjanīyaṃ¹¹⁰ khāded vā bhūṃjed vā bhukte pāyattikā • 34

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 22.3~6. *tra samaye pācattikā. / tatrāyāṃ samayo glānasamayo cīvaradānakālasamayo / ayam atra samayo. / (Pāc 33) yo puna bhikṣur bhūṃjāvī* (s.e. for

⁹⁶ bhikṣuṇīya : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 30), Sa (Pāt 30), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 30) bhikṣuṇī-; Pātīm (Pāc 29) bhikkhūnī-.

⁹⁷ paribhūṃjīyā : Cf. Ma-L °bhuṃjīyā; Pātīm bhuṃjīyā; Sa, Mū(HvH) paribhūṃjīta.

⁹⁸ pūrva : S.e. for °rvaṃ or °rve; cf. Ma-L °rve; Pātīm pubbe; Sa prāg; Mū(HvH) pūrve.

⁹⁹ gr̥hasamārambhe : S.e. for gr̥hasamā° or gr̥hisamā°; cf. Ma-L gr̥hisamā°; Pātīm gihisamā°; Sa, Mū(HvH) gr̥hisamārambhāt.

¹⁰⁰ agilānena bhikṣuṇā : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 31) bhī° agi°; Pātīm (Pāc 31) agi° bhikkhunā; Sa (Pāt 32), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 32) bhikṣuṇā aglānena.

¹⁰¹ āvasatha{ṃ}piṇḍapātaṃ : Cf. Ma-L āvasathapiṇḍapāto; Pātīm āvasathapiṇḍo; Sa ekāvasathoṣitena ... piṇḍapāta(h); Mū(HvH) ekā° ... piṇḍapātaḥ.

¹⁰² paribhūṃjītavayaṃ : Cf. Ma-L °tavayo; Pātīm bhuṃjītabbo; Sa, Mū(HvH) paribhoktavayas.

¹⁰³ <tad>uttari(ṃ) : Cf. Ma-L taduttariṃ; Pātīm tato ce uttari (v.l. °riṃ); Sa tata uttaram; Mū(HvH) tata uttari.

¹⁰⁴ paraṃpar[abh]ojanaṃ : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 32), Pātīm (Pāc 33) °jane; Sa (Pāt 31) °janam; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 31) °janād.

¹⁰⁵ PrMoSū(Ma-L) 26.21f. // uddānaṃ // (21) asaṃmato (22) saṃmato cāpi (23) ovādo (24) āmiṣaṃ (25) niṣadyā ca / (26) adhvanamārgo (27) nāvā ca (28) deti (29) sīveti (30) paripācanena // ṛtīyo vargaḥ //.

¹⁰⁶ glānasamayo : Cf. Ma-L, Pātīm gilāna°; Sa, Mū(HvH) glāna°.

¹⁰⁷ cīvarakālasamayo : =? MaVin 353c6 (Pāy 32) 衣時 (v.l. 作衣時), Ma.Ch.552c10 (Pāy 32) 衣時; cf. Ma-L, Sa cīvaradānakālasamayo; Pātīm cīvaradānasamayo cīvarakārasamayo; Mū(HvH) karmasamayo dhvasamayaś cīvaradānakālasamayo. Cf. 88r4. cīvarakālasamayo (= 70v1~2); note 263.

¹⁰⁸ bhikṣu{h}«[r j]āna»<ṃ> {bhikṣur} bhuktivā«vī» : Probably, «r jāna» was inserted mistakenly by the scribe, after he had come across the expression bhikṣur jānaṃ bhikṣu bhuktāvī in the following folio. Bhuktivā«vī» is a scribal error for bhuktāvī. Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 33) bhikṣur bhūṃjāvī (s.e. for bhuktāvī?); Pātīm (Pāc 35) bhikkhu bhuttāvī; Sa (Pāt 34) bhikṣur bhuktavāṃ; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 34) bhikṣur bhuktavān; MaVin 354c26 (Pāy 33), Ma.Ch.552c11 (Pāy 33) 比丘食已 (“a monk, having eaten”). For the forms bhuktāvī, Pā. bhuttavī and bhuktavāṃ, cf. Geiger § 198, BHSG § 22.51, von Hinüber 2001: § 494, Oberlies 2001: 263 (with further references).

¹⁰⁹ anātiriktaṃ kṛtaṃ : S.e. for anati° kṛ° (= Ma-L)?; Pātīm anātirittam; Sa akṛtā(t)iriktaṃ; Sa(hy) /// tirikta; Mū(HvH) akṛtaniriktaṃ (s.e.); Mū akṛtāiriktaṃ.

¹¹⁰ khāded vā bhūṃjed vā bhukte : Ma-L khādeya vā bhūṃjeya vā; Pātīm khādeyya vā bhuṃjīyeya vā; Sa khāded vā bhūṃjīta vā; Mū(HvH) khāded bhūṃjīta vā.

*bhuktāvī?) pravārito utthito āsanāto. anādiriktam kṛtam khādanīyaṃ vā bhojanīyaṃ vā
khādeya vā bhujjeya vā pācattikam |*

verso:

1 y[o] punar bhikṣuḥ jānaṃ ¹¹¹bhikṣur bhuktāvī pravārito utth(i)t(o) ā-

2 sanāto ¹¹²anādiriktam kṛtam khādanīyabhojanīyaṃ

3 āsvādanāprekṣyo ¹¹³([?])panimaṃtraye ¹¹⁴• ¹¹⁵ehy āvusa {;} khā-

4 dehi bhujjehi [bhu]kt[e] ¹¹⁶pāyattikā : 3(5) || yo pu-

5 nar bhikṣuḥ ¹¹⁷adinnam aparigrhītaṃ m(u) ... r[a]m ¹¹⁸āhāra-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 22.7~10. (Pāc 34) *yo puna bhikṣur jānaṃ bhikṣu bhuktāvī* (← °āvi [= Ms.]) *pravāritam utthitam āsanāto āsvādanāprekṣo anādiriktakṛtena khādanīyena vā bhojanīyena vā upanimantreya “ehi bhikṣu khādāhi bhujjāhi”ti vā vadeya bhuktasmim pācattikam |* (Pāc 35) *yo puna bhikṣur adinnam apratigrhītaṃ mukhadvārikam āhāra-*

69 : Plate 25

recto

1 m āhar(e)[d] ¹¹⁹(a)nyatra udakadantakāṣṭhe ¹²⁰pāyattikā 36 ||

¹¹¹ *bhikṣur bhuktāvī pravārito utth(i)t(o) āsanāto* : S.e. for *bhikṣu* (acc. sg.) *bhuktāvī* (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. Pātim (Pāc 36) *bhikkhuṃ bhuttāviṃ pavāritam*; Sa (Pāt 35) *bhikṣuṃ bhuktavantam pravāritam*; Sa(hy) */// bhūktāvya pravaṃrji ///*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 35) *bhikṣuṃ bhuktavantam*.

¹¹² *anādiriktam kṛtam khādanīyabhojanīyaṃ* : Probably s.e. for *anādirikta[m]kṛtena khādanīyena bhojanīyena*. 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 *anādiriktam* (< *anādiriktam* [68 recto 4, see note 109] < *anādirikta*) is not attested anywhere else. Cf. Ma-L *anādiriktakṛtena khādanīyena vā bhojanīyena vā*; Pātim *anādirittena khādanīyena vā bhojanīyena vā*; Sa *akṛt(āt)iriktena khādanīyabhojanīyena*; Mū(HvH) *akṛtaniriktena* (Mū *akṛtāirikte*) *khādanīyabhojanīyena*.

¹¹³ *āsvādanāprekṣyo* : Cf. Ma-L *āsvādanāprekṣo*; Pātim *āsvādanāprekṣho*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *āsvādanāprekṣī*; Mū *āsvādana*^o. For *prekṣya*~, meaning “intending”, see BHSD, SWTF, s.v.; the word *hāsyaprekṣyam* is found also in KP(V-D) 4v4. Cf. also note 154 on *vitāpanā-prekṣya*.

¹¹⁴ ([?])*panimaṃtraye* : Cf. Ma-L *upanimantreya*; Pātim *abhihaṭṭhuṃ* (absolute of *abhi-√hr*; cf. CPD I 383b, DP I 225b) *pavāreyya*; Sa *yāvadārtham pravārayed*; Mū(HvH) *atyartham* (Mū *ity*^o [s.e.]) *pravārayed*. *Atyartham* is probably hyper-Sanskritisms of Pā. *abhihaṭṭhuṃ*: *aty-artham* < **ati-aṭṭham* < **ati-h-aṭṭham* < **ati-haṭṭham* < *abhi-haṭṭhuṃ* (for the confusion between *ati-* and *abhi-*, see EV I [2nd ed.], 221 [ad Th 447; with further references]; Abhi III 261, *t / bh*). Cf. note 126.

¹¹⁵ *ehy āvusa {;} khādehi bhujjehi* : =? Ma.Ch.552c14 (Pāy 34) 長老食此食 (“Eat, O elder monk, this food!”); MaVin 356c21 (Pāy 34) -; cf. Ma-L *ehi bhikṣu khādāhi bhujjāhi*; Pātim *handā bhikkhu khāda vā bhujja vā*; Sa *idam āvusam khādēti bhujjēvety*; Mū(HvH) *idam āvusam khāda idam bhujjēvety*.

¹¹⁶ [bhu]kt[e] : Cf. Ma-L *bhuktasmim*; Pātim *bhuttasmim*; Sa *kaccid eṣa bhikṣur muhūrtam apy āsāditaḥ syād idam eva pratyayaṃ kṛtvā nānyathā (pāyattikā)*; Mū(HvH) *kaccid eṣa bhikṣur āsādito bhaviṣyatīty etad eva pratyayaṃ kṛtvā (pāyattikā)*.

¹¹⁷ *adinnam aparigrhītaṃ* : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 35) *adinnam apratigrhītaṃ*; Pātim (Pāc 40) *adinnam*; Sa (Pāt 39) *aparigrhītaṃ*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 39) *adattaṃ* (Sanskritisation of MI. *adinna*); MaVin 357b15. 不與取; Ma.Ch 552c15. 不與不受; MśVin 53a10, PrMoSū(Mś) 197c2. 不受(食); DhgVin 663c19 (Pāy 39), PrMoSū(Dh) 1027a3. 受. For the Middle Indic form *dinna*, cf. Abhis III 292, 560.

¹¹⁸ *m(u) ... r[a]m* : Probably *mu(khadvā)ram*; cf. Ma-L *mukhadvārikam*; Pātim *mukhadvaram*; Sa *mukhadvārena*; Mū (*mukhadvāra*); Mū(HvH) *mukhābhyaḥāryam*.

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

¹²⁰ *udakadantakāṣṭhe* : Cf. Ma-L *udakadantapone*; Pātim *udakadantaponā* (v.l. °*poṇā*); Sa *udakadantakāṣṭhā-bhyam*; Mū(HvH) *udakadantakāṣṭhāt*.

- 2 vikālabhojane pāyattikā : 37 || sannidhīkāraka¹²¹
 3 bhojane pāyaṅṅtikā • 38 || bhikṣuḥ¹²² kho punaḥ kule-
 4 ṣūpasamḥkramitvā¹²³ pravārenti¹²⁴ 125pūpair vā manthair vā tataḥ¹²⁶ pra-
 5 vāritena bhikṣuṇā tripātrapūraparamaṃ pratigrhṇi<tavyaṃ pratigrhṇi>tvā¹²⁷

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 22.10~15. *m āhāreya anyatrōdakadantapone pācattikam /* (Pāc 36)
vikālabhojane pācattikam / (Pāc 37) *sannidhīkārabhojane pācattikam /* (Pāc 38) *bhikṣum*
kho punaḥ kulehi upasamkrāntam pravāremsu pūpehi vā manthehi vā / tathāpravāritena
bhikṣuṇā yāvat tripātrapūraparamam tato pratigrhṇitavyam / pratigrhṇitvā

verso

- 1 bahirdhaṃ¹²⁸ vābhinirh<ar>itvā¹²⁹ agilān(e)na bh[i]kṣuṇā sārtha(m) sa(m)-
 2 vibhajitvā khādītavyaṃ bhujitavyaṃ taduttaraṃ¹³⁰ pratigrhṇeyā¹³¹
 3 bahirdhaṃ¹³² vā nirhaṅṅritvā¹³³ 134agilānena bhikṣuṇā 135asaṃ-
 4 vibhajitvā 136khād[e]d vā bhujed vā bhukte¹³⁷ pāyattikā • 39 |(l)
 5 yāni kho p[ū]nar imāni¹³⁸ praṅṅtasaṃmatāni bhoja-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 22.16~19. *bahirdhā nīharitavyam / bahirdhā nīharitvā agilānakehi*
bhikṣūhi sārtham saṃvibhajitvā khādītavyam bhujitavyam / taduttarim pratigrhṇitvā
bahirdhā nīharitvā agilānakehi bhikṣūhi sārtham saṃvibhajitvā vā asaṃvibhajitvā vā
khādeya vā bhujeya vā pācattikam / (Pāc 39) *yāni kho punar imāni praṅṅtasaṃmatāni*
bhoja-

¹²¹ sannidhīkāraka : Read °īkāraka<ṃ>?; a *namul* absolutive (cf. EV II [2nd ed.] 76); for °ī-√kr, cf. Whitney § 1094; cf. also Ma-L (Pāc 37) *sannidhīkāra<ṃ>*; Pātim (Pāc 38) *sannidhīkārakam*; Sa (Pāt 38), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 38) *sannihitam*. Cf. also BHSD, s.v. *saṃnidhi*; PTSD, s.v. *sannidhi*.

¹²² bhikṣuḥ : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 38) *bhikṣum*; Pātim (Pāc 34) *bhikkhum*; Sa (Pāt 33) (*bhikṣa*)*vaḥ punaḥ sambahulāḥ*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 33) *bhikṣavaḥ khalu sambahulāḥ*.

¹²³ kuleṣūpasamḥkramitvā : Cf. Ma-L *kulehi* (Loc. pl.) *upasaṃkrāntam*; Pātim *kulam upagatam*; Sa *kulāny upasaṃkrameyus*; Mū(HvH) *kulāny upasaṃkrāmeyus*.

¹²⁴ pravārenti : Cf. Ma-L *pravāremsu*; Pātim *pavāreyya*; Sa *pravārayeyuḥ*; Mū(HvH) *pravārayeyur*.

¹²⁵ pūpair vā manthair vā : Cf. Ma-L *pūpehi vā manthehi vā*; Pātim *pūvehi vā manthehi vā*; Sa *pūpair vā manthair vā*; Mū(HvH) *manthaiś* (Mū *maṅṅdaiś* [s.e.]) *cāpūpaiś cākāṅṅksadbhis*.

¹²⁶ tataḥ : Cf. Ma-L *tathā*; Pātim *abhihaṅṅthum* (absolutive of *abhi-√hr*); Sa (*yāva*)*dartham*; Mū(HvH) *īyartham* (Mū *tv artham* [s.e.]). Cf. note 114.

¹²⁷ pratigrhṇi<tavyaṃ pratigrhṇi>tvā : Cf. Ma-L *pratigrhṇitavyam pratigrhṇitvā*; Pātim *paṅṅgahetabbā*; Sa *prati-grhṇita(vy)ās*; Mū(HvH) *pratigrhṇitavyās*.

¹²⁸ bahirdhaṃ : Cf. Ma-L *bahirdhā*; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

¹²⁹ abhinirh<ar>itvā : Cf. Ma-L *nīharitvā*; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

¹³⁰ taduttaraṃ : Cf. Ma-L *taduttarim*; Pātim *tato ce uttari* (v.l. °rim); Sa *tata uttaram*; Mū(HvH) *tata uttari*.

¹³¹ pratigrhṇeyā : Cf. Ma-L *pratigrhṇitvā*; Pātim *paṅṅganheyya* (v.l. *paṅṅga*°); Sa, Mū(HvH) *pratigrhṇīyuh*.

¹³² bahirdhaṃ : Cf. Ma-L *bahirdhā*; Pātim *tato*; Sa *bahi(r)*; Mū(HvH) *bahir*.

¹³³ nīharitvā : Cf. Ma-L *nīharitvā*; Pātim *nīharitvā*; Sa (*ārā*)*maṃ (n)īṣk(r)amyā* (v.l. *[ga]tvā*); Mū(HvH) *ārāmaṃ gatvā*.

¹³⁴ agilānena bhikṣuṇā : Cf. Ma-L *agilānakehi bhikṣūhi*; cf. also Pātim *bhikkhūhi*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *bhikṣavaḥ*.

¹³⁵ asaṃvibhajitvā : = MaVin 361b5. 不共(不病比丘食者), Ma.Ch 552c20. 不共(食); ≠ Ma-L *sārtham saṃvibhajitvā vā asaṃvibhajitvā vā*; cf. Pātim *saddhim saṃvibhajitabbam*; Sa *saṃvedayitavyā* (v.l. *saṃv[ī]-bhajy(ā)*); Mū(HvH) *saṃvibhaktavyā*.

¹³⁶ khāded vā bhujed vā : Cf. Ma-L *khādeya vā bhujeya vā*; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

¹³⁷ bhukte : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

¹³⁸ imāni : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 39) *imāni*; Pātim (Pāc 39), Sa (Pāt 40), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 40) *tāni*.

70 : Plate 26

recto

- 1 +¹³⁹ samyyathīda[m] sarpis tailam madhu phāṇ(i)ta(m) dugdham dadhi
 2 matsam¹⁴⁰ māmsam¹⁴¹ tāni ca bhikṣu ātmanārthe¹⁴² agilāno ku-
 3 leṣūpasam Okkramitvā¹⁴³ vijñāpitvā vijñāpayitvā
 4 vā¹⁴⁵ khāde vā bhujje vā bhukte¹⁴⁶ pāyattikā : 40 || gaṇabho-
 5 janam¹⁴⁷ anyatra samayena¹⁴⁸ pāyattikā : 41 ||

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 22.19–23. *nāni bhavanti samyyathīdam sarpis tailam madhu phāṇitam dugdham dadhi matsyam māmsam yo puna bhikṣur evamrūpāni prañītasammatāni bhojanāni ātmārthāya agilāno kulehi vijñāpetvā vā vijñāpāyevā vā khādeya vā bhujjeya vā pācattikam / (Pāc 40) gaṇabhojane anyatra samaye pācattikam /*

verso

- 1 tatrāyam samayo gilānasamay[o] cīvarakālasa-
 2 mayo¹⁴⁹ «adhvānagamasamayo» nāvābhirohaṇasamayo mahāsamāyo¹⁵⁰ śra-
 3 maṇabhaktam¹⁵¹ aOyam atra samayo • 42 || yo pu-
 4 nar bhikṣu ātmaOnārthena¹⁵² agilāno¹⁵³ vitāpanoprekṣyo¹⁵⁴
 5 j(y)otis(m)im¹⁵⁵ kāṣṭham vā ṛṇam vā gomayam vā śakalikam¹⁵⁶ vā

¹³⁹ *bhoja* + : Cf. Ma-L. *bhojanāni bhavanti*; Pātim (*prañīta-*)*bhojanāni*; Sa, Mū(HvH) (*prañīta-*)*bhojanāny*.

¹⁴⁰ *matsam* : Cf. Ma-L. *matsyam*; Pātim *maccho*; Sa, Mū *matsyo*; Mū(HvH) *matsya-*.

¹⁴¹ *tāni ca bhikṣu* : ≠ Ma-L. *yo puna bhikṣur evamrūpāni prañītasammatāni bhojanāni* = MaVin 361c28. 如是美食, Ma.Ch 552c22. 如是乞美食; Pātim *yo pana bhikkhu evarūpāni prañītabhojanāni*; Sa *yaḥ punar bhikṣur evamrūpāni prañītabhojanāny* = Mū; Sa(hy) */// [nī]tānt bhojanāni ///*; Mū(HvH) *yaḥ punar bhikṣur imāny evamrūpāni prañītabhojanāny*.

¹⁴² *ātmanārthe* : It seems that *nā* was crossed out by a later hand. S.e. either for *ātmārthe* or for *ātmano* (‘)rthe; cf. Ma-L. *ātmārthāya*; Pātim *attano atthāya*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *ātmārtham*. Cf. also note 152.

¹⁴³ *kuleṣūpasamkkramitvā* : Cf. Ma-L. *kulehi* = MaVin 361c27. 諸家中; Ma.Ch 552c21 -; Pātim -; Sa -; Mū(HvH) *parakulebhyo*.

¹⁴⁴ *vijñāpitvā vijñāpayitvā vā* : Cf. Ma-L. *vijñāpetvā vā vijñāpāyevā vā*; Pātim *viññāpetvā*; Sa *vijñāpayet*; Mū(HvH) *vijñāpya*.

¹⁴⁵ *khāde vā bhujje vā* : Cf. Ma-L. *khādeya vā bhujjeya vā*; Pātim *bhuñjeya*; Sa -; Mū(HvH) *khāded bhujjūtā vā*.

¹⁴⁶ *bhukte* : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

¹⁴⁷ *gaṇabhojanam* : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 40) °*jane*; Pātim (Pāc 32) °*jane*; Sa (Pāt 36) °*janam*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 36) °*janād*.

¹⁴⁸ *samayena* : Cf. Ma-L °*maye*; Pātim °*mayā*; Sa, Mū(HvH) °*mayāt*.

¹⁴⁹ *cīvarakālasamayo* : Cf. Ma-L *cīvaradānakālasamayo*; Pātim *cīvaradānasamayo cīvarakārasamayo*; Sa *cīvaradānakālasamayah* (v.l. *cīvarakālas°*), Mū(HvH) -; MaVin 362b23 (Pāy 40; missing; cf. Abhis III 568–569); Ma.Ch 552c25 (Pāy 40) 衣時. Cf. note 107.

¹⁵⁰ *mahāsamāyo* : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim °*samayo*; Sa °*samāja-*; Mū(HvH) °*samājah*.

¹⁵¹ *śramaṇabhaktam* : Cf. Ma-L *śravaṇa°*; Pātim *samaṇabhattasamayo*; Sa *śramaṇabhaktasamayo* (v.l. *śramaṇabhaktaḥ, °bhakto*); Mū(HvH) *śramaṇabhaktasamayo*.

¹⁵² *ātmanārthena* : S.e. for *ātmano* (‘)rthena?; cf. Ma-L (Pāc 41) *ātmārthāya*; Pātim (Pāc 56), Sa (Pāt 52) -; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 52) *ātmārtham*. Cf. also note 142.

¹⁵³ *vitāpanoprekṣyo j(y)otis(m)im* : Cf. Ma-L *jyotismim vitāpanāprekṣo*; Pātim *visibbanāpekkho* (v.l. *visīvanā°*) *jotim*; Sa *vitapanaprekṣt ... jyotiḥ*; Mū(HvH) *vitapanaprekṣt jyotiḥ*. The word-order of Ma-L is strange.

¹⁵⁴ *vitāpanoprekṣyo* : Probably s.e. for *vitāpanāprekṣyo*; cf. Ma-L *vitāpanāprekṣo*; Pātim *visibbanāpekkho*; Sa *vitapanaprekṣt* (v.l. *vitapanāp°*); Mū(HvH) *vitapanaprekṣt*. For *prekṣya*, meaning “intending”, see note 113.

¹⁵⁵ *kāṣṭham vā ṛṇam vā* : Cf. Ma-L *ṛṇam vā kāṣṭham vā* = MaVin 365a8. 草木 (the commentary also comments first 草 [“grass”] then 木 [“wood”], 365a11f.; Ma.Ch 552c25. 草木; Pātim, Mū(HvH) -; Sa - (v.l. *ṛṇam vā kāṣṭham vā*; *ṛṇam///*).

¹⁵⁶ *śakalikam* : Cf. Ma-L *sakalikām*; Pātim, Mū(HvH) -; Sa - (v.l. *śakalikām*); cf. also BHSD, s.vv. *śakalika*,

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 22.23~23.2. *tatrāyaṃ samayo — gilānasamayo cīvarādānakālasamayo adhvānagamanasamayo nāvābhirohaṇasamayo mahāsamayo śravanabhaktam / ayam atra samayo / ...*¹⁵⁷ (Pāc 41) *yo puna bhikṣur ātmārthāya aḡilāno jyotismim vitāpanāprekso trnam vā kāṣṭham vā gomayam vā sakalikām vā*

71 : Plate 27

recto

1 (t)u[ṣaṃ] vā [s](aṃ)k[a]ra[m]¹⁵⁸ vā¹⁵⁹ uddahed vā uddahāpayed vā¹⁶⁰ pāyattikā :

2 43 || yo punar bhikṣuḥ anupasaṃpanna pudgalena

3 sārđham uttaraṃ¹⁶¹ ○ dvirātraṃ trirātraparamaṃ¹⁶² sahaḡā-

4 raśayyāṃ kalpeyā¹⁶³ pāyattikā • 44 || yo puna-

5 r bhikṣuḥ pūrvakarmāṇāṃ¹⁶⁴ cchandaṃ datvā paścā¹⁶⁵ doṣā¹⁶⁶ kupito

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 23.2~7. *tuṣam vā saṃkāraṃ vā ādaheya vā ādahāpeya vā anyatra samaye pācattikaṃ* | (Pāc 42) *yo puna bhikṣur anupasaṃpanna pudgalena sārđham uttari dvirātraṃ trirātraṃ vā sahaḡāraśayyāṃ kalpeya pācattikaṃ* | (Pāc 43) *yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣūṇāṃ karmaṇā cchandaṃ datvā paścād duṣṭo doṣāt kupito*

verso

1 [a](nā)tt(a)m(a)nā¹⁶⁷ evaṃ va[de]¹⁶⁸ a[d]inno me eṣ[o¹⁶⁹ c]cha[nd].

2 me eṣo cchando akṛtāny etāni karmāṇi du

3 karmāṇi • nā[h]aOm eteṣā karmāṇāṃ ccha + + + +

4 .. .i pāyattikā • 45 || yo punar bhi + + + +

5 + + + e¹⁷⁰ ehi āvusa¹⁷¹ sahitakā¹⁷² [gr]. + + + +

śakalikā; Pā. sakalika.

¹⁵⁷ PrMoSū(Ma-L) 21.26~29. || uddānaṃ || (31) āvasatho (32) parampara (33) pravāraṇā (34) āsādanā (35) adinnaṃ | (36) vikālaṃ (37) sannidhiṃ (38) manthā (39) vijñaptiḥ (40) gaṇabhojanaṇa || caturtho varḡaḥ ||.

¹⁵⁸ [s](aṃ)k[a]ra[m] : Cf. Ma-L *saṃkāraṃ*; Pātim, Mū(HvH) -; Sa (v.l. *saṃkaraṃ*).

¹⁵⁹ uddahed vā uddahāpayed vā : Cf. MaVin 365a8, Ma.Ch 552c25f. 若自然若使人然; Ma-L *ādaheya vā ādahāpeya vā*; Pātim *samādaheyya vā samādahāpeyya*; Sa *samindhyāt samedhayed vā* (v.l. *u(pasamha)red upasamh(a)raḡy](e)d vā*); Mū(HvH) *samava-dadhyaāt samavadhāpayed vā*.

¹⁶⁰ vā : = Mū(HvH); = MaVin 365a8 -; ≠ Ma-L *vā anyatra samaye*; Pātim *vā aññatra tathārūpapaccayā*; Sa *vānyatra pratyayāt*; Ma.Ch 552c26. 除因緣.

¹⁶¹ uttaraṃ : = Sa (Pāt 53); cf. Ma-L (Pāc 42), Pātim (Pāc 5) *uttari*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 54) *(dvirātrāḡ) ūrdhvaṃ*.

¹⁶² *trirātraparamaṃ* : Cf. MaVin 365c19, Ma.Ch 552c27. 過三宿; Ma-L *trirātraṃ vā*; Pātim *tirattaṃ*; Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

¹⁶³ *kalpeyā* : Cf. Ma-L *kalpeya*; Pātim *kappeyya*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *kalpayet*.

¹⁶⁴ *pūrvakarmāṇāṃ* : = Ma.Ch 552c28. (與)羯磨(欲)已; cf. MaVin 366b8. (與欲)已; ≠ Ma-L (Pāc 43) *bhikṣūṇāṃ karmaṇā* (probably s.e.); cf. Pātim (Pāc 79) *dhammikānaṃ kammānaṃ*; Sa (Pāt 54) *dhārmike saṃghakaraṇīye*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 53) *dhārmike saṃghakaraṇīye*.

¹⁶⁵ *paścā* : Ma-L *paścād*; Pātim *pacchā*; Sa *tataḡ paścāt*; Mū(HvH) *tataḡ paścād*; Mū *paścād*.

¹⁶⁶ *doṣā* : Ma-L *duṣṭo doṣāt*; Pātim, Sa -; Mū(HvH) *abhiṣaktaḡ*.

¹⁶⁷ [a](nā)tt(a)m(a)nā : Ma-L °*mano*; Pātim, Sa -; Mū(HvH) *nāttamanāḡ*; Mū (*nāttamanā*).

¹⁶⁸ va[de] : Ma-L *vadeya*; Pātim, Sa, Mū -; Mū(HvH) *vaded* (v.l.-).

¹⁶⁹ eṣ[o] : Ma-L, Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

¹⁷⁰ + e : Probably (*vad*)e; cf. Ma-L (Pāc 44) *vadeya*; Pātim (Pāc 42) -; Sa (Pāt 51), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 51) *vaded*; Mū *vader**.

¹⁷¹ *āvusa* : Cf. Ma-L *tvam āyuṣmaṃ*; Pātim *āvuso*; Sa *āyuṣmaṃ*; Mū(HvH) *āyuṣmaṃ*. Cf. also notes 222, 347, 384, 400, 428, 440.

¹⁷² *sahitakā* : “together” = Ma.Ch 553a2. 共(汝), 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. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 23.7~11. *anāttamano evaṃ vadeya — adinno me chando durdinno me chando akrtāny etāni karmāni duṣkrtāny etāni karmāni nāham etesaṃ karmaṇāṃ cchandaṃ demīti vadeya pācattikaṃ* | (Pāc 44) *yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣum evaṃ vadeya — ehi tvam āyuṣmaṇ grāmaṃ piṇḍāya praviśiṣyāmaḥ*

Folios 72~81 are published in Karashima 2008: 72~77

82 : Plate 28

recto

- 1 saṃcintya tiryagyonigataṃ prāṇiṃ¹⁷³ jīvitād vyaparop[e]-
 2 yā¹⁷⁴ pāyattikā 64 || yo punar bhikṣuḥ bhikṣusya
 3 <saṃcintya>¹⁷⁵ kaukrtyam upaṀsaṃharet¹⁷⁶ kiṃ tasya¹⁷⁷ muhūrtam api
 4 aphāṣo¹⁷⁸ bhavati¹⁷⁹ {•} pāyattikā • 65 || yo puna-
 5 r bhikṣuḥ bhikṣusya vā bhikṣuṇyā¹⁸⁰ vā śrāmaṇerasya vā

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 25.26~26.3 (Pāc 61) *yo puna bhikṣuḥ saṃcintya tiryagyonigataṃ prāṇinam jīvitād vyaparopeya pācattikaṃ* | (Pāc 62) *yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣusya saṃcintya kaukrtyam upasaṃhareya kiṃ* (Ms. *kin*) *ti se muhūrtam pi aphāsu bhavatū ti pācattikaṃ* | (Pāc 63) *yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣusya vā bhikṣuṇīye vā śrāmaṇerasya vā*

verso

- 1 śrāmaṇerīye vā «śikṣamāṇāye vā» cīvaram datvā apratyuddharitvā¹⁸¹ pari-
 2 bhūṃjam¹⁸² 183: imam «ta»sya bhikṣusya apratyuddhārapāribho[g]i¹⁸⁴ «see the supplementary folio below»¹⁸⁵
 3 ¹⁸⁶anyatarānyaṀtaram vā punaḥ «śrāmaṇakaṃ [jī](v)[i]ta»pariṣkāram^{187a}-
 4 panidhe vā apanidhāpaye vā antamasato¹⁸⁸

(only Mvu) and Abhis III 528.

¹⁷³ *prāṇiṃ* : Acc. sg.; cf. BHSG § 10.43, Abhis III 29, § 10.2; cf. also Ma-L (Pāc 61), Sa (Pāt 61), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 61) *prāṇinam*; Pātim (Pāc 61) *pāṇam*.

¹⁷⁴ *vyaparop[e]yā* : Cf. Ma-L °*eya*; Pātim *voropeyya*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *vyaparopayet*.

¹⁷⁵ <*saṃcintya*> : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 62), Sa (Pāt 62), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 62) *saṃcintya*; MaVin 378b14, Ma.Ch 553b14. 故 (“deliberately”); Pātim (Pāc 77) *sañcicca*.

¹⁷⁶ *upasaṃharet* : Cf. Ma-L *upasaṃhareya*; Pātim *upadaheyya*; Sa *upasaṃhared* (v.l. °*haret*); Mū(HvH) °*haret*.

¹⁷⁷ *tasya* : Cf. Ma-L *ti se* (Gen. sg. masc.; cf. Abhis III 539); Pātim °*ssa*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *asya bhikṣor*.

¹⁷⁸ *aphāṣo* : Ma-L, Pātim *aphāsu*; Sa *aphāṣam* (v.l. *(a)sparṣam*); Mū(HvH) *asparṣo*.

¹⁷⁹ *bhavati* : Ma-L *bhavatū (ti)*; Pātim *bhavissatī (ti)*; Sa *bhaved*; Mū(HvH) *bhaviṣyati*.

¹⁸⁰ *bhikṣuṇyā* : Ma-L (Pāc 63) °*ṇīye*; Pātim (Pāc 59) *bhikkhuniyā*; Sa (Pāt 68) - (v.l. *bhikṣuṇyā*); Mū(HvH) (Pāy 68) - (cf. Pāy 67 *bhikṣuṇyā*).

¹⁸¹ *apratyuddharitvā* : Cf. Ma-L °*dhareya*; Pātim *appaccuddhāraṇam* (v.l. °*āraṇam*); Sa, Mū(HvH) *apratyud-dhārya*.

¹⁸² *paribhūṃjam* : Cf. Ma-L *paribhūṃjeya*; Pātim *paribhūṃjeyya*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *paribhūṃjta*.

¹⁸³ *imam «ta»sya bhikṣusya* : The other versions, incl. MaVin 379a9 and Ma.Ch 553b16, lack these words.

¹⁸⁴ *apratyuddhārapāribho[g]i* : S.e. for °*pāribhoge*. It seems that the scribe had written first as °*bhoni* then corrected to °*bhogi*. Cf. Ma-L °*paribhoge*.

¹⁸⁵ Supplementary words are written on a folio, made of leather.

¹⁸⁶ *anyatarānyataram vā punaḥ «śrāmaṇakaṃ [jī](v)[i]ta»pariṣkāram* : ≠ Ma-L (Pāc 64), MaVin 379b27 (Pāy 64), Ma.Ch 553b18 (Pāy 64), Pātim (Pāc 60) -; ≃ Sa (Pāt 67) *anyatamānyatamaṃ vā śrāmaṇakaṃ pariṣkāram* (v.l. *jīvitapari*°); Mū(HvH) (Pāy 67) *anyatamānyatamaṃ vā śrāmaṇakaṃ jīvitapariṣkāram*.

¹⁸⁷ *apanidhe vā apanidhāpaye vā* : Ma-L *apaniheyā vā apanihāpeya vā*; Pātim *apanidheyya vā apanidhāpeyya vā*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *upanidadhyād upanidhāpayed vā*.

¹⁸⁸ *antamasato* : Ma-L °*śato*; Pātim *antamaso*; Sa *antato*; Mū(HvH) -.

5 hāsyārthāyāmi¹⁸⁹ pāyattikā : 67 || yo punaḥ

Supplementary folio, made of leather : Plate 29

recto

- 1 (pāya)ttikā || yo punar bhikṣur bhi
 2 (k)[ṣu] + + + sya¹⁹⁰ pātram vā c[ī]varam vā ni-
 3 ṣīdanam vā sūcīgharakam¹⁹¹ vā ¹⁹²kāyaba-
 4 ndhanam vā ||

verso

Blank

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 26.3~8. śrāmaṇerīye vā śikṣamānāye vā cīvaram datvā apratyuddhareya paribhumjeya apratyuddhārāparibhoge pācattikam | (Pāc 64) yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣusya pātram vā cīvaram vā niṣīdanam vā sūcīvigramam vā apanihēya vā apanihāpeya vā antamaśato hāsyārtham pi pācattikam | (Pāc 65) yo puna

83 : Plate 30

recto

- 1 bhikṣur bhikṣusya ¹⁹³bhīṣ[e] vā bhīṣāpaye vā pāya-
 2 ttikā : 68 || udakahāsyasaṃmatake¹⁹⁴ pāyatti-
 3 kā : 69 || aṃ᠎gulipratodanake pāyattikā :
 4 70 || yo punar bhikṣur mātrgrāmeṇa sārddham¹⁹⁵ a-
 5 dhvānamārgam pratipadyeyā¹⁹⁶ aṃtamas[a]-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 26.8~12. bhikṣur bhikṣum bhīṣeya pācattikam | (Pāc 66) udakahasta-saṃmardanāt pācattikam | (Pāc 67) aṅgulipratodanake pācattikam | (Pāc 68) yo puna bhikṣu mātrgrāmeṇa sārddham saṃvidhāya adhvānamārgam pratipadyeya antamaśa-

verso

- 1 to¹⁹⁷ grāmāntaram pi pāyattikā • 71 || yo punar bhi-
 2 kṣur mātrgrāmeṇa sārddham sahaḡāśayyām kalpa-
 3 ye¹⁹⁸ pāyattiOkā 72 || yo punar bhikṣu<r> mātr-
 4 grāmeṇa sārddham eko ekā«ya» raho niṣadyāṃ kalpa-

¹⁸⁹ hāsyārthāyāmi : S.e. for *rthāyāpi; cf. Ma-L hāsyārtham pi; Pātim hasāpekkho (v.l. hāsā°, hassā°) pi; Sa hāsyaprekṣyam api; Mū(HvH) -.

¹⁹⁰ bhī(k)[ṣu] + + + sya : Probably nothing was written between bhikṣu and sya; cf. Ma-L (Pāc 64) bhikṣusya; Pātim (Pāc 60) bhikkhussa; Sa (Pāt 67) bhikṣoḥ; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 67) bhikṣor.

¹⁹¹ sūcīgharakam : Cf. Ma-L sūcīvigramam; Pātim sūcīgharam; Sa sūcīgharakam; Mū(HvH) saritam.

¹⁹² kāyabandhanam vā : = Pātim, Mū(HvH); ≠ Ma-L, Sa, MaVin 379b27 (Pāy 64), Ma.Ch 553b18 (Pāy 64) -.

¹⁹³ bhīṣ[e] vā bhīṣāpaye vā : ≠ Ma-L (Pāc 65) bhīṣeya = MaVin 379c24 (Pāy 65) = Ma.Ch 553b20 (Pāy 65) 怖; Pātim (Pāc 55) bhīṣāpeyya; = Sa (Pāt 66) bhīṣayed bhīṣāpayed vā (v.l. bhīṣed bhīṣayed); Mū(HvH) (Pāy 66) bhīṣayed bhīṣāpayed vā.

¹⁹⁴ udakahāsyasaṃmatake : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 66) udakahastasaṃmardanāt; MaVin 380b26 (Pāy 66), Ma.Ch 553b21 (Pāy 66) 水中戲; Pātim (Pāc 53) udake hāsadhamme (v.l. hasā°, hassā°); Sa (Pāt 64), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 64) udakaharṣanāt; Mvy 8489 udakaharṣanam.

¹⁹⁵ sārddham : ≠ Ma-L (Pāc 68) sārddham saṃvidhāya = MaVin 381c18 (Pāy 68) 共期 = Ma.Ch 553b23 (Pāy 68) 期共; Pātim (Pāc 67) saddhiṃ saṃvidhāya; Sa (Pāt 70) sārddham saṃvidhāya (v.l. -); = Mū(HvH) (Pāy 70) sārddham.

¹⁹⁶ pratipadyeyā : Cf. Ma-L °eya; Pātim paṭipajjeyya; Sa, Mū(HvH) pratipadyeta.

¹⁹⁷ aṃtamas[a]to : Cf. Ma-L °śato; Pātim antamaso; Sa antato; Mū(HvH) -.

¹⁹⁸ kalpaye : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 69) kalpeya; Pātim (Pāc 6) kappeyya; Sa (Pāt 65), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 65) kalpayet.

5 ye¹⁹⁹ pāyattikā · 73 || yo punar bhikṣur jānaṃ

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 26.12~20. to grāmāntaram pi pācattikam l (Pāc 69) yo puna bhikṣu mātrgrāmena sārddham sahaḡāraśayyāṃ kalpeya pācattikam l (Pāc 70) yo puna bhikṣu mātrgrāmena sārddham eko ekāya raho niṣadyāṃ kalpeya pācattikam l ...²⁰⁰ (Pāc 71) yo puna bhikṣur jānaṃ

84 : Plate 31

recto

1 ūnaviṃśativarṣa(ṃ)²⁰¹ pudgalo²⁰² bhikṣubhāvena²⁰³ upasaṃ-

2 pādaye²⁰⁴ so ca pudgalo anupasaṃpanno te ca

3 bhikṣ«ūñā»²⁰⁵ gārahyā²⁰⁶ ○ imaṃ teṣāṃ bhikṣūñāṃ garhaṇa-

4 tāye²⁰⁷ pāyattikā · 74 || yo punar bhi-

5 kṣuḡ svahastaṃ pṛthivīm²⁰⁸ khane vā khanāpaye

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 26.20~25. ūnaviṃśativarṣa<ṃ> pudgalaṃ bhikṣubhāvāya upasampādeya. so ca pudgalo anupasaṃpanno. te ca bhikṣū gārhyā. imaṃ teṣāṃ bhikṣūñāṃ garhaṇapācattikam l

(Pāc 72; see verso)

(Pāc 73) yo puna bhikṣuḡ svahastaṃ pṛthivīm khaneya vā khanāpeya

verso

1 vā aṃtamasato ihaṃ²⁰⁹ khane{ṃ}ti²¹⁰ vā vade[y]. pāya-

2 tikā · 75 || yo {vā}²¹¹ punar bhikṣu«r jānaṃ» stānyasārthena

3 sārddhaṃ²¹² adhvāna○mārgaṃ pratipadyeyā²¹³ aṃtama-

4 sato grāmāntaram api vā pāyattikā 76 ||

¹⁹⁹ kalpaye : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 70) kalpeya; Pātim (Pāc 44) kappeyya; Sa (Pāt 43) kalpayer; Mū(HvH) -.

²⁰⁰ PrMoSū(Ma-L) 26.16~19. ll uddānaṃ ll (61) saṃcintya (62) kaukrtyam (63) apratyuddharitvā (64) apaniheyā (65) bhīṣeya (66) udaka (67) aṅguli (← aṅgali) (68) saṃvidhāya (69) sahaḡāra (70) niṣadyāya ll saptamo vargaḡ ll.

²⁰¹ ūnaviṃśativarṣa(ṃ) : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 71) ūnaviṃśativarṣa<ṃ>; Pātim (Pāc 65) ūnaviṃśativarṣaṃ; Sa (Pāt 72), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 72) ūnaviṃśativarṣaṃ.

²⁰² pudgalo : S.e. for °galaṃ = Ma-L; Pātim puggalaṃ; Sa, Mū(HvH) pudgalaṃ.

²⁰³ bhikṣubhāvena : = Sa; Ma-L, Mū(HvH) °bhāvāya; Pātim -.

²⁰⁴ upasaṃpādaye : Cf. Ma-L °pādeya; Pātim °pādeyya; Sa °pādayet; Mū(HvH) °pādyet.

²⁰⁵ bhikṣ«ūñā» : Originally, bhikṣur had been written here, which was then changed to bhikṣ«ūñā» by a later hand. S.e. for bhikṣū (= Ma-L); Pātim bhikkhū; Sa, Mū(HvH) bhikṣavo.

²⁰⁶ gārahyā : Cf. Ma-L gārhyā; Pātim gārayhā; Sa garhyā; Mū(HvH) garhyāḡ.

²⁰⁷ garhaṇatāye : Cf. Ma-L garhaṇa; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

²⁰⁸ khane vā khanāpaye vā : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 73) khaneya vā khanāpeya vā; Pātim (Pāc 10) khaneyya vā khanāpeyya vā; Sa (Pāt 73) khanyāt (v.l. khanet) khanayed vā; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 73) khanet khānyed vā; MaVin 384c20f. (Pāy 73), Ma.Ch 553c2 (Pāy 73) 自手掘地, 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.

²⁰⁹ ihaṃ : = Pkt < Skt. iha; this form is found also in BLSF II.1, p. 428, Or.15010/58 recto 4; cf. Ma-L iha = Ma.Ch 553c2. 是地; Pātim, Mū(HvH) -; Sa - (v.l. imāṃ).

²¹⁰ khane{ṃ}ti : Cf. Ma-L khanehīti; Pātim, Mū(HvH) -; Sa - (v.l. khanāvaṃ).

²¹¹ {vā} : No parallels in the other versions.

²¹² sārddham : ≠ Ma-L (Pāc 72) sārddhaṃ saṃvidhāya = MaVin 384b22 (Pāy 72), Ma.Ch 553b29 (Pāy 72) 期共; Pātim (Pāc 66) saddhiṃ saṃvidhāya; Sa (Pāt 71) sārddhaṃ saṃvidhāya; = Mū(HvH) (Pāy 71) sārddham.

²¹³ pratipadyeyā : Cf. Ma-L °eya; Pātim paṭipajjeyya; Sa= Mū(HvH) pratipadyeta.

5 caturmāsikena²¹⁴ bhikṣuṇā pratyekappravāraṇaṃ²¹⁵

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 26.25~26. vā antamaśato iha khanehīti vā vadeya pācattikaṃ /
 ib. 26.23~24. (Pāc 72) yo puna bhikṣur jānan stainvasārthena sārđhaṃ samvidhāya
adhvānamārgaṃ pratipadyeya antamaśato grāmāntaram pi pācattikaṃ /
 ib. 26.27. (Pāc 74) cāturmāsikā bhikṣuṇā pratyekappravāraṇā

85 : Plate 32

*recto*1 sātayitavy(ā)²¹⁶ taduttaraṃ²¹⁷ sādāyeyā²¹⁸ anyatra

2 punaḥpravāraṇe anyatra yāvajjīvakāye

3 pāyattikā : ○ 78²¹⁹ || yo punar bhikṣur bhikṣu-4 bhīr²²⁰ evaṃ buccamāno²²¹ imehi te āvusā²²² paṃca-5 hi āpattikehi²²³ anadhyācāraḥ²²⁴ śikṣā kara-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 26.27~27.2. sādāyitavyā / taduttarim sādāyeya anyatra punaḥ-
pravāraṇe anyatra yāvajjīvikāye pācattikaṃ / (Pāc 75) yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣūhi evaṃ
vucyamāno — imehi te āvusman pañcahi āpattikāyehi anadhyāvacāya śikṣā kara-

*verso*1 nīyam^{*225} ye so ca bhikṣus²²⁶ taṃ bhikṣur evaṃ vade²²⁷ na tāva-2 d aham āyuṣ[ma]ṃtānāṃ vacanena śikṣiṣyāṃtēmi²²⁸3 yāvad a[ha](ṃ na) ○ drakṣyāmi²²⁹ 230 sthvirā bhikṣuḥ sūtra-4 dharāṃ vinaya[dhar]āṃ mātrkādharaḥ<ṃ>²³¹ madhyamaṃ bhikṣuṃ

5 sūtradharaṃ vi[naya]dharāṃ mātrkādharaṃ navakaṃ

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 27.2~5. nīyēti, so bhikṣu tān bhikṣūn evaṃ vadeya — na tāvad aham

²¹⁴ caturmāsikena : S.e. for °sikā?; cf. Ma-L (Pāc 74) cāturmāsikā; Pātim (Pāc 47) catumāsa(-ppaccaya-pavāraṇā) (v.l. cātummasa°); Sa (Pāt 74) caturmāsikā (v.l. caturmāsaṃ etc.); Mū(HvH) (Pāy 74) caturmāsikī.
²¹⁵ pratyekappravāraṇaṃ : Cf. Ma-L °raṇā; MaVin 385c22f. (Pāy 74) 別自恣請; Ma.Ch 553c4 (Pāy 74) 別請; Pātim paccayapavāraṇā (“an invitation [to accept] requisites”); Sa, Mū(HvH) pravāraṇā.
²¹⁶ sātayitavy(ā) : S.e. for sādāy?; cf. Ma-L sādāyitavyā; Pātim sādātabbā; Sa sādāyitavyā (v.l. svīkartavyā); Mū(HvH) svīkartavyā. Cf. SWTF s.vv. sādāyitavya, sādāyitavya.
²¹⁷ taduttaraṃ : Ma-L taduttarim; Pātim tato ce utari (v.l. °rim); Sa tata uttaraṃ; Mū(HvH) tām atikramato.
²¹⁸ sādāyeyā : Ma-L sādāyeya; Pātim sādāyeyya; Sa sādāyey; Mū(HvH) -.
²¹⁹ 78 : This should be number 77. This wrong numbering caused errors in the consequent numerals up to 89 which occurs twice.
²²⁰ bhikṣubhīr : = Sa (Pāt 75), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 75); cf. Ma-L (Pāc 75) bhikṣūhi; Pātim (Pāc 71) bhikkhūhi.
²²¹ buccamāno : S.e. for vucca°; cf. Ma-L vucya°; Pātim vucca°; Sa, Mū(HvH) ucya°.
²²² āvusā : Cf. Ma-L āyuṣman; Pātim āvuso; Sa - (v.l. āyuṣmaṃ); Mū(HvH) āyuṣman. Cf. also note 171, 384.
²²³ āpattikehi : Cf. Ma-L āpattikāyehi; Pātim sikkhāpade; Sa, Mū(HvH) śikṣāyāṃ.
²²⁴ anadhyācāraḥ : Cf. Ma-L anadhyāvacāya; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.
²²⁵ karaṇīyam* : Cf. Ma-L karaṇīyēti; Pātim -; Sa, Mū(HvH) (śikṣāyāṃ) śikṣitavyam.
²²⁶ taṃ bhikṣur : Probably s.e. for tām bhikṣūn (= Ma-L); Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.
²²⁷ vade : Ma-L vadeya; Pātim vadeyya; Sa vaden; Mū(HvH) <vaden>.
²²⁸ śikṣiṣyāṃtēmi : It seems that the scribe had written first as śikṣiṣyāṃte then corrected to °syāmi. Read either °syāṃ(mi) or °syāḥ(mi); cf. Ma-L śikṣiṣyāṃ; Pātim sikkhissāmi; Sa śikṣiṣyāmi; Mū(HvH) śikṣiṣye.
²²⁹ drakṣyāmi : = Ma-L = MaVin 386b9 (Pāy 75), Ma.Ch 553c7 (Pāy 75) 見 (“sees”). Probably, originally s.e. for prakṣyāmi (= Sa, Mū[HvH]); Pātim paripucchāmi (ti).
²³⁰ sthvirā bhikṣuḥ : Probably s.e. for sthvirā<ṃ> bhikṣūṃ; cf. Ma-L sthvirān bhikṣūn; Pātim aññam bhikkhum; Sa anyān ... bhikṣūṃ; Mū(HvH) anyān bhikṣūn.
²³¹ madhyamaṃ bhikṣuṃ ... vinayadharaṃ mātrkādharaṃ : Acc. sg.; cf. Ma-L °mān bhikṣūn ... vinayadharaṃ mātrkādharaṃ (pl.); Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

āyusmantānām vacanena śikṣiṣyam yāvad ahaṃ na drakṣyāmi sthvirān bhikṣūn
sūtradharān vinayadharān māṭṛkādharān madhyamān bhikṣūn sūtradharān vinayadharān
māṭṛkādharān, navakān

86 : Plate 33

recto

1 [bhi]kṣu[m] sūtradharaṃ vinayadharaṃ māṭṛkādharaṃ te²³²

2 ahaṃ upasaṃkkramitvā²³³ pariṣrechiṣyaṃ pari-

3 praśniṣyāmī²³⁴ ca «[t]e» pāyattikā • 79 || ²³⁶a-

4 pi tu khalu śikṣākāmena bhikṣuṇājñātavyam*

5 ²³⁷upadhārayitavyam* upalakṣayitavyam*

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 27.5~7. bhikṣūn sūtradharān vinayadharān māṭṛkādharān | tāms tāvad
ahaṃ upasaṃkramya pariṣrechiṣyaṃ pariṣraśnikariṣyaṃ ti. pācattikam | śikṣākāmena
bhikṣuṇā ajñātavyam upalakṣayitavyam upadhārayitavyam |

verso

1 surāmaireyamadya«pāne»²³⁸ pāyattikā • 80 || «bhikṣu»anāda-

2 ryake²³⁹ pāyattikā • 81 || yo punar bhikṣur bhikṣu-

3 bhiḥ²⁴⁰ kalahaḥjātehir²⁴¹ bhaṇḍanaajātehi

4 ²⁴²vigrahavivādam āpannehi upa«viharaṃtehi» śroṇata-

5 sthātaṃ²⁴³ tiṣṭhe²⁴⁴ yaṃ cete²⁴⁵ vakṣyaṃti²⁴⁶ taṃ śrutvā²⁴⁷ paścā-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 27.8~11. (Pāc 76) surāmaireyamadya<pāne> (<-pānam>).pācattikam |
(Pāc 77) bhikṣu-(')nādarye pācattikam | (Pāc 78) yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣūhi kalahajātehi
bhaṇḍanaajātehi vighrahavivādāpannehi viharantehi upaśrotrasthāne tiṣṭheya — yaṃ ete
vadiṣyanti taṃ paścā-

²³² te : Acc. pl. masc. (cf. BHS § 21.30~31; Abhis III 38, § 18.27); cf. Ma-L tāms; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

²³³ upasaṃkkramitvā : Cf. Ma-L tāvad °kramya; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

²³⁴ pariṣraśniṣyāmī : Cf. Ma-L pariṣraśnikariṣyaṃ ti; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

²³⁵ ca «[t]e» : No parallels in the other versions.

²³⁶ api tu khalu : No parallels in the other versions.

²³⁷ upadhārayitavyam* upalakṣayitavyam* : Cf. Ma-L upalakṣayitavyam upadhārayitavyam; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -; MaVin 386b11, Ma.Ch 553c10. 應學亦應問.

²³⁸ surāmaireyamadya«pāne» : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 76) surāmaireyamadya<pāne>; Pātim (Pāc 51) surāmaireyamadyapāne; Sa (Pāt 79), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 79) surāmaireyamadyapānāt.

²³⁹ «bhikṣu»anādaryake : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 77) bhikṣu-(')nādarye; Ma.Ch 553c12 (Pāc 77) 輕他比丘; MaVin 387c15 (Pāc 77) 輕他; Pātim (Pāc 54) anādarye; Sa (Pāt 78) anādareyāt; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 78) anādarāt.

²⁴⁰ bhikṣubhiḥ : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 78) bhikṣūhi; Pātim (Pāc 78) bhikkhūnaṃ; Sa (Pāt 76), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 76) bhikṣūnām.

²⁴¹ kalahajātehir : Cf. Ma-L °jātehi; Pātim °jātānaṃ; Sa, Mū(HvH) °jātānām.

²⁴² vighrahavivādam āpannehi : Cf. Ma-L °vivādāpannehi; Pātim vivādāpannānaṃ; Sa vivādam (v.l. vighrhitavi°) āpannānām; Mū(HvH) vivādam āpannānām.

²⁴³ upa«viharaṃtehi» śroṇatasthātaṃ : S.e. for viharantehi upaśrotrasthāne (or °śrotāsth° [Nom. sg. of upaśrotr°] + sthāne?; cf. below 87r2); cf. Ma-L viharantehi upaśrotrasthāne; Pātim upassutim; Sa tūṣṇīm upaśrutikas; Mū(HvH) tūṣṇīm upaśrutikayā.

²⁴⁴ tiṣṭhe : Cf. Ma-L tiṣṭheya; Pātim tiṣṭheya; Sa, Mū(HvH) tiṣṭhed.

²⁴⁵ cete : Cf. Ma-L ete; Pātim ime; Sa, Mū(HvH) ete.

²⁴⁶ vakṣyaṃti : Cf. Ma-L vadiṣyanti; Pātim bhaṇissanti; Sa, Mū(HvH) vakṣyanti.

²⁴⁷ śrutvā : Cf. Ma-L -(s.e.); Pātim sossāmī (ti); Sa, Mū(HvH) ahaṃ śrutvā.

87 : Plate 34

recto

- 1 d upa~~v~~āsaṃhariṣyāmīti • etad eva pratyayaṃ
 2 kṛtvā «anānyam²⁴⁸» imaṃ tasya bhikṣusya upaśrotāsthāne²⁴⁹
 3 pāyattikā ○ 82 || yo punar bhikṣur jā-
 4 nam²⁵⁰ ²⁵¹sāṃghike viniścaye kathāyāṃ varta-
 5 mānāyāṃ ²⁵²{utthāyāsanāto} saṃtaṃ bhikṣuṃ

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 27.11~15. d upasamhariṣyāmīti / etad eva pratyayaṃ kṛtvā, ananyam, imaṃ tasya bhikṣusya upaśrotasthāne pācattikaṃ / (Pāc 79) yo puna bhikṣuḥ saṃghe viniścayakathāhi vartamānāhi utthāyāsanāt prakrameya santam bhikṣum

verso

- 1 anāmaṃtrayitvā «utthāyāsanā» prakrameyā²⁵³ pāyattikā : 83 [[]]
 2 yo punar bhikṣur āraṇyake śayyāsane viharanta vikā-
 3 lam²⁵⁴ grāmaṃ praviśeyā²⁵⁵ saṃtaṃ bhikṣuṃ anāmaṃtrayi-
 4 tvā anyatra tathārūpe atyāyikakaraṇīye²⁵⁶ pā-
 5 yattikā 84 || yo punar bhikṣuḥ sabhaktāḥ samā-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 27.15~24. anāmantrayitvā, anyatra tathārūpe atyāyike karaṇīye pācattikaṃ / (Pāc 80) yo puna bhikṣu āraṇyake śayyāsane viharanta vikāle grāmaṃ praviśeya santam bhikṣum anāmantrayitvā, anyatra tathārūpe atyāyike karaṇīye pācattikaṃ / ...²⁵⁷ (Pāc 81) yo puna bhikṣuḥ sabhaktā samā-

²⁴⁸ *anānyam* : S.e. for *ananyam*; cf. Ma-L *ananyam*; Pātim *anaññam*; Sa, Mū(HvH) -; IOL San 1014vy (ed. Wille, “Buddhist Sanskrit Sources from Khotan”, BLSF II 61) /// .. tvā anaññy. ///.

²⁴⁹ *upaśrotāsthāne* : *upaśrotā* (Nom. sg. of *upaśrotr*) + *sthāne*?; cf. Ma-L *upaśrotasthāne* (However, in *uddānam* [Ma-L 27.22], the manuscript reads *upaśrotra*.).

²⁵⁰ *jānam* : Superfluous. No parallels in the other versions.

²⁵¹ *sāṃghike viniścaye kathāyāṃ vartamānāyāṃ* : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 79) *saṃghe viniścayakathāhi vartamānāhi*; Pātim (Pāc 80) *saṃghe viniścayakathāya vartamānāya*; Sa (Pāt 77) *saṃghasy(a) n(i)ścitāyāṃ kathāyāṃ vartamānāyāṃ*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 77) *saṃghasya dharmyāyāṃ viniścayakathāyāṃ kathyamānāyāṃ*.

²⁵² *{utthāyāsanāto} saṃtaṃ bhikṣuṃ anāmaṃtrayitvā «utthāyāsanā» prakrameyā* : Ma-L *utthāyāsanāt prakrameya santam bhikṣum anāmantrayitvā*; Pātim *chandaṃ adatvā utthāy’ āsanā pakkameyya*; Sa *tūṣṇīm utthāya prakramet saṃtaṃ bhikṣum anava(lokya)*; Mū(HvH) *tūṣṇīm viprakramet santam bhikṣum anavalokya*; MaVin 388c11 (Pāy 79) 默然起去，不白比丘; Ma.Ch 553c15 (Pāy 79) 出去，不白。

²⁵³ *prakrameyā* : Cf. Ma-L *prakrameya*; Pātim *pakkameyya*; Sa *prakramet*; Mū(HvH) *viprakramet*.

²⁵⁴ *vikālam* : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 80), Pātim (Pāc 85) *vikāle*; Sa (Pāt 80), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 80) *akāle*.

²⁵⁵ *praviśeyā* : Cf. Ma-L °*eya*; Pātim *paviśeyya*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *praviśet*.

²⁵⁶ *atyāyikakaraṇīye* : Cf. Ma-L *atyāyike kar°*; Pātim *accāyikā karaṇīyā*; Sa (*tathārūpa-*)*pratyayāt*; Mū(HvH) (*tadrūpāt*) *pratyayāt*.

²⁵⁷ PrMoSū(Ma-L) 27.20~23. // *uddānam* // (71) *ūnaviṃśati* (72) *stainyasārtho* (73) *prthivī* (74) *pravāranā* (75) *na śikṣiṣyaṃ* (76) *maḍyapānam* (77) *anādaryam* (78) *upaśrotra* (79) *viniścaya* (80) *āraṇyakena* // *aṣṭamo vargaḥ* //.

88 : Plate 35

*recto*1 no purabhakta[m]²⁵⁸ paścābhaktaṃ²⁵⁹ kuleṣu cāritram āpadyeyā²⁶⁰2 samtaṃ bhikṣur²⁶¹ anāmanṭrayitvā anyatra samaye pā-3 yattikā : 805 || tatrāyaṃ samayo «glānasamayo»²⁶² cīvara-4 kālasamayo²⁶³ ayam atra samayo « || » yo puna-5 r bhikṣuḥ rājño kṣatriyasya mūrdhnābhiṣiktasya²⁶⁴

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 27.24~27. *no purebhaktaṃ paścādbhaktaṃ vā kuleṣu cāritram āpadyeya santam bhikṣum anāmanṭrayitvā, anyatra samaye pācattikaṃ | tatrāyaṃ samayo — cīvaradānakālasamayo | ayam atra samayah |* (Pāc 82) *yo puna bhikṣu rājñah kṣatriyasya mūrdhābhiṣiktasya*

*verso*1 janapadasthāvareyaprāptasya²⁶⁵ aṃtaḥpuram pravi-2 śeyā²⁶⁶ aniṣkrāṃte rājāne aniṣkrāṃte stryāgāre²⁶⁷3²⁶⁸ anirhrīte hi ratanehi aṃtamasato i-4 ndrakīlam «m a»[p]i laṃgheyā²⁶⁹ pāyattikā : 86 || yo5 punar bhikṣur daṃtamayaṃ vā asthimayaṃ vā²⁷⁰ «śṛṅgamayaṃ vā» ratanā-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 27.27~28.2. *janapadasthāmavīryaprāptasya antaḥpuram praviśeyāniṣkrānte rājāne, aniṣkrānte antaḥpure, anirgatehi ratanehi antamaśato indrakīlam pi atikrameya pācattikaṃ |* (Pāc 83) *yo puna bhikṣu dantamayaṃ vā asthimayaṃ vā śṛṅgamayaṃ vā suvarṇamayaṃ vā rūpyamayaṃ vā ratana-*

²⁵⁸ *purabhakta[m]* : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 81) *purebhaktaṃ*; Pātim (Pāc 46) *purebhaktaṃ vā*; Sa (Pāt 81), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 81) *pūrvabhaktaṃ*.

²⁵⁹ *paścābhaktaṃ* : Cf. Ma-L *paścādbhaktaṃ vā*; Pātim *pacchābhaktaṃ vā*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *paścādbhaktaṃ*.

²⁶⁰ *āpadyeyā* : Cf. Ma-L °*eya*; Pātim *āpajjeyya*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *āpadyeta*.

²⁶¹ *bhikṣur* : S.e. for *bhikṣum*; or read *bhikṣu*(Acc.)-r-(*anāmanṭrayitvā*); Ma-L *bhikṣum*; Pātim, Sa -, Mū(HvH) *grhiṇam*.

²⁶² «*glānasamayo*» : This word, lacking in the other versions, is superfluous.

²⁶³ *cīvarakālasamayo* : Cf. Ma-L *cīvaradānakālasamayo*; Pātim *cīvaradānasamayo cīvarakārasamayo*; Sa, Mū(HvH) -, MaVin 390a5 (Pāy 81), Ma.Ch 553c19 (Pāy 81) 衣時. Cf. note 107.

²⁶⁴ *mūrdhnābhiṣiktasya* : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 82) *mūrdhābhi*°; Pātim (Pāc 83) *muddhābhisittassa*; Sa (Pāt 82) *mūrdhābhiṣiktasya* (v.l. [*mūrdhnā*]^o); Mū(HvH) (Pāy 82) *mūrdhābhi*°.

²⁶⁵ *janapadasthāvareyaprāptasya* : Probably s.e. for °*sthāmavīryapr*° = Ma-L; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -, MaVin 390c15 (Pāy 82), Ma.Ch 553c19 (Pāy 82) -. The expression *janapadasthāmavīryaprāpta* occurs also in the *Mahāvastu*, *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra* etc.

²⁶⁶ *praviśeyā* : Cf. Ma-L *praviśeyā*-; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

²⁶⁷ *stryāgāre* : Cf. Ma-L *antaḥpure*; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -, MaVin 390c15. 王夫人; Ma.Ch 553c20. 夫人.

²⁶⁸ *anirhrītehi ratanehi* : < *anirhrītehi* r°; a locative absolute; for Loc. pl. -*ehi*, see Abhis III 15f., § 5.9 (with references); cf. Ma-L *anirgatehi ratanehi*; Pātim *aniggataratanake*; Sa *anirghīteṣu ratneṣu*; Mū(HvH) *anirhrīteṣu ratneṣu vā ratnasammateṣu vā*.

²⁶⁹ *laṃgheyā* : Cf. Ma-L *atikrameya*; Pātim *atikkāmeyya*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *samatikramed*; MaVin 390c16, Ma.Ch 553c20. 過(門限).

²⁷⁰ «*śṛṅgamayaṃ vā*» *ratanāmayaṃ vā* : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 83) *śṛṅgamayaṃ vā suvarṇamayaṃ vā rūpyamayaṃ vā ratanamayaṃ vā*; the fragments of the *Prātimokṣa-Vibhaṅga* of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins in the Schøyen Collection, written in early Western Gupta script, read *śṛṅgamayaṃ vā sovarṇamayaṃ vā rūpyamayaṃ (am) //* (Karashima 2006: 161); Pātim (Pāc 86) *viśānamayaṃ vā*; Sa (Pāt 84), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 84) *viśānamayaṃ vā*; MaVin 391b7 (Pāy 83), Ma.Ch 553c22 (Pāy 83) 角; cf. also MaVin 391b15. 不聽金銀寶等作針筒.

89 : Plate 36

recto

- 1 mayam²⁷¹ vā sūcīgharakam²⁷² kārāpaye²⁷³ bhedāt²⁷⁴ pāya-
 2 ttikā : 87 || maṃcaṃ pīṭham vā bhikṣuṇā kārāyamā-
 3 ṇena²⁷⁵ sugatāṣṭāṅgulipramāṇam pādakam kārā-
 4 payitavyam anyatra aḍānīye²⁷⁶ taduttaram²⁷⁷ kārā-
 5 paye²⁷⁸ cchedanāye²⁷⁹ pāyattikā : 88 || yo pu-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 28.2~6. *mayam vā sūcīvīgraham kārāpeya bhedanapācattikam* | (Pāc 84) *mañcam vā pīṭham vā bhikṣuṇā kārāpayamānena sugatāṣṭāṅgulapramāṇāḥ pādakāḥ kārāpayitavyāḥ anyatrāṭṭanīye. taduttarim kārāpeya cchedanapācattikam* | (Pāc 85) *yo pu-*

verso

- 1 nar bhikṣus tūlasamṣ[t]jārāmayam²⁸⁰ 281 maṃcaṃ vā pīṭham vā abhi-
 2 niṣīde²⁸² vā abhiniṣadye vā uddharaṇāye²⁸³ pāyatti-
 3 kā • 89 || niṣīṭdanam bhikṣuṇā kārāpayamāṇe-
 4 na prāmāṇikam kārāpayitavyam tatredam pramāṇam
 5 dīrghaśo dvau²⁸⁴ vitastayo²⁸⁵ sugatavīstastinā tīryo²⁸⁶

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 28.6~9. *na bhikṣuḥ tūlasamstrte mañce vā pīṭhe vā abhiniṣīdeya vā abhi[ni]padyeya vā uddālanapācattikam* | (Pāc 86) *niṣīdanam bhikṣuṇā kārāpayamānena prāmāṇikam kārāpayitavyam | tatrēdam pramāṇam — dīrghaśo dve vitastīyo sugatavīstastinā tīryag.*

²⁷¹ *ratanāmayaṃ* : Cf. Ma-L *ratanamayaṃ*; BHSD, p. 452, s.v. *rat(a)nāmaya* (Mvu), BHSG 8.16; Pkt. *rayanā-maya*.

²⁷² *sūcīgharakam* : Cf. Ma-L *sūcīvīgraham*; Pātim *sūcīgharam*; Sa *sūcīgharakam*; Mū(HvH) *sūcīgrham*; Mvy 8511. *sūcīgrhaka-*.

²⁷³ *kārāpaye* : Cf. Ma-L *kārāpeya*; Pātim *kārāpeyya*; Sa *kārāyet*; Mū(HvH) *kārāye<d>*.

²⁷⁴ *bhedāt* : S.e. for *bhedanā*?; cf. Ma-L *bhedana-*; Pātim *bhedanakam*; Sa - (v.l. *bhe(da)nāṭ*); Mū(HvH) *bhedanāt*.

²⁷⁵ *sugatāṣṭāṅgulipramāṇam pādakam kārāpayitavyam* : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 84) *°gulapramāṇāḥ pādakāḥ kārāpayitavyāḥ*; the fragments in the Schøyen Collection read *°gulipramāṇā pādakā kārāpayitavyā* (Karashima 2006: 161); Pātim (Pāc 87) *aṭṭhaṅgulapādakam kāretabham*; Sa (Pāt 85) *sugatāṣṭāṅgulipramāṇāḥ pādāḥ kārāpayitavyā*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 85) *°gulapramāṇāḥ pādakāḥ kārāpayitavyā*.

²⁷⁶ *aḍānīye* : Probably s.e. for *aḍānīye* < Skt. *aṭānī* (“the notched end [of the leg of a couch or chair]”); cf. Ma-L *aṭṭanīye*; the fragment in the Schøyen Collection reads *aḍānīye* (Karashima 2006: 161); Pātim *heṭṭhimāya aṭānīyā*; Sa *araṇyās* (s.e. for **aḍānyās?*); Mū(HvH) *aṭānikāyās*.

²⁷⁷ *taduttaram* : Ma-L *taduttarim*; Pātim *taṃ atikkāmayato*; Sa *tata uttaram*; Mū(HvH) *tata uttari*.

²⁷⁸ *kārāpaye* : Or *°payec* (*chedanāye*). Cf. Ma-L *kārāpeya*; Pātim -; Sa *kārāyet*; Mū(HvH) *kārāyec*.

²⁷⁹ *cchedanāye* : Or (*kārāpayec*) *ch°*. Cf. Ma-L *cchedana-*; Pātim *chedanakam*; Sa -; Mū(HvH) *chedanāt*.

²⁸⁰ *tūlasamṣ[t]jārāmayam* : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 85) *tūlasamstrte*; Pātim (Pāc 88) *tūlonaddham*; Sa (Pāt 86) *tūlasamstrtām*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 86) *tūlenōpanahyād*.

²⁸¹ *maṃcaṃ vā pīṭham vā* : Cf. Ma-L *mañce vā pīṭhe vā*; Pātim *mañcam vā pīṭham vā* (*tūlonaddham kārāpeyya*); Sa *śayyām* (*avanahed*); Mū(HvH) *mañcam vā pīṭham vā* (*tūlenōpanahyād*).

²⁸² *abhiniṣīde vā abhiniṣadye vā* : *Abhiniṣadye* is s.e. for *abhinipadye* (“may lie down on”); cf. Ma-L *abhiniṣīdeya vā abhi<ni>padyeya vā*; MaVin 392a28 (Pāy 85), Ma.Ch 553c25 (Pāy 85) 若坐若臥. Cf. also Pātim (*tūlonaddham*) *kārāpeyya*; Sa (*śayyām*) *avanahed avanāhayed vā*; Mū(HvH) (*tūlenōpanahyād upanāhayed vā*).

²⁸³ *uddharaṇāye* : Cf. Ma-L *uddālana-*; Pātim *uddālanakam*; Sa -; Mū(HvH) *uddālanāt*; MaVin 392a28. 挽出已 (“having pulled out”); Ma.Ch 553c25. 出已 (“having brought out”).

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

²⁸⁵ *vitastayo* : Cf. Ma-L *vitastīyo*; Pātim *vidatthīyo*; Sa *vitastī*; Mū(HvH) *vitastayāḥ*.

²⁸⁶ *tīryo* : Cf. Ma-L *tīryag*; Pātim *tīryam*; Sa *tīryak*; Mū(HvH) *tīryag*. Cf. also BHSD, s.v. *tīrya*.

90 : Plate 37

recto

- 1 ca²⁸⁷ d[*o*]-v-aḍḍham²⁸⁸ taduttaram²⁸⁹ kārāpaye²⁹⁰ cchedanāt²⁹¹ pāyattikā :
 2 kaṇḍūpracchādamnam²⁹² bhikṣuṇā kārāpayamāṇena prā-
 3 māṇikam kārāyitavyam²⁹³ tatra idaṃ pramāṇam dī-
 4 rghaśo catvāra²⁹⁴ vitastayo²⁹⁵ sugatavitastinā ti-
 5 ryo²⁹⁶ ca²⁹⁷ dvau²⁹⁸ taduttaram²⁹⁹ kārāpaye³⁰⁰ cchedanāya³⁰¹ pā-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 28.9~13. *dyardham anyatra daśavitastikaṃ | taduttarim kārāpeya cchedanapācattikam |* (Pāc 87) *kaṇḍūpraticchādanam bhikṣuṇā kārāpayamāṇena prāmāṇikam kārāpayitavyam | tatrēdam pramāṇam dīrghaśo catvāri vitastīyo sugatavitastinā, tiryag dve | taduttarim kārāpeya cchedanapā-*

verso

- 1 yattikā : varṣakaśāṭakam³⁰² bhikṣuṇā kārāpayamāṇe-
 2 na³⁰³ prāmāṇikam kārāpayitavyam* tatreḍam pramāṇ[*y*]am
 3 dīrghaśo ṣaḍ viṭastayo³⁰⁴ sugatavitastinā tī-
 4 rya³⁰⁵ ca aḍḍhātikam³⁰⁶ taduttaram³⁰⁷ kārāpaye³⁰⁸ cche<da>nāye³⁰⁹
 5 pāyattikā : yo punar bhikṣuḥ sugatasya³¹⁰ suga-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 28.13~17. *cattikam |* (Pāc 88) *varṣāśāṭikā bhikṣuṇā kārāpayamāṇena prāmāṇikā kārāpayitavyā | tatrēdam pramāṇam — dīrghaśo ṣaḍ vitastīyo sugatavitastinā, tiryag aḍḍhātīyam | taduttarim kārāpeya cchedanapācattikam |* (Pāc 89) *yo puna bhikṣuḥ suga-*

²⁸⁷ ca : No parallels in the other versions.

²⁸⁸ d[*o*]-v-aḍḍham : Cf. Ma-L *dyardham*; Pātim *diyaḍḍham*; Sa *sārdhavitastir*; Mū(HvH) *a<rdha>trīyās*.

²⁸⁹ taduttaram : Cf. Ma-L *ttarim*; Pātim *taṃ atikkāmayato*; Sa *tata uttaram*; Mū(HvH) *tata uttari*.

²⁹⁰ kārāpaye : Cf. Ma-L *kārāpeya*; Pātim -; Sa *kārayet*; Mū(HvH) *kārayec*.

²⁹¹ cchedanāt : Cf. Ma-L *cchedana-*; Pātim *chedanakam*; Sa -; Mū(HvH) *chedanāt*.

²⁹² kaṇḍūpracchādamnam : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 87), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 88) *°praticchādanam*; Pātim (Pāc 90) *kaṇḍu-ppaticchādīm*; Sa (Pāt 88) *kaṇḍupraticchādanam*.

²⁹³ kārāyitavyam : Cf. Ma-L *kārāpayitavyam*; Pātim *kāretabbā*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *kārayitavyam*.

²⁹⁴ catvāra : Cf. Ma-L *catvāri*; Pātim *catasso*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *catasro*.

²⁹⁵ vitastayo : Cf. Ma-L *vitastīyo*; Pātim *vidatthīyo*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *vitastayaḥ*.

²⁹⁶ tīryo : Cf. Ma-L *tīryag*; Pātim *tīriyam*; Sa *tīryag*; Mū(HvH) *tīryag*.

²⁹⁷ ca : No parallels in the other versions.

²⁹⁸ dvau : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) *dve*. Cf. notes 284, 526.

²⁹⁹ taduttaram : Cf. Ma-L *ttarim*; Pātim *taṃ atikkāmayato*; Sa *tata uttaram*; Mū(HvH) *tata uttari*.

³⁰⁰ kārāpaye : Cf. Ma-L *kārāpeya*; Pātim -; Sa *kārayet*; Mū(HvH) *kārayec*.

³⁰¹ cchedanāya : The *aṣara ya* was crossed out apparently by a later hand. Cf. Ma-L *cchedana-*; Pātim *chedanakam*; Sa -; Mū(HvH) *chedanāt*.

³⁰² varṣakaśāṭakam : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 88) *varṣāśāṭikā*; Pātim (Pāc 91) *vassikasāṭikam*; Sa (Pāt 87), Mū(HvH) (Pāy 89) *varṣāśāṭcīvaram*.

³⁰³ prāmāṇikam kārāpayitavyam* : Cf. Ma-L *°ṇikā °tavyā*; Pātim *pamāṇikā kāretabbā*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *prāmāṇikaṃ kārāyitavyam*.

³⁰⁴ vitastayo : Cf. Ma-L *vitastīyo*; Pātim *vidatthīyo*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *vitastayaḥ*.

³⁰⁵ tīrya : Cf. Ma-L *tīryag*; Pātim *tīriyam*; Sa *tīryak*; Mū(HvH) *tīryag*.

³⁰⁶ aḍḍhātikam : A hyper-Sanskritism of Pā = BHS. *aḍḍha-tiya*~ (“two and a half”); cf. Ma-L *aḍḍhātīyam*; Pātim *aḍḍhateyyā*; Sa *sārdhe* (v.l. *sfārdham*) *dve*; Mū(HvH) *a<rdha>trīyās*. Cf. also 79r5 *ardhātikā*.

³⁰⁷ taduttaram : Cf. Ma-L *ttarim*; Pātim *taṃ atikkāmayato*; Sa *tata uttaram*; Mū(HvH) *tata uttari*.

³⁰⁸ kārāpaye : Cf. Ma-L *kārāpeya*; Pātim -; Sa *kārayet*; Mū(HvH) *kārayec*.

³⁰⁹ cche<da>nāye : Cf. Ma-L *cchedana-*; Pātim *chedanakam*; Sa -; Mū(HvH) *chedanāt*.

³¹⁰ sugatasya : This word, lacking in the other versions, is superfluous.

91 : Plate 38

recto

- 1 tacīvarapramāṇena³¹¹ cīvaram kārāpayet³¹² 313tat[o] vā pu-
 2 nar uttaram³¹⁴ kārāpaye³¹⁵ cchedanāt³¹⁶ pāyattikā • 89 ||
 3 kiṃ ca tasya bha○gavato tathāgatasya a[rh]ato
 4 samyaksambuddhasya sugatasya sugatacīvarapra-
 5 māṇam dīrghaśo daśa³¹⁷ vitastayo³¹⁸ sugatavita-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 28.17~19. tacīvarapramāṇam cīvaram kārāpeya — kiṃ ca tasya bhagavato tathāgatasyārhatāḥ samyaksambuddhasya sugatasya sugatacīvarapramāṇam?
dīrghaśo nava vitastīyo sugatavita-

verso

- 1 stinā [fīryau]³¹⁹ ca ṣaṭ* idam tasya [bh]agavato tathāgata-
 2 sya a[rhato sa]myaksambuddhasya sugatasya «(su)gata»cīvara-
 3 pramāṇam || yo] ○ punar bhikṣur bhikṣusya³²⁰ duṣṭo doṣo³²¹
 4 kupito (a)n[āt]amano amūlakena saṃghāvaśe-
 5 ṣeṇa³²² [dh]arṇeṇa anudhvamseyā³²³ pāyattikā : «90 ||»

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 28.19~23. stinā tīryak ṣaṭ | idam tasya bhagavato tathāgatasyārhatāḥ samyaksambuddhasya sugatasya sugatacīvarapramāṇam | tato vā punar uttarim kārāpeya cchedanapācattikam | (Pāc 90) yo puna bhikṣu bhikṣusya duṣṭo doṣāt kupito anāttamano amūlakena saṃghātiṣeṇa dharmenānudhvamseya pācattikam |

92 : Plate 39

recto

- 1 y(o) punar bhi[kṣu] (s)[ā](m)ghikaṃ lābham saṃghe pariṇa-
 2 tam pud[g]alo pudgalasya pariṇāmaye³²⁴ pāyatti-

³¹¹ sugatacīvarapramāṇena : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 89) °pramāṇam; Pātim (Pāc 92) °ppamāṇam; Sa (Pāt 90) °pramāṇena; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 90) °<pra>māṇam.

³¹² kārāpayet : Cf. Ma-L kārāpeya; Pātim kārāpeyya; Sa, Mū(HvH) kāraved.

³¹³ tat[o] vā punar uttaram kārāpaye cchedanāt pāyattikā • 89 || kiṃca tasya bhagavato ... «(su)gata» cīvarapramāṇam : 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) 若過量截已，波夜提。如來衣量長九修伽陀揲手，廣六揲手，是名如來衣量；Ma.Ch 554a4f. (Pāy 89) 若過截已，波夜提。如來衣長九修伽陀揲手，廣六揲手，while the word order in Ma-L is reversed, namely: kiṃ ca tasya bhagavato ... sugatacīvarapramāṇam | tato vā punar uttarim kārāpeya cchedanapācattikam |

³¹⁴ uttaram : Cf. Ma-L uttarim; Pātim atirekam; Sa uttaram; Mū(HvH) uttareṇa.

³¹⁵ kārāpaye : Cf. Ma-L kārāpeya; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

³¹⁶ cchedanāt : Cf. Ma-L cchedana-; Pātim chedanakam; Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

³¹⁷ daśa : = Mū(HvH); ≠ Ma-L, Pātim, Sa nava, MaVin 394b6, Ma.Ch 554a5. 九(“nine”).

³¹⁸ vitastayo : Cf. Ma-L vitastīyo; Pātim vidatthīyo; Sa, Mū(HvH) vitastayaḥ.

³¹⁹ [fīryau] : S.e. for tīryo?; cf. 89v5, 90r4~5. tīryo; 90v3~4 tīrya; Ma-L tīryak; Pātim tīryam; Sa tīryak; Mū(HvH) tīryak.

³²⁰ duṣṭo doṣo kupito (a)n[āt]amano : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 90) duṣṭo doṣāt kupito anāttamano; Pātim (Pāc 76) -; Sa (Pāt 69) - (v.l. dviṣṭo dveṣād ap(r)atītaḥ śu[ddha]m ... anāpannam); Mū(HvH) (Pāy 69) dviṣṭo dveṣād apratītaḥ śuddham ... anāpannam; MaVin 395a8 (Pāy 90), Ma.Ch 554a6 (Pāy 90) 瞋恨不喜.

³²¹ doṣo : S.e. for doṣā; cf. Ma-L doṣāt; Pātim -; Sa - (v.l. dveṣād); Mū(HvH) dveṣād.

³²² saṃghāvaśeṇa : = Sa, Mū(HvH); cf. Ma-L saṃghātiṣeṇa; Pātim saṃghādisena.

³²³ anudhvamseyā : Cf. Ma-L °eya; Pātim anuddhamseyya; Sa, Mū(HvH) anudhvamsayet.

³²⁴ pariṇāmaye : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 91) pariṇāmeya; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

3 kã : [y]o p[u]Onar bhikṣuḥ anvardhamāsaṃ prāti-

4 mokṣas[ū]tre³²⁵ uddiśeyamāne³²⁶ evaṃ vade³²⁷ idāniṃ³²⁸

5 punaḥ ahaṃ jānāmi idāni³²⁹ punar ahaṃ «pa»śyāmi³³⁰ •

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 28.24~27. (Pāc 91) *yo puna bhikṣur jānan sāmghikam labham samghe parinatam pudgalo pudgalasya parināmeya pācattikam |* (Pāc 92) *yo puna bhikṣur anvardha-māsaṃ sūtre prātimokṣe uddiśyamāne evaṃ vadeya — adya punar ahaṃ jānāmi, idāniṃ punar ahaṃ jānāmi*

verso

1 ayaṃ pi dharmo sūtrāgato sūtraparyāpanno³³¹ sūtre anva-

2 rdhamāse prātimokṣoddeśam āgaccha{ṃ}ti³³² jānā<ṃ>ti³³³ kho pu-

3 naḥ te bhikṣu{s} taṃ ○ bhikṣu³³⁴ sakṛdgi«gu{ṃ}»pto sakṛtrigupto

4 āgatapūrvā<ṃ> pi sannīṣaṇṇapūrvāṃ pi «[sa]nnipatitapūrvāṃ pi»³³⁶ kaḥ punar vā-

5 do bahuśo³³⁷ na³³⁸ kho punas tasya bhikṣusya ajñātakam³³⁹ mo-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 28.27~31. — *ayaṃ pi dharmo sūtrāgato sūtraparyāpanno anvardhamāsaṃ sūtre prātimokṣe uddeśam āgacchati | yāvad ahaṃ na jānāmi tāvan nāstītaṃ mahyam āpattiḥ jānemsu ca te bhikṣu taṃ bhikṣuṃ sakṛd dvikkhuto trikkhuto āgatapūrvāṃ pi sannīṣaṇṇapūrvāṃ pi, kaḥ punar vādo bahuśo | nāsti kho punas tasya bhikṣusya ajñānena mu-*

³²⁵ *prātimokṣas[ū]tre* : Cf. Ma-L (Pāc 92) *sūtre prātimokṣe*; Pātim (Pāc 73) *pātimokkhe*; Sa (Pāt 83) *prātimokṣa-sūtrō(ddiśyamāne)*; Mū(HvH) (Pāy 83) *prātimokṣasūtroddeśe*.

³²⁶ *uddiśeyamāne* : Probably s.e. for *uddiśyamāne* (= 93r5); cf. Ma-L, Sa, Mū(HvH) *uddiśyamāne*; Pātim *uddissamāne*.

³²⁷ *vade* : Cf. Ma-L *vadeya*; Pātim *vadeyya*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *vaded*.

³²⁸ *idāniṃ* : Cf. Ma-L *adya*; Pātim *idān'(eva)*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *idāniṃ*.

³²⁹ *idāni* : Cf. Ma-L *idāniṃ*; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

³³⁰ *«pa»śyāmi* : Cf. Ma-L *jānāmi*; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

³³¹ *sūtre anvardhamāse prātimokṣoddeśam āgaccha{ṃ}ti* : Cf. Ma-L *anvardhamāsaṃ sūtre prātimokṣe uddeśam āgacchati*; Pātim *anvaddhamāsaṃ uddesaṃ āgacchati*; Sa, Mū(HvH) -. Cf. MaVin 396a5f. (Pāy 92), Ma.Ch 554a10f. (Pāy 92) 半月波羅提木叉中說.

³³² *jānā<ṃ>ti ... te bhikṣu{s}* : Cf. Ma-L *jānemsu ... te bhikṣu*; Pātim *aññe bhikkhū jāneyyūṃ*; Sa *bhiksavo jāntiyuḥ*; Mū(HvH) *bhiksavo jānīran*; 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 III 237 *ca* 3); Pātim *ce*; Sa *ca* (“if”); Mū(HvH) *ced*.

³³⁴ *bhikṣu* : Cf. Ma-L *bhikṣuṃ*; Pātim *bhikkhuṃ*; Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

³³⁵ *sakṛdgi«gu{ṃ}»pto sakṛtrigupto* : S.e. for *sakṛd <d>vigupto sakṛt <ṛ>rigupto? Gupto* is a hyper-Sanskritism of MI *khutto* < Skt. *kṛtvās* (> AMg *khutto*, Pā *khattūṃ*, BHS *kṛtvā, kṛtya, khuttam, kṣuttam, kuttam, khattam, kṣattam* etc. [see BHSD, s.v. ¹-*kṛtvā*; Abhis III 279, s.v. *tri-kkhatto*]; cf. also BHS *gupti* which is a hyper-form of MI *kutti* < Skt. *kṛpti*). Cf. Ma-L *sakṛd dvikkhuto trikkhuto*; Pātim *dviitikkhattam*; Sa *divis triḥ*; Mū(HvH) *dve trīṇi vā*.

³³⁶ *«[sa]nnipatitapūrvāṃ pi* : These words, lacking in the other versions, are superfluous.

³³⁷ *na ... mukti bhavati* : Cf. Ma-L *nāsti ... muktiḥ*; Pātim *na ... mutti atthi*; Sa *nāsty ... mokṣo*; Mū(HvH) *na ... muktiḥ*.

³³⁸ *kho punas* : Cf. Ma-L *kho punas*; Pātim *ca*; Sa *punar*; Mū(HvH) *eva*.

³³⁹ *ajñātakam* : S.e. for *ajñātakam* (“without knowing?”); cf. Ma-L *ajñānena* (“because of ignorance”); Pātim *aññānakena*; Sa *ajñānān (mokṣo)*; Mū(HvH) *ajñānān (muktiḥ)*; MaVin 396a7, Ma.Ch 554a12f. 以不知故.

93 : Plate 40

recto

- 1 kṣ.³⁴⁰ bhavati atha khalu³⁴¹ 342yaṃ so³⁴³ āpattim āpanno bhavati³⁴⁴
 2 taṃ kṣipram eva{ṃ} yathādharmam yathāvinayam kārāpayi-
 3 tavyam³⁴⁵ tadutta○raṃ³⁴⁶ ca saṃmoham āpādayitavyo
 4 tasya te āvusā³⁴⁷ sulābham³⁴⁸ durlabdham³⁴⁹ «na s(u)lab[dh]ā»³⁵⁰ yo tvam anva-
 5 rdhamāse³⁵¹ prātimokṣasūtre³⁵² uddiśiyamāne nās[th]i-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 28.31~33. *ktiḥ | atha khu yām pi ca so bhikṣur āpattim āpanno tām kṣipram eva yathādharmam yathāvinayam kārāpayitavyo, uttarim ca saṃmoham āpādayitavyo | tasya te āyuṣman lābhā durlabdā yas tvam anvardhamāsam sūtre prātimokṣe uddiśiyamāne nāsthī-*

verso

- 1 kṛtvā³⁵³ na manas[i]kṛtvā na sarvacetaḥ³⁵⁴ samanvāhara-
 2 yitvā³⁵⁵ nāvahitaśrotro³⁵⁶ dharmam śrṇoṣi • imaṃ tasya
 3 bhikṣusya saṃmo○hanāye³⁵⁷ pāyattikā : || uddi-
 4 ṣṭam³⁵⁸ kho punar āyuṣmaṃto dvānavati³⁵⁹ pāyattikā³⁶⁰ dharmā[h]
 5 tatrāham³⁶¹ āyuṣmaṃtānām³⁶² pṛcchāmi³⁶³ kaś cātra pariśuddhāḥ

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 28.33~29.11. *kṛtvā na manasikṛtvā na sarvacetasā samanvāhṛtya avahitaśroto satkṛtya dharmam śrṇoṣī* (←*saṃo*° [misp]) *| imam tasya bhikṣusya saṃmoha-*

³⁴⁰ mokṣ. : Cf. Ma-L *mukṭiḥ*; Pātim *mutti*; Sa *mokṣo*; Mū(HvH) *mukṭiḥ*.

³⁴¹ khalu : Cf. Ma-L *khu*; Pātim *ca*; Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

³⁴² yaṃ ... taṃ : Cf. Ma-L *yām ... tām*; Pātim *yañ ... tañ*; Sa *yām* (v.l. [*yam*]) ... *tām*; Mū(HvH) *yām ... tāñ*.

³⁴³ so : Cf. Ma-L *pi ca so bhikṣur*; Pātim *ca*; Sa *ca*; Mū(HvH) *sa*.

³⁴⁴ bhavati : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim -; Sa *syāt*; Mū(HvH) -.

³⁴⁵ kārāpayitavyam : Cf. Ma-L *kārāpayitavyo*; Pātim *kāretabbo*; Sa *kārayitavya* (°*vyam*); Mū(HvH) °*vya*.

³⁴⁶ taduttaram : Cf. Ma-L *uttariṃ*; Pātim *uttari* (v.l. °*riñ*); Sa *uttarañ*; Mū(HvH) *uttari*.

³⁴⁷ āvusā : Cf. Ma-L *āyuṣman*; Pātim *āvusō*; Sa *āyuṣmann*; Mū(HvH) *āyuṣman*. Cf. also note 171, 384.

³⁴⁸ sulābham : S.e. for *alābham*; cf. Ma-L *lābhā*; Pātim *alābhā*; Sa *alābho*; Mū(HvH) *alābhā*.

³⁴⁹ durlabdham : Cf. Ma-L °*bdhā*; Pātim *dulladdham*; Sa *durlabdho*; Mū(HvH) °*bdhā*.

³⁵⁰ «na s(u)lab[dh]ā» : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim -; Sa *na sulabdham*; Mū(HvH) *na sulabdā*.

³⁵¹ anvardhamāse : Cf. Ma-L, Sa, Mū(HvH) °*māsam*; Pātim -.

³⁵² prātimokṣasūtre : Cf. Ma-L *sūtre prātimokṣe*; Pātim *pātimokkhe*; Sa *prātimokṣasūtrō(ḍdiśiyamāne)*; Mū(HvH) *prātimokṣasūtroddeśa*.

³⁵³ as[th]ikṛtvā : Cf. Ma-L *asthikṛtvā*; Pātim *sādhukam aṭṭhikatvā* (v.l. *aṭṭhiṃ katvā*); Sa *satkṛtyārthikṛtvā*; Mū(HvH) *gurūkṛtya ... asthikṛtya*. The forms *asthī-√kr* are hyper-Sanskritisms of MI *aṭṭhī-√kr* < *arthī-√kr*.

³⁵⁴ sarvacetaḥ : Cf. Ma-L, Sa, Mū(HvH) °*cetasā*; Pātim -.

³⁵⁵ samanvāharayitvā : Cf. Ma-L, Sa, Mū(HvH) *samanvāhṛtya*; Pātim -.

³⁵⁶ nāvahitaśrotro : Cf. Ma-L *avahitaśroto* (cf. SWTF, s.v.) *satkṛtya*; Pātim -; Sa *nāvahitaśrotro*; Mū(HvH) *nāvahitaśroto*.

³⁵⁷ saṃmohanāye : Cf. Ma-L *saṃmoha-*; Pātim *mohanake*; Sa *saṃvejanāt*; Mū(HvH) *śikṣā saṃvejanāt*.

³⁵⁸ uddiṣṭam : Cf. Ma-L *uddiṣṭāḥ*; Pātim *uddiṣṭhā* (p. 82); Sa (p. 235), Mū(HvH) (at the end of the *Pāyattikā Dharmāḥ*) *uddiṣṭā*.

³⁵⁹ dvānavati : = Ma-L; Pātim *dvenavuti*; Sa *navati*; Mū(HvH) *navatiḥ*.

³⁶⁰ pāyattikā : Cf. Ma-L *śuddhapācattikā*; Pātim *pācittiyā*; Sa *pāyattikā*; Mū(HvH) *pāyattikā*; Ma.Ch 554a18. 波夜提.

³⁶¹ aham : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim -; Sa, Mū(HvH) *aham*.

³⁶² āyuṣmaṃtānām : Cf. Ma-L °*śmanto*; Pātim *āyasmante*; Sa *āyuṣmataḥ* (v.l. °*ś[m]antaḥ*); Mū(HvH) °*śmataḥ*. Cf. also notes 3, 368, 448, 453, 455, 527.

³⁶³ kaś cātra : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim *kacci* (')*ttha*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *kaccit sthātra*. Cf. also note 2.

*pācattikam | ...³⁶⁴ uddistāh kho punar āyusmanto dvānavati śuddhapācattikā dharmāh |
tatrāyusmanto pṛcchāmi kacci (')ttha paṇisuddhāh?*

94 : Plate 41

recto

- 1 dvetīyaka[m]³⁶⁵ pi³⁶⁶ tr(e)t[ī]yakaṃ³⁶⁷ pi āyusmaṃtānāṃ³⁶⁸ pṛcchā-
- 2 mi³⁶⁹ kaś cātra paṇisuddhā paṇisuddhās cātrāyusmaṃto³⁷⁰
- 3 yasmāt tūṣṇī ○ evam etad dhārayāmi ◎ ime kho
- 4 punar āyusmaṃto catvārah pṛādeśanikā³⁷¹ dharmāh³⁷² sū-
- 5 tre anvardhamāse pṛātimokṣe uddeśam āgacchaṃti •

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 29.11~16. *dvitīyaṃ pi āyusmanto pṛcchāmi kacci (')ttha paṇisuddhāh?*
trītyaṃ pi āyusmanto pṛcchāmi kacci (')ttha paṇisuddhāh? paṇisuddhā atrāyusmanto
yasmāt tūṣṇim evam etad dhārayāmi |
ime kho punar āyusmanto catvārah pṛādeśanikā dharmā anvardhamāsaṃ sūtre
pṛātimokṣe uddeśam āgacchanti —

verso

- 1 yo punar bhikṣuḥ āraṇyake śayyāsane³⁷³ viharaṃto pū-
- 2 rve «apṛavārito»³⁷⁴ apṛatisaṃvidito³⁷⁵ aparigrhīto³⁷⁶ bahirdhā ca
- 3 apṛatigrhīto aṃtovāsavastusmi³⁷⁷ svahastaṃ³⁷⁸
- 4 khādanīyaṃ bhojanīyaṃ pṛatigrahāpayitvā³⁷⁹ a-

³⁶⁴ PrMoSū(Ma-L) 29.3~9. // *uddānaṃ* // (81) *sabhakto* (82) *rājño* (83) *sūcī gṛhaṃ* (84) *mañca* (85) *tūla* (86) *niṣīdanaṃ* // (87) *kaṇḍū* (88) *varṣāśāṭikā* (89) *sugatacīvaram* (90) *abhyākhyānaṃ* (91) *paṇināmanam* (92) *ajñānakena* // *navamo vargaḥ* // // *vargāṇāṃ uddānaṃ* // (1) *mṛṣā* (2) *bījaṃ* (3) *asaṃmato* (4) *ekāharamo* // (5) *vyoti* (6) *sapṛāṇakaṃ* (7) *sañcintya* (8) *ūnaviṃṣati* (9) *sabhaktakena navamaḥ* //

³⁶⁵ *dvetīyaka[m]*: Cf. Ma-L *dvitīyaṃ*; Pātim *duṭṭiyaṃ*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *dvir*.

³⁶⁶ *pi*: Cf. Ma-L *pi āyusmanto pṛcchāmi kacci (')ttha paṇisuddhāh*; Pātim *pi pucchāmi kacci 'ttha paṇisuddhā*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *api*.

³⁶⁷ *tr(e)t[ī]yakaṃ*: Cf. 97v3, 104r2~3. *trītyakaṃ*; cf. also Ma-L *trītyaṃ*; Pātim *tatiyaṃ*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *trir*.

³⁶⁸ *āyusmaṃtānāṃ*: Cf. Ma-L *smanto*; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -. Cf. also note 362.

³⁶⁹ *kaś cātra*: Cf. Ma-L, Pātim *kacci (')ttha*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *kaccit sthātra*. Cf. also note 2.

³⁷⁰ *cātrāyusmaṃto*: The other versions lack *ca*.

³⁷¹ *pṛādeśanikā*: Cf. Ma-L *pṛādeśanikā*; Pātim *pāṭidesanīyā*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *pratideśanīyā*; MaVin 396c15, Ma.Ch 554a21. 波羅提提舍尼 (*pṛādeśani*).

³⁷² *sūtre anvardhamāse pṛātimokṣe uddeśam āgacchaṃti*: Cf. Ma-L *anvardhamāsaṃ sūtre pṛātimokṣe uddeśam āgacchanti*; Pātim *uddeśam āgacchati*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *anvardhamāsaṃ pṛātimokṣasūtroddeśam āgacchanti*. Cf. Ma.Ch 554a21f. 半月半月次說波羅提提木叉.

³⁷³ *śayyāsane*: Cf. Ma-L (Pṛātid 1) *śayanāsane*; Pātim (Pāṭid 4) *senāsānāni*; Sa (Pratid 4) *śayyāsānāni*; Mū(HvH) (Pratid 4) *śayanāsānāni*.

³⁷⁴ «*apṛavārito*»: This word, lacking in the other versions, is probably superfluous.

³⁷⁵ *apṛatisaṃvidito*: Cf. Ma-L *saṃveditaṃ*; Pātim *apṛāṭisaṃviditaṃ*; Sa (*pūrv'*) *apṛatisaṃvedakaḥ* (v.l. *pūrvam apṛatisaṃvit samāno*); Mū(HvH) *apṛatisaṃvidite*; Mū *apṛatisaṃvidyate*.

³⁷⁶ *aparigrhīto*: Cf. Ma-L *aparigrhītaṃ*; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

³⁷⁷ *aṃtovāsavastusmi*: Cf. Ma-L *usmim*; Pātim *ajjhārāme*; Sa *antar ārāme*; Mū(HvH) -.

³⁷⁸ *svahastaṃ khādanīyaṃ ... pṛatigrahāpayitvā agilāno khāde*: Cf. Ma-L *agilāno svahastaṃ khādanīyaṃ ... pṛatigrhṇitvā khādeya*; Pātim *khādanīyaṃ ... sahatthā paṭiggahetvā agilāno khādeyya*; Sa *svahastaṃ khādanīya-(bhojanīyaṃ) apṛatigrhīya (antar ārāme) pṛatigrhṇīyār*; Mū(HvH) *khādanīyaṃ bhojanīyaṃ pṛatigrhīya khāded*; MaVin 396c13. 不病(比丘外不受内)自手取, 若嗽 = Ma.Ch 554a23f. 不病(外不受, 於内)受, 若嗽.

³⁷⁹ *pṛatigrahāpayitvā*: Cf. Ma-L *pṛatigrhṇitvā*; Pātim *paṭiggahetvā*; Sa *apṛatigrhīya*; Mū(HvH) *pṛatigrhīya*.

5 gilāno³⁸⁰khāde vā bhuṃje vā³⁸¹prādeśayitavyaṃ tena

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 29.17~19. (Prātid 1) *yo puna bhikṣu āraṇyake śayanāsane viharanto pūrve apratisaṃveditaṃ bahirdhā apratiḡrhitāṃ antovāsavastusmim agilāno svahastam khādanīyaṃ vā bhojanīyaṃ vā pratigrhṇitvā khādeya vā bhuñjeya vā bhuktāvinā³⁸² tena bhikṣunā prati-deśayitavyaṃ* —

95 : Plate 42

recto

- 1 bh[i]kṣuṇā asa[ṃp]r(eyam)³⁸³ m[e] āvusā³⁸⁴ gārahyam³⁸⁵ prādeśanī-
 2 yaṃ³⁸⁶ dharmam³⁸⁷ ā .. + m āpanno taṃ dharmam prādeśayāmi³⁸⁹ •
 3 ayaṃ [p]i + +³⁹⁰ ○ prādeśaniko³⁹¹ • yaḥ punar bhikṣuḥ
 4 any[ātik](ā)y(e)³⁹² bhikṣuṇīye aṃtaraghare³⁹³ pravi-
 5 ṣṭasya³⁹⁴ svahastam khādanīyaṃ bhojanīyaṃ prati-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 29.20~23. *asāpreyaṃ me āyusman gārhyam prātidēśanikaṃ dharmam āpanno / taṃ dharmam pratideśayāmi / ayaṃ dharmo prātidēśaniko ||* (Prātid 2) *yo puna bhikṣur anyātikāye bhikṣuṇīye antaragrham praviṣṭāye agilāno svahastam khādanīyaṃ vā bhojanīyaṃ vā prati-*

verso

- 1 grahāpayitvā³⁹⁶ agilāno³⁹⁷khāded vā bhuṃjed vā³⁹⁸prādeśa-

³⁸⁰ khāde vā bhuṃje vā : Cf. Ma-L khādeya vā bhuñjeya vā; Pātim khādeyya vā bhuñjeyya vā; Sa -; Mū(HvH) khāded bhuṃjīta.

³⁸¹ prādeśayitavyaṃ tena bh(i)kṣuṇā : Cf. Ma-L tena bhikṣuṇā pratideśayitavyaṃ; Pātim paṭidesetabbam tena bhikkhunā; Sa, Mū(HvH) tena bhikṣuṇā ... pratideśayitavyaṃ.

³⁸² bhuktāvinā : No parallels in the other versions.

³⁸³ asa[ṃp]r(eyam) : = Ma-L; Pātim asappāyaṃ (“unbecoming”); Sa asāpreyaṃ; Mū(HvH) asātmyam.

³⁸⁴ āvusā : Probably voc. pl. formed from Pā = BHS. āvusa; cf. Ma-L āyusman; Pātim āvuso; Sa, Mū(HvH) āyusmantah. Cf. also note 171, 222, 347, 400, 428, 440.

³⁸⁵ gārahyam : Cf. Ma-L gārhyam; Pātim gārayham; Sa garhaṇīyam; Mū(HvH) garhya<m>.

³⁸⁶ prādeśanīyaṃ : Cf. Ma-L prātidēśanikaṃ; Pātim pātidēśanīyaṃ; Sa, Mū(HvH) pratideśanīyaṃ.

³⁸⁷ dharmam : = Ma-L; Pātim dhammam; Sa, Mū(HvH) shānam.

³⁸⁸ ā .. + m āpanno : Probably ā(pati)m āpanno; cf. 95v3. āpattim āpanno; Ma-L āpanno; Pātim āpajim; Sa āpanno śmi; Mū(HvH) asmy ... āpanno.

³⁸⁹ prādeśayāmi : Cf. Ma-L pratideśayāmi; Pātim paṭidesemi; Sa, Mū(HvH) pratideśayāmi.

³⁹⁰ + + : Probably dharmo (= Ma-L, Sa, Mū[HvH]); Pātim -. Cf. 95v4. ayaṃ pi dharmo prādeśanīyo; 96v5f. ayaṃ pi dharmah prād[e]śaṇ[ī]ko.

³⁹¹ prādeśaniko : Cf. Ma-L prātidēśaniko; Pātim -; Sa, Mū(HvH) pratideśanīyaḥ.

³⁹² any[ātik](ā)y(e) : A hyper-Sanskritism of MI aññātikā~ < ajñātikā~ (“not related”). Cf. Ma-L (Prātid 2) anyātikāye; Pātim (Pātid 1) aññātikāya; Sa (Pratid 1) ajñātyā; Mū(HvH) (Pratid 1) ajñātikāyā.

³⁹³ aṃtaraghare : Cf. Ma-L antaragrham; Pātim antaragharām; Sa antargrham (v.l. °grhe); Mū(HvH) rathyā gatāyā grāmam.

³⁹⁴ praviṣṭasya : S.e. for praviṣṭāye (= Ma-L), gen. sg. fem.; cf. Pātim pavitthāya; Sa, Mū(HvH) piṇḍāya carantīyā.

³⁹⁵ svahastam khādanīyaṃ ... pratigrahāpayitvā agilāno khāded : Cf. Ma-L agilāno svahastam khādanīyaṃ ... prati-grhṇitvā khādeya; Pātim khādanīyaṃ ... sahatthā paṭiggahetvā khādeyya; Sa svahastam khādanīya- (bhojanīyaṃ) pratigrhṇīyāt; Mū(HvH) svahastam khādanīyaṃ bhojanīyaṃ pratigrhya khāded; MaVin 397c8f. 不病 ... 自手受食, 若噉 = Ma.Ch 554a26f. 不病 ... 受食, 若噉.

³⁹⁶ pratigrahāpayitvā : Cf. Ma-L pratigrhṇitvā; Pātim paṭiggahetvā; Sa pratigrhṇīyāt; Mū(HvH) pratigrhya.

³⁹⁷ khāded vā bhuṃjed vā : Cf. Ma-L khādeya vā bhuñjeya vā; Pātim khādeyya vā bhuñjeyya vā; Sa - (pratigrhṇīyāt); Mū(HvH) khāded bhuṃjīta vā.

³⁹⁸ prādeśayitavyaṃ tena bhikṣuṇā : Cf. Ma-L tena bhikṣuṇā pratideśayitavyaṃ. See note 381.

- 2 yitavyaṃ tena bhikṣuṇā asaṃpreyaṃ³⁹⁹ me āvusā⁴⁰⁰ gāra-
 3 hyaṃ⁴⁰¹ prādeśaniḶkaṃ⁴⁰² dharmāṃ⁴⁰³ āpattim āpanno taṃ dharmāṃ
 4 prādeśayāmi⁴⁰⁴ ayaṃ pi dharmo prādeśanīyo⁴⁰⁵ • bhikṣuḥ
 5 kho punaḥ aṃ[tara]gha[r]e⁴⁰⁶ nimaṃtritaḱā paribhuṃje⁴⁰⁷ tatra⁴⁰⁸

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 29.23~26. *grhṃitvā khādeya* (←*khādoya* [misp]) *vā bhūṃjeva vā bhuktāvīnā*⁴⁰⁹ *tena bhikṣuṇā pratideśayitavyaṃ* — *asaṃpreyaṃ me āyusman gārhyāṃ prādeśanikaṃ dharmāṃ āpanno* / *taṃ dharmāṃ pratideśayāmi* / *ayaṃ pi dharmo prādeśaniko* / (Prātid 3) *bhikṣū kho punar antaragrhe nimaṃtritaḱā bhūñjanti* / *tatra ca*

96 : Plate 43

recto

- 1 [bhi]kṣuṇ[ī] v[ī]śvāsamānarūpā⁴¹⁰ sthitā bhavati iha oda-
 2 naṃ dehi «iha sūpaṃ dehi» iha vyaṃjanaṃ dehi vade⁴¹¹ sarvehi tehi bhikṣuḥi
 3 sā bhikṣuṇī evaḶm asyād⁴¹² vacanīyā : āgamehi⁴¹³ tā-
 4 va {s}tvaṃ bhagini⁴¹⁴ 415 bhikṣu {s}tāvad bhokṣyaṃti • 416 āgamehi tāva {s}tvaṃ
 5 bhagini bhikṣu {s}tāvad bhokṣyaṃti • ekabhikṣu pi ca⁴¹⁷ taṃ⁴¹⁸ bhikṣuṇ(īm)

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 29.26~30.3. *bhikṣuṇī visvāsamānarūpā sthitā bhavati* / *sā evam āha*⁴¹⁹ — *iha odanaṃ dehi. iha sūpaṃ dehi iha vyañjanaṃ dehīti vā vadeya* / *sarvehi tehi bhikṣuḥi sā bhikṣuṇī evam asya vacanīyā* — *āgamaya tāva tvam bhagini! yāvad bhikṣū bhūñjanti* / *ekabhikṣū pi ca tāṃ bhikṣuṇīm*

³⁹⁹ *asaṃpreyaṃ* : = Ma-L; Pātim *asappāyaṃ* (“unbecoming”); Sa *asāṃpreyaṃ*; Mū(HvH) *asātmyaṃ*.

⁴⁰⁰ *āvusā* : Cf. Ma-L *āyusman*; Pātim *āvuso*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *āyusmantah*. Cf. also note 171, 384.

⁴⁰¹ *gārahyāṃ* : Cf. Ma-L *gārhyāṃ*; Pātim *gārayhaṃ*; Sa *garhañiyam*; Mū(HvH) *garhyam*. See note 385.

⁴⁰² *prādeśanikaṃ* : Cf. Ma-L *prādeśanikaṃ*; Pātim -; Sa, Mū(HvH) *pratideśanīyaṃ*.

⁴⁰³ *āpattim āpanno* : Ma-L *āpanno*; Pātim *āpajim*; Sa *āpanno śmi*; Mū(HvH) *asmy ... āpanno*.

⁴⁰⁴ *prādeśayāmi* : Cf. Ma-L *pratideśayāmi*; Pātim *paṭidesemi*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *pratideśayāmi*.

⁴⁰⁵ *prādeśanīyo* : Cf. Ma-L *prādeśaniko*; Pātim *pāṭidesanīyaṃ*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *pratideśanīyaḥ*.

⁴⁰⁶ *aṃ[tara]gha[r]e* : Cf. Ma-L (Prātid 3) *antaragrhe*; Pātim (Pātid 2) *kulesu*; Sa (Pratid 2), Mū(HvH) (Pratid 2) *kulesu*.

⁴⁰⁷ *paribhuṃje* : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim *bhuñjanti*; Sa *bhuñjīraṃs* (v.l. *paribhuṃ*°); Mū(HvH) *bhuñjate*.

⁴⁰⁸ *tatra* : Cf. Ma-L *tatra ca* (“if”); Pātim *tatra ce*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *tatra ced*. Cf. also note 333.

⁴⁰⁹ *bhuktāvīnā* : No parallels in the other versions.

⁴¹⁰ *[v]īśvāsamānarūpā* : Cf. Ma-L *visvāsamāna*°; Pātim *vosāsamānarūpā*; Sa *vyapadiśamānā*; Mū(HvH) *vyapadiśanti*; MaVin 398a13, Ma.Ch 554a29f. 指示 (“gives directions”).

⁴¹¹ *vade* : Cf. Ma-L *ti vā vadeya*; Pātim *tī*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *itī*.

⁴¹² *asyād* : Opt. sg. 3 of *vas* (cf. BHSg, p. 205 a, s.v. *as*; Mvu I 286.13. *asyāt*); cf. Ma-L *asya* (opt. 3. sg.); Pātim -; Sa, Mū(HvH) *syād*.

⁴¹³ *āgamehi* : Cf. Ma-L *āgamaya*; Pātim *apasakka* (“Go away!”); Sa *āgamaya*; Mū(HvH) °*mayasva* (v.l. °*maya*).

⁴¹⁴ *bhagini* : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim, Mū(HvH) *bhagini*; Sa (*bh*)*agini*.

⁴¹⁵ *bhikṣu {s}tāvad bhokṣyaṃti* : S.e. for *bhikṣū yāvad bho*°; cf. Ma-L *yāvad bhikṣū bhūñjanti*; Pātim *yāva bhikkhū bhūñjanti*; Sa *yāvad ime bhikṣavo bhūñjantāṃ*; Mū(HvH) *yāvad ime bhikṣavo bhūñjate*. Cf. also note 422.

⁴¹⁶ *āgamehi tāva {s}tvaṃ bhagini bhikṣu {s}tāvad bhokṣyaṃti* • : These words, lacking in the other versions, are superfluous. Cf. note 423.

⁴¹⁷ *ca* : “if”; cf. Ma-L *ca*; Pātim *ce*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *cen* (*nā*). Cf. also note 333.

⁴¹⁸ *taṃ* : S.e. for *tāṃ*; cf. Ma-L, Sa, Mū(HvH) *tāṃ*; Pātim *taṃ*.

⁴¹⁹ *sā evam āha* : These words, lacking in the other versions, are superfluous.

verso (written by a different scribe)

1 *naivaṃ vade*⁴²⁰ *āgamehi*⁴²¹ *tāva tvaṃ bhagini*⁴²² *bhikṣū tāvad bhokṣyaṃti*

2 ⁴²³*āgamehi tāva tvaṃ bhagini bhikṣū tāvad bhokṣyaṃti sarvehi*⁴²⁴

3 *tehi bhikṣubhiḥ*⁴²⁵ ○ *pratideśayitavyaṃ*⁴²⁶ *asampreyaṃ*⁴²⁷

4 *me āvusa*⁴²⁸ *gārahyam*⁴²⁹ *prātideśanikaṃ*⁴³⁰ *dharmam*⁴³¹ *āpatti-*

5 *m āpanno taṃ dharmam pratideśayāmi*⁴³² *ayam api*

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 30.3~5. *n(°)eva vadeya* — *āgamaya tāva tvaṃ bhagini! yāvad bhikṣū bhuñjantī bhuktāvīhi*⁴³³ *tehi bhikṣūhi pratideśayitavyaṃ* — *asampreyam me āyuṣman! gārahyam prātideśanikaṃ dharmam āpanno / taṃ dharmam pratideśayāmi / ayam pi*

97 : Plate 44

recto

1 *dharmāḥ prād[e]śan[i]ko*⁴³⁴ • 3 *yāni kho punar imāni śaikṣasammat(ā)-*

2 *ni kulāni «bhavaṃti» tatra ca bhikṣuḥ pūrve apravārito*⁴³⁵ *upasaṃkkramitv(ā)*

3 *svahastaṃ khādanīyaṃ bhojanīyaṃ pratigrāhayitvā*⁴³⁶

4 «*agilāno*⁴³⁷ {||}» ⁴³⁸*khāded vā bhuñjed vā*⁴³⁹ *pratideśayitavyaṃ <tena bhikṣuṇā>*

*<asampreyam me āvus[ā]⁴⁴⁰ gārahyam⁴⁴¹ 442 prātideśaki[ni dhar].>*⁴⁴³ *āpattim āpanno*

⁴²⁰ *vade* : Cf. Ma-L *vadeya*; Pātim *paṭibhāseyya*; Sa *pratibhāyat ... vaktum*; Mū(HvH) *pratibhāyat ... vaktum (v.l. vaktavyaṃ)*

⁴²¹ *āgamehi* : Cf. Ma-L *āgamaya*; Pātim *apasakka* (“go away!”); Sa *āgamaya*; Mū(HvH) -.

⁴²² *bhikṣū tāvad bhokṣyaṃti* : S.e. for *bhikṣū yāvad bho°*; cf. Ma-L *yāvad bhikṣū bhuñjanti*; Pātim *yāva bhikkhū bhuñjanti*; Sa *yā(vad i)me bhikṣ(avo bhuñjantāṃ)*; Mū(HvH) - Cf. also note 415.

⁴²³ *āgamehi tāva tvaṃ bhagini bhikṣū tāvad bhokṣyaṃti*: These words, lacking in the other versions, are superfluous (probably a dittography). Cf. note 416.

⁴²⁴ *sarvehi* : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim -; Sa, Mū(HvH) *sarvais*.

⁴²⁵ *bhikṣubhiḥ* : Cf. Ma-L *bhikṣūhi*; Pātim *bhikkhūhi*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *bhikṣubhir*.

⁴²⁶ *pratideśayitavyaṃ* : = Ma-L, Sa, Mū(HvH). Except for here and 97r4, in the other folios of this manuscript, the form *prādeśaya-* is used instead of *pratideśaya-*. This 96th verso, whose script is different from the rest, was probably written by a different scribe later on. See notes 430, 432.

⁴²⁷ *asampreyam* : = Ma-L; Pātim *asappāyam* (“unbecoming”); Sa *asāmpreyam*; Mū(HvH) *asātmyaṃ*.

⁴²⁸ *āvusa* : Cf. Ma-L *āyuṣman*; Pātim *āvuso*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *āyuṣmantah*. Cf. also note 171, 384.

⁴²⁹ *gārahyam* : Cf. Ma-L *gārahyam*; Pātim *gārayham*; Sa *garh(a)ñ(īyam)*; Mū(HvH) *garhyam*. Cf. also note 385.

⁴³⁰ *prātideśanikaṃ* : = Ma-L; Pātim *pāṭidesanīyam*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *pratideśanīyam*. Except for here and 97r4, 5 and v1, in the other folios of this manuscript, the form *prādeśanika~* is used instead of *prātideśanika~ / prātideśanīya~*. See note 426.

⁴³¹ *āpattim āpanno* : Ma-L *āpanno*; Pātim *āpajjimhā*; Sa *āpannā(h) sma*; Mū(HvH) *vayam ... āpannā*.

⁴³² *pratideśayāmi* : = Ma-L; Pātim *paṭidesema*; Sa *pratide(śa)y(āma)*; Mū(HvH) *pratideśayāmo*. In the other folios of this manuscript, the form *prādeśaya-* is used instead of *pratideśaya-*. See note 426.

⁴³³ *bhuktāvīhi* : This word, lacking in the other versions, is superfluous.

⁴³⁴ *prād[e]śan[i]ko* : Cf. Ma-L *prātideśaniko*; Pātim -; Sa, Mū(HvH) *pratideśanīyaḥ*.

⁴³⁵ *apravārito* : = Ma-L (Pratid 4); Mū(HvH) (Pratid 3) *°itah*; Pātim (Pāṭid 3) *animantito*; Sa (Pratid 3) *animantritaḥ*.

⁴³⁶ *pratigrāhayitvā* : Cf. Ma-L *pratigrhṇitvā*; Pātim *paṭiggahetvā*; Sa *pratigrhṇīyāt*; Mū(HvH) *pratigrhya*.

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

⁴³⁸ *khāded vā bhuñjed vā* : Cf. Ma-L *khādeya vā bhuñjeya vā*; Pātim *khādeyya vā bhuñjeyya vā*; Sa - (*pratigrhṇīyāt*); Mū(HvH) *khāded bhuñjīta vā*.

⁴³⁹ *pratideśayitavyaṃ <tena bhikṣuṇā>* : = 94v5~95r1; cf. Ma-L *tena bhikṣuṇā pratideśayitavyaṃ*; Pātim *paṭidesetabbaṃ tena bhikkhunā*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *tena bhikṣuṇā ... pratideśayitavyaṃ*.

⁴⁴⁰ *āvus[ā]* : Cf. Ma-L *āyuṣman*; Pātim *āvuso*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *āyuṣmantah*. Cf. also note 171, 384.

⁴⁴¹ *gārahyam* : Cf. Ma-L *gārahyam*; Pātim *gārayham*; Sa *garhañīyam*; Mū(HvH) *garhyam*. Cf. also note 385.

⁴⁴² *prātideśaki[ni dhar].* : Probably s.e. for *prātideśanika dharmā*; cf. Ma-L *prātideśanikaṃ dharmam*.

5 taṃ dharmā[ṃ] pratideśayāmi • ayaṃ pi dharmo prātideśa-

6 niyo • 4

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 30.5~10. *dharmo prātideśaniko / (Pratid 4) yāni kho punar imāni śaikṣasammatāni kulāni bhavanti tatra ca bhikṣuḥ pūrve apravārito upasamkramitvā svahastam khādanīyaṃ vā bhojanīyaṃ vā pratigrhṇitvā khādeya vā bhujjeva vā bhuktāvinā⁴⁴⁴ tena bhikṣuṇā pratideśayitavyaṃ — asampreyaṃ me āyuṣmaṇ gārhyāṃ prātideśanikaṃ dharmam āpanno / taṃ dharmam pratideśayāmi / ayaṃ pi dharmo prātideśaniko / ...⁴⁴⁵*

verso

1 uddiṣṭā kho punar āyuṣmaṃto catvāri⁴⁴⁶ prātideśanīyā⁴⁴⁷ dharm(āḥ)

2 tatrāyuṣmaṃtānāṃ⁴⁴⁸ pṛcchāmi⁴⁴⁹ kaś cātra pariśuddhāḥ dvetīya-

3 kaṃ⁴⁵⁰ pi⁴⁵¹ tretiyaṃ⁴⁵² ○ pi āyuṣmaṃtānāṃ⁴⁵³ pṛcchāmi⁴⁵⁴ kaś cātra

4 pariśuddhā pariśuddhā (')trāyuṣmaṃtānāṃ⁴⁵⁵ yasmāt tūṣṇī eva-

5 m eto⁴⁵⁶ dhārayāmi • atikkraṃtam idaṃ punaḥ pramādān no

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 30.14~17. *uddiṣṭāḥ kho punar āyuṣmanto catvāraḥ prātideśanikā dharmāḥ / tatrāyuṣmanto pṛcchāmi kacci (')ttha pariśuddhāḥ? dvetīyaṃ pi āyuṣmanto pṛcchāmi kacci (')ttha pariśuddhāḥ? tretiyaṃ pi āyuṣmanto pṛcchāmi kacci (')ttha pariśuddhāḥ? pariśuddhā atrāyuṣmanto yasmāt tūṣṇīm evam etaṃ dhārayāmi /*

98 : Plate 45

recto

1 [pa]dhāritam⁴⁵⁷ ime kho punar āyuṣmaṃto⁴⁵⁷ sātirekapamcā-

2 śa śaikṣakā dharmāḥ⁴⁵⁸ sūtre anvardhamāse prātimokṣe udde-

3 śam āgacchanti • ○ parimaṇḍalanivāsanam⁴⁵⁹ nivā-

⁴⁴³ āpattim āpanno : Ma-L āpanno; Pātim āpajjim; Sa āpanno śmi; Mū(HvH) asmy ... āpanno.

⁴⁴⁴ bhuktāvinā : No parallels in the other versions.

⁴⁴⁵ PrMoSū(Ma-L) 30.11~13. // uddānaṃ // (1) āraṇyakam (2) antaragrhe (3) bhikṣu ca nimantritakāḥ (4) śaikṣa-sammatena caturthaḥ //.

⁴⁴⁶ catvāri : S.e.?.; cf. Ma-L, Sa, Mū(HvH) catvāraḥ; Pātim cattāro.

⁴⁴⁷ prātideśanīyā : Cf. Ma-L prātideśanikā; Pātim pāṭidesanīyā; Sa, Mū(HvH) pratideśanīyā.

⁴⁴⁸ tatrāyuṣmaṃtānāṃ : Cf. Ma-L °manto; Pātim tatth' āyasmante; Sa, Mū(HvH) tatrāham āyuṣmataḥ. Cf. also note 362.

⁴⁴⁹ kaś cātra : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim kacci (')ttha; Sa, Mū(HvH) kaccit sthātra. Cf. also note 2.

⁴⁵⁰ dvetīyakam : Cf. Ma-L dvetīyam; Pātim dutiyam; Sa, Mū(HvH) dvir.

⁴⁵¹ pi : Cf. Ma-L pi āyuṣmanto pṛcchāmi kacci (')ttha pariśuddhāḥ; Pātim pi pucchāmi kacci 'ttha pariśuddhā; Sa, Mū(HvH) api.

⁴⁵² tretiyaṃ : Cf. Ma-L tretiyaṃ; Pātim tatiyam; Sa, Mū(HvH) trir.

⁴⁵³ āyuṣmaṃtānāṃ : Cf. Ma-L °smanto; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -. Cf. also note 362.

⁴⁵⁴ kaś cātra : Cf. Ma-L, Pātim kacci (')ttha; Sa = Mū(HvH) kaccit sthātra. Cf. also note 2.

⁴⁵⁵ āyuṣmaṃtānāṃ : Cf. Ma-L °smanto; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -. Cf. also note 362.

⁴⁵⁶ eto : S.e. for etaṃ?; cf. Ma-L, Pātim etaṃ; Sa, Mū(HvH) etad.

⁴⁵⁷ sātirekapamcāśa śaikṣakā : Cf. Ma-L °pañcāśac chaikṣā; Pātim sekhiyā; Sa, Mū(HvH) sambahulaḥ śaikṣā.

⁴⁵⁸ sūtre anvardhamāse prātimokṣe uddeśam āgacchanti : Cf. Ma-L anvardhamāsam sūtre prātimokṣe uddeśam āgacchanti; Pātim uddeśam āgacchanti; Sa, Mū(HvH) anvardhamāsam prātimokṣasūtroddeśam āgacchanti. Cf. Ma.Ch 554b10f. 半月半月次說波羅提木叉.

⁴⁵⁹ parimaṇḍalanivāsanam : Cf. Ma-L (Śai 1) parimaṇḍalam nivāsanam; Pātim (Sekh 1) parimaṇḍalam; Sa (Śai A12) parimaṇḍalam cīvaram (= Śbh I 196.3); Mū(HvH) (Śai 1) parimaṇḍalan nivāsanam* (v.l. nivāsa°).

4 sayitavyam⁴⁶⁰ śikṣā karaṇīyam*⁴⁶¹ <1> || parimaṇḍalam cī-

5 varam⁴⁶²prāvaraiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyam* 2 ||

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 30.19~22. *ime kho punar āyusmanto sātirekapañcāsac chaikṣā dharmā anvardhamāsam sūtre prātimokṣe uddeśam āgacchanti —*

(Śai 1) *parimaṇḍalam nivāsanam nivāsayiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā |*

(Śai 2) *parimaṇḍalam cīvaram prāvaraiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā |*

verso

1 susaṃvrto aṃtaragharam⁴⁶³ upasaṃkkramiṣyāmīti

2 śikṣā karaṇīyam* 3 || nokṣiptacakṣur⁴⁶⁴ antaragharam⁴⁶⁵

3 upasaṃkkramiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyam 4 ||

4 alpaśabdo antaragharam⁴⁶⁶ upasaṃkkramiṣyāmīti •

5 noccaṃghikāye⁴⁶⁷ nod[gu]ṇṭhikāye⁴⁶⁸ na kāyapracāla-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 30.23~31.3.

(Śai 3) *susaṃvrto antaragrham upasaṃkkramiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā |*

(Śai 4) *na utkṣiptacakṣur antaragrham upasaṃkkramiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā |*

(Śai 5) *alpaśabdo antaragrham upasaṃkkramiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā |*

(Śai 6) *na uccaṃghikāyaṃ antaragrham upasaṃkkramiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā |*

(Śai 7) *na oḡuṇṭhikāya ant° upa° śi° ka° |* (Śai 8) *na utkṣiptikāya ant° upa° śi° ka° |* (Śai 9)

na utkuṭukāya ant° upa° śi° ka° |

(Śai 10) *na khambhakṛto ant° upa° śi° ka° |* (see 99 recto)

(Śai 11) *na kāyapracāla-*

⁴⁶⁰ *nivāsayitavyam* : S.e.? Cf. Ma-L *nivāsayiṣyāmīti*; Pātim *nivāsessāmīti*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *nivāsayiṣyāma iti*.

⁴⁶¹ *karaṇīyam** : Hereafter, this manuscript reads *karaṇīyam* at every occurrence, while the other versions have *karaṇīyā* instead.

⁴⁶² *prāvaraiṣyāmi* : Cf. Ma-L (Śai 2) *prāvaraiṣyāmi*; Pātim (Sekh 2) *pārupissāmi*; Sa (Śai A16) *prāvaraiṣyāma* (v.l. *pravārayiṣyāma*); Mū(HvH) (Śai 8) *prāvaraiṣyāma*.

⁴⁶³ *aṃtaragrham* : Cf. Ma-L (Śai 3) *antaragrham*; Pātim (Sekh 3) *antaraghare*; Sa (Śai B1), Mū(HvH) (Śai 11) *antagrham*.

⁴⁶⁴ *nokṣiptacakṣur* : Cf. Ma-L (Śai 4) *na utkṣi°*; Pātim (Sekh 7) *okkhittacakkhu* (!); Sa (Śai B5) *nōtkṣiptacakṣuṣo*, Mū(HvH) (Śai 14) *anutkṣi°*. For *u-k* < *ut-k*, see Abhis III 128, s.v. *u-k*.

⁴⁶⁵ *antaragharam* : Cf. Ma-L *antaragrham*; Pātim *antaraghare*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *antagrham*.

⁴⁶⁶ *antaragharam* : Cf. Ma-L (Śai 5) *antaragrham*; Pātim (Sekh 13) *antaraghare*; Sa (Śai B7), Mū(HvH) (Śai 13) *antagrham*.

⁴⁶⁷ *uccaṃghikāye* : “with a loud laugh”; cf. Ma-L (Śai 6) *uccaṃghikāyaṃ*; Pātim (Sekh 11) *ujjagghikāya* (v.l. *ujjhaggī°*); Sa (Śai B10) *uccaṃghikāyā* (= Śbh I 194.3); Mū(HvH) (Śai 23) *ujjaṅghikāyā* (v.l. *ujjaṃghikāyā*); Mvy 8546 *ujjaṅghikāyā*; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 297, l. 3. *nōccaṃghikā*, l. 7. *uccaṃghayikā*. These are hyperforms of Pā. *ujjagghikā* < Skt. **uj-jakṣikā*~ (“laughing”), derived from *ud* + *√jakṣ* (“laugh”, a reduplicated form of *√has*); cf. Abhis II 366, note § 42.29, (2); III 130, s.v. *uc-caggha-*. In 99r4, another hyper-form *uccaṃghikāye* occurs: cf. note 476.

⁴⁶⁸ *ud[gu]ṇṭhikāye* : “with the head covered”; cf. Ma-L (Śai 7) *oḡuṇṭhikāya*; Pātim (Sekh 23) *oḡuṇṭhito*; Sa (Śai B15) *ava(guṇḍikākr̥tā*; Mū(HvH) (Śai 16) *udguṇṭhikāyā* (= Mvy 8540); BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 297, ll. 3, 8. *oḡuṇṭhikā*; Śbh I 196.2. *udguṇṭhikāyā kr̥tena*. Cf. also Abhis I 9, note § 1.10, (1); III 170, s.vv. *oḡuṇṭhikā*~, *oḡuṇṭhikā-kr̥tā*~; BHSD, s.vv. *avaguṇṭhikā*, *udguṇṭhikā-kr̥tā*. In 95r5, another form *oḡuṇṭhikāye* occurs: cf. note 477.

99 : Plate 46

*recto*1 k[o]⁴⁶⁹ na ś[ī]rṣapracālak[o]⁴⁷⁰ na khaṃbhakṛto⁴⁷¹ na bāhuvikṣepakō⁴⁷²2 aṃtaraghare⁴⁷³ upasaṃkkramiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyam*3 susaṃvrto (')ntaraOghare⁴⁷⁴ niṣīdiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇī-4 yam* || notkṣiptacakṣu sulpaśabdo⁴⁷⁵ nocchaṃghikāye⁴⁷⁶ n(') o-5 guṇṭhikāye⁴⁷⁷ no⁴⁷⁸ osaktikāye⁴⁷⁹ na pallasthikāye⁴⁸⁰Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 31.3~5. *kam antaragrham upasaṃkkramiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā* /(Śai 12) *na śīrṣapracālakam antaragrham upasaṃkkramiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā* /*ib.* 31.2. (Śai 10) *na khaṃbhakṛto antaragrham upasaṃkkramiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā* /*ib.* 31.6~20(Śai 13) *na bāhuvikṣepakam antaragrham upasaṃkkramiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā* / ...⁴⁸¹(Śai 14) *susaṃvrto antaragrhe niṣīdiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā* /(Śai 15) *na utkṣiptacakṣu antaragrhe niṣīdiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā* /(Śai 16) *alpaśabdo antaragrhe niṣīdiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā* /(Śai 17) *na uccagghikāya antaragrhe niṣīdiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā* /(Śai 18) *na oḡuṇṭhikāya antaragrhe niṣīdiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā* /(Śai 19) *na utkṣiptikāya antaragrhe niṣīdiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā* /(Śai 20) *na osaktikāya antaragrhe niṣīdiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā* /(Śai 21) *na pallasthikāya antaragrhe niṣīdiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā* /

⁴⁶⁹ *kāyapracālak[o]*: Cf. Ma-L (Śai 11), Mū(HvH) (Śai 26) °*pracālakam*; Pātim (Sekh 15) °*ppacālakam*; Sa (Śai B35) °*pracālakā*; Mvy 8550, Śbh I 194.2. °*pracālakam*.

⁴⁷⁰ *ś[ī]rṣapracālak[o]*: Cf. Ma-L (Śai 12), Mū(HvH) (Śai 28), Śbh I 194.3. °*pracālakam*; Pātim (Sekh 19) *śīrṣapracālakam*; Sa (Śai B33) *śīrṣapracālakā*; Mvy 8552. °*pracālakam*; MaVin 401b22 (Śai 12), Ma.Ch 554b23 (Śai 12) 搖頭.

⁴⁷¹ *khaṃbhakṛto*: = Ma-L (Śai 10); cf. Pātim (Sekh 21) *khaṃbhakato*; Sa (Śai B17) *kambhākr̥tā*; Mū(HvH) (Śai 25) *skambhākr̥tā* (v.l. *khaṃbhākr̥tā*); Mvy 8549 *skambhākr̥tā*; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 297, ll. 4, 9. *khaṃbha*; MaVin 401a22 (Śai 10), Ma.Ch 554b21 (Śai 10) 叉腰.

⁴⁷² *bāhuvikṣepako*: Cf. Ma-L (Śai 13) °*pakam*; Pātim (Sekh 17) *bāhuppacālakam*; Sa (Śai B29) *bāhupracālakā* (v.l. °*lakam*); Mū(HvH) (Śai 27), Mvy 8551, Śbh I 194.2. °*cālakam*; MaVin 401c5 (Śai 13), Ma.Ch 554b24 (Śai 13) 掉臂.

⁴⁷³ *aṃtaraghare*: Cf. Ma-L *antaragrham*; Pātim *antaraghare*; Sa, Mū(HvH) *antargrham*.

⁴⁷⁴ (')*ntaraghare*: Cf. Ma-L (Śai 14) °*grhe*; Pātim (Sekh 5) °*ghare*; Sa (Śai B1), Mū(HvH) (Śai 11) *antargrham*.

⁴⁷⁵ *sulpaśabdo*: S.e. for *alpaśabdo*. The characters for *a* and *su* resemble each other in the Brahmi script.

⁴⁷⁶ *uccaṃghikāye*: Cf. Ma-L (Śai 17) *uccagghikāya*. See note 467.

⁴⁷⁷ *oḡuṇṭhikāye*: Cf. Ma-L (Śai 18) °*kāya*; Pātim (Sekh 24) *oḡuṇṭhito*; Sa (Śai B16) *avagunḍikākr̥tā*; Mū(HvH) -. See note 468.

⁴⁷⁸ *no*: Presumably s.e. for *no<tkṣiptikāya na>*; cf. Ma-L (Śai 19) *na utkṣiptikāya* ... (Śai 20) *na*.

⁴⁷⁹ *osaktikāye*: Cf. Ma-L (Śai 20) °*kāya*; Pātim -; Sa (Śai B22) *atyastikākr̥tā*; Mū(HvH) (Śai 18), Mvy 8542 *utsaktikāya*; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 297, l. 8. *osaktikā*; Śbh I 196.2. *uccastikāya*; MaVin 403a11 (Śai 20), Ma.Ch 554c2 (Śai 20) 抱膝 (“hugging one’s knees”). Cf. also BHSD, s.v. *utsaktikā*; Pachow 2000: 172; Nolot 1991: 332, n. 8; PrMoSū(Sa) 307, n. 11; MaVin 403a11f. 抱膝者, 手抱衣抱不得抱膝.

⁴⁸⁰ *pallasthikāye*: A hyper-form of Pā = BHS *pallasthikā*~< Skt *paryastikā* (> Pkt. *pallattiyā*, *palha*°); cf. Ma-L (Śai 21), Pātim (Sekh 26) *pallasthikāya*; Sa (Śai B28) *pallasthikākr̥tā*; Mū(HvH) (Śai 20), Mvy 8544, Śbh I 196.2 *paryastikāya*; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 297, l. 8. *pallasthikā*.

⁴⁸¹ PrMoSū(Ma-L) 31.7~11 // *uddānam* // (1) *nivasanam* (2) *prāvaranam* (3) *susaṃvrto* (4) *caḡṣuḡ* (5) *śabda* (6) *nocagghikā* (7) *na oḡuṇṭhikā* (8) *notkṣiptikā* (9) *na utkuṭukā* (10) *na khaṃbha* (11) *na kāya* (12) *na śīrṣa* (13) *na bāhukena* // *prathamō vargaḡ* //.

verso

1 na khambhakṛto⁴⁸² antaraghare⁴⁸³ 484 niṣaṇṇaḥ hastakaukṛtyaṃ

2 vā⁴⁸⁵ pādakaukṛtyaṃ vā kariṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇī-

3 {yā •}yaṃ satkṛOtya piṇḍapātaṃ pratigrhṇiṣyāmī-

4 ti śikṣā karaṇīyam* ⁴⁸⁶satkṛtyaṃ⁴⁸⁷ piṇḍapātaṃ pari-

5 bhumjīsyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyam* || samasūpikaṃ⁴⁸⁸

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 31.21~32.1.

(Śai 22) na khambhakṛto antaragrhe niṣīdiṣyāmīti śi<kṣā> karaṇīyā /

(Śai 23) na antaragrhe niṣaṇṇo hastakaukṛtyaṃ pādakaukṛtyaṃ vā kariṣyāmīti śikṣā kara-
nīyā / ...⁴⁸⁹

(Śai 24) satkṛtya piṇḍapātaṃ pratigrhṇiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /

(Śai 25) samasūpam

100 : Plate 47

recto

1 piṇḍapāta[m] na stūpakāraḥ na jihvāniḥsāraḥ⁴⁹⁰ na

2 apakhaṇḍakāraḥ⁴⁹¹ piṇḍapātaṃ paribhumjīsyāmī-

3 ti śikṣā karaṇīyam* atimahamtehi kava-

4 lehi⁴⁹² piṇḍapātaṃ na kabaḍācchedakaṃ⁴⁹³ piṇḍapātaṃ

⁴⁸² *khambhakṛto* : = Ma-L (Śai 22). Cf. note 471.

⁴⁸³ *antaraghare* : Read *antaraghare* <niṣīdiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyam na antaraghare>. Cf. Ma-L *antaragrhe niṣīdiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /* (Śai 23) *na antaragrhe*. The scribe seems to have dropped “niṣīdiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyam na antaraghare” due to haplography.

⁴⁸⁴ *niṣaṇṇaḥ hastakaukṛtyaṃ vā pādakaukṛtyaṃ vā kariṣyāmīti ...* : = Ma-L; MaVin 403c9f. (Śai 23) 不得動手足坐家內。應當學; Ma.Ch 554c5 (Śai 23) 不動手足家內坐。應當學。No parallels in the other versions.

⁴⁸⁵ *vā* : Ma-L lacks this word.

⁴⁸⁶ *satkṛtyaṃ piṇḍapātaṃ paribhumjīsyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyam** : No parallels in the other versions.

⁴⁸⁷ *satkṛtyaṃ* : For the extension of a gerund by *-m*, see Karashima 2002: § 21.2 (*abhiruhyam*); Abhis III 48, § 29.8 (*dādiyam*, *prāvāriyam*); EV I (2nd ed.)336 (ad Th 1242; *pavibhajjam*); DhP(tr.N) 157 (ad DhP 392; *sakkaccaṃ*, *upapajjam*, *peccaṃ*). Cf. Ma-L (Śai 24), Sa (Śai C1), Mū(HvH) (Śai 40) *satkṛtya*; Pātim (Sekh 27) *sakkaccaṃ*.

⁴⁸⁸ *samasūpikaṃ* : = Sa (Śai C5) (v.l. °*sūpam*), Mū(HvH) (Śai 42); cf. Ma-L (Śai 25) *samasūpam*; Pātim (Sekh 29) *sama-sūpakam*; Sa(hy) *samasuvi(piṇḍavadah)*.

⁴⁸⁹ PrMoSū(Ma-L) 31.24~27. || *uddānam* || (14) *susaṃvrto* (15) *caḥṣuḥ* (16) *śabda* (17) *noccagghikā* (18) *na oḡuṇṭhikā* (19) *notkṣiptikā* (20) *nossaktikā* (21) *na pallatthikā* (22) *na khambha* (23) *na hastapādakaukṛtyena* || *dviṭṭyo vargaḥ* ||.

⁴⁹⁰ *jihvāniḥsāraḥ* : Cf. Ma-L (Śai 29) *jihvānicāraḥ*; Pātim (Sekh 49) *jivhānicchāraḥ*; Sa (Śai C18), Mū(HvH) (Śai 60) *jihvāniścāraḥ*; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 3 *jihvā* [30]; MaVin 404c1 (Śai 28), Ma.Ch 554c10 (Śai 28) 吐舌.

⁴⁹¹ *apakhaṇḍakāraḥ* : Probaby a hyper-form of *avaḡaṇḍa°*. Cf. Ma-L (Śai 28), Pātim (Sekh 46) *avaḡaṇḍa°* (“stuffing out [the cheeks]”); Sa, Mū(HvH) -, BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 3 *avaḡaṇḍa* [29]; MaVin 404b16 (Śai 27) 口中迴食; Ma.Ch 554c9 (Śai 27) 口中頰食.

⁴⁹² *kavalehi* : Cf. Ma-L (Śai 30) *kavaḡehi*; Pātim (Sekh 39) *kabaḡam*; Sa (Śai C8) *ālopam*; Mū(HvH) (Śai 49~50) *ālopam*; Sa(hy) (*nadimahāṇi(t)a*) (°)lo//; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 3 (*nātimahanta*) [30]; MaVin 404c15 (Śai 29), Ma.Ch 554c11 (Śai 29) (大)團飯食.

⁴⁹³ *kabaḡācchedakaṃ* : Cf. Ma-L (Śai 33) *kavaḡacch°*; Pātim (Sekh 45) *kabaḡāvacch°*; Sa (Śai C12) *kabaḡācchedakaṃ*; Mū(HvH) (Śai 62) *kavaḡacch°*; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 4 *kavaḡacch°* [34]; MaVin 405a25 (Śai 32), Ma.Ch 554c14 (Śai 32) 齧半食.

5 (na) ⁴⁹⁴anāgatehi kabaḍehi mukhadvāraṃ vivari-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 32.1~7. piṇḍapātāṃ paribhumjīṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /

(Śai 26) na stūpakāraḥkaṃ piṇḍapātāṃ paribhumjīṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /

(Śai 27) nāvākīrṇakāraḥkaṃ piṇḍapātāṃ paribhumjīṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /

(Śai 29) na jihvānicāraḥkaṃ piṇḍapātāṃ paribhumjīṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /

(Śai 28) nāvagaṇḍakāraḥkaṃ piṇḍapātāṃ paribhumjīṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /

(Śai 30) nātimahantehi kavadehi piṇḍapātāṃ paribhumjīṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /

ib. 32.10. (Śai 33) na kavadaḥchedakāṃ piṇḍapātāṃ paribhumjīṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /

ib. 32.8. (Śai 31) nānāgate kavade mukhadvāraṃ vivari-

verso

1 ṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyam* na kabaḍavikṣepakaḥ⁴⁹⁵

2 na sakabaḍena mukhena vācaṃ bhāṣīṣyāmīti • na pā-

3 tranirlekhakaṃ⁴⁹⁶ ○ piṇḍapātāṃ paribhumjīṣyāmīti

4 na hastanirlekhakaṃ⁴⁹⁷ na aṅgulinirlekhakaṃ na caccu-

5 kārakaṃ⁴⁹⁸ na sussukārakaṃ⁴⁹⁹ piṇḍapātāṃ na gulugu-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 32.8~9. ṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /

(Śai 32) na kavadoṭkṣepakaṃ piṇḍapātāṃ paribhumjīṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /

ib. 32.11~21

(Śai 34) na sakavaḍena mukhena vācaṃ bhāṣīṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā / ...⁵⁰⁰

(Śai 35) na pātranirlekhakaṃ <piṇḍapātāṃ> paribhumjīṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /

(Śai 36) na hastanirlekhakaṃ piṇḍapātāṃ paribhumjīṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /

(Śai 37) nāṅgulinirlekhakaṃ piṇḍapātāṃ paribhumjīṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /

(Śai 38) na caccukārakaṃ piṇḍapātāṃ paribhumjīṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /

(Śai 39) na surusurukārakaṃ piṇḍapātāṃ paribhumjīṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /

(Śai 40) na gulugu-

⁴⁹⁴ anāgatehi kavadehi : Cf. Ma-L (Śai 31) *anāgate kavade*; Pātim (Sekh 41) *anāhaṭe kabaḷe*; Sa (Śai C10), Mū(HvH) (Śai 51), Mvy 8575 *nānāgate ālope*; Śbh I 196.5. *nānāgate khādanīye*; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 3 *nānāgata* [32]; MaVin 404c28 (Śai 30) 張口待飯食; Ma.Ch 554c12 (Śai 30) 張口待食.

⁴⁹⁵ kabaḍavikṣepakaḥ : Cf. Ma-L (Śai 32) *kavadoṭkṣepakaṃ*; Pātim (Sekh 44) *piṇḍukkhepakāṃ*; Sa, Mū(HvH) -; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 4 *kavadoṭkṣepaka* [33]; MaVin 405a13 (Śai 31) 擲團食; Ma.Ch 554c13 (Śai 31) 挑團食.

⁴⁹⁶ -nirlekhakaṃ : A hyper-form of *nirlekhakaṃ*; *namul* absolutive of *nir-√lih* (“lick”); cf. EV II (2nd ed.) 76. Cf. Ma-L (Śai 35) -*nirlekhakaṃ*; Pātim (Sekh 52) -*nillekhakaṃ*; Sa (Śai C20), Mū(HvH) (Śai 68), Mvy 8587, Śbh I 198.5 -*avalekhakaṃ*; Sa, v.l. // [l]. *khakaṃ*.

⁴⁹⁷ -nirlekhakaṃ: Cf. Ma-L -*nirlekhakaṃ*. See the preceding note.

⁴⁹⁸ *caccukārakaṃ* : Probably s.e. for *cuccu*^o; cf. Ma-L (Śai 38) *cuccukārakaṃ*; Pātim (Sekh 50) *capucapukārakaṃ*; Sa (Śai C14) *cuccukārakaṃ* (v.l. *cucukā*^o); Mū(HvH) (Śai 54) *cuccuk(ā)«ra»kaṃ*; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 7. *cuccu*; Mvy 8577 *cuccukārakaṃ*.

⁴⁹⁹ *sussukārakaṃ* : Cf. Ma-L (Śai 39) *surusurukārakaṃ*; Pātim (Sekh 51) *surusurukārakaṃ*; Sa (Śai C13) *śusukārakaṃ*; Mū(HvH) (Śai 55), Mvy 8578 *śusukārakaṃ*; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 7. *surusuru*.

⁵⁰⁰ PrMoSū(Ma-L) 32.12~15. // *uddānaṃ* // (24) *satkṛtya* (25) *samasūpa* (26) *na stūpa* (27) *nāvākīrṇa* (28) *nāvagaṇḍa* (29) *na jihvā* (30) *nātimahantaṃ* (31) *nānāgatam* (32) *na kavadoṭkṣepaka* (33) *na kavadaḥchedaka* (34) *na sakavaḍena mukhena vācaṃ* // *ṭṛṭīyo vargaḥ* //.

101 : Plate 48

*recto*1 rukāraḥṣaṃ⁵⁰¹ na siṭṭhāpakāraḥṣaṃ⁵⁰² na hastanidhūnaḥṣaṃ⁵⁰³ na2 ativelam parasya pātraṃ nidhyāyisyāmīti⁵⁰⁴ uddhyā-3 yanakarmāṃṭaṃ⁵⁰⁵ upādāya⁵⁰⁶ śikṣā karaṇīyaṃ •

4 pātrasaṃjñī pīṇḍapātāṃ paribhūṃjisyāmīti na

5 dinnādinnāni⁵⁰⁷ vyaṃjanāni odanena⁵⁰⁸ pracchādayi-

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 32.21~33.4.

lukāraḥṣaṃ pīṇḍapātāṃ paribhūṃjisyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /(Śai 42) *na siṭṭhāpakāraḥṣaṃ pīṇḍapātāṃ paribhūṃjisyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /*(Śai 41) *na hastanidhūnaḥṣaṃ pīṇḍapātāṃ paribhūṃjisyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /*(Śai 43) *nāṭivelam parasya pātraṃ nidhyāyisyāmi odhyāyanakarmatām upādāyēti śikṣā karaṇīyā /*(Śai 44) *pātrasaṃjñī pīṇḍapātāṃ pari<bhūṃj>isyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā /*

(Śai 45) (see 101 verso)

(Śai 46) *na dinnādinnāni vyaṃjanāni odanena pracchādayi-**verso*1 śyāmīti bh[ū]yokarmāntam⁵⁰⁹ upādāya • agilāno

⁵⁰¹ *gulugurukāraḥṣaṃ* : S.e. for *gulugulu*^o?; cf. Ma-L (Śai 40) *gulugulu*^o; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 7. *gulugulu*; Pātim -; Sa (Śai C15) *phuphukkāraḥṣaṃ*; Mū(HvH) (Śai 56~57) *thutthukāraḥṣaṃ ... phuphuphukāraḥṣaṃ*; Mvy 8579~80 *thutthukāraḥṣaṃ ... phuphukāraḥṣaṃ*.

⁵⁰² *siṭṭhāpakāraḥṣaṃ* : = Ma-L (Śai 42). A hyper-form for *siṭṭhāvākāraḥṣaṃ* (< Skt. *siktha* “boiled rice” + *namul* absolute of *ava-√kṣ* “scatter around”; cf. EV II [2nd ed.] 76). Cf. BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 8. *siṭṭha* [43]; Pātim (Sekh 48) *siṭṭhāvākāraḥṣaṃ*; Sa (Śai C22) *śistavikiraṃ* (v.l. *sikta*//); Sa(hy) *sistavani* + +; Mū(HvH) (Śai 58) *siṭṭhaprthakāraḥṣaṃ*; Mvy(I/F) 8520 *siṭṭha*^o (Mvy 8582 *siktha*^o); MaVin 406b19 (Śai 40), Ma.Ch 554c22 (Śai 40) 落飯. 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 *hastanidhūnaḥṣaṃ* : Cf. Ma-L (Śai 41) *nirdhūtaḥṣaṃ* (s.e. for *ūnaḥṣaṃ*); BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 8. *hasta* [42]; Pātim (Sekh 47) *hatthanidhūnaḥṣaṃ* (v.l. *ōdhūn*^o); Sa (Śai C21) *hastāvadhūnaḥṣaṃ*; Sa(hy) *hastavi[t](w)[na]///*; Mū(HvH) (Śai 65) *hastasandhūnaḥṣaṃ*; Mvy 8589 *saṃdhūnaḥṣaṃ*; MaVin 406c3 (Śai 41), Ma.Ch 554c23 (Śai 41) 振手.

⁵⁰⁴ *iti* : Cf. Ma-L -.

⁵⁰⁵ *uddhyāyanakarmāṃṭam upādāya* : Cf. Ma-L (Śai 43) *odhyāyanakarmatām up*^o. Both *-karmāṃṭam* and *-karmatām* are hyper-Sanskritisms of MI *kammatā*~ (< Skt. *kāmyatā*); cf. note 505. Cf. also BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 8. *nōdhyāyana*; Pātim (Sekh 38) *ujjhānasaññī*; Sa (Śai C26) *avadhyānapreṣiṇa*; Mū(HvH) (Śai 69), Mvy 8594 *ino*; MaVin 406c17 (Śai 42), Ma.Ch 554c24 (Śai 42) 嫌心. *Uddhyāyana* is a hyper-form of Pā *ujjhāyana* (“complaining”), a derivative of *ujjhāyati* (“complains”; cf. DP, s.v.; Abhis III 171, s.v. *o-jjhāya*-, *o-dhyāya*-).

⁵⁰⁶ *upādāya*: Cf. Ma-L *upādāyēti*.

⁵⁰⁷ *dinnādinnāni* : An *āmreḍita*-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 (Śai 46) *dinna*^o; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 9. *chādayati* [47]; Pātim (Sekh 36), Sa (Śai C25), Mū(HvH) (Śai 46), MaVin 407b13 (Śai 45), Ma.Ch 554c27 (Śai 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 *pracchādayisyāmi* : = Ma-L; cf. Pātim *paṭicchādessāmi*; Sa *praticchādayisyāmo*; Mū(HvH) *ōsyāmah*.

⁵⁰⁹ *bh[ū]yokarmāntam* : Cf. Ma-L *bhūyo āgamanakarmatām*. Both *-karmāntam* and *-karmatām* are hyper-Sanskritisms of MI *kammatā*~ (< Skt. *kāmyatā*); cf. note 505. Cf. Pātim *bhīyokamyatām*, Sa *bhūyaskāmatām*; Mū(HvH) *bhūyahkā*^o; MaVin 407b13f., Ma.Ch 554c27. 更望得.

2 ⁵¹⁰sūpaṃ c(°) odanaṃ ca ⁵¹¹vyamaṅjanaṃ ca ⁵¹²vijñāpiya vijñā[p]i-

3 ○ ya khādiṣyāmīti⁵¹³ • na saṃsthi-

4 te<na>⁵¹⁴ pāṇinā pāṇisthālakam⁵¹⁵ grhṇiṣyāmīti⁵¹⁶ śi-

5 kṣā karaṇ[ī]yā • [na s]aṃsthitena⁵¹⁷ pātrodakam antara⁵¹⁸

Cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 33.4~5.

ṣyāmi bhūyo āgamanakarmatām upādāyēti śikṣā karaṇīyā |

ib. 33.1~3 (Śai 45) na agilāno odanaṃ vā sūpaṃ vā vyañjanaṃ vā ātmārthāya kulehi vijñāpetvā vā vijñāpāyetvā vā piṇḍapātāṃ paribhūṃjīsyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā |

ib. 33.7~8 (Śai 48) na sasitthena pāṇinā pāṇiyasthālakam pratigrhṇiṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā |

l
ib. 33.6 (Śai 47) na sasittham pātrodakam prthivyām niṣiñciṣyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā |

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.

(1)[1]5 : Plate 49

recto

1 + + + t. rāhulaṃ s[u]gataputram* varcaghaṭesmin i

2 + [dḥ]. nāpi «ti» vācāṃ atibahū me • tasmā samagrā ⁵¹⁹sati-

3 tās sagauravā bhūtvānyamanyeṣu paricaratha dharmarā-

4 jaṃ ⁵²⁰adhiga«mi»ṣya .. ○ acy(u)taṃ padaṃ viśokam • buddho vipa-

5 śyī upagamyā pāṭal[ī] : ⁵²¹śikhī pu[m]ṇḍarī + .. m(ū)le

6 sāla[s](ya) m[ū]le puna (v)[i]śvabhur jinaḥ ⁵²²śi + + + +

7 [I]. ..

⁵¹⁰ sūpaṃ c(°) odanaṃ ca : Probably s.e. for *sū° v(°) od° vā*; cf. Ma-L (Śai 45), Sa (Śai C24) *odanaṃ vā sūpaṃ vā*; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 9. *vijñāpti* [46]; Pātim (Sekh 37) *sūpaṃ vā odanaṃ vā*; Mū(HvH) -; MaVin 407a27 (Śai 44), Ma.Ch 554c26 (Śai 44) -.

⁵¹¹ vyamaṅjanaṃ ca : Probably s.e. for *vy° vā* = Ma-L. No parallels in the other versions.

⁵¹² vijñāpiya vijñā[p]iya : Read <ātmārthāya> *vijñāpiya vijñāp<ay>iya*; cf. 70r3. *vijñāpitvā vijñāpayitvā*; Ma-L *ātmārthāya kulehi vijñāpetvā vā vijñāpāyetvā vā*; Pātim *attano atthāya viññāpetvā*; Sa *ātmārtham ... vijñāpayiṣyāma*; Sa(hy) [ā]ṭ[ma] (a)rddhai *vijñāveya*; Mū(HvH) -; MaVin 407a27, Ma.Ch 554c26. 爲己索 (“asks for [food] for one’s self”).

⁵¹³ khādiṣyāmīti : Cf. Ma-L *paribhūṃjīsyāmīti*; Pātim *bhūñjissāmī ti*; Sa, Mū(HvH) -.

⁵¹⁴ saṃsthitē<na> : S.e. for *sasitthena* (< sa + siktha~; “with boiled rice attached”). Cf. Ma-L (Śai 48) *sasitthena*; BhiVin(Ma-L) § 253, p. 298, l. 9. *sasitthena* [49]; Pātim (Sekh 55) *sāmisena* (“soiled by food”); Sa (Śai C23), Mū(HvH) (Śai 70) *sāmiṣeṇa*; MaVin 407b25 (Śai 46), Ma.Ch 554c28 (Śai 46) 膩(手). See note 517.

⁵¹⁵ pāṇisthālakam : S.e. for *pāṇiyasth°* (= Ma-L); Pātim *pāṇiyathālakam*; Sa *pāṇiyasthā°* (v.l. *pāṇīyāll*); Mū(HvH) *udakasthālakam*.

⁵¹⁶ grhṇiṣyāmīti : Cf. Ma-L *parig°*; Pātim *paṭiggahessāmī ti*; Sa *pratigrhṇiṣyāma iti*; Mū(HvH) *grahīṣyāma iti*.

⁵¹⁷ [s]aṃsthitena : S.e. for *sasittham* = Ma-L (Śai 47); Pātim (Sekh 56) *sasitthakam* (“with boiled rice attached”); Sa (Śai C29), Mū(HvH) (Śai 72) *sāmiṣam*; MaVin 407c14 (Śai 47), Ma.Ch 554c29 (Śai 47) 殘食.

⁵¹⁸ antara : Probably *antara*(102recto)(*ghare niṣiñci*)*ṣyāmīti* (see Karashima 2008: 78). Cf. Ma-L *prthivyām niṣiñc-iṣyāmīti*; Pātim *antaraghare chaḍḍessāmī ti*; Sa *antarghe chorayiṣyāmo* Mū(HvH) *a° cchorayiṣyāmah*; MaVin 407c14, Ma.Ch 554c29. 棄地 (“pours [the leftovers] onto the ground”).

⁵¹⁹ satitās : Probably s.e. for *sahitās*; cf. Ma-L *sahitāh*.

⁵²⁰ adhiga«mi»ṣya .. : Probably *adhigamiṣya(tha)*; cf. Ma-L *adhigacchatha*.

⁵²¹ śikhī pu[m]ṇḍarī + .. m(ū)le : Unmetrical. Read *śikhī <jinaḥ> puṇḍari(kasya) mūle?*

⁵²² śi + + + + : Presumably *śi(rīṣamūle)*.

r2~4: cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 4.27~28.

*tasmt̄ samagrāḥ sahitāḥ sagauravāḥ bhaviyā anyamanyam paricaratha /
dharmarājam adhigacchatha nirvāṇam atandritā acyutam padam aśokam //25//*

r4~6: cf. Mhmvr(T) 13.17~20.

*aśokam āsṛitya jino Vipāśyī Śikhī jinaḥ puṇḍarīkasya mūle
śālasya mūle upagamyā Viśvabhūt śīrīṣamūle Krakucchandabrāhmaṇaḥ*

r4~6: cf. DN II 4.6~12. *Vipaśī ... pātaliyā mūle abhisambuddho. Sikhī ... puṇḍarīkassa
mūle abhis°. Vessabhū ... sālassa mūle abhis°. Kakusandho ... sammāsambuddho śīrīsassa
mūle abhisambuddho.*

verso

1 ⁵²³.[r]. k. su .. + hmaṇo buddho ca kanakamun(i) udu .. +

2 nyagrodhamūle puna kāśyapo jinaḥ aśvatthamūle .. +

3 saptamo muni[r ma]Ḫhāmu[n](i)ḥ śākyamuniḥ «sa» gautamo •

4 sukhaṃ buddhānam utpādaḥ sukhaṃ dharmasya deśanā sukhaṃ

5 (saṃ)ghas(y)a sāmagrī samagrāṇāṃ tapaḥ sukhaṃ [•] etā ..

6 + + + + [n]irdiṣṭaṃ pu[r](u)ṣadamyasārathinā • yatra [s].

v1~3: cf. Mhmvr(T) 13.20~24.

*śīrīṣamūle Krakucchandabrāhmaṇaḥ
buddhaś ca Kanakamunī udumbare nyagrodhamūle upagamyā Kāśyapah
aśvatthamūle muni Śākyapuṅgavaḥ upetya bodhiṃ samavāpya Gotamaḥ*

cf. DN II 4.10~17. *Kakusandho ... sammāsambuddho śīrīsassa mūle abhisambuddho.
Konāgamano ... sammāsambuddho udumbarassa mūle abhisambuddho. Kassapo ...
sammāsambuddho nigrodhassa mūle abhis°. ahaṃ ... sammāsambuddho assatthassa mūle
abhis°*

v4~5: cf. Uv 30.22

*sukhaṃ buddhasya cōtpādaḥ sukhaṃ dharmasya deśanā /
sukhaṃ saṃghasya sāmagrī samagrāṇāṃ tapaḥ sukhaṃ //* (cf. also Dh 194, PDhp

68)

v6: cf. PrMoSū(Sa) 262.6. *prātimokṣaḥ samuddiṣṭo nirdiṣṭaś ca maharṣiṇā*

(116) : Plate 50

recto

1 + + + ⁵²⁴[t]ā śikṣaṃ .. + + + + .. dāḥ saptānām +

2 + + + .. lā mahā + . ā .. lokāgrādhipatī ..

3 + + (r)mākhyātāni ⁵²⁵« + + » {•} ni + + sūtra vistareṇa kṛtaṃ saṃ-

4 gh(e)na po[ṣ](a) + ○ ārabhadhvaṃ niṣk[ra]madhvaṃ yujyadhvaṃ b[u]-

5 ddhaśāsane • dhunātha mṛ .. + .ai + + + + + +

6 ku[m]jā[r]. + .[o «hy a»]smin dharmavina .. + + + + + + + +

r1~4: cf. PrMoSū(Ma-L) 37.28~31. *ete sapta daśabalā mahāprajñā amitabuddhī saptānām*

⁵²³ .[r]. k. su .. + hmaṇo : Probably (K)r(a)k(a)su(ndabrā)hmaṇo.

⁵²⁴ The akṣaras tā śi(kṣ)am are visible in the photograph of the verso, as the upper margin of this side is folded underneath itself.

⁵²⁵ « + + » {•} ni : Probably (uktā)ni.

*samyaksaṃbuddhānāṃ abhinnān ... lokākhyādhipatīnāṃ dharmākhyānāni uktāni / uddiṣṭam
prātimokṣasūtram / kṛtaṃ saṃghena poṣadham / āryāḥ śikṣāṃ ciraṃ pālayantu /
śāsanam saṃtu saṃsthātu /*

r3~4: cf. PrMoSū(Sa) 263.6. *uddiṣṭa(h) prātimokṣaḥ kṛtaḥ saṃghena saṃghena poṣatha
iti //*

r4~6: cf. PrMoSū(Sa) 262.10~263.2.

ārabhadhvam niṣkramadvam yujyadvam buddhaśāsane •

*dhunadvam mrtyunaḥ saṅnyam naḍāgāram iva kuñjaraḥ 13 (cf. Uv 4.37; SHT X
100)*

yo hy asmim dharmavinaye

PrMoSū(Mū.HvH) Schlußverse 15~16a ≡ SBV II 162.13f., Divy 68.19f., 138.26f. etc.

ārabhadhvam niṣkrāmata yujyadvam buddhaśāsane /

dhunīta mrtyunaḥ senyan (SBV, Divy saṅnyam) naḍāgāram iva kuñjaraḥ //

yo hy asmin dharmavinaye

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

ārabhatha nikkamatha yuñjatha buddhaśāsane

dhunātha maḍcuno senam naḍāgāram va kuñjaro //

yo imasmim dhammavinaye

verso

1 .. ṣya[t]. + + .. jātis. + ///

2 yasyā(r)th. (s)[ū](t)[r](a)m uddiṣṭam ya ..

3 lam anurakṣ[eth](a) ○ + [lam]vā camarī yathā • kṣ. m. bhavatu

4 + + r.. dev. .. + .. na jinānāṃ vardhatu pūjā

5 + + + + .. e [ci]ra[m*] + + .. ca [de]śitā dharmā yena ..

6 + + + + + + + + + + + + + .. catvāri sutīrthe + +

v1~3: cf. PrMoSū(Sa) 263.2~5. *apramatto bhaviṣyati*

prahāya jātiṣaṃsāraṃ duḥkhasyāntaṃ sa yāsyati 14 (cf. Uv 4.38)

yasyārthe sūtram uddiṣṭam yasyārthe poṣathaḥ kṛtaḥ

tac chilam anurakṣadvam vālāgraṃ camarō yathā 15

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

apramattaṣ carīṣyati /

prahāya jātiṣaṃsāraṃ duḥkhasyāntaṃ karīṣyati //

PrMoSū(Mū.HvH) Schlußverse 18

yasyārthe sūtram uddiṣṭam yasyārthe poṣathaḥ kṛtaḥ

tac chilam anurakṣārthaṃ bālāgraṃ camarī yathā //

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

apramatto vihessati

pahāya jātiṣaṃsāraṃ dukkhas' antaṃ karissati //

A folio written by a different scribe (a supplement to Folio 106 *recto*?) : Plate 51

A

1 uddiṣṭā kho punar āyusmaṃto dvau⁵²⁶ dharmas cānudharma-

2 ś ca ○ tatrāyusmaṃtānāṃ⁵²⁷ pṛcchā-

3 mi ○⁵²⁸kaś cātra pariśuddhā dvitī-

4 yakam pi tṛtīyakam pi āyusmaṃtānāṃ pṛcchām.

5 kaś cātra pariśuddhāḥ pariśuddhā (')trāyusma[m] +

PrMoSū(Ma-L) 35.20f. *uddiṣṭāḥ kho punar āyusmanto dve dharmāḥ dharmo
anudharmaś ca । tatrāyusmanto pṛcchāmi : kacci (')ttha pariśuddhāḥ dviṭṭiyam pi
āyusmanto pṛcchāmi kacci (')ttha pariśuddhāḥ tṛtīyam pi āyusmanto pṛcchāmi kacci
(')ttha pariśuddhāḥ pariśuddhā atrāyusmanto yasmāt tūṣṇim evam eta dhārayāmi ।*

B

Blank

⁵²⁶ *dvau* : Cf. Ma-L *dve*; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -. Cf. notes 284, 298.

⁵²⁷ *āyusmaṃtānāṃ* : Cf. Ma-L *°smanto*; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -. Cf. also note 362.

⁵²⁸ *kaś cātra* : Cf. Ma-L *kacci (')ttha*; Pātim, Sa, Mū(HvH) -. Cf. also note 2.

Symbols used in the Transliteration

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

Symbols used in Notes

~ = stem of a word, e.g. *dharmā~*.

- = absence of word(s)

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

$\alpha < \beta$ = the form α comes from β

$\alpha \in \beta$: α is a scribal error, a corruption, or a hyper-form of β

α (Chinese) $\in \beta$ (Sanskrit *etc.*): the Sanskrit word β was misunderstood by the Chinese translator(s) and translated as α

$\alpha \neq \beta$ = β does not agree with α

$\alpha \approx \beta$ = β is almost the same as α

$\alpha \leftarrow \beta$ = the Sanskrit form β should be changed to α

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Abhis = *Die Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ: Verhaltensregeln für buddhistische Mönche der Mahāsāṃghika-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 University, (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XIII), 3 vols.

AMg = Ardhamaṅgadhī

ARIRIAB = *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University*

- BhiVin(Ma-L) = *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya, including Bhikṣuṇī-Prakīrṇaka and a Summary of the Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*, ed. Gustav Roth, Patna 1970 (*Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series* 12).
- BHS = a Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit word, listed in BHS D
- BHS(D, G) = Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, 2 vols., New Haven 1953: Yale University Press; repr. Delhi, 1970: Motilal Banarsidass.
- BLSF = *The British Library Sanskrit Fragments: Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia*, editors-in-chief, Seishi Karashima and Klaus Wille, Tokyo, vol. I (2006), vol. II (2009): International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University.
- Bollée, Willem B.
2002 *The Story of Paesi (Paesi-kahāṇayam): Soul and Body in Ancient India: A Dialogue on Materialism*, Text, Translation, Notes and Glossary, Wiesbaden 2002 Harrassowitz (Beiträge zur Kenntnis südasiatischer Sprachen und Literaturen 8).
- CPD = *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, begun by V. Trenckner, ed. D. Andersen *et al.*, Copenhagen, Bristol, 1924~2011.
- Dhp(tr.N) = *The Word of the Doctrine (Dhammapada)*, translated with an introduction and notes, Oxford 1997; Reprinted with corrections Oxford 2000: The Pali Text Society (Pali Text Society Translation Series, No. 46).
- DhVin = The Chinese translation of the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas, T. 22, No.1428 四分律, trans. Buddhayaśas and Zhu Fonian 竺佛念, 408~413 C.E.
- Divy = *The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends*, ed. Edward Byles Cowell and Robert Alexander Neil, Cambridge 1886: The University Press.
- DN = *The Dīgha Nikāya*, ed. T.W. Rhys Davids and J. E. Carpenter, 3 vols., London 1890~1911: The Pali Text Society.
- DP = *A Dictionary of Pāli*, by Margaret Cone, Oxford 2001-: The Pali Text Society.
- EV I (2nd ed.) = *The Elders' Verses I, Theragāthā*, translated with an introduction and notes by K. R. Norman, 2nd edition, Lancaster 2007: The Pali Text Society.
- EV II (2nd ed.) = *The Elders' Verses II, Therīgāthā*, translated with an introduction and notes by K. R. Norman, 2nd edition, Lancaster 2007: The Pali Text Society.
- Geiger, Wilhelm
1916 *Pāli, Literatur und Sprache*, Straßburg (Grundriß der Indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde I, 7)
- von Hinüber, Oskar
2001 *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick, 2.*, erweiterte Auflage, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Karashima, Seishi
2002 "Some features of the language of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*", in: ARIRIAB V: 43~66.
2006 "The *Prātimokṣa-Vibhaṅga* of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins in Early Western Gupta Script", in: *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 3, ed. Jens Braarvig *et al.*, Oslo: Hermes Publishing, pp. 161~176.
2008 "Fragments of a Manuscript of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the Mahāsāṃghika-(Lokottara)vādins (1)", in: ARIRIAB XI: 71~90 + 25 plates.
- KP(V-D) = *The Kāśyapaparivarta: Romanized Text and Facsimiles*, ed. Margarita I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya in collaboration with Seishi Karashima and Noriyuki Kudo, Tokyo 2002: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica V).
- Ma.Ch = PrMoSū(Ma.Ch)
Ma-L = PrMoSū(Ma-L)
- MaVin = The Chinese translation of the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghikas, T. 22, No.1425 摩訶僧祇律, trans. Buddhahadra and Faxian 法顯, 418 C.E.
- Mhmvr(T) = *Ārya-mahā-māyūrī Vidyā-rājñī*, edited by Shūyo Takubo, Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- MI = Middle Indic

misp = misprint

Ms = manuscript

MśVin = The Chinese translation of the Vinaya of the Mahīśāsakas, T. 22, No.1421 彌沙塞部和醯五分律, trans. Buddhajīva, Zhu Daosheng 竺道生 et al., 424 C.E.

Mū = *Prātimokṣa-Sūtram (Mūlasarvāstivāda)* in: *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit: Prātimokṣa Sūtra and Bhikṣukarmavākya*, ed. Anukul Chandra Banerjee, Calcutta 1977: The World Press Private Limited.

Mū(HvH) = Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber, “Das Bhikṣu-Prātimokṣasūtra der Mūlasarvāstivādin: anhand der Sanskrit-Handschriften aus Tibet und Gilgit unter Berücksichtigung der tibetischen und der chinesischen Übersetzungen kritisch herausgegeben” (unpublished).

Mvu = *Le Mahāvastu*, ed. Émile Senart, 3 vols., Paris 1882~1897: Imprimerie nationale; Reprint: Tokyo 1977: Meicho-Fukyū-Kai.

Mvy = *Hon'yaku Myōgi Daishū* 翻譯名義大集 (*Mahāvvyutpatti*), ed. Ryōzaburō Sakaki, 2 vols., Kyoto 1926; Reprint: Tokyo 1962: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan 鈴木學術財団.

Mvy(I/F) = Yumiko Ishihama 石濱裕美子 and Yoichi Fukuda 福田洋一 (eds.), *A New critical edition of the Mahāvvyutpatti: Sanskrit-Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionary of Buddhist Terminology* 新訂翻譯名義大集, Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 1989 (Materials for Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionaries 1).

Nolot, Édith

1991 *Règles de discipline des nonnes bouddhistes: Le Bhikṣuṅṭvinaya de l'école Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*, traduction annotée, commentaire, collation du manuscrit, Paris: de Boccard (Publications de l'Institut de civilisation indienne 8/60).

Oberlies, Thomas

2001 *Pāli: A Grammar of the Language of the Theravāda Tipiṭaka: With a Concordance to Pischel's Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, Berlin : W. de Gruyter (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 3).

Pā = Pāli

Pāc = *Pācattikaṃ* (PrMoSū[Ma-L]), *Pācittiyaṃ* (Pātim)

Pachow, W. 巴宙

1955, ²2000 *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa on the Basis of its Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Pali Versions*, Santiniketan: The Sino-Indian Cultural Society; Rev. & enlarged ed., Delhi ²2000: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers (Buddhist Traditions, v. 31).

Pāt = *Pāyantikā* (PrMoSū[Sa])

Pāṇid = *Pāñidesanīya* (Pātim)

Pātim = *The Patimokkha*, edited by William Pruitt, translated by K. R. Norman, Oxford 2001; Reprinted with corrections 2003: Pali Text Society

Pāy = *Pāyantikā* (PrMoSū[Mū]); *Pāyattikā* (PrMoSū[Mū.HvH])

PDhp = Margaret Cone, “Patna Dharmapada: Part I: Text”, in: *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 13(1989), pp. 101~217.

Pkt = Prakrit

Pratid = *Pratideśanīya* (PrMoSū[Sa], PrMoSū[Mū.HvH])

Prātid = *Pratideśanika* (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(Ma.Ch) = The Chinese translation of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the Mahāsāṃghikas, T. 22, No. 1426, 摩訶僧祇律大比丘戒本, trans. by Buddhahhadra (359~429 C.E.)

PrMoSū(Ma-L) = *Prātimokṣasūtram of the Lokottaravādimahāsāṃghika School*, ed. Nathmal Tatia, Patna 1976 (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 16).

PrMoSū(Mś) = The Chinese translation of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the Mahīśāsakas, T. 22, No. 1422, 彌沙塞五分戒本, trans. by Buddhajīva (佛陀什), 423 C.E.

PrMoSū(Mū) = Mū

PrMoSū(Mū.HvH) = Mū(HvH)

PrMoSū(Sa) = Sa

PTSD = Rhys Davids, T. W. & W. Stede, eds., *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*, London, 1921~25.

- Sa = Georg von Simson, *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*, Nach Vorarbeiten von Else Lüders und Herbert Härtel herausgegeben, Teil II: Kritische Textausgabe, Übersetzung, Wortindex sowie Nachträge zu Teil I, Göttingen 2000 (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 11; Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist.Klasse 238).
- Sa(hy) = Georg von Simson, “Eine Prātimokṣasūtra-Handschrift in hybrider Sprache”, in: *Bauddhavidyāsudhākarah: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Swistal-Odendorf 1997: Indica et Tibetica Verlag (Indica et Tibetica 30), pp. 583–604.
- Śai = *Śaikṣadharmā* (PrMoSū[Ma-L], PrMoSū[Sa], PrMoSū[Mū], PrMoSū[Mū.HvH])
- Śbh I = *Śrāvakabhūmi, The First Chapter, Revised Sanskrit Text and Japanese Translation*, ed. Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group (The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, Taisho University), Tokyo 1998: The Sankibō Busshorin (Taishō University Sōgo Bukkyō Kenkyūjo, 4).
- SBV = *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu, being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*, 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* (Pātim)
- SHT = *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, ed. Ernst Waldschmidt *et al.*, Wiesbaden/Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1965- (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Bd. 10), T. 1-.
- Skt = Sanskrit
- SN = *Samyutta-Nikāya*, ed. L. Feer, 5 vols., London 1884~1898: The Pali Text Society.
- SWTF = *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, ed. H. Bechert, K. Röhrborn, J.-U. Hartmann, Göttingen 1973ff.
- T = *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, ed. Junjirō Takakusu, Kaikyoku Watanabe, 100 vols., Tokyo 1924~1934.
- Th = *Theragāthā*, in: *Thera- and Therī-Gāthā*, ed. H. Oldenberg and R. Pischel, rev. K. R. Norman, L. Alsdorf, London, 2nd ed., 1966: The Pali Text Society.
- Uv = *Udānavarga*, hrsg. von Franz Bernhard, Göttingen 1965~1990: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 10), 3 vols.; Bd. III, Der tibetische Text, hrsg. von Champa Thupten Zongtse unter Mitarbeit von Siglinde Dietz.
- Whitney = William Dwight Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar: Including both the Classical Language and the Older Dialects of Veda and Brāhmaṇa*, ²1889 Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard Univ. Press; Second Edition; ⁵1924 Leipzig; Reprint: Delhi 1962: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Wogihara, Unrai
1908 *Asaṅga's Bodhisattvabhūmi, ein dogmatischer Text der Nordbuddhisten, nach dem Unikum von Cambridge, im allgemeinen und lexikalisch untersucht*, Dissertation Straßburg, Leipzig.

The *Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa*: A Transliteration of the Nepalese Manuscript A (5)¹

Noriyuki KUDO

CONVENTIONS:

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

TRANSLITERATION:

SL163.8 na yathānye(71r.4)ṣā² vākyānā³ devadattam ane<na> gr̥hṇam̐ti |
a<<ka>>smākaṃ⁴ ya;⁵ ○ stūpe dattam apaharati | tasyāparimāṇaṃ pāpaṃ teṣāṃ
upamāṇaṃ na teṣā⁶ pramāṇaṃ kriyati⁷ | yat{a} ki(71r.5)ñcid asmim̐ pṛthavīmaṇḍale⁸

¹ As to proceeding parts of this transliteration see Kudo 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012. For convenient reference to Lévi's edition, the pagenumber 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 *yathānyeṣāṃ*.

³ For *vākyānām*.

⁴ Lévi: *a. ka. smākaṃ* (Sic. ms.); Notebook A (34.13): *a-ka-smākaṃ*. Read *asmākaṃ*.

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 *pṛthivī*^o.

- sarvasatvānām hiraṃṇyasuvarṇṇam⁹ dhanadhānyam vastrālamīkārādīnām¹⁰ tasya sarvasya yaḥ kaścīd apahāraṃ karoti | tasmāt pāpāt prabhūtataṃ pā(71v.1)paṃ ya¹¹ stūpe dattam apaharati |
- 163.13 eṣo śmākaṃ siddhāntaḥ | yaḥ¹² stūpe dattaṃ tat{a} stūpa eva yoḥyaṃ | yaḥ¹³ saṃghe tat saṃgha evopayoḥyaṃ | eṣa svasiddhāntaḥ¹⁴ pratiṣṭhāpitaḥ |
- 163.15 yathā'(71v.2)smākaṃ Bhagavān* {} tiṣṭhati tasmimś ca kṛtaḥ adhikāraḥ aprameyavipākaḥ | kathaṃ punar bāhyā ye devās teṣāṃ datte kiṃ puṇya¹⁵ phalata <> evaṃ saṃpratipannaḥ | (71v.3) buddhaḥ pariṇirvṛtaḥ¹⁶ asmākaṃ devā tiṣṭhanti |
- 163.19 eṃvāñ ca brūmaḥ | yas tiṣṭhati yed¹⁷ eva bhaktā vā dhūpaṃ vā puṣpaṃ vā gandhaṃ vā dīpaṃ vā bhojanam vā vastram vā a(71v.4)laṅkāraṃ vā hiraṇyaṃ vā suvarṇṇam vā prayacchanti kiṃ aḥyaṃ¹⁸ hastena hastam na pratigrhṇanti¹⁹ |
- 163.22 atha na pratigrhṇanti <> buddhasya teṣāñ ca kaḥ prativiśeṣa(71v.5)ḥ |
atha mataṃ <> devānāṃ vārccās²⁰ teṣāṃ pratikṛtayaḥ puḥyaṃnti²¹ |asmākaṃ api buddhasya dharmasāraṃ tiṣṭhati | gunāś²² ca puḥyante²³ | pratimāstūpāyās²⁴ ca dhūpaṃ gandhaṃ pra{{..}}²⁵(72r.1)tiyacchanti²⁶ | evaṃ kṛte śmākaṃ eva datte stūpeṣu praṇyaṃ²⁷ asti puḥyate²⁸ yasmān na pratigrhṇanti²⁹ tasmān nāsti devā³⁰ |
- 163.27 athāsti kasmān na pratigrhṇanti³¹ |
kiñ kāraṇaṃ | u(72r.2)ktaṃ Bhagavatā³² <>

9. For *hiraṇya*^o [additional *anusvāra* before class nasal].

10. For *ālaṅkāradīnām* [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 *svasiddhāntaḥ* [*s* > *ś*].

15. For *puṇyaṃ* [omission of *anusvāra*].

16. For *parinirvṛtaḥ* [*n* > *ṇ*].

17. A scribal error for *yad*.

18. For *ayaṃ* [*y* > *j*].

19. Read *pratigrhṇanti* [*hṇ* > *hn*; 3rd, pl]. Lévi emends: *pratigrhṇāti* [3rd, sg]; Notebook A (34.24): *pratigrhṇanti* [3rd, pl].

20. For *vārcās* (*vā* + *arcās*).

21. Read *pūjyante* [*ū* > *u*] as is emended by Lévi; Notebook A (34.26): *pūjyanti*.

22. For *gunāś*. [*ṇ* > *n*].

23. Read *pūjyante* [*ū* > *u*].

24. Lévi emends: *pratimāsu yac ca*; and notes (163, fn. 3): Ms. *pratimāstūpāyās ca* = Notebook A (34.27).

25. Here is one letter erased.

26. Lévi edits: *dhūpaṃ gandhaṃ puṣpaṃ pratiyacchanti* = Notebook A (ibid.). However, *puṣpaṃ* is not found in the manuscript.

27. For *puṇyaṃ* [*pu* > *pra*].

28. For *pūjyante*. [*ū* > *u*].

29. For *pratigrhṇanti* [*hṇ* > *hn*].

30. For *devāḥ* [omission of *visarga*]. Lévi emends: *devāḥ*; Notebook A (34.29): *devāḥ*.

31. For *pratigrhṇanti* [*hṇ* > *hn*].

32. Source unknown.

trayāṇām samavāyena dakṣiṇā mahāphaḌlā bhavati | yadi tāvad dāttā³³ bhavati | yac
ca dravyam dātavyam hira{ṇa}nyasuvārṇṇādi tac ca bhava;(72r.3)ti | ye dekṣiṇīyāḥ³⁴
pratigrāhakāḥ {} devā manuṣyā Ḍ vā evan teṣām trayāṇām api samavāyair nna³⁵
[SL 164] dānaprati{nā}dānam hastena hastam dattam mahāphala³⁶ (72r.4) bhavati |
yady āṣṭi eva kiñ ca na pratigrḥnanti³⁷ taḌ bhaktānām |
atha pratigrḥnanti³⁸ tad bhaktānām |
atha na pratigrḥnanti³⁹ kiṃ kṛtvā :|
atha yuktaṃ(72r.5)ñ⁴⁰ ca bhaktānām⁴¹ eva⁴² krodha⁴³ kāraṇam |
atha teṣām satam⁴⁴ nāsmākaṃ deva⁴⁵ kruddha iti | ucyate | yadi na kruddhāḥ kiṃ⁴⁶
atha⁴⁷ na pratigrḥnanti⁴⁸ | tasmān nāsti sa <> idaṃ ṛṭīyaṃ (72v.1) kāraṇam |

164.6 yac ca teṣān⁴⁹ devānām devabhaktāḥ suvarṇṇam hiraṇyam vā pādāmūle
prayacchanti | eva⁵⁰ devasya ko bandhana⁵¹ iti | taṃ⁵² yadi tasya dhūpeṣu puṣpeṣu
gandheṣu vā mālyā(72v.2)kāre⁵³ vopayujyati⁵⁴ | yena tu dattam tasya puṇyaphaḌlam
asti | atha ta⁵⁵ dravyam anyair eva grḥitaṃ <>
yo dātā tasya puṇyaphalaṃ nāsti <> ye ca grḥnanti⁵⁶ va(72v.3)yaṃ devabhaktā
devapāḍopajīvina devo vayaṃ⁵⁷ ceḌkam iti | teṣān⁵⁸ adattādane aiśvarya deva

33. For *dātā*.

34. For *dakṣiṇīyāḥ* [a scribal error for *da > de; ṇ > n*].

35. For *na*.

36. For *mahāphalaṃ*.

37. For *pratigrḥnanti* [*hṇ > hn*].

38. For *pratigrḥnanti* [*hṇ > hn*].

39. For *pratigrḥnanti* [*hṇ > 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 *satyaṃ* as is emended by Lévi; Notebook A (34.36): *satyaṃ*.

45. For *devaḥ* [omission of *visarga*].

46. Additional *anusvāra* insertion.

47. For *arthaṃ*.

48. For *pratigrḥnanti* [*hṇ > hn*].

49. For *teṣām* [class nasal for *anusvāra*].

50. Read *evam* as is emended by Lévi; 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 na(h) iti* (what the relationship between God and us)?

52. Lévi emends: *tad yadi*; Notebook A (39.40): *taṃ yadi*.

53. Lévi emends: *mālyakare*; Notebook A (34.40): *mālyā kare*.

54. For *vopayujyate* = Lévi; Notebook A (34.40): *vopayujyati*.

55. For *tad*.

56. For *grḥnanti*.

57. Additional *anusvāra* insertion before a class nasal.

58. Additional *anusvāra* insertion before a class nasal.

ca dravyāpahāre⁵⁹ | kiñ kāraṇam<<n*>> devadravyam anyena grā(72v.4)hyaṃ iha devasya {}|} semo⁶⁰ vā devadravyam grhyet* praṭivīṣiṣṭo va <|> ni⁶¹ ca devasya kaścit tulyam⁶² prāg eva viśiṣṭataras⁶³ ca <|>
te prativiṣṭatarāḥ⁶⁴ |;

(72v.5) kiñ kāraṇam <|> yasmāt te tasya pranipātam⁶⁵ kurvanti | devapādaiś ca svapanti <|> yadā te viśiṣṭatarāḥ kiṃm⁶⁶ arthaṃ deva⁶⁷ prasādyate |

^{164.17} atha tatra devadravyagrahane⁶⁸ pāpan⁶⁹ nāṣṭi <<|>> (73r.1) anyeṣām⁷⁰ api staskarāṇām ye cauryeṇa jīvanti | ta⁷¹ dravyaparvasvāpahāraṇ ca kurvanti | teṣām api pāpan⁷² nāṣṭi |

^{164.19} atha mata⁷³ pitā putra⁷⁴ rājā prabhūtya⁷⁵ ca yathā dravyam yathā caityadravyam⁷⁶ pu(73r.2)tro grhṇāti⁷⁷ | bhūtyam⁷⁸ vā rājño dravyam grhṇanti⁷⁹ | tathā vayam aṅpi <|>
evam apy ayuktaṃ | kiñ kāraṇam <|> putrasya tu pitur dravya⁸⁰ grhṇato⁸¹ mahān* pātakah <|>

^{59.} This sentence is confused. Lévi emends: *teṣām adattadevaiśvārye 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 ai>> {... ..} śvārya {...} deva {...} dravyāpahāre |

^{60.} A scribal error for *samo*.

^{61.} Read *vā* | *na*.

^{62.} Read *tulyah* as emended by Lévi; Notebook A (35.2): *tulyam*.

^{63.} For *viśiṣṭataras* [*ś* > *s*].

^{64.} Read *prativiṣṭatarāḥ*.

^{65.} For *pranipātam* [*n* > *n̄*].

^{66.} Additional *anusvāra* insertion before class nasal.

^{67.} For *devaḥ* [omission of *visarga*].

^{68.} For *-grahāne* [*n̄* > *n*].

^{69.} For *pāpaṃ* [class nasal for *anusvāra*].

^{70.} For *anyeṣām* [*ny* > *ṅy*].

^{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): *tadravya-*.

^{72.} For *pāpaṃ* [class nasal for *anusvāra*].

^{73.} For *mātā*. Notebook A (35.7) gives alternative reading in square brackets: *ata mataṃ [mātā] pitā* (*m* is circled by a scribe).

^{74.} For *putro*.

^{75.} Read *bhr̥tyas* (‘servant of a king, a minister’) as is emended by Lévi; Notebook A (35.7-8): *pra{..}bhr̥tya ca [śca]*.

^{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 (→ bhr̥tyo) vā rājño dravyam*”.

^{77.} For *grhṇāti*.

^{78.} Read *bhr̥tyo*.

^{79.} Read *grhṇāti* (3rd, sg.). Lévi emends so; Notebook A (35.9): *grhṇa(→ā){n}ti* (adding a long vowel sign after *akṣara hṇa* and canceling *n* of ligature *nti*).

^{80.} For *dravyam*.

^{81.} For *grhṇato*.

- 164.23 a { ta } tha matam̄ (73r.3) rājā⁸² bhūtyavad⁸³ dravyam̄ iti |
 ucyate | rājā adattānam̄⁸⁴ ○ gr̄hnamānam̄⁸⁵ putra⁸⁶ ca pitā ca dadyāt{a} pitā prāḡ eva
 bhutyam̄⁸⁷ | tasmād̄ asmadartha⁸⁸ so (')yad⁸⁹ dr̄ṣṭāntaḥ <|> yaś⁹⁰ ca (73r.4) evam̄
 sampratiṣṭannā vyaṃ devabhaktāḥ tatpādopajī○vinaś ca tasmād̄ gr̄hnāma⁹¹ iti |
 tac cāyuktaḥ | kiñ kāraṇam̄ | na ca devabhaktā⁹² te devadravyam̄ gr̄(73r.5)hnam̄ti⁹³ |
 atha gr̄hnam̄nti⁹⁴ na te tadbhaktā bhavam̄ti | na kaścid̄ bha{{kti}}ktimān*
 devadravyam̄ gr̄hnām̄ti⁹⁵ <|> na teṣā⁹⁶ devabhaktir bhavati | devadravye teṣām̄
 bhaktir na teṣā⁹⁷ ki(73v.1)ñci popan⁹⁸ na vidyate |
- 164.31 ye ⁹⁹adattam̄ gr̄hnam̄ti¹⁰⁰ | kiñ kāraṇam̄ <|> pūrvaṣibhiḥ mūle chinne tapau vṛkṣam̄
 śākhāyām̄¹⁰¹ | yasya luptapitṛsneha¹⁰² tasya itaro janaḥ |
 etad̄ uktaḥ bha(73v.2)vati | yo ḍattam̄ devadravyam̄ gr̄hnānti¹⁰³ na tasya ki○ñcid̄
 akaraṇīyam̄ | kiñ kāraṇam̄ | na te bhaktimataḥ¹⁰⁴ | atha te bhakti(SL 165)mantaḥ <|>
 śatravaḥ kaivam̄¹⁰⁵ pitā de(73v.3)vasya |

(To be continued)

82. Lévi emends: *rāja-*; Notebook A (35.10): *rājā*.

83. Read *-bhṛtyavad*.

84. Read *adattānām* = Notebook A (35.11).

85. For *gr̄hnamānam* [*hn* > *hn*].

86. For *putram*.

87. Read *bhṛtyam*.

88. For *-artham* = Notebook A (35.12).

89. Lévi emends: *'yam* = Notebook A (35.12).

90. Lévi emends: *yac caivam*; Notebook A (35.12): *yaś ca evam*.

91. For *gr̄hnāma iti*.

92. Read *-bhaktās* = Notebook A (35.14).

93. For *gr̄hnam̄ti* [*hn* > *hn*].

94. For *gr̄hnam̄ti* [*hn* > *hn*].

95. Read *gr̄hnānti* (3rd, sg.) [*hn* > *hn*; additional *anuavāra* before class nasal].

96. For *teṣām*.

97. For *teṣām*.

98. Read *kiñcit pāpan*. 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 *pā-* [*-t pā-* > *po-*]. Notebook A (35.12): *ñci po-* → *ñci<<t*>> pā-* (a vowel sign *-o* is cancelled).

99. Hiatus remains.

100. For *gr̄hnam̄ti* [*hn* > *hn*].

101. Lévi reads: *tapovṛkṣaśākhāyām*; Notebook A (35.18): *tapau vṛkṣam̄ śākhāyām*. See Lévi'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.

102. For *-snehas*; Notebook A (35.18): *-sneha(h)*.

103. For *gr̄hnānti* [*hn* > *hn*; *tī*, a scribal error].

104. Read *bhaktimantaḥ* = Notebook A (35.19).

105. Lévi emends: *ke khyāpitā*; Notebook A (35.20): *ke vam pitā* (*vam* is underlined).

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS:

KV = *Karmavibhaṅga*.

KVU = *Karmavibhaṅga-upadeśa*.

Notebook = Notebook transcribing Manuscript A of the *Karmavibhaṅga*, No. 5-265 (microfilm B94/3), pages 34 (National Archives of Nepal).

SL = Sylvain Lévi 1932.

SECONDARY SOURCES:

KUDO Noriyuki 工藤 順之

- 2009 "The *Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa*: A Transliteration of the Nepalese Manuscript A (1)," in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2008*, vol. XII, pp. 21-27.
- 2010 "The *Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa*: A Transliteration of the Nepalese Manuscript A (2)," in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2009*, vol. XIII, pp. 75-85.
- 2011 "The *Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa*: A Transliteration of the Nepalese Manuscript A (3)," in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2010*, vol. XIV, pp. 25-33.
- 2012 "The *Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa*: A Transliteration of the Nepalese Manuscript A (4)," in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2011*, vol. XV, pp. 105-116.

Lévi, Sylvain

- 1932 *Mahākarmavibhaṅga (La Grande Classification des Actes) et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa (Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga), 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: *Karmavibhaṅga*, *Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa*, 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 Aṣṭasāhasrikā *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 **bosisatvasa aṇugraho karoti** in Gāndhārī becomes *sarvasattvānām anugrahaṃ kartukāmaḥ* 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 praṇatīa bhagavado ṣavaga ya**, which I (HF) understand as "out of this arise the śrāvakas of the Lord". After **ado**, the usual **prasavati** is required and since two out of four letters are identical I take **praṇatīa** as a clerical blunder based on a distorted exemplar. AS renders the term correctly as *prasūtā*, but what arises is now *bodhisattvānām mahāsattvānām anuttarā samyaksambodhiḥ* instead of **bhagavado ṣavaga**. 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)rvañudhammana 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 **viñāṇo aṇicaṃ 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 koṣiga** at the end of 5-46 lasts until another **puṇavaro koṣiga** 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 **civarapeḍavada-śayasana-gilaṇa-praceabheṣa[ja]**, which has an unmistakable parallel in the AS version: *cīvarapiṇḍapāta-śayanāsana-glāna-pratyayabhaiṣajya-pariṣkāraṇ*, 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 **baho bhaṃte 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 *puṇyābhisamkāreṇa* 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 **paḍisamyuteṇa** 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 prañaparamida bhuyasamatrae bhavaṇa parivuri gacheṣati**. AS first had difficulties with *bhavaṇa*, rendering *bhuyasamatrae bhavaṇa* by a simple *bhāvayan* in the first case, but by *bhūyasyā mātrayā bhāvanām* 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 *samyaksambuddhatvaṃ*; in 5-58 a simple **bosae** was changed to *anuttarāvāḥ*

samyaksaṃbodheḥ;

in 5-63 **śikṣeantī** is enlarged to *anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau śikṣeran*, to cite only the clear cases.

(Harry Falk)

Conventions

+++ (1-22) = Line 1-21 has lost bark needed for ca. 3 akṣaras 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 akṣaras 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

AS = the Sanskrit version of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*; cf. Wogihara 1932, Vaidya 1960.

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

AsP.tr. = Conze 1958.

AsP.tr.II = Conze 1973.

Krsh(2010) = Seishi Karashima, *A Glossary of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, Tokyo 2010: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XI).

R = AS; ed. Mitra 1887~1888.

T = Texts from the Taisho Tripiṭaka = *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, ed. Junjirō Takakusu, Kaikyoku Watanabe, 100 vols., Tokyo 1924-1934.

Kj = *Xiaopin Banreboluomi jing* 小品般若波羅蜜經 (T. 8, No. 227), translated by Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什 in 408 C.E.

Lk = *Daoting Banre jing* 道行般若經 (T. 8, No. 224; 179 C.E.), translated by Zhi Loujiachen 支婁迦讖 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 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~(?)

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.

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* 摩訶般若鈔經 (T. 8, No. 226), translated by Tanmopi 曇摩婢 or Dharmapriya and Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 during the Former Qin Dynasty (351-394).

Tib = Texts from the Tibetan Tripiṭaka = *The Tibetan Tripiṭaka: Peking Edition* 影印北京版西藏大藏經, ed. Daisetz T. Suzuki, 168 vols, repr. under the Supervision of Otani University, Kyoto, Tokyo 1955~1961: Tibetan Tripiṭaka Research Institute.

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 phin, 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).
- (2) *The Tibetan Tripitaka: Taipei Edition*, ed. A. W. Barber, Taipei 1991, vol. 7: SMC Publishing.

References

Conze, Edward

- 1958 *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā : The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Ślokas*, translated into English by Edward Conze, Calcutta: The Asiatic Society (Bibliotheca Indica: A Collection of Oriental Works, no. 284, issue no. 1592).
- 1960 *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature* (Indo-Iranian Monographs, 6). 'S-Gravenhage.
- 1973 *The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines & its Verse Summary*, San Francisco: Four Seasons Foundation, Delhi ²1994: Sri Satguru Publications.
- 1978 *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*, 2nd rev. ed. (Bibliographica philologica buddhica, series major, 1). Tokyo.

Cousins, L.S.

- 1983 Pali oral literature. Philip Denwood & Alexander Piatigorsky (eds.), *Buddhist Studies – Ancient and Modern* (Collected Papers on South Asia, 4). London/Totowa: 1-11.

Drewes, David

- 2007 Revisiting the phrase “*sa prthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet*” and the Mahāyāna cult of the book. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 50: 101-143.

Falk, Harry

- 2011 The ‘Split’ Collection of Kharoṣṭhī texts. *ARIRIAB* 14: 13-23.

Falk, Harry & Seishi Karashima

- 2012 A first century *Prajñāpāramitā* manuscript from Gandhāra - parivarta 1 (Texts from the Split Collection 1). *ARIRIAB* 15: 19-61, pls. 5-7.

Gombrich, Richard

- 1988 How the Mahāyāna began. *Journal of Pali and Buddhist Studies* 1: 29-46. Repr. in T. Skorupski (ed.), *The Buddhist forum – Volume I – Seminar Papers 1987-1988*. (vol. 1) London 1990: 21-30.

Karashima, Seishi

- 2011 *A Critical Edition of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, Tokyo 2011: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XII).

Mitra, Rajendralal (ed.)

- 1887~1888 *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, Calcutta: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal (Bibliotheca Indica 110).

Sander, Lore

- 2000a Die “Schøyen Collection” und einige Bemerkungen zu der ältesten *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*-Handschrift. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 44: 87-100.
- 2000b Fragments of an *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* manuscript from the Kuṣāṇa period. Jens Braarvig (ed.), *Buddhist manuscripts, volume 1* (Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, 1). Oslo: Hermes Publishing, pp. 1-51.

Schopen, Gregory

- 1975 The phrase ‘*sa prthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet*’ in the *Vajracchedikā*: Notes on the

cult of the book in Mahāyāna". *Indo-Iranian Journal* 17: 147-181.

Seyfort Rugg, David

2004 Aspects of the study or the (earlier) Indian Mahāyāna. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 27: 3-62.

Vaidya, P.L. (ed.)

1960 *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā with Haribhadra's commentary called Āloka* (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, 4). Darbhanga (The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning).

Wogihara, U. (ed.)

1932 *Abhisamayālamkāra'āloka Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā : The Work of Haribhadra*, together with the text commented on, Tokyo 1932: The Toyo Bunko; Reprint: Tokyo ²1973: Sankibo.

punar aparaṃ kauśika yāvanto jambudvīpe sattvāḥ tān sarvān kaścīd eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā caturṣu apramāṇeṣu

(5-01:) + + hi pradiṭhavea
pratiṣṭhāpayet

evaṃ peyālena kartavyam. yathā caturṣv apramāṇeṣu evaṃ caturṣv ārūpyasamāpattiṣu

[p]aṃcaṣu abhiñeṣu
pañcasv abhijñāsu

yāvat samastāsu dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattyaabhijñāsu

pradiṭhavea
pratiṣṭhāpayet
ta ki [ma]ñāsi [k]o[śi]a
/ tat kiṃ manyase kauśika

avi te sa (5-02:) + + (pra)savea
api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇyaṃ prasavet.

a[ha] bahu (bham)[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 *pañcābhijñā*⁵,

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:

¹ 四禪 : Cf. AS.54.30 = R.107.5 = AAA.291.28. *catur~ dhyāna~*, ZQ.485c26. 四棄, Zfn.518c1. 四禪, Kj.546b8. 四禪; Krsh(2010).461f.

² AS.54.17~55.21 = R.107.5~109.9 = AAA.292.1~294.4. *tat kiṃ manyase Kauśika!* *bhūtakotīprabhāvanatāyām 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.

³ 四諦 : = Zfn.518c1; ≠ ZQ.485c26. 四拔苦; ≠ AS.55.22 = R.109.12 = AAA.294.9. *catur~ apramāṇa~*, Kj.546b8. 四無量心 etc.; cf. Krsh(2010).462f.

⁴ 四神足 : = Zfn.518c1; ≠ ZQ.485c26. 四事空; ≠ AS.55.23 = R.109.12 = AAA.294.11. *catur~ ārūpya-samāpatti~* (“the four formless attainments”) = Kj.546b9. 四無色定 etc.; cf. Krsh(2010).463f.

⁵ 般遮旬 : A transliteration of *pañcābhijñā* (“the five sorts of supernatural knowledge”); cf. AS.55.23 = R.109.12 = AAA.294.11. *pañca~ abhijñā~*, ZQ.485c26. 五通, Zfn.518c1. 五旬, Kj.546b9. 五神通 etc.; Krsh(2010).23f.

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]i bahudaro pu ..**
 ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ
 prasavet

(5-03:) + (pra)[ña]paramidae [p](o)[sta]o

ya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ antaśaḥ pustakagatāṃ
*api kṛtvā abhiśraddadhad abhiśraddadhate avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimuñcann
 adhimucyate prasannacittaḥ prasannacittāya adhyāśayasampanno 'dhyāśayasampannāya
 bodhāya cittam utpādyā samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāya adhyāśayena dadyāt*

pareṣu likhaṇa

antaśo likhanāyāpi

vācanāyāpi akilāsitayā saṃpādayiṣyati udyukto 'muṃ grāhayiṣyati

dasati

samdarśayiṣyati

*samādāpayiṣyati samuttejayiṣyati saṃpraharśayiṣyati vācā neṣyati vineṣyati anuneṣyati
 artham asyā asmai saṃprakāśayiṣyati evaṃ cāsyā cittam viśodhayiṣyati nirvicikitsaṃ
 kariṣyati evaṃ cainaṃ vakṣyati
 ehi tvam kulaputra asminn eva bodhisattvamārge śikṣasva / atra hi tvam śikṣamāṇaś caran
 vyāyachamānaḥ kṣipram evānuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim abhisambhotsyase /
 abhisambudhya ca aparimitaṃ sattvadhātum anuttare upadhisamkṣaye 'bhivineṣyasi yad
 uta bhūtakotīprabhāvanatāyām iti /*

tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika jāmbūdvīpakān sarvasattvān

*dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhijñāsu pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamkāraḥ anena
 paryāyeṇa'pi te kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva
 kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhijñāsu pratiṣṭhāpayet /*

tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sarvasattvān

*dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhijñāsu pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamkāraḥ ye'pi te
 kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā
 kuladuhitā vā dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhijñāsu pratiṣṭhāpayet /*

tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sarvasattvān

*dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhijñāsu pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamkāraḥ ye'pi te
 kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā
 kuladuhitā vā dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhijñāsu pratiṣṭhāpayet .*

tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau sarvasattvān

*dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhijñāsu pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamkāraḥ ye'pi te
 kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro
 vā kuladuhitā vā dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhijñāsu pratiṣṭhāpayet /*

“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 *Jambūdvīpa*; 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 *pañcābhijñā*; 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. *abhiśraddadhad abhiśraddadhate ... samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāyādhyāśayena* = 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. *udyukto 'muṃ grāhayiṣyati samdarśayiṣyati ... yad uta bhūtakotīprabhāvanatāyām 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. 善逝 (= 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. *abhiśraddadhad abhiśraddadhate ... samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāyādhyāśayena* = 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. *udyukto 'muṃ grāhayiṣyati samdarśayiṣyati ... yad uta bhūtakotīprabhāvanatāyām iti* = Xz(I).784b4~9, Sh.604c 18~23, Tib.Pk.66b3~7 = D.63a3~6. The older versions lack parallels.

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau sarvasattvān
dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhiññāsu pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamskāraḥ anena
paryāyeṇa ye'pi kecit kauśika gaṅgānadīvālukopameṣu trisāhasramahāsāhasreṣu
lokadhātuṣu sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā
dhyānāpramāṇārūpyasamāpattiyabhiññāsu pratiṣṭhāpayet /*

*tat kiṃ manyase kauśika
api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tato nidānaṃ bahu puṇyaṃ prasavet
śakra āha bahu bhagavan bahu sugata //
bhagavān āha*

*ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet
ya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ antaśaḥ pustakagatāṃ api kṛtvā
abhiśraddadhad abhiśraddadhate avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimuñcann adhimucyate
prasannacittaḥ prasannacittāya adhyāśayasampanno 'dhyāśayasampannāya bodhāya
cittam utpādyā samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāya adhyāśayena dadyāt*

*antaśo likhanāyāpi vācanāyāpi akilāsitayā saṃpādayiṣyati
udyukto 'muṃ grāhayiṣyati saṃdarśayiṣyati
samādāpayiṣyati samuttejayiṣyati saṃpraharṣayiṣyati
vācā neṣyati vineṣyati anuneṣyati artham asyā asmai saṃprakāśayiṣyati
evaṃ cāsyā cittam viśodhayiṣyati / nirvicikitsaṃ kariṣyati evaṃ cainaṃ vaksyati*

*ehi tvaṃ kulaputra asminn eva bodhisattvamārge śikṣasva / atra hi tvaṃ śikṣamānaś caran
vyāyacchamānaḥ kṣipram evānuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim abhisambhotsyase /
abhisambudhya ca aparimitaṃ sattvadhātum anuttare upadhisamkṣaye 'bhivineṣyasi yad
uta bhūtakotiprabhāvanatāyām iti //*

**puṇavaro k(ośiga) + + + + [p](u)[t](ro) vi ku[1·]
(5-04:) + + + + + + + + + + (po)[stao para](sa) [l](i)[khaṇa da]sati a[ya]me[va]
teṇa bohudaro**

**(5-05:) + + + + [·]o [k]ośiga
punar aparaṃ kauśika**

**yaṃ ca so kulaputro va kuladhita vi ima prañaparamida
yaḥ kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ**

likhitvā

**svaya ca va
svayaṃ ca vācayet**

(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 pūrvavad dadyāt ayatnataḥ kauśika pūrvakāt kulaputrāt kuladuhitur
vā sakāśād bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet / punar aparaṃ kauśika yaḥ kulaputro vā
kuladuhitā vā*

(5-06:) + .. [praña]paramidae atho parasa
imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ arthakuśalo vācayet parebhyaś

ca likhitvā pūrvavad dadyāt sārthāṃ savyañjanām

uvadiśea ayameva teṇa
upadiśet paridīpayet ayatnataḥ

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

(5-07:) + + + .. devaṇa imtro bhagavado edadoya
atha khalu śakro devānām indro bhagavantam etad avocat

[a]ya[m p]i bha(m)te bhaga[va] tasa kulaputrasa vi k[u]
iyam api bhagavan

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

aha
evam ukte bhagavān śakraṃ devānām indram etad avocat

ayaṃ [pi] + + + + + [p](u)[t](ra)[sa] + + + + +
+
iyam api kauśika prajñāpāramitā upadeṣṭavyā abudhyamānasya kulaputrasya vā
kuladuhitur vā /

(5-09:) [paramida]+ + +u

and expounds the wisdom within it¹², their merit is much greater (than that of the former).”

Śakra devendra said to the Buddha:

“How, O Lord, (should) one study the *Prajñāpāramitā* and expound the wisdom within it?”¹³

The Buddha said:

¹⁴“A good man or a good woman, who does not know (the *Prajñāpāramitā*, should) study it.

¹² 解中慧 : = ZQ.485c29; cf. AS.57.4f. = R.112.9 = AAA.297.12. *sārhām savyañjanām upadiśet paridīpayed* (“expound and light it up, both the meaning and the letter” [AsP.tr.II 121 = AsP.tr. 40]), Zfn.518c13f. 解其慧; Kj.546b23. 解說其義; Krsh(2010).643f., s.v. 中(1).

¹³ 云何學般若波羅蜜, {學}, 解中慧{, 其福甚倍多}? : Both 學 and 其福甚倍多 are superfluous; cf. AS.57.7f. = R.112.11f. = AAA.297.18. *iyam api ... prajñāpāramitā upadeṣṭavyā?* (“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. 應爲何等人解說般若波羅蜜義? 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 (dittography).

¹⁴ 善男子、善女人不曉, 學 : Cf. AS.57.8f. = R.112.13f. = AAA.297.24f. *iyam api Kauśika! prajñāpāramitā upadeṣṭavyā abudhyamānasya kulaputrasya vā kuladuhitur 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, 爲解說之; Kj.546b25f. 若有善男子、善女人不知般若波羅蜜義故, 應爲解說其義.

[ta kisa hed]u
tat kasya hetoḥ

[upa¹⁵ kośiga aṇaga] + (5-10:) + + + + [pra]ñāparamidae paḍivaṃṇiga °
utpatsyate hi kauśika anāgate 'dhvani prajñāpāramitāpratīvarṇikā /

tatra so kulaputro va kuladhita vi [aṇ]u[tarae saṃ]ma +
tatra abudhyamānaḥ kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā anuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhim

(5-11:) + + + + duamo ma praṇaśīṣati ta paḍivaṃṇiga śruṇita
abhisamboddhukāmo mā praṇaṃkṣīt tām prajñāpāramitāpratīvarṇikāṃ śrutvā //

evaṃ vuto śakro de + + + + [bhaga] .. (5-12:) + + + + [d](o)ya [ka] + [bhagava]
atha khalu śakro devānām indro bhagavantam etad avocat katham bhagavan
anāgate 'dhvani prajñāpāramitāpratīvarṇikā veditavyā iyaṃ sā

prañāparamidae paḍivaṃṇiga
prajñāpāramitāpratīvarṇikopadiśyata iti

eva[m] v[u]to bhagava śakro devaṇa imtr(o) (5-13:) + + + + +
evam ukte bhagavān śakraṃ devānām indram etad avocat

¹⁵ Probably *upajīśati*; cf. 5:40 +*vajīśati*, where Skt has *āpatsyate*.

For what reason?

(While) a good man or a good woman, in the future, wants to attain *anuttara-samyaksambodhi*¹⁶ and likes to study the *Prajñāpāramitā*, they may, to the contrary, receive teaching on a trifling¹⁷ *Prajñāpāramitā* from a bad acquaintance.

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

The Buddha said:

¹⁶ 阿耨多羅三耶三菩阿惟三佛：A transliteration of Skt. *anuttara~ samyaksambodhi~ abhisam-√budh* (“to attain unsurpassed, perfect enlightenment”). Cf. AS.57.11 = R.112.17 = AAA.298.4. *anuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim abhisamboddu-(kāma~)* (“[wants] to attain unsurpassed, perfect enlightenment”); ZQ.486a1. 得無上正真道最正覺; Zfn.518c16 = Lk; Kj.546b28. 得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提; Krsh(2010).9.

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

+++ [śi]ga aṅagade [adh](va)[ṅ]e [bhikh·]
bhaviṣyanti kauśika anāgate 'dhvani eke bhikṣavaḥ

abhāvitakāyā abhāvitaśīlā abhāvitacittā abhāvitaprajñā eḍamūkajātīyā prajñāparihīṇāḥ /

[t]e [p](r)[aṅapa] ++ [da] [uvadiśiśa](m)[a ti paḍivaṃṇi]
te prajñāpāramitām upadekṣyāma iti tasyāḥ prativārṇikām upadekṣyanti

(5-14:) + + + + [paḍivaṃṇiga] uvadiśiśaṃti
kathaṃ ca kauśika prajñāpāramitā-prativārṇikām upadekṣyanti

- rūpavināśo

ruo aṅiṃcaṃ ti uvadiśiśaṃti
rūpānityatety upadekṣyanti /

ruo aṅicaṃ ti (5-15:) + + + + [ti] gameṣiśaṃti evaṃ ca te uvadiśiśaṃti
yo evaṃ gameṣiśaṃti so prañipara (5-16:) + + .. pialo

eva vedanāsaṃjñāsaṃkhara viñāṇo aṅicaṃ ti uvadiśiśaṃti
evaṃ vedanāsaṃjñāsaṃskārāḥ / vijñānavināśo vijñānānityatety upadekṣyanti /

“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*):

²⁰One (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. 有比丘欲學般若波羅蜜，為惡師所反教；≠ AS.57.14f. = R.113.1f. = AAA.298.23f. *eke bhikṣavo ... te prajñāpāramitām upadekṣyāma iti tasyaḥ prativarnikām upadekṣyanti. kathaṃ ca Kauśika! prajñāpāramitā-prativarnikām upadekṣyanti?* (“[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 etc.

¹⁹ AS.57.15 = R.113.1f. = AAA.298.23f. *abhāvitakāyā abhāvitaśīlā abhāvitacittā abhāvitaprajñā eḍamūkaajātiyā prajñāparihīṇās* (“[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. 愚癡顛倒. 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.57.17f. = R.113.4f. = AAA.299.1f. *“rūpavināśo rūpānityatē”ty upadekṣyanti. evaṃ “vedanā-samjñā-saṃskārā vijñānavināśo vijñānānityatē”ty upadekṣyanti. evaṃ cōpadekṣyanti “ya evaṃ gaveṣyaviṣyati sa prajñāpāramitāyāṃ carīṣyatī”ti.* (“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.486a3f. 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 aṇicam ti (5-17:)

_ evaṃ ca te uvadiśiṣaṃti yo evaṃ gameṣiṣaṃti so prañāparamidaē + + + +
evaṃ copadekṣyanti ya evaṃ gaveṣayisyati sa prajñāpāramitāyāṃ carīṣyatī /

(5-18:) + + + + [ga] p(ra)ñāparamidaē paḍivaṃṇi[gaṇa]
iyaṃ sā kauśika prajñāpāramitā - prativarnikā veditavyā /

[ṇa vaṇa] koṣiga [ruavi]ṇaśeṇa [ruaṇicada pa]
na khalu punaḥ kauśika rūpavināśo rūpānityatā draṣṭavyā /

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

[ṇa ho vaṇa] koṣiga viñāṇaviṇaśeṇa viñāṇaṇicada paśi (5-20:) + + +
na khalu punaḥ kauśika vijñānavināśo vijñānānityatā draṣṭavyā /

+ + evaṃ paśati prañāparamidaē pa[ḍivaṇa]gāe carati
saced evaṃ paśyati prajñāpāramitā-prativarnikāyāṃ carati /

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

.. (th)o uvadiśiṣati
artha upadeṣṭavyaḥ /

prajñāpāramitāyā artham upadiśan kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā

ayaṃ te[ṇa bah]odaro puṇo prasaviṣati
bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ 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*],²¹ does not view that destroyed form is impermanent,²² does not view that destroyed feeling, conception, life and consciousness are impermanent.

For what reason? Because of (their) non-existence²³.

One should, O *Kauśika*, learn by means of the wisdom of the *Prajñāpāramitā*²⁴.

One’s merit will be much greater.”

²¹ 行般若波羅蜜者：= ZQ486a5. 求者. Other versions, incl. Zfn (518c25), lack parallels.

²² 不壞色無常視： “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 punaḥ 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. 不壞五陰無常視; Zfn.518c25f. 其人作壞色行，求色無常<視>; 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 prajñāpāramitāprativarṇikāyāṃ 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 拘翼！般若波羅蜜當點慧學：= ZQ486a6. 如斯當為景明之學；≠ AS.57.22f. = R.113.11f. = AAA.299.24f. *tasmāt tarhi Kauśika! kulaputreṇa vā kuladuhitrā vā prajñāpāramitāyā artha upadeṣṭavyaḥ* (“For that reason, Kausika, should one expound the meaning of the perfection of wisdom.” [AsP.tr.II 122 = AsP.tr. 41]), Zfn.518c27f. 其作是行者，若有點慧，當持般若波羅蜜為解之，Kj.546c10. 以是因緣故，菩薩說般若波羅蜜義。

punavaro kośiga ko[i] ..
punar aparaṃ kauśika

(5-22:) + + + + + + + + [da]²⁵ vi ye jaṃbudive satva te sarve
yāvanto jambūdvīpe sattvāḥ tān sarvān

kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā

sadavatiphale p(r)adiṭhavea
srotaāpattiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet /

[ta k](i) [mañās](i) (5-23:) + + + + + + + + (p)[ut](r)o vi
tat kiṃ manyase kauśika api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā

tatonidānaṃ

[ba]hu puño prasavea
bahu puṇyaṃ prasavet

aha bahu bhaṃte 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 *Jambūdvīpa* all attain the Path of *srotaōpannas*, is their merit much, O *Kauśika*?”

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

²⁶ <復次，拘翼！.....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 aparāṃ Kauśika! yāvanto Jambūdvīpe sattvās tān sarvān kaścīd eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā srotaōpattiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet. tat kiṃ manyase Kauśika! api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahupūṇyaṃ prasavet?*” *Śakra āha* “*bahu bhagavan! bahu sugata*” *bhagavān āha* “*ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa Kauśika! kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasaved ya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ antaśaḥ pustakagatāṃ api kṛtvā ...* (AS.57.31 = R.114.2 = AAA.300.19) *dadyād antaśo likhanāyāpi vācānāyāpy akilāsītayā sampādayiṣyaty ...* (AS.58.5 = R.114.10 = AAA.301.1) *evaṃ ca vācaṃ bhāṣeta eteṣāṃ eva tvaṃ kulaputra! dharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhava yad uta prajñāpāramitāpratisaṃyuktānāṃ iti* (AS.58.6 = R.114.12 = AAA.301.3) *āyam eva Kauśika! tataḥ paurvakāt kulaputrataḥ kuladuhitṛto vā sakāśād bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet. tat kasya hetoḥ? ato hi Kauśika! srotaōpattiphalaṃ prabhāvyyate.*” (“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.II 122 = AsP.tr. 41]); ZQ.486a6f. 復次一天下人皆令得溝港、(頻來、不還、應儀、緣一覽道、)皆令成就; Zfn.518c28~519a5. “復次，拘翼！故闍浮利人，若善男子善女人。皆令得須陀洹道。云何，拘翼！其福寧多不？”釋提桓因言：“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？須陀洹道者，皆從般若波羅蜜出。...”；Kj.546c11~17. 復次，橋尸迦！若有善男子、善女人教闍浮提衆生，令得須陀洹果。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：“橋尸迦！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：‘汝當得是應般若波羅蜜功德。’其福甚多。何以故？須陀洹果從般若波羅蜜出故。...” As everywhere else, the word “*sugata*” (AS.57.27 = R.113.18 = AAA.300.12), the sentences “*abhiśraddhadhad abhiśraddhadhate avakalpayann ... samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisatvāyādhyaśayena* (AS.57.29~31 = R.113.21~114.2 = AAA.300.15~19) and “*udyukto muṃ grāhayaṣyati ... yad uta bhūtakotiḥprabhāvantāyāṃ iti*” have no parallels in ZQ(486a8), Zfn(519a2~3) and Kj(546c13~15). The sentence “*evaṃ ca vācaṃ bhāṣeta eteṣāṃ eva tvaṃ kulaputra! dharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhava yad uta prajñāpāramitāpratisaṃyuktānāṃ iti*” (AS.58.5~6 = R.114.10~12 = AAA.301.1~3) has no parallels in either ZQ or Zfn.

bhagavān āha

ado **kośiga so ku + (5-24:) + + + + + vi ba[hu]daro puño**
ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaram puṇyam

prasaviṣati yo **prañāparamidae** **postao**
prasavet ya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ antaśaḥ pustakagatāṃ

*api kṛtvā abhiśraddhadhad abhiśraddhadhate avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimuñcann
adhimuñcate prasannacittaḥ prasannacittāya adhyāśayasampanno 'dhyāśayasampannāya
bodhāya cittam utpādyā samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāya adhyāśayena dadyāt*

parasa likhaṇa

antaśo likhanāyāpi

*vācanāyāpi akilāsitayā sampādayiṣyati udyukto 'muṃ grāhayiṣyati samdarśayiṣyati
samādāpayiṣyati samuttejayiṣyati sampraharṣayiṣyati vācā neṣyati vineṣyati anuneṣyati
artham aṣyā asmai samprakāśayiṣyati
evaṃ cāsyā cittam viśodhayiṣyati nirvicikitsaṃ kariṣyati
evaṃ cainaṃ vakṣyati ehi tvaṃ kulaputra asminn eva bodhisattvamārge śikṣasva
atra hi tvaṃ śikṣamāṇaś caran vyāyacchamāṇaḥ kṣipram evānuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim
abhisambhotsyase abhisambudhya ca aparimitaṃ sattvadhātum anuttare upadhisamkṣaye
'bhivineṣyasi yad uta bhūtakoṭiprabhāvanatāyāṃ iti /*

(5-25:) + + + + + **yeva tua** **dham[ma]ṇa labhi bhohi**
evaṃ ca vācaṃ bhāṣeta eteṣāṃ eva tvaṃ kulaputra dharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhava

yam ida _ _ prañāparamida paḍisaṃyuteṇa

yad uta prajñāpāramitā pratisaṃyuktānāṃ iti /

*ayam eva kauśika tataḥ paurvakāt kulaputrataḥ kuladuhitṛto vā sakāśād
bahutaram puṇyam prasavet /*

ta kisa he +

tat kasya hetoḥ

(5-26:) + + + + + **[ga] sodavatiphale** **prabhaviati °**
ato hi kauśika srotaāpattiphalaṃ prabhāvyate //

tiṭṭhadu ho **vaṇa ko[śiga ya]ṃ jambudivo**

tiṭṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika jāmbūdvipakān

sarvasattvān srotaāpattiphale pratiṭṭhāpya puṇyābhisamkārāḥ

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 *srotaāpannas* originates from the *Prajñāpāramitā*.>

Moreover, O *Kauśika*, leave aside (not to mention, let alone) (people) in *Jambūdvīpa*,

ya[vato?] .. (5-27:) + + + .. (ma)hasahaṃsa lo __ gadhadue satva
yāvantaḥ kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sattvāḥ

te koideva sodavatiphale pratiṭha[v](e)[a]
tān api sarvān kaścīd eva kulaputro vā kuladuhita vā srotaāpattiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet //

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

aha bahu bhaṃte bhagava

ado kośiga so [śaʔ] (5-29:) + + + [ge viʔ] [bahudar]o puño prasaviśati yo
prañaparamīdae postao para[sa likha ..].....

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sarvasattvān srotaāpattiphale
pratiṣṭhāpya. puṇyābhisamskāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sattvāḥ tān
api sarvān kaścīd eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā srotaāpattiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet /
tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sarvasattvān srotaāpattiphale
pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamskāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau
sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścīd eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā srotaāpattiphale
pratiṣṭhāpayet /
tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau sarvasattvān
srotaāpattiphale pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamskāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika trisāhasramahā-
sāhasre lokadhātau sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścīd eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā
srotaāpattiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet //*

(5-30:) + + + + + [kośiga] trisahaṃsamahasahaṃsa [l]o[gadhad]u
tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika trisāhasra- mahāsāhasre lokadhātau

sarvasattvān srotaāpattiphale pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyabhisamskāraḥ

yavada kośiga gaganati valiāsa (5-31:) + + +²⁷
yāvantaḥ kauśika gaṅgānādī vālukopameṣu trisāhasramahāsāhasreṣu

+ + + ·u satva te koideva
lokadhātuṣu sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścīd eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā

sodavatiphale pratiṭhavea ta ki maṃñasi kośiga
srotaāpattiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet / tat kiṃ manyase kauśika

avi ṇu (5-32:) + + + + + [ñ]o prasavea
api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇyaṃ prasavet

²⁷ Cf. the Brāhmī ms (Sander 2000b: 9, 38) -vālikāsāmām /-vālikāsamām kalpam tiṣṭatā/triṣṭamto.

-(AS)²⁸

if a good man or a good woman makes (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

attain the Path of *srotaāpannas*, is their merit much, O *Kauśika*?"

²⁸. AS.58.10~19 = R.114.16~115.7 = AAA.301.8~21. *yāvantaḥ Kauśika! cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sattvās ... tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ Kauśika! dviśāhasre madhyame lokadhātau sarvasattvān srotaāpattiphale pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamskāro* = 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 bhaṃte bhagava

śakra āha bahu bhagavan bahu sugata //

bhagavān āha

ado kośiga so kulaputro va kuladhita vi ba (5-33:) + + +

ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaram

+ ño prasaviśati yo prañāparamidaē postao
punyaṃ prasavet ya imāṃ prañāpāramitāṃ antaśaḥ pustakagatām

*api kṛtvā abhiśraddadhad abhiśraddadhate avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimuñcann
adhimuñcate prasannacittaḥ prasannacittāya adhyāśayasampanno 'dhyāśayasampannāya
bodhāya cittam utpādyā samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāya adhyāśayena dadyāt*

parasa likhita [daea]²⁹

antaśo likhanāyāpi

*vācanāyāpi akilāsitayā saṃpādayiṣyati udyukto 'muṃ grāhayiṣyati saṃdarśayiṣyati
samādāpayiṣyati samuttejayiṣyati saṃpraharṣayiṣyati vācā neṣyati vineṣyati anuneṣyati
artham asyā asmai saṃprakāśayiṣyati evaṃ cāsya cittaṃ viśodhayiṣyati nirvicikitsaṃ
kariṣyati evaṃ cainaṃ vakṣyati ehi tvaṃ kulaputra asminn eva bodhisattvamārgē śikṣasva /
atra hi tvaṃ śikṣamānaś caran vyāyacchamānaḥ kṣipram evānuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim
abhisambhotsyase / abhisambudhya ca aparimitaṃ sattvadhātum anuttare
upadhisamkṣaye 'bhivineṣyasi yad uta bhūtakoṭiprabhāvanatāyām iti / evaṃ ca vācaṃ
bhāṣeta*

[etaṣa ye?] (5-34:) + + + [la]bhi bhohi

eteṣāṃ api tvaṃ kulaputra dharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhava

yam idaṃ prañāparamida paḍisaṃyuteṇa

yad uta prañāpāramitā pratisaṃyuktānām iti /

²⁹ Cf. *prañāparamida likhita daeati* in 5-49.

Śakra devendra said: “Very much, very much, O Lord! -(AS)³⁰”

The Buddha said:

“It is inferior to that of a good man or a good woman, who copies the *Prajñāpāramitā*, - (AS)³¹

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

-(AS)³²-

(AS)³³

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

³¹ AS.58.27~29 = R.115.19~22 = AAA.302.6~10. *abhiśraddadhad abhiśraddadhate ... samutpādītabodhi-cittāya bodhisattvāyādhyāśayena* = 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.

³² AS.58.30~59.3 = R.116.1~8 = AAA.302.11~20. *udyukto muṃ grāhayaṣyati samdarśayaṣyati ... yad uta bhūtaakoṭīprabhāvanatāyām iti* = Xz(I).785c21~25, Sh.605b22~27, Tib.Pk.69a4~8 = D.65b1~4. The older versions lack parallels.

³³ AS.59.3~5 = R.116.8~10 = AAA.302.20~22. *evaṃ ca vācaṃ bhāṣeta “eteṣāṃ eva tvaṃ kulaputra! dharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhava yad uta prajñāpāramitāpratisaṃyuktānām”* = Tib.Pk.69a8 = D.65b4; = Kj.546c23. 作是言：“汝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 tataḥ paurvakāt kulaputrataḥ kuladuhitrto vā sakāśād bahutaram
 puṇyaṃ prasavet /
 tat kasya hetoḥ
 ato hi kauśika srotaāpattiphalaṃ prabhāvyate //

punar aparaṃ kauśika

yo hi kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā yāvanto jambūdvīpe sattvāḥ tān sarvān
 sakṛdāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet /

tat kiṃ manyase kauśika

api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇyaṃ prasavet
 śakra āha bahu bhagavan bahu sugata /

bhagavān āha

ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaram

puṇyaṃ prasavet ya imāṃ prajñāpāramitām antaśaḥ pustakagatām api kṛtvā

abhiśraddhadhad abhiśraddhadhate avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimuñcann adhimuñcate

prasannacittāḥ prasannacittāya adhyāśayasampanno 'dhyāśayasampannāya bodhāya

cittam utpādya samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāyādhyāśayena dadyāt antaśo

likhanāyāpi vācanāyāpi akilāsitayā sampādayiṣyati udyukto 'muṃ grāhayiṣyati

samdarśayiṣyati samadāpayiṣyati samuttejayiṣyati sampraharṣayiṣyati vācā neṣyati

vineṣyati anuneṣyati artham asyā asmai samprakāśayiṣyati evaṃ cāsyā cittam

viśodhayiṣyati nirvicikitsam

kariṣyati evaṃ cainaṃ vakṣyati ehi tvaṃ kulaputra asminn evabodhisattvamārge śikṣasva /

atra hi tvaṃ śikṣamānaś caran vyāyacchamānaḥ kṣipram evānuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim

abhisambhotsyase / abhisambudhya ca aparimitam sattvadhātum anuttare

upadhisamkṣaye 'bhivineṣyasi yad uta bhūtakoṭiprabhāvanatāyām iti /

evaṃ ca vācaṃ bhāṣeta eteṣām eva tvaṃ kulaputra dharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhava

yad uta prajñāpāramitāpratisamnyuktānām iti /

ayam eva kauśika tataḥ paurvakāt kulaputrataḥ kuladuhitrto vā sakāśād bahutaram

puṇyaṃ prasavet /

tat kasya hetoḥ

ato hi kauśika sakṛdāgāmiphalaṃ prabhāvyate /

tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika jambūdvīpakān sarvasattvān sakṛdāgāmiphale

pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamkārah yāvantaḥ kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sattvāḥ

tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā sakṛdāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet /

tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sarvasattvān

sakṛdāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamkārah yāvantaḥ kauśika sāhasre cūlike

lokadhātau sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā sakṛdāgāmiphale

pratiṣṭhāpayet /

tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sarvasattvān sakṛdāgāmiphale

pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamkārah yāvantaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau

sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā sakṛdāgāmiphale

pratiṣṭhāpayet /

Their merit is much greater. For what reason?

Because the Path of *śrotaāpannas* originates from the *Prajñāpāramitā*.

³⁴Moreover, O *Kauśika*, if a good man or a good woman makes people in *Jambūdvīpa* attain (the states of) *sakṛdāgāmins*,

³⁴ 復次，拘翼！閻浮利人若善男子、善女人皆教令得斯陀含、阿那含、阿羅漢，皆令成就。云何，拘翼！其福寧轉倍多不？：“Moreover, O *Kauśika*, if a good man or a good woman makes the people in *Jambūdvīpa* attain (the states of) *sakṛdāgāmins*, *anāgāmins*, or *arhants*, and make them accomplish (their aims), is their merit much, O *Kauśika*?”; cf. ZQ.486a6f. 復次一天下人皆令得(溝港)、頻來、不還、應儀、(緣一覺道)，皆令成就；Zfn.519a11f. 復次，拘翼！悉得斯陀含、阿那含、阿羅漢道。其福寧多不？；Kj.546c25f. 復次，橋尸迦！若有善男子、善女人，教閻浮提衆生，令得斯陀含果、阿那含果、阿羅漢果、辟支佛道。於意云何？是人以是因緣其福多不？；Xz(I).785c11~18, Xz(II).879b21~27; The newer versions are much more detailed with many repetitions: AS.59.7~62.3 = R.116.12~122.6 = AAA.303.13~309.4. *punar aparaṃ Kauśika! yo hi kaścīd eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā yāvanto Jambūdvīpe sattvās tān sarvān sakṛdāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet anāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet ... arhattve pratiṣṭhāpayet. tat kiṃ manyase Kauśika! api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tato nidānaṃ bahupunyaṃ prasavet* = Sh.605c1~ 606b16, Tib.Pk.69b1~73a2 = D.65b5~69a2.

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau sarvasattvān
sakṛdāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamkāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika
trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā
kuladuhitā vā sakṛdāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet /*

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau sarvasattvān
sakṛdāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamkāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika
gaṅgānādvālukopameṣu trisāhasramahāsāhasreṣu lokadhātuṣu sattvāḥ tān api sarvān
kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā sakṛdāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet /*

*tat kiṃ manyase kauśika
api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇyaṃ prasavet śakra āha bahu
bhagavan bahu sugata //*

*bhagavān āha
ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet ya
imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ antaśaḥ pustakagatāṃ api kṛtvā abhiśraddhadhad abhiśraddhadhate
avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimuñcann adhimuñcate prasannacittaḥ prasannacittāya
adhyāśayasampanno 'dhyāśayasampannāya bodhāya cittaṃ utpādyā
samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāya adhyāśayena dadyāt antaśo likhanāyāpi
vācanāyāpi akilāsitayā sampādāyīṣyati udyukto 'muṃ grāhayīṣyati samdarśayīṣyati
samādāpayīṣyati samuttejayīṣyati sampraharṣayīṣyati vācā neṣyati vineṣyati anuneṣyati
artham asyā asmai samprakāśayīṣyati evaṃ cāsyā cittaṃ viśodhayīṣyati nirvicikitsaṃ
karīṣyati evaṃ cainaṃ vakṣyati ehi tvaṃ kulaputra asmīn eva bodhisattvamārge śikṣasva /
atra hi tvaṃ śikṣamāṇaś caran vyāyacchamānaḥ kṣīpram evānuttaraṃ samyaksambodhim
abhisambhotsyase / abhisambudhya ca aparimitaṃ sattvadhātum anuttare
upadhisamkṣaye 'bhivineṣyasi yad uta bhūtakoṭiprabhāvanatāyāṃ iti /
evaṃ ca vācaṃ bhāseta eteṣāṃ eva tvaṃ kulaputra dharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhava
yad uta prajñāpāramitāpratisamyuktānāṃ iti /
ayaṃ eva kauśika tataḥ paurvakāt kulaputrataḥ kuladuhitṛto vā sakāśād bahutaraṃ
puṇyaṃ prasavet /*

*tat kasya hetoḥ
ato hi kauśika sakṛdāgāmiphalaṃ prabhāvyate //*

*punar aparaṃ kauśika
yo hi kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā yāvanto jambūdvīpe sattvāḥ tān sarvān
anāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet /*

*tat kiṃ manyase kauśika
api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇyaṃ prasavet
śakra āha bahu bhagavan bahu sugata //*

*bhagavān āha
ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet ya
imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ antaśaḥ pustakagatāṃ api kṛtvā abhiśraddhadhad abhiśraddhadhate
avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimuñcann adhimuñcate prasannacittaḥ prasannacittāya
adhyāśayasampanno 'dhyāśayasampannāya bodhāya cittaṃ utpādyā*

anāgāmins,

samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāya adhyāśayena dadyāt antaśo likhanāyāpi
vācanāyāpi akilāsitayā sampādayiṣyati udyukto 'muṃ grāhayiṣyati saṃdarśayiṣyati
samādāpayiṣyati samuttejayiṣyati saṃprahaṣayiṣyati vācā neṣyati vineṣyati anuneṣyati
artham asyā asmai saṃprakāśayiṣyati evaṃ cāśya cittaṃ viśodhayiṣyati nirvicikitsaṃ
kariṣyati evaṃ cainaṃ vakṣyati ehi tvam kulaputra asmīn eva bodhisattvamārgē śikṣasva /
atra hi tvam śikṣamānaś caran vyāyacchamānaḥ kṣipram evānuttarām samyaksambodhim
abhisambhotsyase / abhisambudhya ca aparimitaṃ sattvadhātum anuttare
upadhisaṃkṣaye 'bhivineṣyasi yad uta bhūtakoṭiprabhāvanatāyām iti / evaṃ ca vācaṃ
bhāṣeta eteṣāṃ evaṃ tvam kulaputra dharmāṇaṃ lābhī bhava
yad uta praññāpāramitāpratisamyuktānām iti /
ayam eva tato bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet /
tat kasya hetoḥ ? ato hi kauśika anāgāmiphalaṃ prabhāvyate /

tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika jāmbūdvīpakān sarvasattvān anāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpya
puṇyābhisamṣkāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sattvāḥ tān api
sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā anāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet / tiṣṭhatu khalu
punaḥ kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sarvasattvān anāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpya
puṇyābhisamṣkāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sattvāḥ tān api sarvān
kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā anāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet /

tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sarvasattvān anāgāmiphale
pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamṣkāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau
sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhita vā anāgāmiphale
pratiṣṭhāpayet /

tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau sarvasattvān
anāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamṣkāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre
lokadhātau sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā anāgāmiphale
pratiṣṭhāpayet /

tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau sarvasattvān
anāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamṣkāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika
gaṅgānadīvālukopameṣu trisāhasramahāsāhasreṣu lokadhātuṣu sattvāḥ tān api sarvān
kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā anāgāmiphale pratiṣṭhāpayet /
tat kiṃ manyase kauśika

api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇyaṃ prasavet ? śakra āha
bahu bhagavan bahu sugata //

bhagavān āha

ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ
prasavet ya imāṃ praññāpāramitāṃ antaśaḥ pustakagatām api kṛtvā abhiśraddhad
abhiśraddhadhate avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimuñcann adhimuñcate prasannacittāḥ
prasannacittāya adhyāśayasampanno 'dhyāśayasampannāya bodhāya cittaṃ utpādyā
samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāya adhyāśayena dadyāt antaśo likhanāyāpi
vācanāyāpi akilāsitayā sampādayiṣyati udyukto 'muṃ grāhayiṣyati saṃdarśayiṣyati
samādāpayiṣyati samuttejayiṣyati saṃprahaṣayiṣyati vācā neṣyati vineṣyati anuneṣyati
artham asyā asmai saṃprakāśayiṣyati evaṃ cāśya cittaṃ viśodhayiṣyati

nirvicikitsaṃ kariṣyati evaṃ cainaṃ vakṣyati ehi tvaṃ kulaputra asminn eva
bodhisattvamārgē śikṣasva /
atra hi tvaṃ śikṣamānaś caran vyāyacchamānaḥ kṣipram evānuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim
abhisambhotsyase / abhisambudhya ca aparimitaṃ sattvadhātum anuttare
upadhisamkṣaye 'bhivineṣyasi yad uta bhūtakotīprabhāvanatāyām iti /

evaṃ ca vācaṃ bhāṣeta eteṣām eva tvaṃ kulaputra dharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhava
yad uta prajñāpāramitāpratisaṃyuktānām iti /
ayaṃ eva tato bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet /
tat kasya hetoḥ ? ato hi kauśika anāgāmiphalaṃ prabhāvyaṭe //

punar aparaṃ kauśika

yo hi kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā yāvanto jāmbūdvīpe sattvāḥ tān api sarvān
arhattve pratiṣṭhāpayet /
tat kiṃ manyase kauśika
api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇyaṃ prasavet ?
śakra āha bahu bhagavan bahu sugata /

bhagavān āha

ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet ya
imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ antaśaḥ pustakagatāṃ api kṛtvā abhiśraddadhad abhiśraddadhate
avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimuñcann adhimuñcate prasannacittaḥ prasannacittāya
adhyāśayasampanno 'dhyāśayasampannāya bodhāya cittam utpādyā
samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāya adhyāśayena dadyāt antaśo likhanāyāpi
vācanāyāpi akilāsitayā sampādayiṣyati udyukto 'muṃ grāhayiṣyati samdarśayiṣyati
samādāpayiṣyati samuttejayiṣyati sampraharṣayiṣyati vācā neṣyati vineṣyati anuneṣyati
artham asyā asmai samprakāśayiṣyati evaṃ cāsya cittaṃ viśodhayiṣyati nirvicikitsaṃ
kariṣyati evaṃ cainaṃ vakṣyati ehi tvaṃ kulaputra asminn eva bodhisattvamārgē śikṣasva.
atra hi tvaṃ śikṣamānaś caran vyāyacchamānaḥ kṣipram evānuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim
abhisambhotsyase / abhisambudhya ca aparimitaṃ sattvadhātum anuttare
upadhisamkṣaye 'bhivineṣyasi yad uta bhūtakotīprabhāvanatāyām 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)³⁵”

The Buddha said: “It is inferior to that of a good man or a good woman, who copies the *Prajñāpāramitā*,
-(AS)³⁶

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

-(AS)³⁷

³⁵ AS.62.3 = R.122.7 = AAA.309.5. *sugata* = Xz(I).785c18. 善逝 (= Xz[II].879b27), Tib.Pk.73a2 = D.69a2. *bde bar gshegs pa*. Other versions (ZQ.486a9, Zfn.519a13, Kj.546c28, Sh.606b17) as well as Lk lack parallels.

³⁶ AS.62.5~7 = R.122.10~13 = AAA.309.8~12. *abhiśraddadhad abhiśraddadhate ... samuṣpādiabodhi-cittāya bodhisattvāyādhyāśayena* = Xz(I).785c19~21, Sh.606b18~20, Tib.Pk.73a3~5 = D.69a3~4. The older versions (Lk.437b2, ZQ.486a9, Zfn.519a14, Kj.546c29, Xz[II].879b29) lack parallels.

³⁷ AS.62.8~14 = R.122.14~21 = AAA.309.13~22. *udyukto 'muṃ grāhayaṣyati saṃdarśayaṣyati ... yad uta bhūtakoṭiprabhāvanatāyām iti*= Xz(I).785c21~25, Sh.606b21~27, Tib.Pk.73a5~b1 = D.69a5~7. The older versions lack parallels.

*evaṃ ca vācaṃ bhāṣeta eteṣāṃ eva tvaṃ kulaputra dharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhava
yad uta prajñāpāramitāpratisaṃyuktānāṃ iti / ayam eva tato bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet /
tat kaśya hetoḥ
ato hi kauśika arhattvaṃ prabhāvvyate /*

*evaṃ cāsya utsāhaṃ vardhayiṣyati
yathā yathā hi tvaṃ kulaputra prajñāpāramitāyāṃ śikṣiṣyase
tathā tathā tvam anupūrveṇa buddhadharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhaviṣyasi
āsannaś ca bhaviṣyasy anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodheḥ /
atra hi tvaṃ śikṣāyāṃ śikṣamānaś caran vyāyacchamānaḥ
srotaāpattiphalaṃ prabhāvavyiṣyasi sakṛdāgāmiphalaṃ prabhāvavyiṣyasi anāgāmiphalaṃ
prabhāvavyiṣyasi arhattvaṃ prabhāvavyiṣyasi pratyekabuddhatvaṃ prabhāvavyiṣyasi
samyaksambuddhatvaṃ prabhāvavyiṣyasīti/*

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika jāmbūdvīpakān sarvasattvān arhattve pratiṣṭhāpya
puṇyābhisamskāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sattvāḥ tān api
sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā arhattve pratiṣṭhāpayet /*

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sarvasattvān arhattve
pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamskāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sattvāḥ tān
api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā arhattve pratiṣṭhāpayet /*

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sarvasattvān arhattve
pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamskāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau
sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā arhattve pratiṣṭhāpayet*

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau sarvasattvān arhattve
pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamskāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau
sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā arhattve pratiṣṭhāpayet /*

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau sarvasattvān arhattve
pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamskāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika gaṅgānadīvālu-kopameṣu
trisāhasramahāsāhasreṣu lokadhātuṣu sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā
kuladuhitā vā arhattve pratiṣṭhāpayet*

*tat kiṃ manyase kauśika
api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇyaṃ prasavet
śakra āha bahu bhagavan bahu sugata /
saṃkhyā api bhagavaṃs tasya puṇyaskandhasya na sukarā kartum /
gaṇanā pi upamā pi aupamyama pi upaniṣā pi upaniṣada pi bhagavaṃs tasya
puṇyaskandhasya na sukarā kartum //*

-(AS)³⁸

³⁸. AS.62.14~15 = R.122.21~22 = AAA.309.22~25. *evaṃ ca vācaṃ bhāṣeta "eteṣāṃ eva kulaputra! dharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhava yad uta prajñāpāramitāpratisaṃyuktānām"* = 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.

bhagavān āha

ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet ya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ antaśaḥ pustakagatāṃ api kṛtvā abhiśraddadhad abhiśraddadhate avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimuñcann adhimuñcate prasannacittaḥ prasannacittāya adhyāśayasampanno 'dhyāśayasampannāya bodhāya cittaṃ utpādyā samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāya adhyāśayena dadyāt antaśo likhanāyāpi vācanāyāpi akilāsitayā sampādayiṣyati udyukto 'muṃ grāhayiṣyati samādāpayiṣyāti samuttejayiṣyati samprahaṣayiṣyati vācā neṣyati vineṣyati anuneṣyati artham asyā asmai samprakāśayiṣyati evaṃ cāsyā cittaṃ viśodhayiṣyati nirivicikitsaṃ kariṣyati evaṃ cainaṃ vakṣyati ehi tvaṃ kulaputra asminn eva bodhisattvamārge śikṣasva / atra hi tvaṃ śikṣamānaś caran vyāyacchamānaḥ kṣipram evānuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim abhisambhotsyase / abhisambudhya ca aparimitaṃ sattvadhātum anuttare upadhisamkṣaye 'bhivineṣyasi yad uta bhūtakotiḥprabhāvanatāyām iti / evaṃ ca vācaṃ bhāseta eteṣāṃ eva tvaṃ kulaputra dharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhava yad uta prajñāpāramitāpratisamyuktānām iti / ayam eva tato bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet /

tat kasya hetoḥ

ato hi kauśika arhattvaṃ prabhāvyate / evaṃ ca asyotsāhaṃ vardhayiṣyati yathā yathā hi tvaṃ kulaputra prajñāpāramitāyām śikṣiṣyase tathā tathā tvaṃ anupūrveṇa buddhadharmāṇāṃ labhī bhaviṣyasi āsannaś ca bhaviṣyasy anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodheḥ /

atra hi tvaṃ śikṣāyām śikṣamānaś caran vyāyacchamānaḥ srotaāpattiḥphalaṃ prabhāvayiṣyasi sakṛdāgāmiphalaṃ prabhāvayiṣyasi anāgāmiphalaṃ prabhāvayiṣyasi arhattvaṃ prabhāvayiṣyasi pratyekabuddhatvaṃ prabhāvayiṣyasi samyaksambuddhatvaṃ prabhāvayiṣyasi / iti //

punar aparaṃ kauśika

yāvanto jambūdvīpe sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpayet / tat kiṃ manyase kauśika api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇyaṃ prasavet śakra āha bahu bhagavan bahu sugata /

bhagavān āha

ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhita vā bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet ya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ antaśaḥ pustakagatāṃ api kṛtvā abhiśraddadhad abhiśraddadhate avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimuñcann adhimuñcate prasannacittaḥ prasannacittāya adhyāśayasampanno 'dhyāśayasampannāya bodhāya cittaṃ utpādyā samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāya adhyāśayena dadyāt antaśo

likhanāyāpi vācanāyāpi akilāsitayā sampādayiṣyati udyukto 'muṃ grāhayiṣyati
 saṃdarśayiṣyati samādāpayiṣyati samuttejayiṣyati saṃprahaṣayiṣyati vācā neṣyati
 vineṣyati anuneṣyati artham asyā asmai saṃprakāśayiṣyati evaṃ cāsyā cittam
 viśodhayiṣyati nirvicikitsam kariṣyati evaṃ cainam vaksyati ehi tvam kulaputra asminn eva
 bodhisattvamārge śikṣasva /
 atra hi tvam śikṣamāṇas caran vyāyacchamānaḥ kṣipram evānuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim
 abhisabhotsyase / abhisambudhya ca aparimitam sattvadhātum anuttare upadhisamkṣaye
 'bhivineṣyasi yad uta bhūtakoṭiprabhāvanatāyām iti /
 evaṃ ca vācam bhāseta eteṣām eva tvam kulaputra dharmāṇām lābhī bhava
 yad uta prajñāpāramitāpratisamyuktānām iti /
 ayam eva tato bahutaram puṇyam prasavet /

tat kasya hetoḥ
 ato hi kauśika pratyekabuddhatvam prabhāvyate /
 evaṃ cāsyotsāham vardhayiṣyati
 yathā yathā hi tvam kulaputra prajñāpāramitāyām śikṣiṣyase
 tathā tathā tvam anupūrveṇa buddhadharmāṇām lābhī bhaviṣyasi
 āsannaḥ ca bhaviṣyasi anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodheḥ /
 atra hi tvam śikṣāyām śikṣamāṇas caran vyāyacchamānaḥ kṣipram eva srotaāpattiphalaṃ
 prabhāvayiṣyasi sakṛdāgāmiḥ phalaṃ prabhāvayiṣyasi anāgāmiḥ phalaṃ prabhāvayiṣyasi
 arhattvam prabhāvayiṣyasi pratyekabuddhatvam prabhāvayiṣyati samyaksambuddhatvam
 prabhāvayiṣyasi /

tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika jambūdvīpakān sarvasattvān pratyekabuddhatve
 pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sattvāḥ
 tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpayet

tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sarvasattvān
 pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika sāhasre cūlike
 lokadhātau sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā
 pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpayet /

tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sarvasattvān
 pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre
 madhyame lokadhātau sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā
 pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpayet /

tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau sarvasattvān
 pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ ye 'pi kecit kauśika
 trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau sattvāḥ tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā
 kuladuhitā vā pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpayet /

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau sarvasattvān
pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamkāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika
gaṅgānadīvālukopameṣu trisāhasramahāsāhasreṣu lokadhātuṣu sattvāḥ tān api sarvān
kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā pratyekabuddhatve pratiṣṭhāpayet /*

*tat kiṃ manyase kauśika
api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇyaṃ prasavet
śakra āha bahu bhagavan bahu sugata //*

*bhagavān āha
ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaraṃ
puṇyaṃ prasavet ya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ antaśaḥ pustakagatāṃ api kṛtvā
abhiśraddhad abhiśraddhadate avakalpayann avakalpayate adhimuñcann adhimuñcate
prasannacittaḥ prasannacittāya adhyāśayasampanno 'dhyāśayasampannāya bodhāya
cittam utpādyā samutpāditabodhicittāya bodhisattvāyādhyāśayena dadyāt antaśo
likhanāyāpi vācanāyāpi akilāsitayā saṃpādayiṣyati udyukte 'muṃ grāhayiṣyati
saṃdarśayiṣyati samādāpayiṣyati samuttejayiṣyati saṃpraharṣayiṣyati vācā neṣyati
vineṣyati anuneṣyati artham asyā asmai saṃprakāśayiṣyati evaṃ cāsyā cittam
viśodhayiṣyati nirvicikitsaṃ kariṣyati evaṃ cainaṃ vaksyati ehi tvam kulaputra asminn eva
bodhisattvamārgē śikṣasva
atra hi tvam śikṣamāṇaś caran vyāyacchamānaḥ kṣipram evānuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhim
abhisambhotsyase / abhisambudhya ca aparimitaṃ sattvadhātum anuttare
upadhisamkṣaye 'bhivineṣyasi yad uta bhūtakotiprabhāvanatāyām iti /
evaṃ ca vācaṃ bhāṣeta eteṣāṃ eva tvam kulaputra dharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhava yad uta
prajñāpāramitā pratisaṃyuktānām iti /
ayaṃ eva tato bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet /
tat kasya hetoḥ
ato hi kauśika pratyekabuddhatvaṃ prabhāvvyate /
evaṃ cāsyā utsāhaṃ vardhayiṣyasi*

[yada tu]a tatra [śikṣiś·s·]
yathā yathā hi tvam kulaputra prajñāpāramitāyām śikṣiṣyase

(5-35:) + + + + rvañudhaṃmana labhi bhaviśasi
tathā tathā tvam anupūrveṇa buddhadharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhaviṣyasi

*āsannaś ca bhaviṣyasy anuttarāyāḥ samyaksaṃbodheḥ /
atra hi tvam śikṣāyām śikṣamāṇaś caran vyāyacchamānaḥ*

Their merit is much greater. For what reason?

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

³⁹ 薩芸若德成法德。一切從般若波羅蜜中學，成佛：“(Because) the virtues of *sarvajñā(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. *evaṃ cāsyōtsāhaṃ vardhaviṣyati yathā yathā hi tvaṃ kulaputra! prajñāpāramitāyāṃ śikṣiṣyase tathā tathā tvaṃ anupūrveṇa buddhadharmāṇāṃ lābhī bhaviṣyasi āsannaś ca bhaviṣyasi anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodheḥ* (“And the Bodhisattva will increase his endurance by the reflection that by training himself in the perfection of wisdom, he will by and by 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悉得。是般若波羅蜜之所致。何以故？為薩芸若法; Kj.547a2f. 汝隨學是法，當得薩婆若法。

tado tua sodavatiphalo prabhaviśasi pialo
srotaāpattiphalaṃ prabhāvaiśyasi

sai (5-36:) + + + + aṅgamiphalo
sakṛdāgāmiphalaṃ prabhāvaiśyasi anāgāmiphalaṃ prabhāvaiśyasi

arahapo prabhaviśasi tado tua pracegabosi pravhabhiśasi
arhattvaṃ prabhāvaiśyasi samyaksambuddhatvaṃ prabhāvaiśyasīti /

(The *Prajñāpāramitā*), then, produces the Path of *srotaāpannas*,

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 Ganges⁴³ attain the Path of *srotaāpannas*, 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. *samyaksambuddhatvaṃ prabhāvayīṣyasi* = Tib.Pk. 73b5f. = D.69b4; ≡ Sh.606c4f. 及彼如來・應供・正等正覺皆悉從是般若波羅蜜多出生。Other versions (ZQ.486a10, Zfn.519a18, Kj.547a4, Xz[I].785c27, Xz[II].879c4) as well as Lk lack parallels.

⁴¹ 閻浮利：S(1), S(2), S(3), Y etc. 閻浮利人 (= Zfn.519a18).

⁴² AS.62.21~31= R.123.9~21 = AAA.310.5~20. *arhattve pratiṣṭhāpya puṇyābhisamkāro yāvantaḥ Kauśika! cāturmahādīvīpake lokadhātau ... yāvantaḥ Kauśika! trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātu sattvās tān api sarvān kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā arhattve 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. 恒邊沙佛刹；≡ Kj.547a6. 十方如恒河沙等世界 ≡ Xz(I).785c15. 十方各如藝伽沙等世界 (= Xz[II].879b24); ≠ AS.62.32f.= R.124.1f. = AAA.310.23f. *Gaṅgānādivālukopameṣu trisāhasramahāsāhasreṣu lokadhātuṣu* (“in great trichilocosms countless like the sands of the Ganges”) = Sh.606c10f. 滿燒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 *srotaāpannas*, 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. *arhattva*~ (“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 *srotaāpannas*, the Path of *sakṛdāgāmins*, the Path of *anāgāmins*, the Path of *arhants*, the Path of *pratyekabuddhas*. Therefore, their merit is much greater.

⁴⁵ AS.63.3 = R.124.6 = AAA.310.28. *sugata* = Xz(I).785c18. 善逝 (= Xz[III].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*} “*saṃkhyā api bhagavaṃs tasya puṇya-skandhasya na sukarā kartuṃ. gaṇanā 'py upamā 'py aupamyam apy upaniśā(AS, R °sā) 'py upaniśad api bhagavaṃs tasya puṇyaskandhasya na sukarā kartuṃ*” (“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甚多，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[I].785c18, Xz[III].879b27) lack parallels.

⁴⁷ AS.63.7~10 = R.124.12~15 = AAA.311.5~9. *abhiśraddhadhad abhiśraddhadhate ... samutpāditabodhi-cittāya bodhisattvāyādhyāśayena* = 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[III].879b29) lack parallels.

(5-37:) + + + + [a] ye jambudi _ ve satva te sarva
punar aparaṃ kauśika yāvanto jambūdvīpe satvāḥ teṣāṃ sarveṣāṃ

kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā

anutarae saṃmasaṃbosie cito upadeamsu
anuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhau cittam samutpadayet

yaś cānyaḥ kaścit kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā

te (5-38:) + + + + [.. saṃmasaṃbo]sae prathidaṇa
teṣāṃ sarveṣāṃ anuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhau cittam utpādyā tebhya

ima prañāparamida 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. 閻浮利人都盧皆使行佛道已，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 teṣāṃ sarveṣāṃ kaścīd eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā anuttarāyāṃ samyak-sambodhau cittaṃ 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無上正真道福; Zfn.519a28f. 閻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 kuladuhitā vā avinivartanīyāya

.. sa imayeva prañāparamida likhita uvaṇamea
bodhisattvāya mahāsattvāya enāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ likhitvā upanāmayet

atra prañāparamidae śikṣi (5-40:) + + + + vajiśati
atraiva prajñāpāramitāyāṃ śikṣiṣyate yogam āpatsyate /

eva sa prañāparamida bhuyasamatrae bhavaṇa
atraiva prajñāpāramitāṃ bhāvayan

parivuri gacheśati
vṛddhiṃ virūddhiṃ vipulatāṃ gataḥ paripūrayiṣyati buddhadharmān iti /

aya te (5-41) + + + [ṇa?] puñavisamkhareṇa
ayaṃ tasmāt paurvakāt kulaputrataḥ kuladuhitṛto vā sakāśād

bahudaro puño prasavati
bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet /

tat kasya hetoḥ
niyatam eṣo 'nuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim abhisambudhya sattvānāṃ duḥkhasyāntaṃ
kariṣyatīti /

⁴⁹If 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. *yaś cānyaḥ kaścit Kauśika! kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā teṣāṃ sarveṣāṃ anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau cittam utpādyā tebhya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ likhitvā dadyāt. yo vā Kauśika! kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā avinivartanīyāya bodhisattvāya mahāsattvāyānāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ likhitvā upanāmayed ‘atrāva prajñāpāramitāyāṃ śikṣiṣyate yogam āpatsyate. atrāva prajñāpāramitāṃ bhāvayan vṛddhiṃ virūddhiṃ vipulatāṃ gataḥ paripūrayiṣyati buddhadharmān’ ity. ayaṃ tasmāt paurvakān kulaputratāḥ kuladuhitṛto vā sakāśād bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet* (“and if someone else were not only to raise their hearts to full enlightenment, but would also in addition give them a copy of this perfection of wisdom; or, if he would present a copy of this perfection of wisdom to an irreversible Bodhisattva, in the hope that he will let himself be trained in it, make endeavours about it, develop it, and as a result of the growth, increase, and abundance of the perfection of wisdom, fulfil the Buddha-dharmas; then, compared with that former person, he will beget the greater merit.” [AsP.tr.II 122 = AsP.tr. 41]); ZQ.486a9.-; Zfn.519a28f. 不如善男子、善女人持般若波羅蜜經卷與人使書，教令學，為說之，若授與阿惟越致菩薩經書：“其人當從是學，深入般若波羅蜜，學知。般若波羅蜜者轉增益多守，無極知因得成就。”以是故其福轉倍甚多甚多；Kj.547a18f. 不如善男子、善女人以般若波羅蜜經卷與一阿毘跋致菩薩，作是念：“是菩薩於是中學，當能修習般若波羅蜜。以是因緣般若波羅蜜增廣流布。”福多於彼。

⁵⁰ AS.65.16 = R.128.19 = AAA.315.18f. *teṣāṃ sarveṣāṃ anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau cittam utpādyā* (“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.

⁵¹ 轉增多守：“(the *Prajñāpāramitā*) will be practised in a much greater degree”; cf. AS.65.19 = R.129.2 = AAA.315.27. *vṛddhiṃ virūddhiṃ vipulatāṃ gataḥ* (“as a result of the growth, increase, and abundance [of the perfection of wisdom]” [AsP.tr.II 122 = AsP.tr. 41]); Zfn.519b3. 轉增益多守；Kj.547a21. 增廣流布；Krsh(2010).448f., s.v. 守, ih 659, s.v. 轉增。

⁵² 無有極智：“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. 無極知；Krsh(2010).520.

⁵³ AS.65.21f. = R.129.4f. = AAA.316.9f. *tat kaṣya hetoḥ? nīyatam eṣo 'nuttarāṃ samyak-sambodhim abhisambudhya satvānāṃ duḥkhasyāntaṃ kariṣyati* (“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.437b22, ZQ.486a9, Zfn.519b4, Kj.547a22, Xz[I].786c7, Xz[II].879c18) lack parallels. Cf. n. 56.

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika jāmbūdvīpakānāṃ sarvasattvānāṃ anuttarāyāṃ
samyaksaṃbodhau cittam utpādya puṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika
cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sattvāḥ teṣāṃ api sarveṣāṃ kaścīd eva kulaputro vā
kuladuhitā vā anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau cittam utpādayet /*

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau
sarvasattvānāṃ anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau cittam utpādya puṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ
yāvantaḥ kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sattvāḥ teṣāṃ api sarveṣāṃ kaścīd eva
kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau cittam utpādayet /*

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sarvasattvānāṃ anuttarāyāṃ
samyaksaṃbodhau cittam utpādya puṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre
madhyame lokadhātau sattvāḥ teṣāṃ api sarveṣāṃ kaścīd eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā
anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau cittam utpādayet /*

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau sarvasattvānāṃ
anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau cittam utpādya puṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika
trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau sattvāḥ teṣāṃ api sarveṣāṃ kaścīd eva kulaputro vā
kuladuhitā vā anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau cittam utpādayet /*

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau sarvasattvānāṃ
anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau cittam utpādya puṇyābhisaṃskāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika
gaṅgānadīvālukopameṣu*

puṇavaro kośiga

ye trisāhasae maha (5-42:) + + + [d]ue satva te

trisāhasramahāsāhasreṣu lokadhātuṣu sattvāḥ teṣāṃ api sarveṣāṃ

kaścīd eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā

⁵⁴Leave 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,

⁵⁴. 置閻浮利，拘翼！三千大國土及如恒邊沙佛國中人，皆行阿耨多羅三耶三菩，皆發意，行佛道： “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’) *anuttara-samyaksambodhi* (i.e. unexcelled, perfect enlightenment), make a resolution (for enlightenment) and practise the Buddha-path.”; ≡ Zfn.519b4f. 置閻浮利三千大千國土，拘翼！及如恒邊沙佛刹人，皆發心，為阿耨多羅三耶三菩行; Kj.547a22f. 置是閻浮提及三千大千世界衆生，乃至十方如恒河沙等世界衆生皆發阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心 (≡ Xz[III].879c18~21, Sh.607b7~10). Parallels in the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions as well as Xz(I) are greatly detailed with many repetitions: AS.65.22~66.5 = R.129.5~130.4 = AAA.316.19~318.1. *tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ Kauśika! Jāmbūdvīpakānāṃ sarvasattvānāṃ tiṣṭhatu ... trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātāu ... yāvantaḥ Kauśika! Gaṅgānādvāluko-pameṣu trisāhasramahāsāhasreṣu lokadhātuṣu sattvās teṣāṃ api sarveṣāṃ kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā anuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhau cittam utpādayet* = Tib.Pk.77b7~78b1 = D.73a2~b3; ≡ Xz(I).786c7~20.

aṅutarae samasambosae cito upadeamsu
anuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhau cittam utpādayet /

yaś cānyaḥ kaścit kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā

teṣa [satvaṇa] (5-43:) + +

teṣāṃ sarveṣāṃ anuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhau cittam utpādyā tebhya

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

yo ya avevaṭiasa bosisatva (5-44:) + + + + +
yo vā kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā avinivartanīyāya bodhisattvāya mahasattvāya

[pa]ramida likhita uvaṇameati
enāṃ praññāpāramitāṃ likhitvā dadyāt upanāmayet

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

[e]va sa prañāparamida bhuyasamat[rae] [bhavaṇa] (5-46:)
evam asyeyāṃ praññāpāramitā bhūyasyā mātrayā bhāvanāṃ

+ + + + + + + +
vṛddhiṃ virūḍhiṃ vipulatāṃ paripūrīṃ gamiṣyatīti /

.. [vi?] teṇa purimageṇa
ayaṃ kauśika tataḥ paurvakāt kulaputrataḥ kuladuhitṛto vā sakāśād

puñavisam[khareṇa bahudaro] puño prasavati
bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet /

*tat kasya hetoḥ / niyatam eṣo 'nuttaraṃ samyaksambodhim abhisambudhya sattvānāṃ
duḥkhasyāntaṃ kariṣyatīti //*

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)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)⁵⁶

⁵⁵. AS.66.6 = R.130.5f. = AAA.318.2f. *teṣāṃ sarveṣāṃ anuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhau cittam utpādyā* (“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.

⁵⁶. AS.66.11f. = R.130.12f. = AAA.318.10f. *tat kasya hetoḥ? niyatam eṣo 'nuttarāṃ samyak-sambodhim abhisambudhya sattvānāṃ duḥkhasyāntaṃ kariṣyātīti* = 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 koṣiga (5-47:)

+ + + + sameṣu logadhaduṣu satva te sarva aṇutarae saṃmasaṃbosae cito
upadeaṃsu

teṣu s· (5-48:) + + + + .. [e] saṃmasaṃbosae prathidaṇa koideva ima prañaparamida
saartha saveñaṇa uvadiṣe ..

(437c)⁵⁷ 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！閻浮利人都盧皆行阿耨多羅三耶三菩……授與，使學入點慧中，其福轉倍多： “Moreover, O *Kauśika*, (suppose that) all the people in *Jambūdvīpa* seek for (行; or ‘practise’) *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’) *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, study it or enter into the wisdom —, copies scriptural scrolls of the *Prajñāpāramitā* even (及至) 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).”; = Zfn.519b11~20. 復次，拘翼！閻浮利人皆發阿耨多羅三耶三菩行，不如善男子、善女人持般若波羅蜜經卷與人，使書之，為解說其慧，令學之，及授與阿惟越致菩薩·摩訶薩般若波羅蜜經，為解中慧。其福轉倍益多。置閻浮利，三千大千國土及至恒邊沙佛刹人皆發阿耨多羅三耶三菩心，不如善男子、善女人持般若波羅蜜經卷與人，使書之，教令學，入點慧中，若授與阿惟越致菩薩·摩訶薩般若波羅蜜經，為解中慧，其福轉倍益多; Kj.547b2~15. 復次，憍尸迦！閻浮提所有衆生皆發阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心。若有善男子、善女人以般若波羅蜜經卷與之，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一阿毘跋致菩薩，為解其義。福多於彼。憍尸迦！置是閻浮提及三千大千世界衆生，乃至教十方如恒河沙等世界衆生，皆發阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心。若有善男子、善女人以般若波羅蜜經卷與之為解其義。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一阿毘跋致菩薩，為解其義。福多於彼。”; = Xz(II).879c18~28; ≠ Xz(I).787a4~788a14 (greatly detailed). The newer versions (AS.66.13 = R.130.14 = AAA.318.17, Xz[I], Sh.607b17, Tib.Pk.78b5 = D.73b6) 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
 ayaṃ teṇa pu[ñio] (5-50:) _____ puñavisamkhareṇa bahudaro puño prasavati

puṇavaro kośiga ye jāmbudīve satva (5-51:) + + + ..
 punar aparaṃ kauśika yāvanto jāmbūdvīpe sattvāḥ te sarve

[sa]ma[sabosae] cito upadeati avevaṭṭā bhavaṃti
 avinivartanīyā bhaveyur anuttarāyāḥ
 samyaksambodheḥ /

*tebhyaḥ kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā anuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim
 abhisamprasthitebhya imāṃ praññāpāramitāṃ pustakalikhitāṃ kṛtvā dadyād upanāmayet /
 yaś ca tebhyaḥ kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhita vā imāṃ praññāpāramitāṃ
 pustakalikhitāṃ kṛtvā dadyād upanāmayet sārthāṃ savyañjanāṃ upadiśet*

*tat kiṃ manyase kauśika
 api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇyaṃ prasavet?
 śakra āha bahu bhagavan bahu sugata /
 samkhyā pi bhagavaṃs tasya puṇyaskandhasya na sukarā kartum /
 gaṇanā pi upamā pi aupamyam api upaniśā pi upaniśad api bhagavaṃs tasya
 puṇyaskandhasya na sukarā kartum //
 bhagavān āha*

*ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavet yas
 teṣāṃ avinivartanīyānāṃ bodhisattvānāṃ mahāsattvānāṃ kṣiprataram anuttarāṃ
 samyaksambodhim abhisamboddhukāmebhya*

*imāṃ praññāpāramitāṃ pustakalikhitāṃ kṛtvā dadyāt upanāmayet
 sārthāṃ savyañjanāṃ upadiśet iha ca tān praññāpāramitāyāṃ avaveded anuśiṣyāt /
 tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika jāmbūdvīpakebhyaḥ
 sarvasattvebhyo 'vinivartanīyebhya imāṃ praññāpāramitāṃ upanāmya
 puṇyābhisamskāraḥ yāvantaḥ kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sattvāḥ te 'pi sarve
 'vinivartanīyā bhaveyur anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodheḥ / tebhyo 'pi kaścid eva kulaputro
 vā kuladuhitā vā imāṃ praññāpāramitāṃ pustakalikhitāṃ kṛtvā dadyād upanāmayet
 sārthāṃ savyañjanāṃ uddiśet /*

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika cāturmahādvīpake lokadhātau sarvasattvebhyo
 'vinivartanīyebhya imāṃ praññāpāramitāṃ upanāmya puṇyābhisamskāraḥ yāvantaḥ
 kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sattvāḥ te 'pi sarve 'vinivartanīyā bhaveyur
 anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodheḥ /*

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)⁵⁸ 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).]

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*,⁶⁰ what do you think, O *Kauśika*, is their merit not great?”

Śakra devendra said: “Very much, very much, O Lord! -(AS)⁶¹-(AS)⁶²”

⁵⁸ 及至(←若有)? : J, S(1), FS. 有若; the other editions and manuscripts read 若有. Cf. Zfn.519b18. 若.

⁵⁹ 閻浮利人都盧皆令行阿惟越致菩薩阿耨多羅三耶三菩 : “(Moreover, O *Kauśika*,) suppose that all the people in *Jambūdvīpa* seek for *anuttara-samyaksambodhi* as *avivartika-bodhisattvas*.”; cf. AS.66.13f. = R.130.14f. = AAA.318.17f. *yāvanto Jambūdvīpe sattvās te sarve avinivartanīyā bhavayur anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodhes* (“All beings in *Jambūdvīpa* become irreversible from full enlightenment.”); Zfn.519b20f. 閻浮利人皆令如阿惟越致菩薩阿耨多羅三耶三菩; Kj.547b15f. 閻浮提所有衆生皆是阿毘跋致菩薩.

⁶⁰ 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 makes them enter into the *Prajñāpāramitā*”; = Zfn.519b21f. 若有善男子、善女人隨教入入般若波羅蜜中, Kj.547b16f. 若有善男子、善女人以般若波羅蜜義教之; = Sh.607b19f. Parallels in the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions are more detailed: AS.66.14f. = R.130.15f. = AAA.318.19f. *tebhyaḥ kaścīd eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā anuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim abhisamprasthitebhya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ pustakalikhitāṃ kṛtvā dadyād upanāmayet. yaś ca tebhyaḥ kaścīd eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ pustakalikhitāṃ kṛtvā dadyād upanāmayet sārthāṃ savyañjanāṃ upadiśet* (“The first would present a copy of this perfection of wisdom to any number of beings in any number of world systems who have become irreversible from full enlightenment, who have definitely set out for it; the second would in addition expound it to them, according to the meaning and according to the letter.” [AsP.tr.II 122f. = AsP.tr. 42]).

⁶¹ AS.66.18 = R.131.1 = AAA.318.27. *sugata* = Xz(I).788a26. 善逝 (= Xz[III].880a6), Tib.Pk.78b8 = D.74a1. Other versions (Lk.437c16, ZQ.486a12, Zfn.519b24, Kj.547b19, Sh.607b22[!]) lack parallels.

⁶² AS.66.18f. = R.131.1f. = AAA.318.27f. *saṃkhyā 'pi bhagavaṃs tasya puṇyaskandhasya na sukarā kartuṃ. gaṇanā 'py upamā 'py aupamyam apy upanīṣā 'py upanīṣad api bhagavaṃs tasya na sukarā kartuṃ* (“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.607b22f., Tib.Pk.78b8f. = D.74a1f. Except for the newest versions, the other ones (Lk.437c16, ZQ.486a12, Zfn.519b24, Kj.547b19, Xz[I].788a26, Xz[III].880a6) lack parallels.

*tebhyo 'pi kaścīd eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ pustakalikhitāṃ
kṛtvā dadyād upanāmayet sārthāṃ savyañjanāṃ upadiśet /*

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika sāhasre cūlike lokadhātau sarvasattvebhyo
'vinivartanīyebhya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ upanāmya puṇyābhisamkāraḥ yāvantaḥ
kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau sattvāḥ te 'pi sarve 'vinivartanīyā bhavye
anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodheḥ / tebhyo 'pi kaścīd eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imāṃ
prajñāpāramitāṃ pustakalikhitāṃ kṛtvā dadyād upanāmayet sārthāṃ savyañjanāṃ
upadiśet /*

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika dvisāhasre madhyame lokadhātau sarvasattvebhyo
'vinivartanīyebhya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ upanāmya puṇyābhisamkāraḥ yāvantaḥ
kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau sattvāḥ te 'pi sarve 'vinivartanīyā bhavye
anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodheḥ /
tebhyo 'pi kaścīd eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ pustakalikhitāṃ
kṛtvā dadyād upanāmayet sārthāṃ savyañjanāṃ upadiśet /*

*tiṣṭhatu khalu punaḥ kauśika trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau sarvasattvebhyo
'vinivartanīyebhya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ upanāmya puṇyābhisamkāraḥ yāvantaḥ
kauśika gaṅgānadīvālukopameṣu trisāhasramahāsāhasreṣu lokadhātuṣu sattvāḥ te 'pi
sarve 'vinivartanīyā bhavye anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodheḥ / tebhyo 'pi kaścīd eva
kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā / imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ pustakalikhitāṃ kṛtvā dadyād
upanāmayet sārthāṃ savyañjanāṃ upadiśet /*

*tat kiṃ manyase kauśika
api nu sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇya prasavet*

*śakra āha
bahu bhagavan bahu sugata /
samkhyāpi bhagavaṃs tasya puṇyaskandhasya na sukarā kartum/ gaṇanāpi upamāpi
aupamyam api upanisāpi bhagavaṃs tasya puṇyaskandhasya na sukarā kartum //*

bhagavān āha

ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaram puṇyam prasavet

teṣa sarveṣa avevaṭiṇa (5-52:) + + + + .. + .. + + + + +
yas teṣām avinivartanīyānām bodhisattvānām mahāsattvānām kṣiprataram
anuttarām samyaksaṃbodhim abhisamboddhukāmebhya

[ku]lap(u)tro va kuladhita vi
ima prañāparamida likh[ita] uvaṇa(m)e
imām prajñāpāramitām pustakalikhitām kṛtvā dadyād upanāmayet

(5-53:) + + + + [ñā]ṇa uvatidiśea
sārtham savyañjanām upadiśet

iha ca tām prajñāpāramitāyām avavaded anuśiṣyāt /

ta ki mañasi kośiga
athāparaḥ kauśika

avi ṇu so kulaputro va kuladhita vi bahu p(u)ṇo

(5-54:) + + + + .. bahu bhaṃte

The Buddha said:

“⁶³Suppose 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.

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 *avivartika-bodhisattvas*. If a good man or a good woman teaches and make them enter into the *Prajñāpāramitā*⁶⁴,

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，若有人持般若波羅蜜經卷書，授與者，其福轉倍多：“Suppose that a *bodhisattva* appears amongst them ... this person’s merit is much greater.”; cf. AS.66.21f. = R.131.4f. = AAA.319.4f. *ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa Kauśika! kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaram puṇyaṃ prasaved yas teṣāṃ avinivartanīyānāṃ bodhisattvānāṃ mahāsattvānāṃ kṣiprataram anuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim abhisamboddhukāmebhya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ pustakalikhitāṃ kṛtvā dadyād upanāmayet sārthāṃ savyañjanāṃ upadiśet iha ca tān prajñāpāramitāyām avavaded anuśiṣyāt* (“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]); 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，不如人入般若波羅蜜者。其福轉倍益多; Kj.547b19f. 於是中有一菩薩，疾得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提。若有人以般若波羅蜜義教之，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. *tebhyo 'pi kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ pustakalikhitāṃ kṛtvā dadyād upanāmayet sārthāṃ savyañjanāṃ upadiśet*; Zfn.519b28f. 若有教善男子、善女人入般若波羅蜜中; Kj.547b23f. 若有善男子、善女人以般若波羅蜜義教之。

⁶⁵ AS.67.16 = R.132.19 = AAA.320.20. *sugata* = Xz(I).788b27. 善逝(= Xz[III].880a18), Tib.Pk.80a2 = D.75a1. Other versions lack parallels.

⁶⁶ AS.67.16f. = R.132.19f. = AAA.320.20f. *saṃkhyā 'pi bhagavaṃs tasya puṇyaskandhasya na sukarā kartuṃ. gaṇanā 'py upamā 'py aupamyam apy upanīśā 'py upanīśad api bhagavaṃs tasya puṇyaskandhasya na sukarā kartuṃ* = Sh.607c6f., Tib.Pk.80a2f. = D.75a1f. Other versions lack parallels.

bhagava

avaro bosisatvo

upajeati

aham

kṣipadaro

bodhisattvo mahāsattva utpadyeta sa evaṃ vadet aham eteṣāṃ kṣiprataram

aṅutarasaṃmasaṃbosi [a] (5-55:) + + [bo]ji _ śami

anuttarāṃ samyaksam̐bodhim abhisam̐bhotsya iti /

yo ayaṃ

kṣipadaro

yas taṃ kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā kṣiprābhijñataram̐ bodhisattvaṃ

mahāsattvaṃ

aṅutarasaṃmasabosi avisaṃbujidumo yo so

p[rañapa] (5-56:) _____ ramidae ovadeati anuśaśeati ayaṃ teṇa purimakeṇa⁶⁷

prajñāpāramitāyām

avavaded anuśiṣyāt ayaṃ tataḥ paurvakāt

kulaputrāt kuladuhitur vā sakāśād

puñavisam̐khareṇa [baho] (5-57:) _____ daro puño prasavati

bahutaram̐

punyaṃ prasavet //

asa hu śakro devaṇa im̐tro bhagavado edadoca

atha khalu śakro devānām indro bhagavantam̐ etad avocat

⁶⁷. Cf. *purimako* in the Brāhmī ms (Sander 2000b: 9).

The Buddha said: “-(AS)⁶⁸ ⁶⁹Suppose 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 :

⁶⁸ AS.67.18~21 = R.132.22~133.5 = AAA.320.24~30. *ataḥ khalu punaḥ sa Kauśika! kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bahutaram puṇyaṃ prasaved yas teṣāṃ avinivartanīyānāṃ bodhisattvānāṃ mahāsattvānāṃ samyaksambodhim abhisamboddhukāmebhya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ pustakalikhitāṃ kṛtvā dadyād upanāmayet sārthāṃ savyañjanāṃ upadiśet iha ca tān prajñāpāramitāyām avaveded anuśiṣyāt* (AAA. °*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.

⁶⁹ 若有一菩薩從其中出，便作是言：‘我欲疾作佛。’ 正使欲疾作佛，若有人持般若波羅蜜經卷書，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. *athāparaḥ Kauśika! bodhisattvo mahāsattva utpadyeta. sa evaṃ vaded “aham eteṣāṃ kṣiprataram anuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim abhisambhotsya” iti. yas taṃ Kauśika! kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā kṣiprābhijñatarāṃ bodhisattvaṃ mahāsattvaṃ prajñāpāramitāyām avaveded anuśiṣyād, ayaṃ tataḥ paurvakāt kulaputrāt kuladuhitur vā sakāśād bahutaram puṇyaṃ prasavet* (“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]); ZQ.486a12f. 若有善願欲疾作佛，以經施之，令成士，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。

yasa ya[sa] + (5-58:) + + + [bha]gava b(o)[sisatv]e mahasatve asaṇobhatiti
yathā yathā bhagavan bodhisattvo mahāsattva āsannībhavaty

bosa[e tasa tasa yo so prañāparami] + (5-59:) + +
anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodheḥ tathā tathā prajñāpāramitāyām

[o]vadeti aṇuśāseti
avavaditavyo 'nuśāsitavyaḥ

*tathā tathā prajñāpāramitāyām avodyamāno 'nuśiṣyamāṇas tathatāyā āsannībhavati /
tathatāyā āsannībhavan yeṣāṃ paribhūṅkte*

civarapeḍavada-śayasana-gilāṇa-praceabheṣa[ja] +
cīvarapiṇḍapāta-śayanāsana-glāṇa-pratyayabhaiṣajyaparīṣkāraṇ

teṣāṃ tān kāraṇ kṛtān mahāphalān karoti mahānuśamsān /

(5-60:) + + .. [a?]sa daje so bahu[dar]o puṇo [prasav]eti
ataḥ sa bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavati /

ta kisa hedu
tat kasya hetoḥ

“It is so, O Lord, (O Most Composed One!)^{70 71}If a *bodhisattva-mahāsattva*, while coming swiftly near

enlightenment, teaches people the *Prajñāpāramitā* or gives (438a) them (its scriptural scrolls), -

(AS)⁷² his merit is much greater.

⁷³For 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.321.10.-; Xz(II).880a25. 善逝； Krsh(2010).237.

⁷¹ 菩薩·摩訶薩疾近佛，般若波羅蜜若教人，若授與人，其福轉倍多：“If a *bodhisattva-mahāsattva*, while coming swiftly near enlightenment, teaches people the *Prajñāpāramitā* or gives them (its scriptural scrolls), his merit is much greater.”; ≠ AS.67.26f. = R.133.10f. = AAA.321.10f. *yathā yathā bhagavan! bodhisattvo mahāsattva āsannībhavaty anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodhes tathā tathā prajñāpāramitāyām avavaditavyo ’nuśāsitavyaḥ tathā tathā prajñāpāramitāyām avodyamāno ’nuśīyamānas tathatāyā āsannībhavati. ... ataḥ sa bahutarāṃ puṇyaṃ prasavati* (“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. 是闍士·大士疾近佛。用是故，受其福轉倍多；Zfn.519c5. (極安隱者)即菩薩·摩訶薩今近佛。…… 不如持般若波羅蜜教授人者。其福轉倍益多；Kj.547b29f. 隨菩薩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. *tathatāyā āsannībhavan yeṣāṃ paribhūkte cīvarapiṇḍapātaśayanāsanaglānapratyayabhaiṣajyapariṣkāraṃs teṣāṃ tān kāraṇaḥ kṛtān mahāphalān karoti mahānuśaṃsān* (“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 = D.75b1. 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 hetoḥ? evaṃ hy etad bhagavan! bhavati yad bodhisattvo mahāsattva āsannībhavaty anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodheḥ* (“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.

*evam hy etad bhagavan bhavati yad bodhisattvo mahāsattva āsannībhavaty anuttarāyāḥ
samyaksambodheḥ //*

*atha khalv āyusmān subhūtiḥ śakraṃ devānām indram etad avocat
sādhu sādhu kauśika*

*yas tvam bodhisattvayānikānām pudgalānām utsahaṃ dadāsi anuḡṛhṇīṣe
anuparivārayasi /*

evamedo bhate karaṇio

evam ca kauśika tvayā karaṇīyam -

ya a[ri] (5-61:) + [a]śravago bosisatvasa aṇugraho karoti

ya āryaśrāvakaḥ sarvasattvānām anugrahaṃ kartukāmaḥ

[aṇ](u)[tara[e] saṃmasambosie [usaha] + +
sa bodhisattvānām mahāsattvānām anuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodhāv utsāhaṃ

(5-62:) + + [ṇa]ti aṇuparivareti

vardhayati anuḡṛhṇīte 'nuparivārayati

evam tvayam karaṇio

evam etat karaṇīyam /

{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)⁷⁴

⁷⁵This 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)⁷⁶ one should act.(?)

⁷⁴ AS.68.4 = R.134.1f. = AAA.322.20f. *yas tvaṃ bodhisattvayānikānām pudgalānām utsāham dadāsi anugr̥h̥ṇīṣe anuparivārayasi* (“You fortify those who belong to the Bodhisattva-vehicle, help them, stand by them.” [AsP.tr.II 123 = AsP.tr. 42]) = Tib.Pk.80b5 = D.75b3; ≡ Xz(I).790b26~27, Xz(II).880b6~7, Sh.607c22~23. The older versions (Lk.438a3, ZQ.486a17, Zfn.519c9, Kj.547c5) lack parallels.

⁷⁵ 當所爲。尊弟子！菩薩・摩訶薩作是受，疾作佛。所爲作者，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. *evam ca Kauśika! tvayā karaṇīyaṃ. ya āryaśrāvakaḥ sarvasattvānām anugrahaṃ kartukāmaḥ sa bodhisattvānām mahāsattvānām anuttarāyaṃ samyaksambodhav utsāham vardhayaty anugr̥h̥ṇīte 'nuparivārayaty. evam etat karaṇīyaṃ. tat kasya hetoḥ? ataḥ prasūtā hi bodhisattvānām mahāsattvānām anuttarā 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。闍士受淨定，疾得作佛。所作行當如淨; Zfn.519c9f. 於尊弟子菩薩・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護念。

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 karaṇīyaṃ* (“This is what one should do.”).

tat kaṣya hetoḥ

ado praṇatīa bhagavado ṣavaga ya
ataḥ prasūtā

hi bodhisattvānām mahāsattvānām anuttarā samyakṣambodhiḥ /

yadi (5-63:) ++ to **ṇa upadito siati**
yadi hi bodhisattvā mahāsattvā etad bodhicittam notpādayeran

ṇa idaṃ bosisatva **śikṣeanti**
na caite bodhisattvā mahāsattvā anuttarāyām samyakṣambodhau śikṣeran

*na ṣaṭpāramitāsu śikṣeran aśikṣamāṇā anuttarām samyakṣambodhiṃ nābhisambudhyeran/
yasmāt tarhi bodhisattvā mahāsattvā bodhisattvaśikṣāyām āsu*

ṣah[i] [p.] + + + + + + + + + +
ṣaṭpāramitāsu śikṣante tasmād etad bodhicittam utpādayante tasmād

(5-64:) anutaraṃ saṃmasaṃbosi **avisambuji[eaṃ]ti**
anuttarām samyakṣambodhim abhisambudhyanta iti //

[ya] .. + + + + + + + + + + (5:65:) + + + + + [sa](ṃ)buja vi

āryāṣṭasāhasrikayām prajñāpāramitāyām puṇyaparyāyaparivarto nāma pañcamah //

Disciples of the Buddha originate from it (*i.e.* the *Prajñāpāramitā*).

⁷⁷If these people, *i.e.* *bodhisattva-mahāsattvas* 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!}⁷⁹”

⁷⁷ 是輩人不索佛道者，菩薩・摩訶薩不當於其中學六波羅蜜，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 bodhisattvā mahāsattvā etad bodhicittaṃ nōtpādayeran na cāte bodhisattvā mahāsattvā anuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhau śikṣeran na śatpāramitāsu śikṣerann aśikṣamānā anuttarāṃ samyaksambodhiṃ nābhisambudhyeran* (“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. 不得景定，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，疾作阿耨多羅三耶三佛：“(If) one follows the Dharma and studies it, one will swiftly become an *anuttarasamyaksambuddha*.”; cf. AS.68.10f. = R.134.9f. = AAA.323.17f. *yasmāt tarhi bodhisattvā mahāsattvā bodhisattvaśikṣāyāṃ āsu śatpāramitāsu śikṣante tasmād etad bodhicittam utpādayante tasmād anuttarāṃ samyaksambodhiṃ 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，疾成阿耨多羅三耶三菩，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 *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* Compiled in Gandhāra in Gāndhārī?*

Seishi KARASHIMA

Prologue

Each Mahāyāna 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 Gāndhārī version of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (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 back-formations, reductions, additions and interpolations over the centuries. This means that when we attempt to understand early Mahāyāna 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 Gāndhārī fragments, discovered in Central Asia and “Greater Gandhāra” (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 Gāndhārī manuscripts of Mahāyāna scriptures, dating even back to the first century, which have been discovered in recent years, may change our understanding of Mahāyāna 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 Mahāyāna 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 Mahāyāna 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) Gāndhārī 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 transliterations of nineteen fragments in this collection were published in 2008¹. However, although 13 years have passed since this sensational discovery, careful transliterations 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 (*śravagayaṇa*, *praceabudhayaṇa*, *samasabudhayaṇa*) and *Akṣobha* (Skt. *Akṣobhya*) Buddha, a text which refers to *prañāparamida* (Skt. *prajñāpāramitā*) (*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 Gāndhārī Mahāyāna text. This is a Gāndhārī 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 Gāndhārī 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 Gāndhārī fragments, the Chinese translations by Lokakṣema, by Zhi Qian 支謙 (fl. ca. 220~257 C.E.; T. 8, no. 225), by Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 (in 382 C.E.; T. 8, no. 226), by Kumārajīva (in 408 C.E.; T. 8, no. 227) and by Xuanzang 玄奘 (in 660~663 C.E.; T. 7, no. 220, pp. 865~920) — are simpler, while the newer ones — namely another translation by Xuanzang 玄奘 (in 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 *Sadāprarudita* 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 recently², 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 Gāndhārī manuscript fragments, which may retain more of the original shape of the text.

The recto of the Gāndhārī fragments of the *Aṣṭasahasrikā 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 Gāndhārī 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 *prakṛtiś cittasya prabhāsvarā* (“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-prabhāsvara-citta* 自性清淨心 “the innately luminous (pure) mind”, while all the other Chinese and Tibetan translations have it³.

² “Li-yung “fan-pan” yen-chiu chung-ku han-yü yen-pien : i *Tao-hsing Pan-jo Ching* “i-i” yü *Chiu-se-lu Ching wei li*” 利用「翻版」研究中古漢語演變：以《道行般若經》「異譯」與《九色鹿經》為例 [A Study of the Evolution of Middle Chinese Using “Modified Versions”: Case Studies of the *Tao-hsing Pan-jo Ching* and Its Later Modifications and the *Chiu-se-lu Ching*], in: Chung-cheng Ta-hsüeh Chung-wen Hsüeh-shu Nien-k’an 中正大學中文學術年刊, no. 18 (2011): 165~188; “Shoki kan-yaku butten no gengo no kenkyū — Shirukasen yaku to Shiken yaku no taihiwo chūshin toshite” 初期漢訳仏典の言語の研究—支婁迦讖訳と支謙訳の対比を中心として— [A Study of the Language of the Early Chinese Buddhist Translations: Comparison between the translations by Lokakṣema and those by Zhi Qian], in: *Okuda Seiō Sensei Shōju Kinen Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Ronjū* 奥田聖應先生頌寿記念 インド学仏教学論集: Tokyo: Kōsei Shuppansha 佼成出版社 (forthcoming).

³ Krsh 2011: 4, n. 25; Falk/Karashima 2012: 34~35, n. 15.

(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 *Aṣṭasāhasrikā 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 怛薩阿竭 (429a27, 429c14 etc.; cf. Krsh 2010: 98; EH. tat sat ṛa gjiat; **tasaga*(a), which occurs around 200 times in AS(Lk), corresponds to Gā. *tasagada*⁴ (< 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(←願)捷提 (471c11; cf. Krsh 2010: 329) may have been based on the Gāndhārī form *masu-ga<m>dhi* (< BHS. *madhu-gandhika* < *mṛdu-gandhika*⁵; cf. Gā. *masu* < Skt. *madhu*). The words *bodhi* and *bodhisat(t)va* become *bosi* 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. śju: ha; **Śuha* < *Śubhā*; Krsh 2010: 454), 波栗多修呵 (435a13; EH. pa ljiət ta sju he; **Parittaśuha* < *Parittaśubha*; Krsh 2010: 45f.), 首訶迦 (439c25; EH. śju: ha kja[kra]; **Śuhaka* < *Śubhakṛtsna*; Krsh 2010: 453) and 阿波摩首訶 (439c24; EH. ṛa pa ma śju: ha; **Apama(ṇa)śuha* < *Apramāṇaśubha*; Krsh 2010: 1) indicate that the underlying Indian text read *śuha*, which is actually found in the Gāndhārī *Dharmapada*⁶, 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. *Subhūti*; 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- > ø

One of the characteristics of Gāndhārī is that the *h* in the medial position, is

⁴ Ajitaseṇa Inscription: 3–4; British Library Fragment 7: a Da1 = Baums 2009: 241; Nasim Khan 73.18f., 77.3f., 81.10 etc.

⁵ Cf. Krsh 2010: 329, ns. 181 and 182.

⁶ DhP-G^k: 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 consonant⁹. 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. *ɣwat- pa la*; **Ve'a(p)phala* < *Vehapphala* [= Pā] < BHS. *Vṛhatphala* / *Brhatphala*; Krsh 2010: 234), 梵摩三鉢 (431a27; EH. *b(r)jam- ma səm pat*; *Brama Sa'aṃpati* < Gā. *Brama Sahāṃpati*¹⁰ < BHS. *Brahmā Sahāṃpati*; Krsh 2010: 159), 僧那 (443a24; EH. *səng na*; **sa(m)ṇa'a* < **sa(m)ṇaha* < Skt. *saṃnāha*; Krsh 2010: 405), 摩訶僧那僧涅 (427b29, 427c2 etc.; EH. *ma ha səng na səng niət*; **mahasa(m)ṇa'a-saṃnaddha* < Gā. **mahasa(m)ṇaha-saṃnaddha* < BHS. *mahāsaṃnāha-saṃnaddha*; Krsh 2010: 323).

(5) *-bh-* > *-h-* or *∅*

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: 阿波摩那 (467b9; EH. *ʔa pa ma na*; **Ap(r)amaṇa'a* / **Ap(r)amaṇaha* < *Apramāṇābha*; Krsh 2010: 1), 阿波摩修 (435a13; EH. *ʔa pa ma sju*; **Ap(r)amaṇaśu'a* / **Ap(r)amaṇaśuha* < *Apramāṇaśubha*; Krsh 2010: 1-2), 阿會亘修 (431a16, 435a12 etc.; EH. *ʔa ɣwat- sjwan sju*; **Avasvara śu'a* / **Avasvara śuha* < BHS. *Ābhāsvara* + *śubha*?; Krsh 2010: 2-3), 波利陀 (435a11, 439c23; EH. *pa ljjiəi- da*; **Paritta'a* / **Parittaha* < *Parittābha*; Krsh 2010: 45), 耨(v.l. 盧)波摩那 (435a12, 439c23; EH. *ʔap pa ma na*; **Ap(r)amaṇa'a* / **Apramaṇaha* < BHS. *Apramāṇābha*; Krsh 2010: 143), 修乾 (435a13; EH. *sju gjian[kan]*; **Su'akiṇṇ(a)* / **Suhakiṇṇa* < *Śubhakṛtsna*; cf. Pā. *Subhakiṇha*, °*kiṇṇa*; Krsh 2010: 552). The transliteration 阿彌陀 (EH. *ʔa mjiei[mjiei:] da*; *Amida'a* / **Amidaha* < *Amitābha*) for the well-known Mahāyāna Buddha, which Lokakṣema used in his Chinese translation of the Larger *Sukhāvaiṭṭvyūha*, 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. *ʔju ba sək*; Gā. **uvasak(a)* < BHS. *upāsaka*; Krsh 2010: 595), 優婆夷 (431a15, 451a13 etc.; EH. *ʔju ba źjiəi*; Gā. *uvasia* < BHS. *upāsikā*; Krsh 2010: 595) indicate that in the underlying Indic text had *-v-* for OIA *-p-*. Actually, in the above-mentioned Bajaur fragments, similar forms *uvasēa* (< BHS. *upāsaka*), *uvasia* (< BHS. *upāsikā*) occur (Nasim Khan 110.9¹¹). Also, the Chinese characters 𪛗 (EH. *ɣwa*), 和 (EH. *ɣwa*), 洹 (EH. *ɣwan*), 曰 (EH. *ɣjwat*), 越 (EH. *ɣjwat*) 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: 漚𪛗拘舍羅 (433c7 etc.; EH. *ʔou ɣwa kou[kjou] śja- la*; **uvaakośalla*¹² < BHS. *upāyakausālya* or *upāyakausāla*; Krsh 2010: 346f.), 波耶和提 (431a1; EH. *pa źja[źja] ɣwa dei*; **Pajavadi*, **Prajapati* < BHS. *Prajāpati*; Krsh 2010: 48), 和夷羅洹 (455b28; EH. *ɣwa źjiəi la ɣwan*; **Vajiravāṇi*, *Vayiravāṇi*¹³ < BHS. *Vajrapāṇi*; Krsh 2010: 212), 提和竭羅 (431a7; EH. *dei*

⁹ Cf. Brough 1962: § 39; Karashima 1994: 28, § 2.8; von Hinüber 2001: § 223; Allon 2001: 102; Salomon 2008: 128.

¹⁰ Senavarman Inscription: Salomon 1995: 10: *Braṃa Saha[m]pati* = von Hinüber 2003: 34. *Bramo Sahāṃpati*.

¹¹ *uvasiana* is a misprint of *uvasiana*.

¹² Cf. Gā. *kośala* < *kausālya* (Baums 2009: 636~637).

¹³ Cf. Gā. *vayira-* (Senavarman Inscription: 5; Mount Banj Inscription: 3~2).

ɣwa gjiat la; **Diva(m)gara* < BHS. *Dīpaṃkara*; Krsh 2010: 478f.), 摩訶惟日羅 (468c12; EH. ma ha ʒjwəi ɣjwat la; **Maha-vevula*¹⁴ < **Mahā-vevulla* < BHS. *Mahā-vaipulya*; Krsh 2010: 324), 三昧越 (455b14f.; EH. səm mət- ɣjwat; **samavaj(adi)*¹⁵ < Skt. *samāpadyate*; Krsh 2010: 400-401).

(7) -t- > -d-

The Chinese characters 陀 (EH. da), 檀 (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. ʔa da pa; **Adapa* < BHS. *Atapa*; Krsh 2010: 11), 阿比耶陀 (439c25; EH. ʔa bjiəi[bjiəi-] ʒja[zja] da; **Aviyada(va)?* < **Aviha Adava* < Pā. *Avihā Atapā* > BHS. *Avrhaḥ Atapāḥ*; Krsh 2010: 1), 兜術陀 (EH. tou ʒjwət da; 435a4, 468b-3; Gā. *Tuṣida*¹⁶ < BHS. *Tuṣita*; Krsh 2010: 129f.), 沙羅伊檀 (470a21; EH. sra la ʔjiəi dan; **ṣal-ayadaṇ(ani)* < BHS. *ṣaḍ-āyatanāni*; Krsh 2010: 405).

(8) -d- > -l-, -ḍ- > -l-

The following transliteration shows the development of -d- > -l-: 拘文羅 (471c10; EH. kou[kjou] mjən la; Gā. *kumula*¹⁷ < Skt. *kumuda*; Krsh 2010: 281f.). The following suggests the changes of *ratna* > MI. *ratana* > Gā. *radaṇa*¹⁸ > **ralaṃṇa*¹⁹: 羅蘭(←麟)那枝頭 (461c1, 9; EH. la lan[麟 ljiən] na kie?/tʃjei dou; **Ralaṃnakedu?* < *Radaṇa*^o < *Ratana*^o < BHS. *Ratnaketu*; Krsh 2010: 315f.). Also, the following transliteration indicates the development of -ḍ- > -l-: 沙羅伊檀 (470a21; EH. sra la ʔjiəi dan; **ṣal-ayadaṇ(ani)* < BHS. *ṣaḍ-āyatanāni*; Krsh 2010: 405).

(9) jñ > (m)ñ

In Gāndhārī, like other Middle Indic languages, *jñ* becomes (m)ñ. The transliterations in AS(Lk) also indicate the same development: 般若波羅蜜 (425c8 etc.; EH. pan nja: pa la mjiet; Gā. *prañaparamida*²⁰ < BHS. *prajñāpāramitā*; cf. Krsh 2010: 23), 般遮旬 (433b29, c2 etc.; EH. pan tʃja zjwən; Gā. **pa(m)cavi(m)ñ(a)*²¹ < BHS. *pañcābhijñā*; Krsh 2010: 23f.), 尼惟先 (465a7; EH. nrjiəi[niəi-] ʒjwəi siən; **Nevasaṇa*²² < BHS. *Naivasamjñā(nāsamjñāyatana)*; Krsh 2010: 336), 薩芸若 (426a24 etc.; EH. sat ɣjwən nja:; Gā. *sarvaṇa*²³ < Skt. *sarvajña*; Krsh 2010: 395-396). Thus, the Chinese word 般若 (EH. pan nja:), though pronounced in various ways such as *bo re*, *ban ruo* or *ban re*, should be

¹⁴ Cf. Gā. *vehula* (< *veulla* < *vevulla* < *vaipulya*) (Nasim Khan 81.12); Gā. *vivula* (CKI 249: 4; Dhṛ-G^K: r 164) < Skt. *vipula*.

¹⁵ Cf. Gā. *pradivajadi* (EĀ-G: r 43, 46, 49, 56, 59) < *pratipadyate*; Gā. *uvavajadi* (Dhp-G^K: r 232f.) < Skt. *upapadyate*.

¹⁶ Cf. Nasim Khan 73.38. *Tuṣidaṇa*.

¹⁷ Cf. Dhṛ-G^K: 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), paralleling Skt. *Prabhūtaratna* (> **Prahūtaratana* > **Prahūtaradana* > **Pahū(la)ralan(a)?*), in which 休(EH. hyu) 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.

²¹ Cf. Gā. *aviṇa*~ (Senior Fragment 19: v 30) < *abhijñā*; Gā. *ṣaḍa[vi]ñā* (British Library Fragment 9: v 156 [Baums 2009: 255]) < *ṣaḍ-abhijñāḥ*.

²² Cf. Gā. *saṇa* (British Library Fragment 1: r 32d; Senior Fragment 5: r 17, 21, v 26; Baums 2009: 678f. *saṇa*-; Nasim Khan 75.18, 79.23, 81.1f., Nasim Khan 81.14f., 83.38f. etc.) < *samjñā*; Pā. *Nevasaññā(nāsaññāyatana)*.

²³ Gā. *sarvaṇa*- (CKD 399: Obv 2; CKD 272: Obv 3; CKD 358: Obv 3; CKI 241: 7, 10); Gā. *sarvaṇu* (EĀ-G: r 3d); cf. Pā *sabbaññū*.

pronounced *ban re*, due to its being originally a transliteration of the Gāndhārī form *prañā* 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.

(10) -nt- > -nd-, -mp- > -mb-

The following three transliterations correspond to Pā. *Puṇṇa Mantānīputta* rather than to BHS. *Pūrṇa Maitrāyaṇīputra*: 邠那(←邠)文陀弗 (427b29, c21, 23; EH. pjən na mjən da pjət; cf. Krsh 2010: 43), 邠那文陀羅弗 (430a14; EH. pjən na mjən da la pjət; cf. Krsh 2010: 43), 分漫陀尼弗 (454a21; EH. pjən man da nrjəi[niəi-] pjət; cf. Krsh 2010: 163). 文陀 (EH. mjən da) and 漫陀 (EH. man da) in the above-quoted transliterations indicate that *Mantā-* had become *Mandā-* in the underlying text.

Also, from the transliteration 占匍 (471c12; EH. tšjam bjək?; cf. Krsh 2010: 623), we may assume its original form to have been **cambaka* (< Skt. *campaka*; cf. Kho. *cambaa*).

These transliterations show the developments *-nt- > -nd-* and *-mp- > -mb-*, which are attested in the Gāndhārī Khotan *Dharmapada*, the Gāndhārī documents from Niya and the Gāndhārī loanwords in Khotanese²⁴.

(11) -ṇḍ- > -ṇṇ-

The following three transliterations show the development *-ṇḍ- > -ṇṇ-* peculiar to the Gāndhārī Khotan *Dharmapada* and the Gāndhārī documents from Niya: 不那利 (471c11; EH. pju na ljəi-; **puṇṇari(a)* < Skt. *puṇḍarīka*; cf. Krsh 2010: 51f.), 鳩垣 (475b19; EH. kju yjwan; **kuvāṇṇ(a)*²⁵ < **kubhāṇḍa* < BHS. *kumbhāṇḍa(ka)*; cf. Krsh 2010: 281).

(12) 波斯匿 = Gā. *Praṣeniga* ≠ BHS. *Prasenajit*

The transliteration 波斯匿 (434a9; EH. pa sjei nrjək; cf. Krsh 2010: 47), ending with the velar /k/, corresponds to Gā. *Praṣeniga*²⁶, differing from BHS. *Prasenajit*.

(13) 彌勒 = Bactrian *Metraga*

The transliteration 彌勒 (425c6, 438a-16; EH. mjiei[mjiei:] lək; cf. Krsh 2010: 318), ending with the velar /k/ differs from BHS. *Maitreya*, Pā. *Metteya*. In the Gāndhārī inscriptions, the personal names *Metreya*²⁷, *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 *Μετραγο Βουδο* (*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 *Mekhalādharaṇī* (once)³¹; and the Tocharian forms *Maitrāk*, *Metrak*³². I assume that while the

²⁴ Cf. Karashima 1994: 34, 71~72 (n. 109).

²⁵ Cf. Gā. *kuvhāḍa*~ (Senavarman Inscription: 13).

²⁶ British Library Fragment 14: recto 75 = Allon 2001: 304. *P[r]aṣen[i]ga*.

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 Samādh(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) = Samādh(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 Maitrakam*.

³² Cf. Bailey 1946: 780; Brough 1962: 92, n. 4; Ji 1998: 57f.

Bactrian form **Μετραγα* (**Metraga*) was sanskritised to *Maitraka* on the one hand, it was Gāndhārised to *Metreya*, *Metrea* on the other. From these Gāndhāri forms, BHS. *Maitreya*, Pā. *Metteya* were coined, though it is unlikely that they were the original forms. As I pointed out several years ago³³, there is a description of *Metteya* receiving the prediction of Buddhahood from the Buddha in the *Cakkavatti-Sihananda-suttanta* of the *Dīgha-nikāya* (No. 26, III 75f.) and in the Chinese translation of the same text, namely the *Zhuanlunshengwang xiuxing jing* 轉輪聖王修行經 of the *Dīrghāgāma* 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 *Madhayamāgama* of an unknown school (T.1, no. 26, 520b~525a) lacks this description, which is apparently truer to the original. Throughout the Pāli *Nikāyas*, 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 canon³⁴. The original meaning of *Μετραγα* 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 Gandhāra region was at some point introduced into Buddhism.

(14) 耆闍崛 = **G(r)ija-guḍa*

From the transliteration 耆闍崛 (425c4 etc.; EH. gjiəi dźja giwət; cf. Krsh 2010: 356), we may be able to reconstruct an original form like **G(r)ija-guḍa*, which resembles Gā. *Grija-uḍa*³⁵ in the AS(Gā) and Pā. *Gijjhakūṭa*, while differing from BHS. *Gr̥dhrakūṭa*.

(15) 泥犁 = *nirea*

The transliteration 泥犁 (440b14 etc.; EH. niəi liəi[ljiəi]; cf. Krsh 2010: 337f.) is closer to Gā. *nirea*³⁶ than to Skt. *niraya* (“hell”).

(16) 塔 = *thuva*

The character 塔 (435b11; EH. thəp; cf. Krsh 2010: 475f.) was invented specially to transliterate Gā. *thuba*³⁷ or Gā. *thuva*³⁸ (< Skt. *stūpa*).

(17) 三耶三菩, 三耶三佛 = **samya-bosi*, **samya-budha*

The transliterations 阿耨多羅三耶三佛 (432a13; EH. ʔa nou ta la səm źja[zja] səm bjət; cf. Krsh 2010: 8), 阿耨多羅三耶三菩 (437b24 etc.; EH. ʔa nou ta la səm źja[zja] səm bo; cf. Krsh 2010: 8-9) and 三耶三佛 (429a28 etc.; EH. səm źja[zja] səm bjət; cf. Krsh 2010: 403) parallel Skt. *anuttara~ samyaksambodhi~*, *samyaksambuddha~*, while their Gāndhāri equivalents are Gā. *aṇutara~ sa(m)masa(m)bosi~*³⁹, *aṇutara~ saṃmasa(m)bosi~*⁴⁰, *sa(m)masabudha~*⁴¹, *sa(m)mesa(m)budha*⁴². The Chinese 三耶 (EH. səm źja[zja]) in the

³³ *Gendaigoyaku: Agon-Kyōten, Jō-agonkyō* 現代語訳『阿含經典・長阿含經』 [An Annotated Japanese Translation of the Chinese Version of the *Dīrghāgāma*], vol. 2, Tokyo: Hirakawa Shuppan, 310~311, n. 121.

³⁴ Cf. Anālayo 2010: 95f.

³⁵ Falk/Karashima 28, 1-01; cf. MPS-G: r b1. *Gri[ja]///*.

³⁶ CKM 252: r 12, 14; cf. Salomon 2003: 88.

³⁷ Nasim Khan 77.8.

³⁸ British Library Fragment 1: r 82c; Senavarman Inscription: 2 etc.

³⁹ Nasim Khan 73.13, 81.12, 81.29, 83.53.

⁴⁰ Falk/Karashima 2013: 5-55.

⁴¹ 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. *samyā*⁴³, *samyā*⁴⁴ (< Skt. *samyak*) rather than Gā. *sa(m)ma-*, *sa(m)me-*.

(18) 曇無竭 = Gā. **Dha<ṃ>mogada*

The transliteration 曇無竭 (471c23 etc.; EH. dam mjo gjat; cf. Krsh 2010: 477) suggests that its original form was not Sanskrit but Gāndhārī, such as Gā. **Dha<ṃ>mogada* (< BHS. *Dharmodgata*), which is not attested anywhere.

(19) 阿僧祇, 般泥曰, 釋迦文, 釋提桓因, 伊沙

The following various transliterations seem to have been based on Gāndhārī forms: 阿僧祇 (427c5 etc.; EH. ʔa səng gjiei; Gā. *asa(m)khea*⁴⁵ < Skt. *asamkhyeya*; cf. Krsh 2010: 10), 般泥曰 (438b25; EH. pan niəi ʔjwat; Gā. *pariṇivuda*⁴⁶ < BHS. *parinirvṛta*; cf. Krsh 2010: 22), 釋迦文 (431a10 etc.; EH. śjiak kja mjən; Gā. *Śakamuṇi*⁴⁷ < *Śākyamuni*; cf. Krsh 2010: 447f.), 釋提桓因 (429a11; EH. śjiak dei ʔwan ʔjən; Gā. *Śakra~ devaṇa imtra*⁴⁸; Gā. *Śakra~ devaṇa i(m)dra*⁴⁹; Gā. *Śakra defva]ṇa i(m)dra*⁵⁰; Gā. *Śakra~ devaṇi(m)dra*⁵¹ < Skt. *Śakra devānām indra*; cf. Krsh 2010: 448), 伊沙 (431a2; EH. ʔjəi sra; Gā. *iṣi*⁵² < Skt. *rṣi*; cf. Krsh 2010: 566).

(20) 斯陀含 = Gā. *saiḍagami*, 須陀洹 = Gā. *sodavaṇa*

The transliterations 斯陀含 (429b8 etc.; EH. sjei da gəm; cf. Krsh 2010: 459f.) and 須陀洹 (429b8 etc.; EH. sjou da ʔwan; cf. Krsh 2010: 555) correspond well with Gā. *saiḍagami*⁵³ (< BHS. *sakṛdāgāmin*) and Gā. *sodavaṇa*⁵⁴ (< BHS. *srotaāpanna*) respectively. However, they occur also in the *Qichusanguan jing* 七處三觀經 (T. 2, no.150A, 877a11~12) and in the Kongōji (金剛寺) Manuscript of the *Anbanshouyi jing* 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 Lokakṣema's translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* was Gāndhārī or at least contained Gāndhārī elements⁵⁵.

⁴² Dhp-G^k: 3b, r 77d, 304d.

⁴³ Mansehra Rock Edict 9: 4. *samyā*-(*paṭipati*).

⁴⁴ Mansehra Rock Edict 11: 12. *samyā*-(*paṭipati*).

⁴⁵ Nasim Khan 73.12.

⁴⁶ Senavarman Inscription: 7 = von Hinüber 2003: 23; Nasim Khan 66.42, 46, 76.12.

⁴⁷ Senavarman Inscription: 11 = von Hinüber 2003: 37; Senior Fragment 14: r 21 = Salomon 2008: 354 etc.

⁴⁸ Falk/Karashima 2013: 5-57.

⁴⁹ BL16+25: r 25 = Lenz 2003: 144.

⁵⁰ Loṇa's Reliquary Inscription 1.

⁵¹ Senavarman Inscription: 10 = von Hinüber 2003: 34.

⁵² AG-G¹: r 25a (= Salomon 2008: 220); Nid-G¹: 9.2 (= Baums 2009: 242); Nid-G¹: 13.58 (= Baums 2009: 268).

⁵³ Nasim Khan 36.6; Falk/Karashima 2013: 53.5. *saiḍagami*-; cf. CKI 358 = Reliquary Inscription of the Azes year 98, B = Sadakata 1996: 308, Nasim Khan 1997; Senavarman Inscription: 8b = von Hinüber 2003: 28. *sadagami*.

⁵⁴ Nasim Khan 54.26f., 73.34f.; Reliquary Inscription of the Azes year 98, B = Sadakata 1996: 308, Nasim Khan 1997.

⁵⁵ The following words in Lokakṣema's translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 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. *mṛdu-vacana~ ... mita-vacana~* ("the speech ... will become ... soft, measured") indicate that he confused *mṛdu* ("soft") or *mita* ("measured") with *amṛta* ("ambrosia"; MI. **amṛta*, Gā. **amṛda*, **amrida*); cf. Krsh 2011: 62, n. 69.

Also, 薩芸若 (457c29; EH. sat ʔjwən nja; a set transliteration of *sarvajña* "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 away⁵⁶. Lokakṣema's translation says that this sūtra will first appear in southern India, then spread through western India, finally reaching northern India (北天竺) (T. 8, no. 224, 446a28f.; Krsh 2011: 225f.). The translations by Kumārajīva (T. 8, no. 227, 555a27f.) and Shihu (T. 8, no. 228, 623b2f.) 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 (T. 7, no. 220, 889c26f.) describes the route as directly from the south to the north, though the newer version (T. 7, no. 220, 808b21f.) relates the route as from the southeast → south → southwest → northwest → north → 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 (*Dakṣiṇāpatha*). 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 Śakyan (釋氏國), then spread to the countries in *Vartani* (會多尼) and then to those in *Uttarakuru* (鬱單曰) (T. 8, 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*"⁵⁷.

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 菩薩至無水漿中時，心不畏怖。自念言：“……願我後得阿惟三佛時，使我剎中皆有水漿，令我剎中人悉得薩芸若八味水。” corresponds to AS.179.21 = R.363.5 = AAA.741.6. *tathā ca sarvasattvān punyāih samniyokṣye yathā 'ṣṭāṅgopetapāṇīyalābhino 'mī bhaviṣyanti*. Lokakṣema seems to have confused Skt. *punya* (MI. *puñña*; "merit") with MI. *pañña* (< Skt. *prajña* "wisdom"); cf. Krsh 2011: 337, n. 327.

Moreover, Lokakṣema transliterated Skt. *jana* ("people") sporadically as 禪 (EH. *džjan*; cf. Krsh 2010: 57~59, s.vv. 禪, 禪法), which he used to render MI. *jhāna*, Skt. *dhyāna* ("meditation") as well, namely 悉速得禪 (428c7~8, 10; "one, who has attained all the *jhānas*") and 速得禪者 (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. *prthagjana*~ ("the common people") (cf. Krsh 2011: 33, n. 266; *ibid.*, 304, n. 7), while 悉速得禪法 (428c11; "one, who has attained *jhāna*-Dharma completely") corresponds to AS.15.7 = R.29.22 = AAA.120.15. *prthagjana-dharma*~ ("the dharmas which constitute the common people") (cf. Krsh 2011: 33f., n. 269). Presumably, this fact reflects that in the underlying language as with Gāndhārī, both Skt. *jana* ("people") and MI. *jhāna* had merged as *jana*, *jana*.

⁵⁶ Cf. Krsh 2011: 225f., n. 289.

⁵⁷ AS.112.16 = R.226.7 = AAA.489.3; cf. Krsh 2011: 226f.

from the Gangetic basin in northern India to Mathura, Taxila, and Bactria in northern Afghanistan and western Central Asia”⁵⁸. I assume that, in the above-quoted prophecy by the Buddha, *Uttarāpatha* is none other than the Gandhāra region. As we shall see later, in the story of *Sadāprarudita*, 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 (*vilīna vaiḍūrya*) on golden tablets, is placed and to preach this perfection of wisdom in the country of *Gandhāvātī*, 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 Gāndhārī, as the newly-discovered Gāndhārī 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 Brāhmī script of the Kuṣāṇa 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, unminyata-niminyitāni* (< BHS. *unmiñjita-nimiñjitāni*), *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 Gāndhārī fragments, the Chinese translations by Lokakṣema, Zhi Qian, Zhu Fonian, Kumārajīva, and a translation by Xuanzang⁵⁹ — and the newer ones — namely the Sanskrit manuscript fragments of the Kuṣāṇa Period, the other translation by Xuanzang, Shihu’s translation, the Sanskrit version and the Tibetan translation⁶⁰.

(4) The story of *Sadāprarudita* and the origin of Buddha-images

The final part of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* is the story of Bodhisattva *Sadāprarudita* 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 *Gandhāvātī* and to listen to the teaching on the *Prajñāpāramitā* being given by the Bodhisattva *Dharmodgata*. Following these instructions, he went to *Gandhāvātī* 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, *Sadāprarudita* went to where *Dharmodgata* was preaching and listened.

⁵⁸ Cf. Neelis 2011: 186.

⁵⁹ Underlying Indian texts of the Chinese translations by Kumārajīva and Xuanzang were written probably in Sanskrit.

⁶⁰ Cf. Krsh 2011: xii~xiii.

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*⁶¹. This story was adapted in Kang Senghui's *Liuduji 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-images⁶², 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” 佛神⁶³) 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 Lokakṣema⁶⁵, but I do not agree with this assumption. Presumably, the

⁶¹ Cf. Krsh 2011: 531 and n. 190.

⁶² E.g., Lewis R. Lancaster, “An Early Mahayana Sermon about the Body of the Buddha and the Making of Images”, *Artibus Asiae* 36, no. 4 (1974): 287~291; Juhyung Rhi, “Images, Relics, and Jewels: The Assimilation of Images in the Buddhist Relic Cult of Gandhāra— or vice versa”, in: *Artibus Asiae* 65, no. 2 (2005), 204f.

⁶³ Cf. Krsh 2010: 172.

⁶⁴ “譬如佛般泥洹後，有人作佛形像。人見佛形像，無不跪拜供養者。其像端正姝好，如佛無有異。人見，莫不稱歎，莫不持華、香、繒綵供養者。賢者！呼佛神在像中耶？” 薩陀波倫菩薩報言：“不在中。所以作佛像者，但欲使人得其福耳。不用一事成佛像，亦不用二事成。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。” 薩陀波倫菩薩報師言：“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，端正姝好，如佛無異。人見，莫不稱歎持花、香、繒綵供養者。賢者！謂佛神在其像中耶？” 對曰：“不也。所以作像者，但欲使人繫意敬自警脩，得其福耳。亦不用一事、二事成。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。”

⁶⁵ Kajiyama 1976: 79.

composer(s) — he or they might have been a *dharmabhāṅaka* / *dharmabhāṅakas* — of the story of *Sadāprarudita* was (were) cynical about the worship of Buddha statues which, at that time, might have just started in Gāndhara. 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 *buddha*'s omniscience⁶⁶ and consequently all the *buddhas* themselves⁶⁷, was true worship of the Buddha which actualises meeting him and living in his presence⁶⁸, whereas worshipping a Buddha-image would not afford the same effect at all⁶⁹.

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 āhārikā sarvajñā-jñānasya*; AS. 260.14 = R.527.19 = AAA.989.23. *prajñāpāramitā bodhisattvānām mahāsattvānām sarvajñā-jñānasyāhārike* etc.

⁶⁷ Cf. AS(Lk).477c11f. 般若波羅蜜是怛薩阿竭·阿(←呵)羅訶·三耶三佛母 (“The *Prajñāpāramitā* is the mother of *tathāgatas*, *arhants*, *samyaksambuddhas*”); = AS[ZQ].508a2f. 是經如來·無所著·正眞道·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. *evaṃ hi Subhūte! prajñāpāramitā tathāgatānām arhatāṃ samyaksambuddhanām mātā janantī janayitṛī* (This phrase is wanting in the oldest translations; cf. Krsh 2011: 262, n. 112); AS. 228.4f. = R.461.10f. = AAA.870.2f. *prajñāpāramitā 'tītanāgatapratyutpannānām tathāgatānām arhatāṃ samyaksambuddhānām mātā janantī janayitṛī sarvajñatāyā āhārikā* (This phrase is wanting in the older versions; cf. Krsh 2011: 442, n. 34).

⁶⁸ Cf. AS(Lk). 477c29f. 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。用是供養。若於薩和薩爲極大慈具, 諸菩薩當視如見佛 (“[The Buddha said to Ānanda:] ‘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 *buddhas*, 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. *avirahitās te Ānanda! sattvā buddhadarśanena dharmasṛavaṇena samghopasthānena ca veditavyaṃ tathāgatāntikāvaccarās te Ānanda! sattvā veditavyā ya enām prajñāpāramitāṃ śroṣyanti udgraḥṣyanti dhārayiṣyanti vācayiṣyanti paryavāpsyanti pravartayiṣyanti deśayiṣyanti upadekṣyanti uddeksyanti svādhyāsyanti likhiṣyanti satkariṣyanti gurukariṣyanti mānayiṣyanti pūjayiṣyanti arcayiṣyanti apacayiṣyanti puṣpa-dhūpa-gandha-mālya-vilepana-cūrṇa-civara-cchattra-dhvaja-ghaṇṭā-patakābhīḥ samantac ca dīpamālābhīḥ bahuvīdhābhīḥ ca pūjabhīḥ* (“It should be known that those beings — who will hear this *Prajñāpāramitā*, take it up, study, spread, repeat and write it, will honour, revere, worship and adore it with heavenly flowers, incense, perfumes, wreaths, unguents, aromatic powders, strips of cloth, parasols, 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 Tāthagata.”; cf. AsP.tr. 300 = AsP.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 (*likhitvā*) the *Prajñāpāramitā* and made it into a manuscript (*pustakagatāṃ kṛtvā*), 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-jñāna*)”. (AS. 28.29~29.27 = R.57.5~59.5 = AAA.208.22~212.12; cf. AsP.tr. 105f. = AsP.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 Gāndhārī 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 Gāndhārī 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 *Sadāprarudita* in different versions from such a historical point of view.

BIBLIOGRAPHY, ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGNS

- AAA = *Abhisamayālaṅkāra'ālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyaḥkyā: The Work of Haribhadra*, together with the text commented on, ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo 1932: The Toyo Bunko; Reprint: Tokyo ²1973: Sankibō Busshorin.
- AG-G¹ = Gāndhārī London *Anavataptaḡāthā* = Salomon 2008
- Allon, Mark
 2001 *Three Gāndhārī Ekottarikāgama-Type Sūtras: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 12 and 14*, Seattle and London: University of Washington Press (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 2).
- Allon, Mark and Richard Salomon
 2000 “Kharoṣṭhī fragments of a Gāndhārī version of the *Mahāpariṇirvāṇa-sūtra*”, in: *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection I, Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 1, ed. Jens Braarvig *et al.*, Oslo: Hermes Publishing, pp. 243~273.
- Anālayo
 2010 *The Genesis of the Bodhisattva Ideal*, Hamburg: Hamburg University Press (Hamburg Buddhist Studies 1). (http://www.buddhismuskunde.uni-hamburg.de/fileadmin/pdf/publikationen/HamburgUP_HBS01_Analayo.pdf)
- ARIRIAB = *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University*
- AS = the Sanskrit version of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*
- AS = *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)
- AS(Gā) = fragments of a Gāndhārī version of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Falk/Karashima 2012, 2013)
- AS(Lk) = Lokakṣema's translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, namely the *Daoxing Banre jing* 道行般若經 (T. 8, no. 224; 179 C.E.)
- AS(ZQ) = Zhi Qian's translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, namely the *Da Mingdu jing* 大明度經 (T. 8, no. 225)
- AsPtr. = *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā: The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Ślokas*, translated into English by Edward Conze, Calcutta 1970: Asiatic Society (Bibliotheca Indica: A Collection of Oriental Works, no. 284, issue no. 1592)
- AsPtr.II = *The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines & its Verse Summary*, translated into English by Edward Conze, San Francisco: Four Seasons Foundation, Delhi ²1994: Sri Satguru Publications.
- Bailey, Harold Walter
 1946 “Gāndhārī”, in: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11: 764~797.
- Baums, Stefan
 2009 *A Gāndhārī Commentary on Early Buddhist Verses: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 7, 9, 13 and 18*, PhD Dissertation. University of Washington.
- BHS = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit
- BL16+25 = Gāndhārī manuscript of Previous-Birth Stories (ed. Lenz 2003)
- Brough, John
 1962 *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, London : Oxford University Press (*London Oriental Series*, vol. 7).
 1982 “Amitābha and Avalokiteśvara in an inscribed Gandhāran sculpture”, in: *Indologica Taurinensia*, X: 65~70 (= 1996: 469~473).
 1996 *Collected Papers*, ed. Minoru Hara and J. C. Wright, London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- CKD = Corpus of Kharoṣṭhī Secular Documents from Central Asia (Seattle, 2004–); see: http://gandhari.org/a_documents.php

- CKI = Corpus of Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions (Seattle, 2004~); see: http://gandhari.org/a_inscriptions.php
- CKM = Corpus of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts (Seattle, 2004~); see: http://gandhari.org/a_manuscripts.php
- Coblin, W. South
1983 *A Handbook of Eastern Han Sound Glosses*, Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.
- CPD = *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, begun by V. Trenckner, ed. D. Andersen *et al.*, Copenhagen, Bristol, 1924~2011.
- Dhp-G^k = Gāndhārī Khotan *Dharmapada* (ed. Brough 1962)
- EĀ-G = Gāndhārī *Ekottarikāgama* (ed. Allon 2001)
- EH = reconstructions of the Eastern Han (25-220 C.E.) Chinese sound system, posited by Coblin (1983)
- Falk, Harry
2010 “Signature Phrases, Azes Dates, Nakṣatras and Some New Reliquary Inscriptions from Gandhāra”, in: ARIRIAB 13: 13~33.
- Falk, Harry and Seishi Karashima
2012 “A first-century *Prajñāpāramitā* manuscript from Gandhāra – *parivarta* 1 (Text from the Split Collection 1)”, in: ARIRIAB 15: 19~61 + plates 5~7.
2013 “A first-century *Prajñāpāramitā* manuscript from Gandhāra – *parivarta* 5 (Text from the Split Collection 1)”, in: ARIRIAB 16.
- Fussman, Gérard
1986 “Documents épigraphiques kouchans (IV) : Ajitasena, père de Senavarma”, in: *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 75: 1~14.
1999 “La Place des Sukhāvati-vyūha”, in: *Journal Asiatique* 287: 523~86.
- Gā = Gāndhārī
- Gv = *Gaṇḍavyūha*, ed. Daisetz Teitarō Suzuki, Hōkei Idzumi, Kyoto 1934~36: The Sanskrit Buddhist Texts Publishing Society; new rev. ed. Kyoto 1949: The Society for the Publication of Sacred Books of the World.
- Gv(V) = *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra*, ed. P. L. Vaidya, Darbhanga 1960: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, no. 5).
- von Hinüber, Oskar
2001 *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick, 2.*, erweiterte Auflage, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
2003 *Beiträge zur Erklärung der Senavarma-Inschrift*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 2003, Nr. 1. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- IBInsc = Keishō Tsukamoto (塚本啓祥), *Indo Bukkyō Himei no Kenkyū* インド仏教碑銘の研究 [A Comprehensive Study of the Indian Buddhist Inscriptions], part I, Text, Notes and Japanese Translation; part II, Indices, Maps and Illustrations; part III, Inscriptions in Northern Areas, Pakistan, Kyoto 1996~2003: Heirakuji Shoten.
- Ji, Xianlin 季美林
1998 *Tuholuowen Mile Huijian Ji Yishi* 吐火罗文《弥勒会见记》译释, in: *Ji Xianlin Wenji* 季美林文集 *Collected Papers of Ji Xianlin*, vol. XI, Nanchang 南昌: Jiangxi Jiaoyu Chubanshe 江西教育出版社.
- Kajiyama, Yūichi 梶山雄一
1976 *Hannyakyo – Kū no Sekai* 般若經：空の世界 [The *Prajñāpāramitā – the World of Emptiness*], Tokyo, 1976: Chūō-Kōronsha (Chūkō Shinsho 中公新書 422).
- Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋静志
1994 *Jō-agonkyō no Gengo no Kenkyū — Onshago Bunseki o Chūshin tosite* 「長阿含經」の原語の研究——音写語分析を中心として [A Study of the Underlying Language of the Chinese *Dirghāgama*—Focusing on an Analysis of the Transliterations], Tokyo: Hirakawa Shuppansha, 1994.
- Kho = Khotanese
- Konow, Sten
1929 *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions with the Exception of Those of Aśoka*. Corpus Inscriptionum

- Indicarum, vol. II, part I. Calcutta: Government of India Central Publication Branch.
- Krsh 2010 = Seishi Karashima, *A Glossary of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 道行般若經詞典, Tokyo 2010: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XI) (available at: <<http://buddhoinformatics.ddbc.edu.tw/glossaries/download.php#lokaksema>> and <<http://iriab.soka.ac.jp/orc/Publications/BPPB/pdf/BPPB-11.pdf>>)
- Krsh 2011 = *A Critical Edition of Lokakṣema'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). (available at: <http://archives.bukkyo-u.ac.jp/infolib/user_contents/repository_txt_pdfs/soken17/SK017L015.pdf>)
- Lee, Mei-huang
 2009 *A Study of the Gāndhārī Dārukkhandhopamasutta* (“Discourse on the Simile of the Log”), PhD Dissertation. University of Washington.
- Lenz, Timothy
 2003 *A New Version of the Gāndhārī Dharmapada and a Collection of Previous-Birth Stories: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 16 + 25*, Seattle: University of Washington Press (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 3).
- Md = Chandrabhāl Tripathi, “Gilgit Blätter der Mekhalā-dhāraṇī”, in: *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 7 (1981): 153~161.
- MI = Middle Indic
- MPS-G = Gāndhārī *Mahāpariṇirvāṇa-sūtra* (ed. Allon/Salomon 2000)
- Nasim Khan = Nasim Khan 2008
- Nasim Khan, M
 1997 “An Inscribed Relic-Casket from Dir”, *The Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 5: 21~33.
 2008 *Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts from Gandhāra*, published by Dr. M. Nasim Khan, Department of Archaeology, University of Peshawar.
- Neelis, Jason
 2011 *Early Buddhist Transmission and Trade Networks: Mobility and Exchange within and beyond the Northwestern Borderlands of South Asia*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Nid-G¹ = Gāndhārī Verse Nideśa (ed. Baums 2009)
- OIA = Old Indo-Aryan
- Pā = Pali
- R = *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, ed. Rajendralala Mitra, Calcutta 1887~1888: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal (Bibliotheca Indica 110).
- Sadakata, Akira
 1996 “Inscriptions kharoṣṭhī provenant du marché aux antiquités de Peshawar”, in: *Journal Asiatique* 284: 301~324.
- Salomon, Richard
 1995 “A Kharoṣṭhī Reliquary Inscription of the Time of the Apraca Prince Viṣṇuvarma”, in: *South Asian Studies* 11: 27~32.
 2003 “The Senior Manuscripts: Another Collection of Gandhāran Buddhist Scrolls.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 123: 73~92.
 2008 *Two Gāndhārī Manuscripts of the Songs of Lake Anavatapta (Anavatapta-gāthā): British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 1 and Senior Scroll 14*, Seattle and London, University of Washington Press (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts, vol. 5).
- Samādh(D) = *Samādhirājasūtra*, in: *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. II, ed. Nalinaksha Dutt, Calcutta 1953; Delhi 1984: Sri Satguru Publications.
- Samādh(V) = *Samādhirājasūtra*, ed. P.L. Vaidya, Darbhanga 1961: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, no. 2).
- Sander, Lore
 2000a “Fragments of an Aṣṭasāhasrikā manuscript from the Kuṣāṇa period”, in: *Manuscripts*

in the Schøyen Collection I, Buddhist Manuscripts, vol. I, ed. Jens Braarvig *et al.*, Oslo 2000: Hermes Publishing, pp. 1~51.

2000b “A brief paleographical analysis of the Brāhmī manuscripts in volume I”, in: *op. cit.*, pp. 285~300.

Skt = Sanskrit

T = *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, ed. Junjirō Takakusu, Kaikyoku Watanabe, 100 vols., Tokyo 1924-1934.

~ = stem of a word, e.g. *dharma~*

* = a hypothetical form which is not attested anywhere, e.g. **snāru*

$\alpha < \beta$ = the form α comes from β ; e.g. Gā. *masu* < Skt. *madhu*

$\leftarrow = \alpha \leftarrow \beta$: the Chinese character β should be changed to α

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 Lokakṣema'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, ed. Rajendralala Mitra, Calcutta 1887~1888: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal (Bibliotheca Indica 110). (abbr. **R**)

Abhisamayālaṅkāra'ālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā: The Work of Haribhadra, together with the text commented on, ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo 1932: The Toyo Bunko; Reprint: Tokyo 1973: Sankibō Busshorin. (abbr. **AAA**)

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 *Danḍas* 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 arhantaṃ*”. 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 arhantaṃ*”.

Vaidya's edition reads: *śrāvakayāni ... gatam arhantaṃ*¹

His footnote (p. 229) on *śrāvakayāni* is as follows:

“It appears that some portion of the text after *śrāvakayāni*^o 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*² to have translated this "missing" portion from the Tibetan translation instead³. Also, an eminent Japanese specialist of the *Prajñāpāramitā* scriptures, Takayasu Kimura, who edited the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*⁴, wrote an article, entitled “On the Omission and its Filling in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*”⁵ in which he tried to restore the "missing" portion from the quotations, found in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 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 arhantaṃ*”, which does not 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.

² *Hassenju Hanmyakyo* 八千頌般若經, translated by Yūichi Kajiyama (梶山雄一) and Teruyoshi Tanji (丹治昭義), Tokyo 1974~1975, ²1980: Chūō Kōronsha 中央公論社; Tokyo ³2001: Chūō Kōron Shinsha 中央公論新社, 2 vols. (Daijō Butten 大乘仏典 2, 3).

³ See *op. cit.* p. 289, l. 15~ p. 291, l. 15; cf. p. 391f., n. 171.

⁴ *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, ed. Takayasu Kimura, Tokyo 1986~2009: Sankibō Busshorin, 6 vols.

⁵ Takayasu Kimura 木村高尉, “Hassenju Hanmya bonpon no ketsuraku to sono hoten” 八千頌般若梵本の欠落とその補填, in: *Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Kenpō Nenpō* 大正大学総合仏教研究所年報 7 (1985): 228~219 (1~10).

now in the Library of the University of Tokyo, no. 47⁶. In it, the "missing" portion can be found and it reads as follows:⁷

“(221 verso 4) sacet tvam Ānanda! **śrāvakayānikānām** pudgalānām śrāvaka-
bhūmau dharmam deśayes tasyām ca dharmadeśanā(221v5)yām ye
trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau satvās te sarve arhatvaṃ sākṣāt kuryus
tathāpi tvayā me śrāvakeṇa dharmacakrapravarttanānupravarttanato
dharmadeśayatā śrāvakakṛtyam na kṛtam syāt sacet punas tvam Ānanda
bodhisatvasya mahāsatvasya ekam api prajñāpāramitā(222r1)pratisaṃyuktām
(read: °ktaṃ) dharmam deśayeḥ saṃprakāśayeḥ evam ahaṃ tvayā śrāvakeṇa
dharmacakrapravarttanānupravarttanato dharmam deśayanato ārādhitaḥ syān. na tu
tayā paurvikayā dharmadeśanayā yayā te trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau
sarvasatvā arhatvaṃ prāpitās. teṣāṃ cārhatām yad dānamayaṃ
puṇya(222r2)kriyāvastu śīlamayaṃ puṇyakriyāvastu bhāvanāmayaṃ
puṇyakriyāvastu tat kiṃ manyase Ānandāpi nu sa bahu puṇyaskandhaḥ?” |
Ānandaḥ āha | “bahu bhagavan! bahu sugata!” bhagavān āha | “tata sa Ānanda!
śrāvakayānikaḥ pudgalo bahutaram puṇyam prasavati yo bodhisatvānām
mahāsatvānām prajñāpāramitā(222r3)pratisaṃyuktām (read: °ktaṃ) dharmam
deśayati. ato (°)pi sa Ānanda! bahutaram puṇyam prasavati yo bodhisatvo
mahāsatvo ’parasya bodhisatvasya mahāsatvasya prajñāpāramitā-
pratisaṃyuktam dharmam deśayati | antaśa ekadivasam api tiṣṭhatv
Ānandaīkadivasam antataḥ (read: antaśaḥ) purobhaktam api. tiṣṭhatv
Ā(222r4)nanda! purobhaktam api. tiṣṭhatv Ānanda! purobhaktam deśitaḥ |
antaśa ekanālikām api ekanālikāntaram api vā tiṣṭhatv Ānanda! ekanālikāntaram
antaśo muhūrttam api tiṣṭhatv Ānanda! muhūrttam antaśa ekalavam api tiṣṭhatv
Ānanda! ekalavam antaśa ekakṣaṇasamnīpātam api yo hy Ā(222r5)nanda!
bodhisatvo mahāsatvaḥ aparasya bodhisatvasya mahāsatvasya ekakṣaṇalavam
api prajñāpāramitāpratisaṃyuktam dharmam deśayanty ayan tato ’tibahutaram
puṇyam prasavati | idam hy Ānanda! tasya bodhisatvasya mahāsatvasya
dharmadānam sarvaśrāvakapratyekabuddhayānikānām (222v1) pudgalānām
kuśalamūlāny abhibhavati || evam Ānanda! kuśalamūlasamanvāgato bodhisatvo
mahāsatva evam etat kuśalamūla<ṃ> samanvāharann asthānam etad
Ānandānavakāśo yat sa bodhisatvo mahāsatvo vivarttetānuttarāyāḥ
samyaksambodher nātat sthānam vidya(222v2)te” || atha khalu bhagavāms
tasyām velāyām tathārūpam ṛddhyabhisamskāram abhisamskṛtavān yathārūpeṇa
ṛddhyabhisamskṛtena tāś catasraḥ parśado bhikṣubhikṣuṇyupāsakopāsikā-
devanāgayakṣagandharvāsuraḡarūḡakinnaramahoragā manuṣyāmanuṣyā vā
sarve te (222v3) buddhānubhāvenĀkṣobhyaṃ tathāgatam **arhantaṃ** ...

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

⁶ See Seiren Matsunami, *A Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tokyo University Library*, Tokyo 1965: Suzuki Research Foundation, p. 22.

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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka* in India*

Peter SKILLING (Bangkok) and SAERJI (Beijing)

This article continues research on the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka* published in *ARIRIAB XV*.

The protohistory and history of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* collection and its component text units, which we describe here as the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* 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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka* 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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka* collection, either from South Asia or Central Asia. As a collection, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* 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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka* 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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka* and in Mahāyāna sūtras,” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2011*, Vol. XV, Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, 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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka* 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.

Buddhāvataṃsaka collection was compiled. One important field of investigation is the history of the long succession of Chinese translations of the components of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family.³ In this paper, we follow another line of enquiry, and attempt to sketch the history of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* 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.⁴ 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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka* 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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka* 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 *Ratnagoṭravibhāgavyākhyā*, the *Vyākhyāyukti* and its commentary, the *Vyākhyāyuktiṭīkā*, the *Madhyamakahrdaya-tarkajvālā*, the *Madhyamakāloka*, the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, and the three *Bhāvanākramas*. Only the *Ratnagoṭravibhāgavyākhyā*, the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and the first and last *Bhāvanākramas* survive in Sanskrit.⁵ 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,⁶ both of whom give reference to earlier research, and occasionally other sources, in the understanding that the dates are all provisional.

³ See the recent contributions by Jan Nattier: “The Proto-History of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*: The *Pusa benye jing* 菩薩本業經 and the *Dousha jing* 兜沙經,” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004*, Vol. VIII, Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, 2005, pp. 323–360; “Indian Antecedents of Huayan Thought: New Light from Chinese Sources,” in Imre Hamar (ed.), *Reflecting Mirrors: Perspectives on Huayan Buddhism* (Asiatische Forschungen, Band 151), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2007, pp. 109–138. In the same volume, see Ōtake Susumu, “On the Origin and Early Development of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*,” pp. 87–107, and Imre Hamar, “The History of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*: Shorter and Larger Texts,” pp. 139–167.

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.

⁶ Hajime Nakamura, *Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes*, Ogura, Hirakata City: Kansai University of Foreign Studies, 1980; David Seyfort Ruegg, *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz: 1981 (Jan Gonda [ed.], *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. VII, Fasc. 1).

I The *Buddhāvataṃsaka* in the Land of Snows

For the study of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, we examine Kanjurs⁷ and Kanjur catalogues or registers.⁸

(1) *Buddhāvataṃsaka* in Kanjurs

In the Kanjurs available today, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* 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 Palace¹³ and Shel dkar¹⁴ 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

⁷ For the necessity of referring to plural “Kanjurs” rather than a singular “Kanjur”, see Peter Skilling, “From bKa’ bstan bcos to bKa’ ’gyur and bsTan ’gyur,” in Helmut Eimer (ed.), *Transmission of the Tibetan Canon: Papers Presented at a Panel of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies*, Graz 1995, Vienna, pp. 87–111, especially pp. 100–101 (= Vol. III of Ernst Steinkellner [gen. ed.], *Proceedings of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Graz 1995*, Vienna: Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, Nr. 22 (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Denkschriften, 257. Band).

⁸ For the “catalogue” (*dkar chag*: register, inventory) as a genre in Tibet, see Dan Martin, “Tables of Contents (*dKar chag*),” in José Ignacio Cabezón and Roger R. Jackson (eds.), *Tibetan Literature: Studies in Genre*, Ithaca: Snow Lion, 1996, chapter 30, pp. 500–514. For the topic in question, see most recently Georgios T. Halkias, *Luminous Bliss: A Religious History of Pure Land Literature in Tibet*, Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2012, especially pp. 61–63.

⁹ The *Buddhāvataṃsaka* section of Phug brag Kanjur appends three texts to the last volume (*phal chen, ca*) of *Buddhāvataṃsaka 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 (*śloka*s).

¹¹ This is as checked directly from the Kanjur; Hakuju Ui, Munetada Suzuki, Yenshō Kanakura, and Tōkan Tada, *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons (Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur)*, 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*.

¹³ Tadeusz Skorupski, *A Catalogue of the Stog Palace Kanjur*, Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1985, no. 10, pp. 37–41.

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 Śel 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,¹⁵ and Gondhla¹⁶ 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 *Gaṇḍavyūha* or *Daśabhūmika* sūtras, do not open with their own titles in “the language of India” and “the language of Tibet” (*rgya gar skad du, 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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka* have all been merged into one single and continuous work, with one important exception. This is the *Daśabhūmika* sūtra, which occurs not only as a chapter of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* section, but also as an independent sūtra in Kanjurs belonging to the Them spangs ma branch like Stog Palace,¹⁷ Ulan Bator,¹⁸ Shel dkar,¹⁹ and in local Kanjurs like Phug brag.²⁰ In these cases, it has its own individual title and a concluding colophon. The *Daśabhūmika* is also preserved in Dunhuang manuscripts.²¹ After checking the Kanjurs available to us as well as the Dunhuang manuscript,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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka* section.²³ In other words, two different recensions of the *Daśabhūmika* are preserved in Tibetan.²⁴

¹⁵ Helmut Eimer, *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.

¹⁶ Helmut Tauscher, *Catalogue of the Gondhla Proto-Kanjur* (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 72), Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 2008.

¹⁷ Tadeusz Skorupski (1985), no. 38, p. 83.

¹⁸ Géza Bethlenfalvy, *A Hand-List of the Ulan Bator Manuscript of the Kanjur Rgyal-rtse Them Spang-ma* (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 mdo*” is missing.

¹⁹ Ulrich Pagel and Séan Gaffney (1996), no. 14, p. 18.

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 bTan ’gyur,” and Helmut Eimer (2012), pp. xvii–xxi.

²¹ Louis de la Vallée Poussin, *Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun-huang in the India Office Library*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962, nos. 82–86, 88, p. 34; no. 132, p. 51.

²² We have examined the Stog Palace, Shel dkar, and Phug brag Kanjurs, and Dunhuang manuscripts nos. 82, 83, 85, 86, 132.

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 *Bodhisatvapitaka*, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-mahāyāna-sūtra* (*byang cub sems dpa’i sde snod | sangs rgyas phal po che theg 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 rdzogs so*). It gives the translators as Surendrabodhi and Ye shes sde. Because Tibetan tradition ascribes the whole *Buddhāvataṃsaka* section to the same translation team, we do not know to which of the two *Daśabhūmikas* the Dunhuang colophon fragments belongs.

²⁴ Jampa Samten noted that the Phug brag version is different from that preserved in the *Avataṃsaka* section: see Jampa Samten (1992), p. 128, n. 2.

(2) *Buddhāvataṃsaka* 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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka* is a primary category or class under which a series of titles are grouped. Each of the individual units given under the primary category *Buddhāvataṃsaka* is counted separately in terms of *bampos*, implying that they once existed as independent physical manuscripts.

In both registers, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* is the second section, following the *Prajñāpāramitā* (*Shes phyin*). In the *Lhan dkar ma*, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* is the second out of thirty sections; in the *'Phang thang ma*, it is the second out of twenty-seven or thirty-two sections.²⁵ In later registers like those of Bcom ldan rig pa'i ral gri or Bu ston Rin chen grub, or in most Kanjurs, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* also follows the *Prajñāpāramitā* to make the second section. This privileged position reflects the exalted status of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*.

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 *Mahāvvyutpatti* (for which see below).²⁶ 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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka* Sūtra,” in the following order:²⁷

[18] **Āryabuddhāvataṃsakavaipūlyasūtra*

'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

²⁵ The first figure is according to Kawagoe, the second according to Halkias. See Eishin Kawagoe, *dKar chag 'Phang thang ma* (Tohoku Society for Indo-Tibetan Studies Monograph Series 3), Sendai: Tohoku Society for Indo-Tibetan Studies, 2005; Georgios T. Halkias, “Tibetan Buddhism Registered: A Catalogue from the Imperial Court of 'Phang thang,” *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series vol. 36, nos. 1–2, 2004, pp. 46–105.

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 gtogs pa*: the numbers follow Kawagoe (2005).

[20] *Āryabodhisatvadaśabhūmika*²⁸

'Phags pa byang chub sems dpa'i sa bcu

[21] *Āryaratnolkā*

'Phags pa dkon mchog ta la la

[22] *Tathāgatopattisambhavanirdeśa*

De bzhin gshegs 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:²⁹

[17] *Āryabuddhāvataṃsakanāmamahāvaiṣṭyasūtra*

'Phags pa shin tu rgyas pa chen po'i sde sangs rgyas phal po che

[18] **Tathāgatāvataṃsakaparivarta*

De bzhin gshegs pa phal po che'i le'u

[19] **Bodhisatvavajradhvajaparīṇāmaparivarta*

Byang chub sems dpa' rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyis yongs su bsngo ba'i le'u

[20] *Āryabodhisatvadaśabhūmikānirdeśa*

'Phags pa byang chub sems dpa'i sa bcu bstan pa

[21] *Āryasamantabhadracaryānirdeśa*³⁰

'Phags pa kun du bzang po'i spyod pa bstan pa

[22] *Āryatathāgatopattisambhavanirdeśa*

'Phags pa de bzhin gshegs 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 for 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 *Theg pa chen po'i mdo sde shin tu rgyas pa'i phyogs su gtogs pa*: the numbers follow Adelheid Herrmann-Pfandt, *Die lHan kar ma: ein früher Katalog der ins Tibetische übersetzten buddhistischen Texte; kritische Neuauflage 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 *Mahāvīyūṭṭi*, *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and *Bhāvanākrama*.

³⁰ This refers to *Kun tu bzang po'i spyod pa bstan pa'i le'u*, chapter 42 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka* (= chapter 36 of Śikṣānanda's Chinese version). It should not be confused with the *Samantabhadracaryāpraṇidhāna*, which, when it rounds off the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* collection, is placed at the end of the *Gaṇḍavyūha*. The *Samantabhadracaryāpraṇidhāna*, which to the present day is recited daily in some monastic traditions in Tibet and China, goes under several titles, such as *Bhadracari(-ī)*, *Bhadracaryāpraṇidhāna*, *Samantabhadracaryāpraṇidhāna*.

[24] *Āryagaṇḍavyūhasūtra*

'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 *Āryaratnolkā* (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 *Ratnolkā* as “from the Great Extensive Sūtra, Exalted *Buddhāvataṃsaka*,” 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 brag³² and Bathang³³ Kanjurs, but not in representatives of the Tshal pa branch like the Derge and Peking Kanjurs.³⁴ The *Ratnolkā* is indeed incorporated into the Tibetan translation of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* (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 bya ba'i gzungs kyi chos kyi nram 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.

³³ Eimer (2012), no. 155, p. 109.

³⁴ In the Them spangs ma branch and local Kanjurs listed above, the *Ratnolkā* 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 sngags bka' 'gyur dkar chag and of Nor chen kun dga' bzañ 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 *Ratnolkā* had apparently been removed from the *Avataṃsaka* and placed in the Dhāraṇī section: but since it is not dhāraṇī, it should be counted as belonging to the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* (*dkon mchog ta la la bam 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 bya ba phyi nas gzungs 'dus su bcug nas snang ste | 'di gzungs ma yin pas phal chen gyi lta la gzugs so*), cf. Kurtis R. Schaeffer and Leonard W. J. van der Kuijp (eds.), *An Early Tibetan Survey of Buddhist Literature: The Bstan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nyi '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 *Ratnolkā* 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 gis ... dkon mchog ta la la ... la sogs pa bris pa ni nor ba yin te mdo dang rgyud ma 'dres par phye ba'i dkar chag dag tu mdor bshad pa'i phyir ro*), cf. Soshū Nishioka, ““Putun Bukkyōshi” mokurokubusakuin III,” *Tōkyō Daigaku Bungakubu Bunka Kōryū Kenkyū Shisetsu Kenkyū Kiyō* 6, 1983, pp. 64–65.

³⁵ Our tentative conclusion is that the *Ratnolkā* can be divided into five parts (at least in the Derge version). The second part corresponds to chapter 20 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, 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 *Ratnolkā* was translated into Chinese by Fa Tian 法天 during the Northern Sung dynasty, and during the Ming dynasty, the renowned Chinese master Zhi xu 智旭 (1599–1655) noticed the correspondences between the *Ratnolkā* and the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* in his *Yue zang zhi jin* 閱藏知津 [Annotated Catalogue of Chinese Tripiṭaka]. Cf. *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經, appended

(2.3) *The Mahāvvyutpatti (Bye brag tu rtogs par byed pa chen po)*

The *Mahāvvyutpatti*, 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.³⁶ 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] *Buddhāvataṃsakam*

Sangs rgyas phal po che

[S 1330] *Bodhisatvapiṭakam*³⁸

Byang chub sems dpa'i sde snod.

The hierarchy of the opening titles of the *Mahāvvyutpatti* seems to be determined by length combined with category, although the significance of *Bodhisatvapiṭaka* here is not clear. Does the *Mahāvvyutpatti* 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 *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, available in Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia, and recently in a complete manuscript from the Potala in Lhasa?³⁹

After this, the *Mahāvvyutpatti* 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 —

volume III, no. 271, 799a22–b10.

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 *Rājāvavādaka (Rgyal po la gdams pa)*.

³⁷ 榎亮三郎編著《梵藏漢和四譯對校翻譯名義大集》京都帝國大學文科大学叢書3, 京都：真言宗京都大學, 1916年, 1925年(初版), 東京：鈴木學術財團, 1973年(第五次印刷) [Ryōzaburō Sakaki, (ed.), *Mahāvvyutpatti*, parts 1 and 2, Kyoto: Kyoto Imperial University, 1916 and 1925]. We give the Sanskrit titles (with Sakaki numbers) as in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* and do not attempt to standardize them against other lists or sources.

³⁸ In the *Mahāvvyutpatti*, the term *bodhisatva* 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.

³⁹ Jens Braarvig and Ulrich Pagel, “Fragments from the Bodhisattvapiṭaka,” in Jens Braarvig, Paul Harrison, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Kazunobu Matsuda and Lore Sander (eds.), *Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*, Oslo: Hermes Publishing, 2006, pp. 11–88. The Potala manuscript has not yet been published.

the sequence does not follow size, genre (for example, *sūtra*, *nirdeśa*, *paripṛcchā*, *vyūha*), or category (for example, *Ratnakūṭa*, *Prajñāpāramitā*, *Dhāraṇī*). The *Mahāvvyutpatti* lists the following members of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family, but does not group them together or give any indication of their relation to the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*:

[S 1334] *Lokottaraparivartaḥ*

'Jig rten las 'das pa'i le'u

[S 1341] *Gaṇḍavyūhaḥ*

Sdong po bkod pa

[S 1350] *Daśabhūmikam*

Sa bcu pa

[S 1375] *Ratnolkā*

Dkon mchog ta la la

[S 1376] *Gocarapariśuddham*

Spyod yul yongs su dag pa

[S 1378] *Tathāgatopattisambhavanirdeśaḥ*

De bzhin gshegs pa skye ba 'byung ba bstan pa.

In addition to the texts mentioned above, we can add two further texts to the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family: the *Tathāgatagaṇajñānācintyaṣayāvātāranirdeśa* (D 185) and the *Śraddhābalādhānāvātāramudrā* (D 201). As we will see below, there is evidence to indicate that these two sūtras are associated with the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*.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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka*.⁴¹ The text is also included in the Ulan Bator Kanjur,⁴² 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 Gondhla 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 *Rnying rgyud* section of the Derge Kanjur (D 829); it bears the long title *De bzhin gshegs pa thams cad kyi thugs gsang ba'i ye shes don gyi snying po rdo rje bkod*

⁴⁰ Ōtake Susumu, "On the Origin and Early Development of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*," in Imre Hamar (ed.), *ibid.* pp. 96 ff.

⁴¹ The text mentions two chapter titles, that of chapter 9 (150b4): *'jig rten gyi khams kyi rigs nam par gzhaḡ pa'i sgra ma lus 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 nam 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?);⁴³ the text opens with customary (but not necessarily authentic) Sanskrit and Bru zha titles.⁴⁴ 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.⁴⁵ 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.⁴⁶

II The *Buddhāvataṃsaka* in South Asia

Now that we have reviewed the structure and history of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* in the Land of Snows, let us return to South Asia. Scholars have long been familiar with the two sections of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* that have been preserved in complete Sanskrit manuscripts in Nepal:

[1] *Daśabhūmika*

[2] *Gaṇḍavyūha*.

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.⁴⁷

Recently, the *Anantabuddhakṣetrageṇodbhāvananāmamahāyānasūtra* has been published in a collection of twenty Sanskrit sūtras.⁴⁸ The Sanskrit colophon describes the sūtra as “from the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, the Extensive Basket.”⁴⁹ A few fragments of the

⁴³ 290a6: *Rgya gar gyi mkhan po dharmabodhi dang | ring lugs chen po dānarakṣita dang | zhu chen gyi lo tsā ba che btsan skyes kyis bru sha'i yi ge las bru sha'i yul gyi khrom du bsgyur cing gtan 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 zhe hal pa'i ma kyang ku'i dang rong ti.*

⁴⁵ *The Mtshams-brag manuscript of the Rñin ma rgyud 'bum*, Thimphu: 1982, TBRC version, vol. 16, ma, 309a3–4.

⁴⁶ 'Gos lo gzhon nu dpal gyis brtsams, *Deb ther sngon po*, Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1984, p. 137: *khong (snubs sangs rgyas ye shes rin po che) gi bla ma bru sha'i lo tsā ba che btsan skyes kyis mdo dgongs pa 'dus pa bod du bsgyur ba.* For an English translation, see George N. Roerich, (tr.), *The Blue Annals*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1976 (second edition), p. 104.

⁴⁷ See Brian Houghton Hodgson, *Essays on the Languages, Literature and Religion of Nepal and Tibet: together with further papers on the geography, ethnology, and commerce of those countries* [London: Trübner & Co., 1874] repr. 1972 with introduction by Philip Denwood (Bibliotheca Himalayica Series II Volume 7), New Delhi: Mañjuśrī Publishing House, 1972.

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 7/1, 2), Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press / Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House, 2010, pp. 557–593. This is chapter 37 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*; it also exists in two independent Tibetan translations (D 104 and D 268).

⁴⁹ *Buddhāvataṃsakād vaipulyaṭīkāḥ*: ibid. p. 582. Note that the two independent Tibetan translations (D 104 and 268) do not give this detail.

Buddhāvataṃsaka 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.⁵⁰ These finds have added to the corpus of *Buddhāvataṃsaka* texts in Sanskrit. In this paper, we study the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* in India from the perspective of citations in Indian *śāstra* literature both in Sanskrit and in Tibetan translation.

(1) *Buddhāvataṃsaka* in the *Sūtrasamuccaya*

The date, authorship, and provenance of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* are all problematic.⁵¹ At present, only two small Sanskrit fragments of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* from Central Asia have been identified;⁵² for our purposes, we study this anthology as attested by the Tibetan translation by Jinamitra, Śīlendrabodhi, and Ye shes sde.⁵³ The *Sūtrasamuccaya*

⁵⁰ Seishi Karashima and Klaus Wille (editors-in-chief), *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia: The British Library Sanskrit Fragments*, Volume II.1, 2, Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University, 2009, especially p. 28. Most of the fragments belong to the *Gaṇḍavyūha*; Shin'ichirō Hori, however, has identified a few fragments from the early chapters of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, and at least one fragment from the *Lokottaraparivarta*: see Shin'ichirō Hori, "Sanskrit Fragments of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* from Central Asia," in Robert Gimello, Frédéric Girard, Imre Hamar, (eds.) *Avataṃsaka 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 *Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikā*, and if that is the case, on Nāgārjuna's date. See most recently, with references to earlier literature, Bhikkhu Pāsādika, "Der Mahāyāna-Buddhismus gemäss Nāgārjunas Sūtrasamuccaya," in *Hōrin: Vergleichende Studien zur Japanischen Kultur*, vol. 10 (2004), pp. 73–96, and idem, "Sūtrasamuccaya," *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Vol. VIII, Fascicle 1, Sri Lanka: The Department of Buddhist Affairs, Ministry of Religious Affairs, 2007, pp. 203–205. If the *Sūtrasamuccaya* 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 *Sūtrasamuccaya* 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 *Sūtrasamuccaya* from Central Asia," in Martin Straube, Roland Steiner, Jayandra Soni, Michael Hahn, and Mitsuyo Demoto [eds.], *Pāsādikadānam. Festschrift für Bhikkhu Pāsādika* [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 *Sūtrasamuccaya* is older than the Khādalik fragment. In this study, however, we must bear in mind the possibility that the *Sūtrasamuccaya* 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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka* 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).

⁵³ We have consulted Bhikkhu Pāsādika, *Nāgārjunas Sūtrasamuccaya: A Critical Edition of the mDo kun las btus pa*, København: Akademisk Forlag, 1989.

cites the members of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family under seven individual titles, without relating them to the broader *Buddhāvataṃsaka* category, with the exception of no. 6:

[1] *Daśabhūmikasūtra*

Sa bcu'i mdo sde

[2] *Tathāgatopattisambhavasūtra*

De bzhin gshegs pa skye ba srid pa'i mdo

[3] *Lokottaraparivarta*

'Jig rten las 'das pa'i le'u

[4] *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra*

Sdong po bkod pa'i mdo

[5] *Tathāgataḡaṇājñānācintyaṡiṡayāvātāranirdeśa*

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] *Buddhāvataṃsakasūtra*

Sangs rgyas phal po che'i mdo

[7] *Śraddhābalādhānāvātāramudrā*

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 *vimokṡas*.⁵⁴ 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?) *Buddhāvataṃsaka*” all correspond to the *Śraddhābalādhānāvātāramudrā*, 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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka* 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 *Śraddhābalādhāna-(avātāramudrā)-sūtra*, but these citations do not occur anywhere in the extant Tibetan or Chinese versions of the sūtra. The situation is as follows:

Buddhāvataṃsaka (*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 *vimokṡa*, liberation, with the sense of the “liberation taught by so and so,” for example, *yathā-ārya-maitreyavimokṡe*.

The *Sūtrasamuccaya* definitely knows a version of the *Śraddhābalādhānāvātāramudrā*, to which it refers both under the name *Buddhāvataṃsaka* 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 *Śraddhābalādhānāvātāramudrā* 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) *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā*

The *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā*, of which the full title is *Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānoṭtaratantraśāstravyākhyā*, is preserved in Sanskrit⁵⁵ and in Tibetan and Chinese translations. The Tibetan version was translated by Sajjana and Blo ldan shes rab in the eleventh century; the Chinese translation is ascribed to Ratnamati (Le na mo ti, 勒那摩提), 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),⁵⁶ but the Chinese translation gives the author’s name as *Sāramati (Jian Yi, 堅意, 350–450).⁵⁷ The *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā* quotes the *Tathāgatotpattisambhava* twice.⁵⁸ One of the quotations is quite long, but neither of the citations is given a title.⁵⁹ At the beginning, the *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā* quotes the *Tathāgatagūṇajñānācintyaviśayāvātāranirdeśa* as an authority;⁶⁰ the passage corresponds to part of a much longer citation in the

⁵⁵ E. H. Johnston (ed. and tr.), *The Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānoṭtara-tantraśāstra*, Patna: Bihar Research Society, 1950, an edition based primarily on two palm-leaf Sanskrit manuscripts photographed in Tibet by Rāhula Sāṅkrīyāyana, “A” written in early Śāradā script, perhaps dating to the tenth century, and “B” in “a Nepali script of the XI century.” The films are preserved in Patna.

⁵⁶ Date after Nakamura (1980), p. 264.

⁵⁷ Ibid. p. 261.

⁵⁸ D 4025, 86a3–87a6; 94a7–b1; cf. Johnston (1950), pp. 22.10–24.8; 36.16–37.1.

⁵⁹ The Chinese version of the *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā* gives a reference for the second citation, saying that it is from *Huayan xingqi* 華嚴性起, which indicates the (*Tathāgata-jutpattisambhava* chapter of *Buddhāvataṃsaka*; the corresponding passage is indeed to be found in this chapter (both Chinese and Tibetan). The Chinese *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā* does not assign a title to the other citation, but the passage quoted is almost same as the *Tathāgatotpattisambhava* chapter of the Chinese *Buddhāvataṃsaka* (Buddhabhadra’s version), suggesting that the translator(s) must have been aware of the relationship between the citation and the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*. In his English translation of the Tibetan *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā*, 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.

Sūtrasamuccaya.⁶¹

(3) Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti*

Vasubandhu's (320–400)⁶² *Vyākhyāyukti* is only preserved in Tibetan translation,⁶³ done by Viśuddhasiṃha, Śākyasiṃha and Devendrarakṣita during early spread of Buddhism in Tibet. Vasubandhu appeals to two members of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family, the *Lokottaraparivarta* and the *Tathāgatotpattisambhava*, as authorities.⁶⁴ 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)⁶⁵ is the greatest compendium of Mahāyāna sūtras available in Sanskrit.⁶⁶ The original Tibetan translation done by Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, and Ye shes sde was later revised by the “Kashmiri paṇḍita” Tilakakalaśa and the Tibetan Bhikṣu Blo Idan shes rab. Several texts of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* 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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka* category: rather, he cites them under their individual titles:

[1] *Gocarapariśuddhisūtra*

[2] *Ratnolkādhāraṇī*

[3] *Vajradhvajasūtra*

⁶¹ Cf. Pāsādika (1989), p. 202.6–9.

⁶² Date after Nakamura (1980), p. 268.

⁶³ For a critical edition, see Jong Cheol Lee [李鐘徹], *The Tibetan Text of the Vyākhyāyukti of Vasubandhu, Critically Edited from the Cone, Derge, Narthang and Peking Editions* (Bibliotheca Indologica et Buddhologica 8), Tokyo: The Sankibo Press, 2001. For a general overview, see P. Skilling, “A Survey of the Vyākhyāyukti Literature,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 23/2 (2000), pp. 297–350. For an English translation of chapter 1, see Richard F. Nance, *Speaking for Buddhas: Scriptural Commentary in Indian Buddhism*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2012, Appendix A, pp. 129–152.

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 *Vyākhyāyuktiṭīkā*: '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).

⁶⁵ Date after Nakamura (1980), p. 287. Ruegg (1981, p. 82) gives “flourished probably in the first part of the eighth century.”

⁶⁶ Cecil Bendall (ed.), *Śikṣāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhist Teaching compiled by Śāntideva chiefly from earlier Mahāyāna-sūtras* (Bibliotheca Buddhica I), St. Pétersbourg: Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1897–1902 (repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Pvt. Ltd.). For the author Śāntideva, see recently, with references to earlier literature, Paul Harrison, “The Case of the Vanishing Poet. New Light on Śāntideva and the *Śikṣā-samuccaya*,” in Konrad Klaus and Jens-Uwe Hartmann (eds.), *Indica et Tibetica: Festschrift für Michael Hahn: zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern überreicht* (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 66), Vienna: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 2007, pp. 215–248.

[4] *Daśabhūmikasūtra*

[5] *Lokottaraparivarta*

[6] *Gaṇḍavyūha*

[7] *Śraddhābalādhānāvātāramudrā*.

The *Śikṣāsamuccaya* mentions only the title of the *Gocarapariśuddhisūtra*, which is also cited in the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*⁶⁷ and in the second or middle *Bhāvanākrama*.⁶⁸ Both citations are very brief, and cannot be traced anywhere in the corresponding chapter of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*. It is not impossible that they refer to another sūtra with the same title.

In his *Mahāyānaśāṅgrahabhāṣya*, Vasubandhu quotes a sūtra entitled *Spyod lam yongs su dag pa'i mdo* as an authority;⁶⁹ this should be the same *Gocarapariśuddhisūtra*. In his commentary on the *Mahāyānaśāṅgraha*, the *Mahāyānaśāṅgrahopanibandhana*, 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,⁷⁰ including one sentence which may be traced to chapter 16 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*. In his *Sūtrālamkāravākhyā*, Vasubandhu also invokes the authority of a sūtra entitled *Spyod yul yongs su dag pa'i mdo*.⁷¹

The title *Tathāgatagocarapariśuddhi* does occur in both the *Lhan dkar ma*⁷² and the *'Phang thang ma*⁷³ registers, but in the Mahāyāna sūtra section rather than the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* section. The Sanskrit and Tibetan titles are also listed in the *Mahāvīyutpatti*.⁷⁴ The Tanjur preserves a short summary of this text entitled “Compendium of the meaning of the *Bodhisatvagocarapariśuddhisūtra*” (*Bodhisatvagocarapariśuddhisūtrārthasaṅgraha*, D 3965); the author is given as Rāhulabhadra,⁷⁵ and the translation ascribed to Śākyaśrībhadrā and Gnubs Byams pa'i dpal. The *Bodhisatvagocarapariśuddhisūtrārthasaṅgraha* is indeed a summary of the contents of a text similar to chapter 16 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*.

⁶⁷ D 3961, 78b3–5.

⁶⁸ D 3916, 54a5–6.

⁶⁹ D 4050, 157a2.

⁷⁰ D 4051, 240b3.

⁷¹ D 4026, 144b3; cf. Lévi (1907) p. 21.17 = Lévi (1911) p. 48.11 (Sylvain Lévi [ed.], *Mahāyāna-Sūtrāṅkāra, Exposé de la doctrine du Grand véhicule*, Paris: Champion, 1907, 1911; Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co, 1983 [reprint], in two volumes).

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: *Gocarapariśuddham, 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 Rugg (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 *Gocaraparīśuddhisūtra* 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 *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 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 *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, 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 *Vajradhvaṃsūtra* 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 Vajradhvaṃsūtra” (*vajradhvaṃsya vidhinā*), one of few texts explicitly recommended in the whole *Bodhisatvacaryāvatāra*.⁷⁷ The fact that he refers to the *Vajradhvaṃsūtra* in both of his main works demonstrates the importance of the *Vajradhvaṃsūtra* to Śāntideva.

The title *Vajradhvaṃsūtra* occurs in both the *Lhan dkar ma*⁷⁸ and the *'Phang thang ma*⁷⁹ 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 grub's 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 *Vajradhvaṃsūtra* 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. – *vajradhvaṃsṭha* instead of *vajradhvaṃsya*).

⁷⁸ [468] *'Phags pa rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyi bsngo ba*.

⁷⁹ [447] *Rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyi bsngo ba*.

⁸⁰ *Rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyi bsngo ba bcwa brygad*, cf. Schaeffer and van der Kuijp (2009), p. 152.

⁸¹ Skorupski (1985), no. 327, p. 166.

⁸² Bethlenfalvy (1982), no. 373, p. 34.

⁸³ Pagel and Gaffney (1996), no. 243, p. 47.

⁸⁴ Jampa Samten (1992), no. 253, p. 97.

Gondhla,⁸⁵ and Bathang⁸⁶ Kanjurs. The Mustang Kanjur catalogue lists two texts with a similar title.⁸⁷ Two copies of this text, one complete and another incomplete, are preserved among the Dunhuang manuscripts.⁸⁸ 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.⁸⁹ This text should be associated with the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*.⁹⁰ In his *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts*, Bendall notes that the last folio of one *Prajñāpāramitā* text contains a short treatise ending *Vajradhajapariṇāma* (= *Vajradhvaja*?) *nāma samāptā*. It is possible that this is a Sanskrit – or even Prakrit? – *Vajradhvajapariṇāma*.⁹¹

Śāntideva cites the *Lokottaraparivarta* once, the *Śraddhābalādhānāvātāramudrā* 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)⁹² were translated by Prajñāvarman and Ye shes sde.⁹³ The *Bhāvanākrama* is not an anthology, but it regularly makes short citations to support or illustrate points. Kamalaśīla quotes at least the following *Buddhāvataṃsaka* texts:

[1] *Gocarapariśuddhisūtra*

[2] *Daśabhūmika*

⁸⁵ Tauscher (2008), no. 35.41, p. 108.

⁸⁶ Eimer (2012), no. 161, p. 112.

⁸⁷ *Phags rdo rje rgyal mtshan yongs su bsngo ba’i mdo* and *Rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyi bsngo ba*, cf. Eimer (1999), no. 516, p. 97; no. 603, p. 107.

⁸⁸ La Vallée Poussin (1962), no. 179 (complete), p. 65. Marcelle Lalou, *Inventaire des Manuscrits tibétains de Touen-houang conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Fonds Pelliot tibétain) Nos. 1–849, I, Paris: Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1939, no. 740 (incomplete), p. 163.

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.

⁹⁰ Jampa Samten describes this title as an “abridged version” of *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, chapter 30: see Jampa Samten (1992), p. 97, n. 1.

⁹¹ Cecil Bendall, *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge*, Cambridge: 1883; Stuttgart: Steiner, 1992 (reprinted), pp. 151–152, Add. 1643.

⁹² Date after Ruegg (1981), p. 93, Nakamura (1980, p. 281) suggests c. 700–750.

⁹³ Cf. Giuseppe Tucci, *Minor Buddhist Texts, Part II. First Bhāvanākrama of Kamalaśīla: Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts with Introduction and English Summary* (Serie Orientale Roma 9.2), Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1958, and idem, *Minor Buddhist Texts, Part III. Third Bhāvanākrama* (Serie Orientale Roma 43), Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1971.

[3] *Tathāgatotpattisambhavasūtra*

[4] *Lokottaraparivarta*

[5] *Gaṇḍavyūha*

[6] *Bhadracaryāprañidhāna*

[7] *Āryaśraddhābalādhāna*.

Generally speaking, Kamalaśīla does not cite *Buddhāvataṃsaka* 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 Śīlendrabodhi and Dpal brtsegs rakṣita in the early period of translation. In this text, Kamalaśīla cites the *Lokottaraparivarta* once,⁹⁴ the *Daśabhūmika* twice,⁹⁵ and the *Gaṇḍavyūha* once.⁹⁶ The same citations also occur in his first *Bhāvanākrama* and in the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, with the exception of those from the *Daśabhūmika*.

(7) Bhavya's⁹⁷ *Madhyamakahrdayatarkajvālā*

In his *Madhyamakahrdayatarkajvālā*, translated by Jo bo rje (Atiśa) and Tshul khriims rgyal ba in the eleventh century, Bhavya (c. 490—570)⁹⁸ cites the *Lokottaraparivarta* one time⁹⁹ and the *Daśabhūmika* four times.¹⁰⁰ All of the citations are short or abbreviated.

Further evidence for the circulation of the Buddhāvataṃsaka

Looking more broadly, we find tangible evidence of the circulation of the texts belonging to the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family in central Asia, in the form of Sanskrit manuscript fragments from Khotan (fifth, more probably the sixth century), on the southern Silk route.¹⁰¹ 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

⁹⁴ D 3887: 'Phags pa 'jig rten las 'das pa'i le'u (158b2–3) = First *Bhāvanākrama*, cf. Tucci (1958), p. 217.9–11.

⁹⁵ D 3887: 'Phags pa sa bcu pa (145b1; 158b5–7).

⁹⁶ D 3887: 'Phags pa sdong pos brgyan pa (238a1–7) = Pāsādika (1989): p. 132.5–133.9.

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.

⁹⁸ Date after Nakamura (1980), p. 284, Ruegg (1981, p. 61) gives c. 500–570 with a question mark.

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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka*.

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 *Bhadracarī* was engraved on a stone *caitya*.¹⁰²

It can be conclusively said that the texts of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family circulated in Sanskrit in Central Asia in the sixth centuries. In India, they circulated from the fourth to ninth centuries; the *sāstras* 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.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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family of texts are all in Buddhist Sanskrit: *Daśabhūmika*, *Gaṇḍavyūha*, *Bhadracarī*, and also *Ratnolkādhāraṇī*. 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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, either as a whole or its remaining parts. This has led to the questioning of the Indian credentials of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*. 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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka* 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.¹⁰⁴

The situation in India seems to have stayed much the same at the time that the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* texts were introduced to the Land of Snows. The early Tibetan

¹⁰² See Gregory Schopen, “A Verse from the *Bhadracariprañidhāna* in a Tenth-Century Inscription Found at Nālandā,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 12, part 1, 1989, pp. 149–157, reprinted in Gregory Schopen, *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India: More Collected Papers*, Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2005, pp. 299–305.

¹⁰³ For the recitation of the *Gaṇḍavyūha* and *Daśabhūmika* in India, see T. Ganapati Shastri (ed.), *Ārya Mañjuśrīmūlakalpaḥ* [1920] repr. CBH Publications, Trivandrum, 1992, pp. 38.12, 99.9, 109.28 – see also Ariane MacDonald, *Le Maṇḍala du Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (Collection Jean Przyluski 3), Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1962, pp. 102–103.

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.

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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, 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 *Buddhāvataṃsaka*. The question that remains is when, and why, did the merger occur?

Appendix

MAIN CITATIONS OF THE *BUDDHĀVATAṂSAKA* IN INDIAN BUDDHIST LITERATURE
AS ATTESTED IN SANSKRIT VERSIONS AND TIBETAN TRANSLATIONS

I. Members of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family cited or referred to in Indian works

SŪTRASAMUCCAYA

1. *Daśabhūmikasūtra* / *Sa bcu'i mdo sde*

Pāsādika (1989): pp. 199.2–200.18 = „*Linh-Son*“ – *Publication d'Études Bouddhologiques* (Institut de Recherche Bouddhique Linh-Son, Paris = LSPEB) 20, pp. 34.21–35.20

2. *Tathāgatopattisambhavasūtra* / *De bzhin gshegs pa skye ba srid pa'i mdo*

Pāsādika (1989): pp. 113.6–120.5 = LSPEB 13, pp. 37.26–41.29

3. *Lokottaraparivarta* / 'Jig rten las 'das pa'i le'u

Pāsādika (1989): p. 121.22–24 = LSPEB 13, p. 42.13–15

4. *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra* / *Sdong po bkod pa'i mdo*

Pāsādika (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;¹⁰⁵

pp. 132.5–133.16 (*sdong po bkod pa'i rnam par thar pa*) = LSPEB 14, pp. 22.27–23.36

5. *Tathāgatagunajñānācintyaṣayāvātāranirdeśa* / *De bzhin gshegs pa'i yon tan dang ye shes bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i yul la 'jug pa bstan pa'i mdo*

Pāsādika (1989): p. 14.11–15.12 = LSPEB 3, p. 33.1–21;

pp. 200.19–202.9 = LSPEB 20, pp. 35.21–36.19

6. *Buddhāvataṃsakasūtra* / *Sangs rgyas phal po che'i mdo*

Pāsādika (1989): pp. 154.22–156.2 = LSPEB 16, pp. 26.32–27.37 = D 201 37a7–b6;

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. *Śraddhābalādhānāvātāramudrā* / *Dad pa'i stobs bskyed pa la 'jug pa'i phyag rgya'i mdo*

Pāsādika (1989): p. 11.12–25 (*Dad pa'i stobs bskyed 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 bskyed pa'i mdo*) = LSPEB 14, pp. 23.40–24.15;¹⁰⁶

pp. 32.14–35.19 (*Dad pa'i stobs bskyed 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): 350.21¹⁰⁷

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 bskyed 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 ayam ... sarvāvasthāsu satvārthaḥ ... puṇyavṛdhihetuḥ | vistaratas tv āryagocarapariśuddhisūtre draṣṭavyaḥ*.

2. *Ratnolkādhāraṇī*

Bendall (1902): 2.15–5.1 = Chapter 17 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*;
 p. 5.3–6 (... *tat parisamāpya saṃkṣepataḥ punar āha* | ...) ¹⁰⁸ = Chapter 17 of the Tibetan
Buddhāvataṃsaka;
 p. 153.11–15 = Chapter 20 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*;
 pp. 327.5–347.11 = Chapter 17 of the Tibetan *Buddhāvataṃsaka*

3. *Vajradhvajasūtra*

Bendall (1902): 22.5–27.3; ¹⁰⁹
 27.4–33.10 (... *punar atraivāha* | ...); ¹¹⁰
 213.3–216.5 (*Vajradhvajaparīṇāmanāyām uktā* ...);
 278.14–283.2 (*Āryavajradhvajasūtre 'py āha* ...);
 291.10 ¹¹¹

4. *Daśabhūmikasūtra*

Bendall (1902): 10.15–11.1; 11.3–4 (*pramuditāyām tu pathyate* ...); 11.4–8 (*evam
 ādisūtreṣu* ...); 11.10–11; 126.9–14; 227.11–228.6; 287.14–288.11; 288.11–289.10 (...
tathātraivāha | ...); 291.11–296.1

5. *Lokottaraparivarta*

Bendall (1902): 151.13–152.19

6. *Gaṇḍavyūha*

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. *Śraddhābalādhānāvātāramudrā*

Bendall (1902): 86.1–13; 87.4–13; 153.16–18; 311.6–12

BHĀVANĀKRAMA

1. *Gocarapariśuddhisūtra*

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 24.15–17 ¹¹⁴

3. *Tathāgatopattisambhavasūtra*

Tucci (1971): 13.2–6

4. *Lokottaraparivarta*

Tucci (1958): 217.9–11

5. *Gaṇḍavyūha*

Tucci (1958): 191.2–9 (*tathā cokaṭṭam maitreyavimokṣe* ...) = Bendall (1902): 9.8–12;

¹⁰⁸ The citation is condensed, omitting three verses.

¹⁰⁹ The citation is selective.

¹¹⁰ The *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* also quotes the passage from *sa tāni kuśalamūlāni* (29.13) to *sukhacittaḥ
 pariṇāmayati* (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.

192.19–193.1 = Bendall (1902): 8.16–18;

192.16–17; 228.19–21

6. *Bhadracaryāprañidhāna*

Tucci (1958): 221.2¹¹⁵

7. *Āryaśraddhābalādhāna*

Tucci (1958): 187.17–19; 195.4–6

II. Distribution of citations from the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family in Indian works

1. *Gocarapariśuddhisūtra* / *Spyod yul yongs su dag pa'i mdo*

Śikṣāsamuccaya (1); *Sūtrālamkāravayākhyā* (1); *Mahāyānasaṅgrahabhāṣya* (1);
Mahāyānasaṅgrahopanibandhana (1); *Second Bhāvanākrama* (1)

2. *Ratnolkādharaṇī* / *Dkon mchog ta la la'i gzungs*

Śikṣāsamuccaya (4)

3. *Vajradhavasūtra* / *Rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyi mdo*

Śikṣāsamuccaya (5); *Bodhisatvacaryāvatāra* (1); *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* (2)

4. *Daśabhūmikāsūtra* / *Sa bcu'i mdo*

Sūtrasamuccaya (1); *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (9); *Madhyamakahrdayatarakajvālā* (4); *First Bhāvanākrama* (1); *Third Bhāvanākrama* (2); *Madhyamakāloka* (1)

5. *Tathāgatopattisambhavasūtra* / *De bzhin gshegs pa skye ba srid pa'i mdo*

Sūtrasamuccaya (1); *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā* (2); *Vyākhyāyukti* (1); *Vyākhyāyuktiṭikā* (2);
Third Bhāvanākrama (1)

6. *Lokottaraparivarta* / *'Jig rten las 'das pa'i le'u*

Sūtrasamuccaya (1); *Vyākhyāyukti* (1); *Vyākhyāyuktiṭikā* (1); *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (1);
Madhyamakahrdayatarakajvālā (1); *First Bhāvanākrama* (1); *Madhyamakāloka* (1)

7. *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra* / *Sdong po bkod pa'i mdo*

Sūtrasamuccaya (6); *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (16); *First Bhāvanākrama* (4); *Madhyamakāloka* (1)

8. *Bhadracaryāprañidhāna* / *'Phags pa bzang po spyod pa (smon lam)*

First Bhāvanākrama (1)

9. *Tathāgataṅajñānācintyaṣayāvatāranirdeśa* / *De bzhin gshegs pa'i yon tan dang ye shes bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i yul la 'jug pa bstan pa'i mdo*

Sūtrasamuccaya (2); *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā* (1)

10. *Buddhāvataṃsakasūtra* / *Sangs rgyas phal po che'i mdo*

Sūtrasamuccaya (3)

11. *Śraddhābalādhānāvātāramudrā* / *Dad pa'i stobs bskyed pa la 'jug pa'i phyag rgya'i mdo*

Sūtrasamuccaya (5); *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (4); *First Bhāvanākrama* (2)

III. Circulation of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* family in Indian works: A tentative chronology

The table is meant to give a general overview of the circulation of texts in the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* 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 śāstras and their careers.

¹¹⁵ This is a reference to the title only, without citation.

| DATE | Title | ŚĀSTRA |
|------------|--|----------------------------|
| 150–250 CE | Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra | Sūtrasamuccaya |
| | Tathāgatagaṇajñānācintya viṣayāvatāranirdeśa | |
| | Tathāgatopattisambhavasūtra | |
| | Daśabhūmikasūtra | |
| | Lokottaraparivarta | |
| | Śraddhābalādhānāvātamudrā | |
| 320–400 CE | Gocarapariśuddhisūtra | Mahāyānasāṅgrahabhāṣya |
| | | Sūtrālaṃkāravākhyā |
| | Tathāgatopattisambhava | Vyākhyāyukti |
| | Lokottaraparivarta | |
| 350–450 CE | Tathāgatagaṇajñānācintya viṣayāvatāranirdeśa | Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā |
| | Tathāgatopattisambhava | |
| 500–570 CE | Daśabhūmika | Madhyamakahrdayatarkajvālā |
| | Lokottaraparivarta | |
| 650–750 CE | Gaṇḍavyūha | Śikṣāsamuccaya |
| | Gocarapariśuddhisūtra | |
| | Daśabhūmikasūtra | |
| | Ratnolkādhāraṇī | |
| | Lokottaraparivarta | |
| | Vajradhvajasūtra | |
| | Śraddhābalādhānāvātamudrā | |
| 740–795 CE | Gaṇḍavyūha | Bhāvanākrama |
| | Daśabhūmika | |
| | Gocarapariśuddhisūtra | |
| | Tathāgatopattisambhavasūtra | |
| | Bhadracaryāprañidhāna | |
| | Lokottaraparivarta | |
| | Śraddhābalādhānāvātamudrā | |

Maitreyavyākaraṇa

LI Xuezhū (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 Bengālī 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 *akṣaras*, which amount to approximately 660 *akṣaras* in one folio. Although the title is shown at the end of the manuscript as “*Maitreyavyākaraṇaṃ samāptaṃ*” 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].

² Tomabechei [2009] p. 314, fn 7 and Luo Zhao [2008].

- T. The Sanskrit manuscript of the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* discovered in Turfan, as in Wille [2004].
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe : “*Maitreyavyākaraṇa*,” in *Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen collection*, vol III, ed. Jens Braarvig, Paul Harrison, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Kazunobu Matsuda, Lore Sander, pp. 7–9, Oslo 2006
- Ishigami Zenno : “Neparu-bon *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*,” in Fujita Kotatsu Hakushi Kanreki Kinen Ronshu *Indo Tetsugaku to Bukkyo*, (“*Maitreyavyākaraṇa* a Buddhist Manuscript in the National Archives of Nepal,” in *Indian Philosophy and Buddhism: Essays in Honour of Professor Kotatsu Fujita on His Sixtieth Birthday*), pp. 295–310, Kyoto 1989
- Lévi, Sylvain : “*Maitreya le Consolateur*,” in *Mélanges R. Linossier*, Vol. 2, ed. Musée Guimet, pp. 355–402, Paris 1932
- Luo Zhao : “Overseas news: The cataloguing of Sanskrit manuscripts preserved in the Tibetan autonomous region: a complicated process of more than 20 years by Luo Zhao,” translated by Kazunobu Matsuda, *Buddhist seminar*, Vol. 88, 128–117, 2008
- Majumder, Prabhas Chandra : *Ārya-Maitreya-Vyākaranam*, Calcutta 1959
- Tomabechi Toru : “On a newly available Sanskrit manuscript of the *Adhyardhaśatikā Prajñāpāramitā*,” *Bulletin of the Research Institute of Esoteric Buddhist Culture*, Koyasan University, Vol 22, 316–300, 2009
- Wille, Klaus : *Sanskrit-Handschriften aus den Turfan-Funden*, Teil 9, Katalognummern 2000–3199, Klaus Wille, Heinz Bechert, Nr. 2013.33, Stuttgart 2004

Maitreyavyākaraṇa

(1b1) namo buddhāya³ ||

evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye bhagavān rājagrhe viharati sma | veṇuvane
kalandakanivāpe⁴ tatra bhagavān bhikṣūn āmantrayate sma⁵ | athāyusmān*⁶

śāriputro (1b2) mahāprājño⁷ dharmasenāpatir vibhuḥ [K.1ab]

trilokasyānukaṅkṣāpārthaṃ⁸ śāstāraṃ pariṣcchati || (1) [K.1cd]

yo (')sāv anāgato buddho nirddiṣṭo lokanāyakaḥ⁹ [K.2ab]

maitreya iti nā¹⁰(1b3)mnā[sau] sūtre pūrvvāparāntake¹⁰ || (2) [K.2cd]

³ namo buddhāya : K. Oṃ namo maitreyaṅāthāya.

⁴ kalandakanivāpe : K. °nivāse.

⁵ tatra bhagavān bhikṣūn āmantrayate sma : K. mahatā bhikṣusamghena sārddham ardhatrāyodaśabhir
bhikṣusataiḥ.

⁶ athāyusmān* : K. atha khalv āyusmān.

⁷ mahāprājño : K. mahāprajño.

⁸ trilokasyānukampārthaṃ : K. lokasya anukampārthaṃ (Ms. lokasyānukampārthaṃ).

⁹ T. (2013.33rw) /// [O]ṣṭo lokanāyaka[{}]} | .. ///.

¹⁰ sūtre pūrvvāparāntake : K. sūtrapūrvvāparāntike.

| | |
|--|----------|
| tasyāhaṃ vistaraṃ sarvvaṃ śroṭum ¹¹ icchāmi nāyaka ¹² | [K.3ab] |
| rddhiñ cāsyānubhāvañ ca tan me brūhi narottama 3 | [K.3cd] |
| athainam avadac chāstā śṛṇum andho ^(1b4) mahāmato ¹³ | [K.4ab] |
| vistaraṃ tasya buddhasya maitreyasya mahātmanaḥ ¹⁴ (4) | [K.4cd] |
| udadhis tena kālena dvātriṃśat*śatayojanaḥ ¹⁵ | [K.5ab] |
| śoṣam āyāsyate yasmāc cakravartī yatho ¹⁶ hy a ^{1(1b5)} sau (5) | [K.5cd] |
| daśayojanasāhasro ¹⁷ janbūdīpo bhaviṣyati ¹⁸ | [K.6ab] |
| āṀlayaḥ sarvvabhūtānāṃ vistarāya ¹⁹ samantataḥ (6) | [K.6cd] |
| rddhisphītā janapadā adaṇḍā anupadravāḥ | [K.7ab] |
| tatra kāle bhavi ^(1b6) ṣyanti narās te śubhakāriṇaḥ ²⁰ (7) | [K.7cd] |
| akaṇṭa[kā] vasumatī samāharitaśādvalā ²¹ | [K.8ab] |
| unnamantī namantī ca mṛdutūlapicūpamā (8) | [K.8cd] |
| akṛṣṭotpadyate śāliḥ madhurāñ ca sugandhikaṃ ²² | [K.9ab] |
| cai ^(2a1) lavṛkṣā bhaviṣyanti nānāraṅgopaśobhitāḥ (9) | [K.9cd] |
| puṣpapatraphalotpatā ²³ vṛkṣāḥ krośatrayocchritāḥ ²⁴ | [K.10ab] |
| aśtīvarṣasahasrāṇy ²⁵ āyus teṣāṃ bhaviṣyati (10) | [K.10cd] |
| nirāmayāś ca te ^(2a2) satvā vītaśokā ²⁶ mahotsavāḥ | [K.11ab] |
| varṇṇavanto maheśāṀkhyā ²⁷ mahānagnabalānvitāḥ ²⁸ (11) | [K.11cd] |
| trayo ²⁹ rogā bhaviṣyanti icchā anasanaṃ ³⁰ jarā | [K.12ab] |

¹¹ *vistaraṃ sarvva śrotum* : K. *vistarañ caivaṃ śrotum*.

¹² T. (2013.33rx) /// [O m] *icchāmi nā[ya] + +* ///.

¹³ *śṛṇum andho mahāmato* : K. *vyākariṣyāmy ahaṃ* (Ms. *ahan tava*; T. (2013.33ry) /// [O ri] *ṣyāmy ahaṃ tava + +* ///.

¹⁴ *mahātmanaḥ* : K. *śṛṇohi me*.

¹⁵ T. (2013.33rz) /// [O] *cchatayojanaḥ +* ///.

¹⁶ *yatho* : K. *yathā*.

¹⁷ *daśayojanasāhasro* : K. *daśayojanasāhasrā*.

¹⁸ *janbūdīpo bhaviṣyati* : K. *jambudvīpo bhaviṣyati*; T. (2013.33v1) /// [O] *dvīpo bhaviṣyati ..* ///. Read *jambūdīpo bhaviṣyati*.

¹⁹ *vistarāya* : K. *vistareṇa*.

²⁰ *śubhakāriṇaḥ* : K. *śubhakarīṇaḥ*.

²¹ T. (2013.33v2) /// [O] *māhari[ta] .. + +* ///.

²² *śāliḥ madhurāñ ca sugandhikaṃ* : K. *śālimadhunāś ca sugandhi ca*.

²³ *puṣpapatraphalotpatā* : K. *puṣpapatraphalopatā*.

²⁴ *vṛkṣāḥ krośatrayocchritāḥ* : K. *vṛkṣāś ca krośam ucchritāḥ*.

²⁵ *aśtīvarṣasahasrāṇy* : K. *aśtīvarṣasahasrāni*; T. (2013.33v3) /// [O] *śtīḥ prāṇi[n]*. + + ///.

²⁶ *vītaśokā* : K. *vītaśoko*.

²⁷ *maheśāṀkhyā* : K. *mahaśāṅkhyā*. Read *mahaśāṅkhyā*.

²⁸ *mahānagnabalānvitāḥ* : K. *mahānāgabalāt citāḥ*.

²⁹ *trayo* : K. *trayā*.

³⁰ *anasanaṃ jarā* : K. *anaśanaṃ jarā*; T. (2013.33v4) /// [O] *ana[śa]naṃ jarāḥ [i]* ///.

| | |
|--|----------|
| pañcavarṣaśatā kanyā svāmi _(2a3) no ³¹ varaiṣyati (12) | [K.12cd] |
| tadā ketumatī nāma rājadhānī bhaviṣya○ti | [K.13ab] |
| [āvāsas śuddhasa]tvānām prāṇinām śubhakarmmiṇām ³² (13) | [K.13cd] |
| yojanadvādaśāyāmam saptayojanavis[ta]raṃ{{h}} ³³ _(2a4) | [K.14ab] |
| nagaraṃ kṛtapuṇyānām bhaviṣyati manoramaṃ (14) | [K.14cd] |
| [sapta]ratnama○yās caiva prakārāḥ krośam ucchritāḥ ³⁴ | [K.15ab] |
| iṣikā dvāraṣaṇḍās ca ³⁵ nānāratnavibhūṣitāḥ (15) | [K.15cd] |
| parikhās ³⁶ ca bhavi _(2a5) ṣyanti ratna iṣṭakasamcitāḥ | [K.16ab] |
| padmo[tpalā]samā kīrṇās ³⁷ cakravā○kopaśobhitāḥ (16) | [K.16cd] |
| samantataḥ parivṛtāḥ saptabhis talāpaṅktibhiḥ ³⁸ | [K.17ab] |
| catūratnamayās tālāḥ kiṃkiṇī jāla _(2a6) śobhitāḥ (17) ³⁹ | [K.17cd] |
| tenaiva tālaśabdena krīḍiṣyanti pramoditāḥ | [K.19cd] |
| puṣkariṇyo ⁴⁰ bhaviṣyanti kumudotpalasañcetāḥ (18) | [K.20ab] |
| udyānavanasampannaṃ bhaviṣyati ca tat puraṃ | [K.20cd] |
| rājā bhaviṣya _(2b1) ti tatra saṅkho ⁴¹ nāma mahādyutiḥ (19) | [K.21ab] |
| mahābalaś cakravartti ⁴² caturddvīpeśvaraḥ ⁴³ prabhuḥ | [K.21cd] |
| caturāṅgalopetaḥ saptaratnasamanvitaḥ (20) | [K.22ab] |
| pūrṇaṃ sahasraṃ putrāṇām ⁴⁴ tasya rājño bhaviṣyati _(2b2) | [K.22cd] |
| imāṃ samudraparyantām adaṇḍena vasundharām (21) | [K.23ab] |
| prasādayiṣyati ⁴⁵ ○ dharmmeṇa samena sa narādhipaḥ | [K.23cd] |
| mahānidhayaś ⁴⁶ catvāro niyutāḥ śatalakṣitāḥ ⁴⁷ (22) | [K.24ab] |

³¹ svāmino : K. svāminam.

³² śubhakarmmiṇām : K. śubhakarminām.

³³ saptayojanavis[ta]raṃ{{h}} : K. saptayojanavistaram.

³⁴ ucchritāḥ : K. uccitāḥ (Ms ucchitāḥ).

³⁵ iṣikā dvāraṣaṇḍās ca : K. iṣṭakā dvāraḥṣaṇḍānām .

³⁶ parikhās : K. pariṣās.

³⁷ padmotpalāsamā kīrṇās : K. padmotpalasamān kīrṇās.

³⁸ saptabhis talāpaṅktibhiḥ : K. saptabhi(s) talapa(ṇ)ktibhiḥ (Ms saptabhik talapaktibhiḥ);

³⁹ K. adds: vāteneritatalēbhyas tadā śruti(Ms śrūti) manoharaḥ |

bhaviṣyanti śubha śabdās tūryas pañcāṅgikar iva || 18 ||

ye ca tasmin pure martyaḥ krīḍā(Ms kriḍā) ratisukhānvitāḥ(Ms °atvitāḥ) |

⁴⁰ puṣkariṇyo : K. puṣkariṇo.

⁴¹ rājā bhaviṣyati tatra saṅkho : K. bhaviṣyati tadā rājā śamkho.

⁴² mahābalaś cakravartti : K. mahābalacakravartti.

⁴³ caturddvīpeśvaraḥ : K. catudvīpeśvaraḥ.

⁴⁴ pūrṇaṃ sahasraṃ putrāṇām : K. pūrṇasahasraputrāṇām.

⁴⁵ prasādayiṣyati : K. pālayiṣyati.

⁴⁶ mahānidhayaś : K. mahānidhānās.

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| bhaviṣyanti tadā tasya rā _(2b3) jñāḥ saṃkhasya ⁴⁸ bhūpateḥ | [K.24cd] |
| piṅgalaś ca kaliṅgeṣva ⁴⁹ mithilāyā [○] ñ ca pāṇḍukaḥ (23) | [K.25ab] |
| ⁵⁰ elapatraś ⁵¹ ca gāndhāre saṃkho ⁵² vārāṇasīpure | [K.25cd; C.25cd] |
| caturbhir ebhir nndhibhiḥ sa rājā susamanvi _(2b4) taḥ (24) | [K.26ab; C.26ab] |
| bhaviṣyati mahāvīraḥ śatapuṇyavaloditaḥ ⁵³ | [K.26cd; C.26cd] |
| brahma [○] ṇas ⁵⁴ tasya rājñasya subrahmā nāma ⁵⁵ purohitaḥ (25) | [K.27ab; C.27ab] |
| bahuśrutaś caturvveda upādhyāyo bhaviṣyati ⁵⁶ | [K.27cd; C.27cd] |
| adhyāpako _(2b5) mantradharaḥ smṛtimān ⁵⁷ vedapāraḡaḥ (26) | [K.28ab; C.28ab] |
| kaiṭābhe sa nirghaṇṭe ○ ca padavyākaraṇānvitaḥ ⁵⁸ | [K.28cd; C.28cd] |
| tadā ⁵⁹ brahmavati nāma tasya ⁶⁰ bhāryā bhaviṣyati (27) | [K.29ab; C.29ab] |
| prāsādikā darśantiyā ⁶¹ abhirūpā _(2b6) yasasvini ⁶² | [K.29cd; C.29cd] |
| tuṣitebhyas cyavitvā ⁶³ maitreyo hy agrapudgalaḥ (28) | [K.30ab; C.30ab] |
| tasyāḥ kuṣṡau sa niyatam pratisandhiṃ grahiṣyati ⁶⁴ | [K.30cd; C.30cd] |
| daśamāsāṃś ca ⁶⁵ nikhilāṃ dhārayitvā mahādyutim (29) | [K.31ab; C.31ab; G.31ab] |
| supuṣpīte _(3a1) ca udyāne gatvā maitreyamātarāḥ ⁶⁶ | [K.31cd; C.31cd; G.31cd] |
| mahatyā rāja-rddhyā ca nānāpakṣini nādite (30) | [K. – ; C. – ; G. –] |

⁴⁷ *niyutāḥ śatalakṣitāḥ* : K. + + + (Ms *nerdhuta*)*śatalakṣitāḥ*.

⁴⁸ *saṃkhasya* : K. *saṃkhasya*.

⁴⁹ *kaliṅgeṣva* : K. *kaliṅgeṣu*.

⁵⁰ C. starts here.

⁵¹ *elapatraś* (= K.) : C. *elapattraś*.

⁵² *saṃkho* : K., C. *saṃkho*.

⁵³ *śatapuṇyavaloditaḥ* | : K. *śatapuṇyaphalārpitaḥ* || 26; C. *śatapuṇyabaloditaḥ*; T. (2013.30r1) ||| + + *tapuṇya[balo]ditaḥ* 20 (the number should be 23?).

⁵⁴ *brahmaṇas* : K., C. *brāhmaṇas*.

⁵⁵ *rājñasya subrahmā nāma* : K. *rājño 'tha subrahmā nāmnā*(Ms *nāmma*?); C. *rājñas ca subrahmaṇaḥ*.

⁵⁶ *caturvveda upādhyāyo bhaviṣyati* | : K. *caturvedt upādhyāyo bhaviṣyati* || 27; C. *caturvedas tasyopādhyāyo bhaviṣyati*; T. (2013.30r2) ||| + + *dhya[yo bhaviṣy]yati*] 2[4].

⁵⁷ *smṛtimān* (= C.) : K. *smṛtivān*(Ms *vat*).

⁵⁸ *kaiṭābhe sa nirghaṇṭe ca padavyākaraṇānvitaḥ* : K. *kaiṭābhe ca sa nirghaṇṭe padavyākaraṇaṃ tathā*; C. *kaiṭābhe sa nirghaṇṭe ca padavyākaraṇe tathā*.

⁵⁹ *tadā* (= C.) : K. *tasya*.

⁶⁰ *tasya* (= C.) : K. *tadā*.

⁶¹ *prāsādikā darśantiyā* : K., C. *darśantiyā prāsādika*.

⁶² *abhirūpā yasasvini* : K., C. *abhirūpā yaśasvini*(K. Ms *vanī*); T. (2013.30r3) ||| ... *bh[ī]ra i .ī*

⁶³ *cyavitvā* (= C.) : K. *tataś cyutvā*.

⁶⁴ *niyatam pratisandhiṃ grahiṣyati* | : K. *niyatam pratisandhiṃ grahiṣyati* || 30; C. *niyatam pratisandin grahiṣyati*; T. (2013.30v1) ||| *im pratisandhi[m] g[r]ahiṣyati* [26].

⁶⁵ G. starts here.

⁶⁶ *supuṣpīte ca udyāne gatvā maitreyamātarāḥ* | : K. *supuṣpīte codyāne gatvā maitreyamātarāḥ*(Ms *taramḥ*) || 31; C. *supuṣpīte ca udyāne gatvā maitreyamātara*; G. *supuṣpītesminn udyāne maitreyajanant tataḥ*; T. (2013.30v2) ||| *[i] «+» yaṃ janayisyati* 27.

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| na niṣaṅṅā nipannā vā ⁶⁷ sthitā sā dharmmacāriṇī ⁶⁸ | [K.32ab; C.32ab; G.32ab] |
| drumaśākhām ⁶⁹ ālambya maitreyaṃ janayiṣyati (31) ⁷⁰ | [K.32cd; C.32cd; G.32cd] |
| niṣkrami _(3a2) ṣyati pārśvāc ca ⁷¹ dakṣiṇāmse ⁷² narottamaḥ | [K.33ab; C.33ab; G. –] |
| abhṛakūṭād yathā sū ^o ryo nīrgataś ca prabhāsyate ⁷³ (32) | [K.33cd; C.33cd; G. –] |
| kariṣyati jagālokaṃ ⁷⁴ sanarāmaravanditaḥ | [K.34ab; C. –; G. –] |
| alipto garbhapaṅkena padmaṃ caiva ⁷⁵ _(3a3) yathāmbunā ⁷⁶ (33) | [K.34cd; C.34ab; G.33ab] |
| traidhātukam idaṃ sarvvaṃ prabhayā pūrayiṣyati | [K.34ef; C.34cd; G.33cd] |
| ⁷⁷ prī ^o to 'tha taṃ ⁷⁸ sahasrākṣo devarājā ⁷⁹ śacīpatiḥ (34) ⁸⁰ | [K. –; C.35ab; G.34ab] |
| grahīṣyati kumāraṃ taṃ jāyamānaṃ narottamaṃ | [K. –; C.35cd; G. –] |
| śriyā jva _(3a4) lantaṃ maitreyaṃ dvātriṃśadvaralakṣaṇaṃ (35) | [K. –; C.36ab; G. –] |
| muñca muñca sahasrākṣa ^o jātamātro vadiṣyati | [K. –; C.36cd; G. –] |
| padāni sapta saptāsau kramiṣyati caturddaśaṃ ⁸¹ (36) | [K. –; C.37ab; G.35ab] |
| pade pade nidhānañ ⁸² ca padmaṃ _(3a5) padmaṃ bhaviṣyati | [K.35ab; C.37cd; G.35cd] |
| diśāś catasraś codvikṣya ⁸³ vācaṃ pravyāhariṣya ^o ti (37) | [K.35cd; C.38ab; G.36ab] |
| iyam me paścimā jāti ⁸⁴ nāsti bhūyaḥ punarbhavaḥ | [K.35ef; C.38cd; G.36cd] |
| na punar āgamiṣyāmi ⁸⁵ nirvvāṣyāmi ⁸⁶ nirāsravaḥ ⁸⁷ (38) ⁸⁸ | [K.36ab; C.39ab; G.36ef] |
| śītoṣṇa _(3a6) vāridhārābhīḥ ⁸⁹ snāpayiṣyanti pannagāḥ ⁹⁰ | [K.36cd; C.39cd; G.38cd] |

⁶⁷ nipannā vā (= K., G.) : C. na suptāsau.

⁶⁸ dharmmacāriṇī : K. brahmacāriṇī; C., G. dharmacāriṇī.

⁶⁹ drumaśākhām : K., C., G. drumasya śākhām.

⁷⁰ maitreyaṃ janayiṣyati || (31) : T. (2013.30v3) /// + + m(ai)treyaṃ janayiṣyati (presumably v.28).

⁷¹ pārśvāc ca : K. pārśvena(Ms °eṇa); C. pārśvena; G. –

⁷² dakṣiṇāmse : K. dakṣiṇāṅge; C. dakṣiṇena; G. –

⁷³ prabhāsyate : K. prabhāyate; C. prabhāsate; G. –

⁷⁴ kariṣyati jagālokaṃ : K. kariṣyate samālokaṃ; C., G. –

⁷⁵ padmaṃ caiva : K. padmañ caiva; C. padmaṃ caiva; G. kuśeṣayam.

⁷⁶ yathāmbunā : K. yathāmbhuvā; C. yathāmbhasā; G. ivāmbunā.

⁷⁷ The other versions each have a similar verse, which is not found in P. See fn. 94.

⁷⁸ prī^oto 'tha taṃ (= G.) : K. –; C. atha prītas.

⁷⁹ devarājā (= G.) : K. –; C. devarājaś.

⁸⁰ G. adds : jāyamānaṃ grahitā sa maitreyaṃ dvīpadottama* || 34 ||

⁸¹ sapta saptāsau kramiṣyati caturddaśaṃ : K. –; C. jātamātras tu saptāsau prakramiṣyati; G. jātamātraś ca saptāsau prakramiṣyati.

⁸² nidhānañ (= K.) : C. nidhanañ; G. nidhanaṃ.

⁸³ codvikṣya (= C., G.) : K. udvikṣya.

⁸⁴ jāti (= K., G.) : C. jātir.

⁸⁵ āgamiṣyāmi (= K., C.) : G. abhyāgamiṣyāmi.

⁸⁶ nirvvāṣyāmi : K., C., G. nirvāṣyāmi.

⁸⁷ nirāsravaḥ (= G.) : K., C. nirāsravaḥ.

⁸⁸ G. adds : saṃsārāṅṅavamagnānāṃ sattvānāṃ duḥkhabhāgināṃ |
tṛṣṇābandhanabaddhānāṃ kariṣyāmi vimocanam* || 37 ||
śvetam cāsyā surāś chatraṃ dhārayiṣyanti mūrhdhani |

⁸⁹ śītoṣṇavāridhārābhīḥ (= K.) : C. °dhārābhīḥ; G. °dhārābhyaṃ.

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| divyāsvarāṇi ⁹¹ puṣpāni prakṣepsyanti divaukaṣaḥ ⁹² (39) | [K.37ab; C.40ab; G. –] |
| svetañ cāśya mahacchattraṃ hemadaṇḍaṃ manoramam ⁹³ ⁹⁴ | [K.37cd; C.40cd; G.38ab] |
| vicitraṃ ratnakhacitaṃ dārayiṣyanti mūrddhani (40) _(3b1) | [K. – ; C. – ; G. –] |
| pusar ⁹⁵ ḡhītvā maitreyaṃ devarājā śacīpatiḥ | [K. – ; C. – ; G. –] |
| prasādajāto jagannāthaṃ mātuḥaste pradāsyati (41) | [K. – ; C. – ; G. –] |
| manoramam ca śivikam nānāratnavibhūṣitaṃ | [K.39ab; C.42ab; G.40ab] |
| ārūḍhām putrasahitaṃ ⁹⁶ ayaṃ neṣyantaṃ _(3b2) devatāḥ ⁹⁷ (42) | [K.39cd; C.42cd; G.40cd] |
| tatas tūryasahasreṣu ⁹⁸ vādyamāneṣu tatpuraṃ | [K.40ab; C.43ab; G.41ab] |
| praviṣṭamātre maitreyaṃ puṣpavṛṣṭiḥ ⁹⁹ patiṣyati ¹⁰⁰ (43) | [K.40cd; C.43cd; G.41cd] |
| tasmin dine subhe nāryaḥ prasaviṣyanti tatpure ¹⁰¹ | [K.41ab; C.44ab; G. –] |
| sarvvās tā {ja} _(3b3) janayiṣyanti putrān* kṣemeṇa svastinā (44) | [K.41cd; C.44cd; G. –] |
| dṛṣṭvaiva ¹⁰² putraṃ subrahmā ○ dvātriṃśadvaralakṣaṇam | [K.42ab; C.45ab; G.42ab] |
| pratyavekṣya sumantreṣu tataḥ ¹⁰³ prīto bhaviṣyati (45) | [K.42cd; C.45cd; G.42cd] |
| gatidvayaṃ kumārasya yathā mantreṣu _(3b4) dṛṣyate | [K.43ab; C.46ab; G.43ab] |
| narādhipaś cakravartī buddho vā dvīpadottamaḥ (46) | [K.43cd; C.46cd; G.43cd] |
| sa ca ○ yauvanasaṃprāpto ¹⁰⁴ maitreyaḥ puruṣottamaḥ ¹⁰⁵ | [K.44ab; C.47ab; G.44ab] |

⁹⁰ snāpayiṣyanti pannagāḥ (= C.) : K. snāpayiṣyanti punnagāḥ; G. nāgendrau snāpayiṣyataḥ.

⁹¹ divyāsvarāṇi : K. divyāsuraṇi; C. divyāmarāṇi.

⁹² prakṣepsyanti divaukaṣaḥ : K., C. patiṣyanti nabhastalāt; G. –.

⁹³ svetañ cāśya mahacchattraṃ hemadaṇḍaṃ manoramam : K., C., G. śvetaṃ tasya surāś chattraṃ dhārayiṣyanti mūrddhani.

⁹⁴ K. adds : hr̥ṣṭas caiva sahasrākṣo devarājāḥ śacīpatiḥ |
pragrahiṣyati kumāraṃ taṃ dvātriṃśalakṣaṇānvitam |
śrīyā jvalantaṃ maitreyaṃ mātur haste pradāsyati || 38 ||

C. adds : hr̥ṣṭas caiva sahasrākṣo devarājo śacīpatiḥ |
grahīṣyati taṃ kumāraṃ dvātriṃśadvaralakṣaṇam |
śrīyā jvalantaṃ maitreyaṃ mātur haste pradāsyati || (41)

G. adds : pratigṛhya ca taṃ dhātṛ dvātriṃśadvaralakṣaṇam* |
śrīyā jvalantaṃ maitreyaṃ mātre samupaneṣyati || 39 ||

⁹⁵ pusar : S.e. for punar.

⁹⁶ ārūḍhām putrasahitaṃ (= K., G.) : C. ārūḍhā putrasahitā.

⁹⁷ ayaṃ neṣyantaṃ devatāḥ : K. vahiṣyanti (ca) devatāḥ; C. vahiṣyate ca devavat; G. vahiṣyanti ca devatā.

⁹⁸ tūryasahasreṣu (= C., G.) : K. tūryasahasreṣu (Ms °reṇa).

⁹⁹ puṣpavṛṣṭiḥ : K., C., G. puṣpavarṣaṇam.

¹⁰⁰ patiṣyati : K. patiṣyati (Ms prati°).

¹⁰¹ tasmin dine subhenāryaḥ prasaviṣyanti tatpure : K. tasmimś ca divase nāryo gurviṇyaḥ prasaviṣya(n)ti; C. tasmimś ca divase bhāryā gurviṇyaḥ prasaviṣyanti; G. –.

¹⁰² dṛṣṭvaiva : K., G. dṛṣṭvaivam; C. dṛṣṭvā ca.

¹⁰³ pratyavekṣya sumantreṣu tataḥ : K. pratyavekṣya sumantreṇa tataḥ; C. pratyavekṣya ca mantreṣu tataḥ; G. pratyavikṣātha mantreṣu tadā.

¹⁰⁴ yauvanasaṃprāpto (= G.) : K. °samptoprā; C. samprāpto.

¹⁰⁵ maitreyaḥ puruṣottamaḥ (= G.) : K., C. maitreyo hy agrapudgalaḥ.

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| cintayīṣyati dharmmātmā duḥkhitā khalv iyaṃ prajā ¹⁰⁶ (47) | [K.44cd; C.47cd; G.44cd] |
| brahmasvaro ^(3b5) mahāghoṣo ¹⁰⁷ hemavarṇṇo mahādyutiḥ | [K.45ab; C.48ab; G.45ab] |
| viśālacakṣuḥ pīnāmsaḥ padmapatranibhekṣaṇaḥ ¹⁰⁸ (48) | [K.45cd; C.48cd; G.45cd] |
| aśī«ta»hastam ucchrayas tasya kāyo bhaviṣyati ¹⁰⁹ | [K.46ab; C.49ab; G.46ab] |
| vistarāṃ viṃśahastāni tato ^(3b6) (')rddham mukhaṃ maṇḍalaṃ ¹¹⁰ (49) | [K.46cd; C.49cd; G.46cd] |
| aśītibhīś catu<r>bhīś ca sahasraiḥ sampuraskṛtaḥ ¹¹¹ | [K.47ab; C.50ab; G.47ab] |
| māṇavānāṃ sa ¹¹² maitreyo mantrān adhyāpayīṣyati (50) | [K.47cd; C.50cd; G.47cd] |
| tataḥ saṃkho mahārāja ¹¹³ yūpaṃ ucchrāpayīṣyati | [K.48ab; C.51ab; G.48ab] |
| ṣoḍaśavyāma ^(4a1) vistāram ¹¹⁴ ūrdhvaṃ vyāmasahasrakam ¹¹⁵ (51) ¹¹⁶ | [K.48cd; C.51cd; G.48cd] |
| saptaratnamayaṃ yūpaṃ ¹¹⁷ brāhmaṇebhyaḥ ¹¹⁸ pradāsyati | [K.49cd; C.52ef; G. –] |
| tañ ¹¹⁹ ca ratnamayaṃ yūpaṃ dattamātram manoramam (52) | [K.50ab; C.53ab; G.50ab] |
| brāhmaṇānāṃ ¹²⁰ sahasraṇi vikariṣyanti tatṣaṇam ¹²¹ | [K.50cd; C.53cd; G.50cd] |
| tasya ^(4a2) yūpasya ¹²² maitreyo drṣṭvā cainām ¹²³ anityatām (53) | [K.51ab; C.54ab; G.51ab] |
| kṛtsnaṃ vicintya ○ saṃsāraṃ pravra[jyā]ṃ rocayīṣyati | [K.51cd; C.54cd; G.51cd] |

¹⁰⁶ *duḥkhitā khalv iyaṃ prajā* (= K.): C. *duḥkhitāḥ khalv imāḥ prajāḥ*; G. *duḥkhita khalv iyaṃ prajāḥ*.

¹⁰⁷ *mahāghoṣo* (= C., G.): K. *mahāvego*.

¹⁰⁸ *viśālacakṣuḥ pīnāmsaḥ padmapatranibhekṣaṇaḥ* : K. *viśālacakṣuḥ*(Ms *viśālavakṣaḥ*) *pīnāṅgaḥ padmapatranibhedekṣaṇaḥ*; C. *viśālavakṣaḥ pīnāṅgaḥ padmapatranibhekṣaṇaḥ*; G. *viśālavakṣaḥ pīnāmsaḥ padmapatranibhekṣaṇaḥ*.

¹⁰⁹ *aśī«ta»hastam ucchrayas tasya kāyo bhaviṣyati* : K. *ucchrāyeṇa hastāśītiḥ kāyas tasya bhaviṣyati*; C. *samucchrāyeṇa hastāśītiḥ tasya kāyo bhaviṣyati*; G. *hastāḥ pañcāśad ucchrāya tasya kāyo bhaviṣyati*.

¹¹⁰ *vistarāṃ viṃśahastāni tato* (')*rddham mukhaṃ maṇḍalaṃ* : K. *vistarāṃ viṃśatir hastā tato 'rdham mukhamaṇḍalaṃ*(Ms *°tvaṃ*); C. *vistarāṃ viṃśahastāni tato rdham mukhamaṇḍalaṃ*; G. *visṛtaś ca tato 'rdhheṇa śubhavarṇasamucchrāyaḥ*.

¹¹¹ *sampuraskṛtaḥ* (= G.): K., C. *sa puraskṛtaḥ*.

¹¹² *māṇavānāṃ sa* : K. *mānavānāṃ sa*; C. *mānavānān ca*; G. *mānavānāṃ sa*; S. *māṇavānāṃ sa*.

¹¹³ *tataḥ saṃkho mahārāja* : K. *tataḥ saṅkho mahārāja*; C. *tataś saṅkho mahārājo*; G. *atha saṅkho narapatīḥ*.

¹¹⁴ *ṣoḍaśavyāmaṃ vistāram* (= K., C.): G. *tiryāñ ca ṣoḍaśavyāmaṃ*.

¹¹⁵ *ūrdhvaṃ vyāmasahasrakam* (= C., G.): K. *ūrdhavyāmasahasrakam*.

¹¹⁶ K. adds : *sa tam*(Ms *śatam*) *yūpaṃ narapatir nānāratnavibhūṣitam* |

C. adds : *sa taṃ yūpaṃ narapatir nānāratnavibhūṣitam* |

pradāsyati dvijātībhyo yajñāṃ kṛtvā purassaram |

G. adds : *sa taṃ yūpaṃ narapatir nānāratnavibhūṣitam* |

pradāsyati dvijātībhyo yajñāṃ kṛtvā puraḥsaram |

S. *vibhūṣitam • pradāsyati dvijātībhyo ya[jña]ṃ [k]r .v. [p]u[r]. .s. ra* ||

S. does not have a half verse that corresponds to P. 52ab (K. 49cd, C. 52ef) since the following akṣara is t. which is the initial akṣara of P. 52cd (see fn 119 and Hartmann p. 9, fn 9).

¹¹⁷ *saptaratnamayaṃ yūpaṃ* (= C.): K. *saptaratnasamakīrṇam*.

¹¹⁸ *brāhmaṇebhyaḥ* (= C.): K. *brāhmaṇebhyaḥ*(Ms *°bhāḥ*).

¹¹⁹ *tañ* (= C., G): K. *tac*; S. *t. ///*.

¹²⁰ *brāhmaṇānāṃ* (= K., C.): G. *brāhmaṇāṅam*.

¹²¹ *vikariṣyanti tatṣaṇam* : K., C. *vikariṣyanti tatṣaṇāt*; G. *vikiriṣyanti tatṣaṇāt**.

¹²² *tasya yūpasya* (= K., C.): G. *yūpasya tasya*.

¹²³ *drṣṭvā cainām* (= K., C., G.): S. (2382/286 line 3) (*dr*)*ṣṭvevan tam*.

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| yatv ahaṃ ¹²⁴ pravrajitveha spr̥ṣeyam amṛtaṃ padam (54) | [K.52ab; C.55ab; G.52ab] |
| vimocayeyam janatām vyādhi _(4a3) mṛtyujarābhayāt {1} | [K.52cd; C.55cd; G.52cd] |
| aṣṭibhiś caturbhiś ca sahasraiḥ saṃpuraṣkṛtaḥ ¹²⁵ (55) | [K.53ab; C.56ab; G.53ab] |
| niḥkramiṣyati ¹²⁶ maitreyaḥ pravrajyām ¹²⁷ agrapudgalaḥ | [K.53cd; C.56cd; G.53cd] |
| nāgavṛkṣas tadā tasya bodhivṛkṣo bhaviṣya _(4a4) ti (56) | [K.54ab; C.57ab; G.54ab] |
| pañcāsadyojanās tasya ¹²⁸ ūrdhva[m] śākhāḥ samudgatāḥ ¹²⁹ < > ○ | [K.54cd; C.57cd; G.54cd] |
| ṣaṭkrośaviṭapānyāni ¹³⁰ vivṛtāni ¹³¹ samantataḥ (57) | [K.54ef; C.57ef; G. –] |
| tasya mūle niṣaṅgo (')sau ¹³² maitreyo dvipadottamaḥ ¹³³ _(4a5) | [K.55ab; C.58ab; G.55ab] |
| anuttarām śivām bodhim ¹³⁴ jītvā mārān avāpsyati ¹³⁵ (58) ¹³⁶ | [K.55cd; C.58cd; G.55cd] |
| aṣṭāṅgo○petayā vācā tataḥ sa puruṣottamaḥ | [K.56ab; C.59ab; G.57ab] |
| deśayiṣyati saddharmaṃ sarvvaduḥkhāpahaṃ ¹³⁷ śivam (59) | [K.56cd; C.59cd; G.57cd] |
| duḥkhaṃ duḥ _(4a6) khasamutpādaṃ duḥkhasya samatikramam | [K.57ab; C.60ab; G.58cd] |
| āryam cāṣṭāṅgikam ¹³⁸ mārggam kṣemanirvāṇagāminam ¹³⁹ (60) | [K.57cd; C.60cd; G.59ab] |
| prasannām janatām dṛṣṭvā satyāni kathayiṣyati | [K.58ab; C.61ab; G.58ab] |
| taṃ cāsyā ¹⁴⁰ dharmmaṃ saṃśrutya ¹⁴¹ pratipadya _(4b1) nti ¹⁴² śāsane (61) | [K.58cd; C.61cd; G.59cd] |
| supuṣpīte {{tā}} ca udyāne ¹⁴³ sannipāto bhaviṣyati | [K.59ab; C.62ab; G.60ab] |

¹²⁴ yatv ahaṃ (= K., G.) : C. yatraham.

¹²⁵ aṣṭibhiś caturbhiś ca sahasraiḥ saṃpuraskṛtaḥ (= K.) : C. aṣṭibhiś caturbhiś ca sahasrais sa puraskṛtaḥ; G. aṣṭibhiḥ sahasrais sa caturbhiś ca puraskṛtaḥ; S. (2382/286 line 4) + + + + hasrai saṃpuraskṛtaḥ.

¹²⁶ niḥkramiṣyati (= K.) : C., G., S. (2382/286 line 4) niṣkramiṣyati.

¹²⁷ pravrajyām (= C., G.) : K. pravrajyārtham.

¹²⁸ pañcāsadyojanās tasya (= C.) : K. pañcāsadyojanā tasya; G. pañcāsadyojanāny asya.

¹²⁹ ūrdhvaṃ śākhāḥ samudgatāḥ : K. ūrdhvaṃ śākhā bhaviṣyanti; C. ūrdhvaṃ śākhās samudgatāḥ; G. śākhā ūrdhvaṃ samucchritāḥ.

¹³⁰ ṣaṭkrośaviṭapānyāni : K. ṣaṭkrośaviṭapādyāni; C. ṣaṭkrośaviṭapāny asya; G. –.

¹³¹ vivṛtāni (= C.) : K. vidhūtāni; G. –.

¹³² tasya mūle niṣaṅgo (')sau (= K., C.) : G. niṣadya tasya cādhasṭān.

¹³³ dvipadottamaḥ (= K., C.) : G. puruṣottamaḥ; S. (2382/286 line 5) [p]. [ruṣ]o ...

¹³⁴ śivām bodhim (= G.) : K., C. ca sambodhim.

¹³⁵ jītvā mārān avāpsyati : K. prāpsyate nātra saṃśayaḥ; C. prāpsyati nātra saṃśayaḥ; G. samavāpsyati nāyakaḥ.

¹³⁶ G. adds : yasyām eva ca rātrau sa pravrajyām niṣkramiṣyati |
tasyām eva ca rātrau hi parām bodhim avāpsyati || 56 ||

¹³⁷ sarvvaduḥkhāpahaṃ (= C., G.) : K. sarvaduḥkhāpalam.

¹³⁸ āryam cāṣṭāṅgikam (= C., G.) : K. āryāṣṭāṅgikam.

¹³⁹ kṣemanirvāṇagāminam : K., C., G. kṣemaṃ nirvāṇagāminam.

¹⁴⁰ taṃ cāsyā (= C., G.) : K. tathāsya.

¹⁴¹ saṃśrutya (= C., G.) : K. saṃśrutvā.

¹⁴² pratipadyanti (= K., C.) : G. pratipatsyanti.

¹⁴³ supuṣpīte {{tā}} ca udyāne : K. supuṣpīte ca udyāne (Ms codyāne); C. supuṣpīte ca udyāne; G. udyāne puspasaṃcchane.

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| paripūrṇaṃ yojanaśataṃ ¹⁴⁴ paryantasya ¹⁴⁵ bhaviṣyati (62) | [K.59cd; C.62cd; G.60cd] |
| tataḥ śrutvā narapatiḥ saṃkho rājā ¹⁴⁶ mahāyāsāḥ | [K.60ab; C.63ab; G.61ab] |
| dattvā dāna _(4b2) m asaṃkhyeyaṃ pravrajyāṃ rocayiṣyati ¹⁴⁷ (63) | [K.60cd; C.63cd; G.61cd] |
| aśtībhiś caturbhiś ca ○ sahasraiḥ parivāritaḥ ¹⁴⁸ | [K.61ab; C.64ab; G.62ab] |
| narādhipo (')pi niṣkrāmya ¹⁴⁹ pravrajyāṃ upayāsyati (64) | [K.61cd; C.64cd; G.62cd] |
| anenaiva ¹⁵⁰ pramāṇena mānavā _(4b3) nāṃ puraskṛtaḥ | [K.62ab; C.65ab; G.63ab] |
| maitreyasya pitā caiva ¹⁵¹ pravrajyān niṣkrāmi○ṣyati ¹⁵² (65) | [K.62cd; C.65cd; G.63cd] |
| tato gṛhapatis tasya ¹⁵³ sudhano nāma viśrutah | [K.63ab; C.66ab; G.64ab] |
| pravrajīṣyati dharmmātmā sahasraiḥ parivāritaḥ ¹⁵⁴ (66) _(4b4) | [K.63cd; C.66cd; G.64cd] |
| strīratnam atha saṃkhasya ¹⁵⁵ viśākhā nāma viśrutā | [K.64ab; C.67ab; G.65ab] |
| aśtīyā ca ¹⁵⁶ ○ caturbhiś ca sahasraiḥ saṃpuraskṛtā ¹⁵⁷ (67) | [K.64cd; C.67cd; G.65cd] |
| nārī{{ma}}bhi«ḥ saha» niṣkrāmya ¹⁵⁸ pravrajyāṃ upayāsyati ¹⁵⁹ | [K.64ef; C.67ef; G.65ef] |
| prāṇināṃ ¹⁶⁰ tatra samaye sa _(4b5) hasrāṇi śatāni ca (68) | [K.65ab; C.68ab; G.66ab] |
| pravrajyāṃ upayāsyanti maitreyasyā○ṇuśāsane ¹⁶¹ | [K.65cd; C.68cd; G.66cd] |
| tataḥ kāruṇikaḥ śāstā maitreyo dvīpadottamaḥ ¹⁶² (69) | [K.66ab; C.69ab; G.68ab] |
| samitiṃ ¹⁶³ vyavalokyātha idam ¹⁶⁴ a _(4b6) rthaṃ pravakṣyati ¹⁶⁵ | [K.66cd; C.69cd; G.68cd] |

¹⁴⁴ paripūrṇaṃ yojanaśataṃ : K. saṃpūrṇaṃ yojanaśataṃ; C. pūrṇaṃ ca yojanañ śataṃ; G. pūrṇaṃ ca yojanaśataṃ.

¹⁴⁵ paryantasya : K., C., G. parśat tasya.

¹⁴⁶ tataḥ śrutvā narapatiḥ saṃkho rājā : K. tataḥ śrutvā narapatiḥ saṃkho nāma; C. tataḥ śrutvā narapatiḥ saṃkho rājā; G. śrutvā narapati rājā nāma.

¹⁴⁷ rocayiṣyati (= K., C.) : G. niṣkrāmiṣyati.

¹⁴⁸ parivāritaḥ (= G.) : K., C. sa puraskṛtaḥ.

¹⁴⁹ (')pi niṣkrāmya (= K.) : C., G. viniṣkrāmya.

¹⁵⁰ anenaiva (= G.) : K., C. tenaiva ca.

¹⁵¹ caiva (= K., C.) : G. tatra.

¹⁵² niṣkrāmiṣyati (= G.) : K., C. upayāsyati.

¹⁵³ tasya : K., G. tatra; C. + + .

¹⁵⁴ dharmmātmā sahasraiḥ parivāritaḥ (= K., C.) : G. śuddhātmā maitreyasyānuśāsane.

¹⁵⁵ saṃkhasya : K. saṃkhasya(Ms saṃkhasya); C., G. saṅkhasya.

¹⁵⁶ aśtīyā ca : K., C., G. aśtībhiś.

¹⁵⁷ saṃpuraskṛtā (= G.) : K., C. sā puraskṛtā.

¹⁵⁸ nārī{{ma}}bhi«ḥ saha» niṣkrāmya : K. nārīnāṃ saha niṣkrāmya; C. nārīnāṃ saha niṣkrāmya; G. nārīnāṃ abhiniṣkrāmya.

¹⁵⁹ upayāsyati (= K., C.) : G. rocayiṣyati.

¹⁶⁰ prāṇināṃ (= K., C.) : G. prāṇināḥ.

¹⁶¹ G. adds : supuṣpīte 'smin udyāne sannipāto bhaviṣyati | samantato yojanaśataṃ parśat tasya bhaviṣyati || 67 ||

¹⁶² dvīpadottamaḥ (= K., C.) : G. puruṣottamaḥ.

¹⁶³ samitiṃ (= C., G.) : K. samitaṃ.

¹⁶⁴ idam (= K., C.) : G. imam.

¹⁶⁵ pravakṣyati (= C., G.) : K. pravakṣyate.

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| sarvve te śākyasiṃhena ¹⁶⁶ muniśreṣṭhe<na> tāyinā ¹⁶⁷ (70) | [K.67ab; C.70ab; G.69ab] |
| arthato lokanāthena sprṣṭāḥ ¹⁶⁸ saddharmmadhātunā | [K.67cd; C.70cd; G.69cd] |
| ropitā mokṣamārggeva ¹⁶⁹ nikṣiptā ¹⁷⁰ mama śāsane (71) | [K.67ef; C.70ef; G.69ef] |
| cchattra _(5a1) dhvajapatākābhīr ggandhamālyānulepanaiḥ ¹⁷¹ | [K.68ab; C.71ab; G.70ab] |
| kṛtvā śākyamuneḥ pūjām āgatā ¹⁷² mama śāsane (72) ¹⁷³ | [K.68cd; C.71cd; G.70cd] |
| kumkumodakasekena ¹⁷⁴ candanena vilepanam ¹⁷⁵ | [K.69ab; C.72ab; G.72ab] |
| kṛtvā ¹⁷⁶ śākyamuneḥ stūpe _(5a2) āgatā mama śāsane ¹⁷⁷ (73) | [K.69cd; C.72cd; G.72cd] |
| datvā saṃghāya ¹⁷⁸ dānāni cīvaraṃ pānabhojanam < | [K.72ab; C.75ab; G.71ab] |
| vicitraṃ ¹⁷⁹ glānabhaisajyam āgatā mama śāsane ¹⁸⁰ (74) ¹⁸¹ | [K.72cd; C.75cd; G.71cd] |
| buddhaṃ dharmmañ ca saṃghaṃ ca gatvā tu śaraṇatrayam _(5a3) sadā ¹⁸² | [K.70ab; C.73ab; G.75bc] |
| kṛtvā ¹⁸³ kuśalam kamma āgatā mama śāsane ¹⁸⁴ (75) | [K.70cd; C.73cd; G.75ef] |
| śikṣāpadāṃ samādāya ¹⁸⁵ śākyasiṃha<syā> śāsane ¹⁸⁶ { } | [K.71ab; C.74ab; G.73ab] |
| pratipālya ¹⁸⁷ yathābhūtam āgatā mama śāsane ¹⁸⁸ < (76) | [K.71cd; C.74cd; G.73cd] |
| caturddaśiṃ pañcada _(5a4) śiṃ pakṣasyehāṣṭamīn tathā | [K.73ab; C.76ab; G.74cd] |
| prātihārakapa<kṣa>ñ ca aṣṭāṅgam susamāhitāḥ ¹⁸⁹ | [K.73cd; C.76cd; G.74ef] |
| upavāsam upoṣitvā āgatā ¹⁹⁰ mama śāsane (77) ¹⁹¹ | [K.73ef; C.76ef; G. –] |

¹⁶⁶ śākyasiṃhena (= G.): K., C. śākyamuninā.

¹⁶⁷ muniśreṣṭhe<na> tāyinā (= K., C.): G. guniśreṣṭhena trāyina.

¹⁶⁸ sprṣṭāḥ : K. drṣṭā; C. drṣṭas; G. drṣṭvā.

¹⁶⁹ ropitā mokṣamārggeva : K. āropitā mokṣamārgge(Ms °mārgge); C. ropitā mokṣamārgge; G. ropitā mokṣamārggeṇa.

¹⁷⁰ nikṣiptā (= K.): C., G. vikṣiptā.

¹⁷¹ ggandhamālyānulepanaiḥ : K., C. gandhamālyānulepanaiḥ; G. gandhamālyavilepanaiḥ.

¹⁷² pūjām āgatā : K., C. pūjām hy āgatā; G. see the next fn.

¹⁷³ G. 70cd : kṛtvā stūpeṣu satkāraṃ āgatā hi mamāntikam* || 70 ||

¹⁷⁴ kumkumodakasekena : K. kumkumodakasekena; C. kumkumodaka[ra]sena; G. kumkumodakasekam ca.

¹⁷⁵ candanena vilepanam : K., C., G. candanenānulepanam.

¹⁷⁶ kṛtvā : K., G. datvā; C. dattvā.

¹⁷⁷ stūpe āgatā mama śāsane : K., C. stūpe hy āgatā mama śāsane; G. stūpeṣv āgatā hi mamāntikam*.

¹⁷⁸ datvā saṃghāya : K. datvā saṃghe ca; C. dattvā saṃghe ca; G. saṃghe datvā ca.

¹⁷⁹ vicitraṃ (= K., C.): G. vividhaṃ.

¹⁸⁰ āgatā mama śāsane : K., C. hy āgatā mama śāsane ; G. āgatā hi mamāntikam*.

¹⁸¹ G. 75ab : śīlāni ca samādāya saṃprāptāni ca śāsanam*.

¹⁸² gatvā tu śaraṇatrayam sadā : K., C. gatvā tu śaraṇam sadā; G. sattvās te śāsanam gatāḥ.

¹⁸³ kṛtvā : K., C. kṛtvā tu; G. kṛtvā ca.

¹⁸⁴ āgatā mama śāsane : K., C. hy āgatā mama śāsane; G. macchāsanam upāgatāḥ.

¹⁸⁵ śikṣāpadāṃ samādāya : K. śikṣāpadāṃ samādāya; C. śikṣāpadāni samādāya; G. śikṣāpadāni cādāya.

¹⁸⁶ śākyasiṃha<syā> śāsane (= K., G.): C. + śākyamuniśāsane.

¹⁸⁷ pratipālya (= C.): K. pratipadya; G. paripālya.

¹⁸⁸ āgatā mama śāsane : K., C. hy āgatā mama śāsane; G. āgatā hi mamāntikam*.

¹⁸⁹ susamāhitāḥ : K. susamāhitah; C., G. susamāhitam.

¹⁹⁰ upoṣitvā āgatā : K. upoṣyeha hy āgatā; C. upoṣitvā hy āgatā; G. –.

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| tenaiva preritāḥ sarvve mamāpy ete ^(5a5) pratīcchitāḥ ¹⁹² | [K. – ; C. – ; G.76ab] |
| gaṇaśreṣṭhena ¹⁹³ muninā paritā bhūrimedhasā (78) ○ | [K. – ; C. – ; G.76cd] |
| prasannām janatām dṛṣṭvā satyāni kathayiṣyati | [K. – ; C. – ; G.77ab] |
| śrutvā ca te tadā ¹⁹⁴ dharmmaṃ prāpsyanti padam uttamaṃ (79) | [K. – ; C. – ; G.77cd] |
| prātihā ^(5a6) ryatrayeṇāsau śrāvākān vinayiṣyati ¹⁹⁵ | [K.74ab; C.77ab; G.78ab] |
| sarvve te sāsravān dharmmān* ¹⁹⁶ kṣapayiṣyanti sūratāḥ ¹⁹⁷ (80) | [K.74cd; C.77cd; G.78cd] |
| prathamaḥ sannipāto (')sya śrāvākānām bhaviṣyati | [K.75ab; C.78ab; G.79ab] |
| pūrṇṇā ṣaṇnavatiḥ koṭyaḥ ¹⁹⁸ śrā ^(5b1) vakānām bhavac chidām ¹⁹⁹ (81) | [K.75cd; C.78cd; G.79cd] |
| dvitīyaḥ sannipāto 'sya śrāvākānām bhaviṣyati | [K.76ab; C.79ab; G.80ab] |
| pūrṇṇāś caturṇnavati koṭyo muktānām kleśabandhanāt* ²⁰⁰ (82) | [K.76cd; C.79cd; G.80cd] |
| trītya ²⁰¹ sannipāto 'sya śrāvākānām bhavi ^(5b2) ṣyati | [K.77ab; C.80ab; G.81ab] |
| pūrṇṇā dvānavati ²⁰² koṭyo ²⁰³ dāntānām ²⁰⁴ śāntacetāsām (83) | [K.77cd; C.80cd; G.81cd] |
| dharmmacakraṃ pravartyātha vinīya suramānuṣān* | [K.78ab; C.81ab; G.82ab] |
| sārdhamaḥ śrāvakaṣaṅghena ²⁰⁵ pure piṇḍaṃ cariṣyati (84) | [K.78cd; C.81cd; G.82cd] |
| tataḥ ^(5b3) praviśatas tasya ²⁰⁶ ramyām ketumatīm purīm ²⁰⁷ | [K.79ab; C.82ab; G.83ab] |
| māndāravāṇi ²⁰⁸ pu○ṣpāni prakṣepsyanti divaukasaḥ ²⁰⁹ (85) ²¹⁰ | [K.79cd; C.82cd; G.83cd] |
| catvāraś ca mahārājāḥ ²¹¹ śakraś ca tridaśādhipaḥ | [K.80ab; C.83ab; G.84ab] |

¹⁹¹ G. 74ab : upośadham upoṣyeha āryam aṣṭāṅgikam śubham |

¹⁹² G. 76ab : tenaite preṣitāḥ sattvā pratīṣṭās ca mayāpy amī |

¹⁹³ gaṇaśreṣṭhena : K., C. – ; G. gaṇiśreṣṭheṇa.

¹⁹⁴ tadā : K., C. – ; G. tato.

¹⁹⁵ vinayiṣyati (= K., G.): C. vedayiṣyati.

¹⁹⁶ sāsravān dharmmān* : K. sāsravān dharmān; C. hy āsravān dharmān; G. āsravās tatra.

¹⁹⁷ kṣapayiṣyanti sūratāḥ (=G.): K. kṣayayiṣyanti sūratāḥ; C. kṣapayiṣyanti + + + .

¹⁹⁸ pūrṇṇā ṣaṇnavatiḥ koṭyaḥ : K. pūrṇṇā ṣaṇnvati(Ms ṣarṇṇa^o) koṭyaḥ; C. pūrṇṇāś ṣaṇnvatiḥ koṭyaś; G. pūrṇṇāś ṣaṇnavatikōṭyaḥ.

¹⁹⁹ bhavac chidām (= C., G) : K. bhaviṣyati.

²⁰⁰ muktānām kleśabandhanāt* (= C.) : K. kleśa(Ms kleśai) muktā(Ms muktāstuta) kṣaṇāt; G. śāntānām bhūrimedhasām.

²⁰¹ trītya : K., G. trītyaḥ; C. trītyas.

²⁰² dvānavati (= K.) : C. dvānavatiḥ; G. dvāviṃśati.

²⁰³ koṭyo (= C.) : K. koṭy; G. koṭyaḥ.

²⁰⁴ dāntānām : K., C. muktānām; G. śāntānām.

²⁰⁵ śrāvakaṣaṅghena (= K., C) : G. śrāvakaṣaṅgheṇa.

²⁰⁶ praviśatas tasya (= C.) : K. praveśatas tasya; G. praviśatas tasyām.

²⁰⁷ ketumatīm purīm (= G.) : K. ketumatīpurī; C. ketumatīpurīm.

²⁰⁸ māndāravāṇi (= K., C) : G. māndārakāṇi.

²⁰⁹ prakṣepsyanti divaukasaḥ : K., C., G. paṭiṣyanti purottame.

²¹⁰ K. adds : devatāḥ prakramiṣyanti tasmin pure gate munau || 79

C. adds : devatāḥ prakariṣyanti tasmin puragate munau || (82)

G. adds : devatāḥ prakariṣyanti tasmin puragate munau || 83 ||

²¹¹ mahārājāḥ : K. mahārājanāḥ; C. mahārājāś; G. mahārājā.

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| brahmā ²¹² devagaṇaiḥ _(5b4) sārddham pūjān tasya kariṣyati ²¹³ (86) | [K.80cd; C.83cd; G.84cd] |
| utpalaṃ kumudaṃ padmaṃ puṇḍarīkaṃ sugandhikaṃ ²¹⁴ | [K.81ab; C.84ab; G.85ab] |
| agurum candanaṃ caiva ²¹⁵ divyaṃ mālyam patiṣyati ²¹⁶ (87) | [K.81cd; C.84cd; G.85cd] |
| cailakṣepaṃ kariṣyanti ²¹⁷ devaputrā maharddhi _(5b5) kāḥ | [K.82ab; C.85ab; G.86ab] |
| taṃ lokanātham udvīkṣya praviśantaṃ purottamaṃ ○ (88) ²¹⁸ | [K.82cd; C.85cd; G.86cd] |
| pathi bhūmyāstaraṇaṃ tatra ²¹⁹ mṛdus tūlapicūpamā ²²⁰ | [K.83ab; C.86ab; G.89ab] |
| vicitraṃ ca śubhaṃ ²²¹ mālyam prakariṣyanti te pathi ²²² (89) | [K.83cd; C.86cd; G.89cd] |
| chatradhvajapa _(5b6) tākābhir ²²³ arccayiṣyanti nāyakaṃ ²²⁴ | [K.84ab; C.87ab; G.90ab] |
| śubhaiś ²²⁵ ca tūryanirghoṣaiḥ prasannamanaso narāḥ (90) | [K.84cd; C.87cd; G.90cd] |
| śāstuh pūjāṃ ²²⁶ kariṣyanti devaputrā maharddhikāḥ | [K.84ef; C.87ef; G. –] |
| sa ²²⁷ ca śakraḥ sahasrākṣo devarājā ma _(6a) hādyutiḥ ²²⁸ (91) | [K.85ab; C.88ab; G.91ab] |
| prahrṣtaḥ prāñjalim kṛtvā ²²⁹ stoṣyate lokanāyakaṃ ²³⁰ | [K.85cd; C.88cd; G.91cd] |
| namas te puruṣājanya ²³¹ namas te puruṣottama (92) | [K.86ab; C.89ab; G.92ab] |
| anukampasva janatāṃ bhagavān agrapudgala ²³² ²³³ | [K.86cd; C.89cd; G.92cd] |

²¹² brahmā devagaṇaiḥ (= K., G.) : C. brahmadevagaṇais.

²¹³ pūjān tasya kariṣyati (= C., G.) : K. pājān tasya vidhāsyati.

²¹⁴ utpalaṃ kumudaṃ padmaṃ puṇḍarīkaṃ sugandhikaṃ (= K., G.) : C. utpalakumudapadmapuṇḍarīka-sugandhikaṃ.

²¹⁵ caiva (= K., C.) : G. cāpi.

²¹⁶ divyaṃ mālyam patiṣyati (= G.) : K. divyamālyam tathaiva ca; C. divyamālās tathaiva ca.

²¹⁷ kariṣyanti (= C., G.) : K. vidhāsyanti.

²¹⁸ G. adds : divyaś ca tūryanirghoṣo divyaṃ mālyam patiṣyati |
devatā prakariṣyanti tasmin puragate munau || 87 ||
ye tu ketumatīṅ kecit* vāsaiṣyanti mānuṣāḥ |
te pi taṃ pūjayiṣyanti praviśantaṃ purottamaṃ* || 88 ||

²¹⁹ bhūmyāstaraṇaṃ tatra (= G.) : K. tatra sthita bhūmir; C. bhūmiḥ sthita tatra.

²²⁰ mṛdus tūlapicūpamā (= K.) : C. mṛdutūlapicūpamā; G. mṛdutūlapicopamam*.

²²¹ śubhaṃ (= G.) : K. tato; C. śrutam.

²²² prakariṣyanti te pathi : K. vikariṣyanti te pathi; C. vistariṣyanti te pathi; G. vikariṣyanti te tadā.

²²³ chatradhvajapatakābhir : K., G. chatradhvajapatakābhir; C. chatradhvajapatakāni.

²²⁴ arccayiṣyanti nāyakaṃ : K., C. gandhamālyānulepanaiḥ; G. arccayiṣyanti mānuṣāḥ.

²²⁵ śubhaiś (= K., G.) : C. śrutaiś.

²²⁶ pūjāṃ (= C.) : K. pājāṃ; G. –.

²²⁷ sa (= K., C.) : G. taṃ.

²²⁸ devarājā mahādyutiḥ : K., C. devarājo mahādyutiḥ; G. devarājah śacīpatih.

²²⁹ prāñjalim kṛtvā (= K., C.) : G. prāñjalir bhūtvā.

²³⁰ stoṣyate lokanāyakaṃ (= K., C.) : G. maitreyaṃ stoṣyate jinam*.

²³¹ puruṣājanya (= C., G.) : K. puruṣasiṃha.

²³² bhagavān agrapudgala : K., bhagavann agrapuṅgala; C., G. bhagavann agrapudgala.

²³³ K. adds : maharddhiko devaputras tasya māro bhaviṣyati |
sa caiva prāñjali(ṃ) bhūtvā stoṣyate lokanāyakaṃ || 87

C. adds : maharddhiko devaputras tasya māro bhaviṣyati |
sa caiva prāñjaliṃ kṛtvā stoṣyate lokanāyakaṃ || (90)

G. adds : maharddhiko devaputras tasya māro bhaviṣyati |
sa cāpi prāñjalir bhūtvā stoṣyate lokanāyakaṃ* || 93 ||

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| śuddhāvāsahasrai _(6a2) ś ca bahubhiḥ parivāritāḥ (93) | [K.88ab; C. – ; G.94ab] |
| pravekṣate ketumatī<ṁ> maitreḥ lokanandanāḥ ²³⁴ | [K.88cd; C. – ; G.94cd] |
| brāhma{ne}naparivāreṇa ²³⁵ brahmās caiva puraskṛtāḥ ²³⁶ (94) | [K.89ab; C.91ab; G.95ab] |
| kathayīṣyati saddharmmaḥ brahma _(6a3) ghoṣam udīrayan* | [K.89cd; C.91cd; G.95cd] |
| ākīrṇṇā pṛthivī sarvā arhadbhiś ca bhaḥviṣyati (95) | [K.90ab; C.92ab; G.96ab] |
| kṣīṇāsṛavair ²³⁷ vāntadoṣaiḥ prahīṇābhavabandhanaiḥ {} | [K.90cd; C.92cd; G.96cd] |
| hr̥ṣṭā devamanuṣyās ²³⁸ ca gandharvā yakṣa _(6a4) rākṣasāḥ (96) | [K.91ab; C.93ab; G.97ab] |
| śāstuh pūjām kariṣyanti nāgās cāpi maharddhiḥkāḥ | [K.91cd; C.93cd; G.97cd] |
| te vai nūnaḥ bhaviṣyanti akhilās ²³⁹ chinnaśāyāḥ (97) | [K.92ab; C.94ab; G.98ab] |
| chinnaśāyāḥ nyadānā ²⁴⁰ uttīrṇṇā bhavasāgarā _(6a5) h ²⁴¹ {} | [K.92cd; C.94cd; G. –] |
| brahmacaryaḥ carīṣyanti maitreyasyānuśāsane | [K.92ef; C.94ef; G.98ef] |
| te vai nūnaḥ ²⁴³ bhaviṣyanti amamā aparigrahāḥ (98) | [K.93ab; C.95ab; G.99ab] |
| ajātarūparajāta aniketā asaṃbhavāḥ ²⁴⁴ | [K.93cd; C.95cd; G.99cd] |
| brahma _(6a6) caryaḥ carīṣyanti maitreyasyānuśāsane ²⁴⁵ (99) | [K.93ef; C.95ef; G.99ef] |
| te vai nūnaḥ bhaviṣyanti ²⁴⁶ cchitvā jālam ivāṇḍajāḥ ²⁴⁷ | [K.94ab; C.96ab; G.100ab] |
| ye dhyānāny upasampādyā ²⁴⁸ pṛṭisaukhyasamanvitāḥ < (100) | [K.94cd; C.96cd; G.100cd] |
| brahmacaryaḥ carīṣyanti mai _(6b1) treyasyānuśāsane | [K.94ef; C.96ef; G.100ef] |
| śaṣṭiṃ varṣasahasrāṇi ²⁴⁹ maitreyo dvipadottamaḥ (101) | [K.95ab; C.97ab; G.101ab] |
| deśayīṣyati saddharmmaḥ sarvabhūtānukampakaḥ ²⁵⁰ | [K.95cd; C.97cd; G.101cd] |
| śataṃ lakṣasahasrāṇi ²⁵¹ prāṇināḥ ²⁵² sa vināyaka _(6b2) ḥ (102) | [K.96ab; C.98ab; G.102ab] |

²³⁴ *pravekṣate ketumatī<ṁ> maitreḥ lokanandanāḥ* (= K.) : G. *pravekṣyate ca maitreḥ lokanātho vināyakaḥ*.

²³⁵ *brāhma{ne}naparivāreṇa* : Read *brāhmaṇap°* (= K., C., G.).

²³⁶ *brahmās caiva puraskṛtāḥ* : K., C. *brahmā caiva puraskṛtāḥ*; G. *brahmā cāpi girāspṛuṭam**.

²³⁷ *kṣīṇāsṛavair* (= C.) : K., G. *kṣīṇāśṛavair*.

²³⁸ *devamanuṣyās* (= K., G.) : C. *devā manuṣyās*.

²³⁹ *akhilās* (= K.) : G. *cyānaghās*.

²⁴⁰ *chinnaśāyāḥ nyadānā* : K. *chinnaśrotā anādātā*; C. *chinnaśrotā anādānā*; G. –.

²⁴¹ *uttīrṇṇā bhavasāgarāḥ* : K. *uttīrṇā bhavasāgarāḥ*; C. *uttīrṇābhavasāgarāḥ*; G. –.

²⁴² G. 98cd : *utkṣiptaparikhāḥ dhīrā anādānā nirutsakāḥ |*

²⁴³ *te vai nūnaḥ* (= C.) : K. *te vai nānaḥ*; G. *te 'pi nūnaḥ*.

²⁴⁴ *asaṃbhavāḥ* (= K.) : C., G. *asamstavāḥ*

²⁴⁵ *maitreyasyānuśāsane* (= K., C.) : G. *ye maitreyānuśāsane*.

²⁴⁶ *nūnaḥ bhaviṣyanti* (= K., C.) : G. *pāraṃ gamiṣyanti*.

²⁴⁷ *cchitvā jālam ivāṇḍajāḥ* : K. *chinnaśāyāḥ aśaktikāḥ*; C. *chinnaśāyāḥ aśaktikāḥ*; G. *cchitvā jālam eva bhujāt**.

²⁴⁸ *ye dhyānāny upasampādyā* : K. *dhyānāny upasampādyā*; C., G. *dhyānāni copasampādyā*.

²⁴⁹ *śaṣṭiṃ varṣasahasrāṇi* : K., C. *śaṣṭivarṣasahasrāṇi*; G. *śaṣṭiṃ varṣasahasrāṇi*.

²⁵⁰ *sarvabhūtānukampakaḥ* (= K.) : C. *sarvabhūtānukampakaḥ*; G. *śāstā lokānukampayā*.

²⁵¹ *śataṃ lakṣasahasrāṇi* : K., C. *śatalakṣasahasrāṇi*; G. *śatāni ca sahasrāṇi*.

²⁵² *prāṇināḥ* (= K.) : C. *prāṇināḥ*; G. *prāṇināḥ*.

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| vinayitvā ca saddharmme ²⁵³ tato nirvvāṇam eṣyati | [K.96cd; C.98cd; G.102cd] |
| tasmiṃ○ś ca nirvvrte dhīre maitreye dvipadottame (103) ²⁵⁴ | [K. – ; C. – ; G.103ab] |
| daśavarśasahasrāṇi saddharmmaḥ ²⁵⁵ sthāsyati sadā ²⁵⁶ | [K.97cd; C.99cd; G.103cd] |
| prasā _(6b3) dayiṣyati ²⁵⁷ cittāni tasmiṃ ²⁵⁸ chākyamunau jine (104) | [K.98ab; C.100ab; G.104ab] |
| tato dra○kṣatha ²⁵⁹ maitreyaṃ saṃbuddhaṃ dvipadottamam ²⁶⁰ | [K.98cd; C.100cd; G.104cd] |
| idam āścaryakaṃ śrutvā imāṃ ṛddhim anuttamām ²⁶¹ (105) | [K.99ab; C.101ab; G.107ab] |
| na prasīde _(6b4) ta ko vidvān ²⁶² api kṛṣṇāhi jātikah ²⁶³ | [K.99cd; C.101cd; G.107cd] |
| tasmād ihātmakā○mena mähātmyam abhikāṃkṣatā ²⁶⁴ | [K.100ab; C.102ab; G.108ab] |
| saddharmmo gurukartavyaḥ smaratā buddhaśāsanam ²⁶⁵ (106) | [K.100cd; C.102cd; G.108cd] |
| | |
| ²⁶⁶ ārabhadhva niṣkrā _(6b5) mata yujyadhva buddhaśāsane | |
| dhunīta mrtyunaḥ sainyaṃ na○ḍāgāram iva kuñjaraḥ | |
| yo hy asmin dharmmavinaye apramattaś ca bhaviṣyati | |
| prahāya jātisamsā _(6b6) raṃ duḥkhasyāntaṃ kariṣyati | |
| | |
| maitreyavyakāraṇaṃ samāptam ²⁶⁷ ²⁶⁸ | |

²⁵³ vinayitvā ca saddharmme (= K.): C. vinayitvā ca saddharman; G. vinīya dharmakāyena.

²⁵⁴ K. 97ab : parinirvṛtasya tasyaiva maitreyasya mahāmuneḥ |

C. 99ab : parinirvṛtasya + tasyaiva + mahāmuneḥ |

²⁵⁵ saddharmmaḥ (= K.): C. saddharmas; G. saddharman.

²⁵⁶ sthāsyati sadā (= G.): K., C. sthāsyate tadā.

²⁵⁷ prasādayiṣyati : K. prasādayiṣyatha; C. prasādayitvā; G. prasādayati.

²⁵⁸ tasmiṃ (= K., C.): G. tasmāc.

²⁵⁹ draḥkṣatha (= K.): C. draḥkṣyatha; G. drkṣatha.

²⁶⁰ G. adds : tasmād dharme ca buddhe ca saṃghe cāpi gaṇottame |

prasādayati cittāni bhaviṣyati maharddhikaṃ || 105 ||

taṃ tādrśaṃ kārūnikaṃ maitreyaṃ dvipadottamaṃ |

ārādhayitvā kālena tato nirvāṇam eṣyatha || 106 ||

²⁶¹ imāṃ ṛddhim anuttamām (= K., C.): G. drṣtvā ca vibhavān alpikāṃ.

²⁶² na prasīdeta ko vidvān : K., C., G. ko vidvān na prasīdeta.

²⁶³ api kṛṣṇāhi jātikah (= K.): C. atikṛṣṇābhijātikah; G. api kṛṣṇāsu jātiṣu.

²⁶⁴ abhikāṃkṣatā (= K.): C. abhikāṃkṣiṇā; G. abhikāṃkṣatāḥ.

²⁶⁵ smaratā buddhaśāsanam (= C., G.): K. smarataṃ buddhaśāsanam.

²⁶⁶ ārabhadhva ... kariṣyati : K., C., G. – .

²⁶⁷ maitreyavyakāraṇaṃ samāptam (= C., G.): K. iti maitreyavyakāraṇaṃ nāma mahāyānasūtraṃ samāptam.

²⁶⁸ K. adds : ye dharmā hetuprabhavaḥ hetu teṣān tathāgato | hy avadat

teṣāṃ ca yo nirodha evaṃvādī mahāśramaṇaḥ |

śubham astu ||

abdeglāvagnidvirade śīta māghe guhānane |

pūṣyāṃ pūṣṇadvase sarvvānanda samāpta kṛt ||

C. adds : ye dharmā ... (etc...) | cīṇadeśtvinirgataḥ bhikṣu puṇyaktīrtir yad atra puṇyan tad bhavaty
ācāryopādhyāyamātāpitṛpūrvaṅgaman kṛtvā sakalasattvarāśer anuttarajñānaphalāptaya iti ||
śrīmad gopāladevarājyaśaṃvat 57 phalguṇa dine 9 ghoṣaṭīgrāme likhati | oṃ hārīti mahāyākṣiṇī
hara hara mama sarvapāpāni svāhā.

A Sanskrit folio of the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti* from Tibet

YE Shaoyong (Beijing)*

The Sanskrit folio of the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti* 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.”¹ 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 *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* and eleven of the *Buddhapālitamūlamadhyamakāvṛtti* 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 *Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti*, of unknown dimensions, is made of palm-leaf. The script, which could be called a variety of the Eastern Nāgārī script, might suggest a date around the 10th or 11th century. The right end of the folio is broken and five to six *akṣaras* 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 *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā-kārikā* is regarded as one of the authentic works of Nāgārjuna (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 *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā-kārikā* named *Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti*, whose Sanskrit original was believed to be lost, except for the opening dedication and a few following words found in a line of *akṣaras* on the verso of the last folio of the *Madhyamakahrdayakārikā* 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.

¹ Wang Sen 王森. 民族圖書館藏梵文貝葉經目錄 [A Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts Preserved in the China Ethnic Library]. 1985. See Hu-von Hinüber 2006: 297-335.

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 *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*, an unknown commentary on the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*, the *Sūtrālaṅkārapīṇḍārtha* by Sajjana, the *Sūtrālaṅkāradhikārasaṃgati* by Mahājāna, the *Sūtrālaṅkāraparicaya*, 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 Xuezhong 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 *Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti*, will be found.

script is different from the one of the newly identified folio, was first transliterated by Sāṅkrṭyāyana (1937, 48, n. 1) and then identified by V. V. Gokhale (1958, 165, n. 1; cf. also Scherrer-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 *Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti*. The Tibetan text follows the critical edition by Scherrer-Schaub (1991) checked against Loizzo et al. 2007.

The opening line of the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti*:

(nam)[o] (Ma)m(ju)[n]āthāya ||

janasya¹ yo muktīpathānuyāyinīn²

nirākṛtāntadvayayuktiṣaṣṭikāṃ <|>

cakāra{h} tasya praṇipatyā sā mayā

vibhajyate madhyamakānusārataḥ |

(*Vamśasṭha*)

ihāyām³ ācāryo yathāvasthita-

pratīyasamutp[ā]dadarśanāsāditapṛīti-

viśeṣaḥ paraprāsādāyatanam⁴

tadadhigama«(m a)»vetya pratīya-

samutpādadarśa[na]prabhā ...

D no. 3864, dBu ma, Ya 1b1; P. no. 5265, dBu ma, Ya 1b1

|| rgya gar skad du | Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti | 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 'gro¹ ba || D1b2

mtha' gnyis sel ba'i Rigs pa drug cu pa ||

gang gis mdzad pa de la phyag 'tshal te ||

bdag gis dbu ma'i tshul gyis de rnam² ' D1b3

dbye ||

de la³ slob dpon 'di ni rten cing 'brel par P2a1

'byung ba ji ltar gnas pa bzhin du de kho na

gzigs pas dgyes pa'i khyad par brnyes pa ste

| de rtogs 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

mngon par rdzogs par byang chub pa yang ' D2a1

gzigs nas [...]

¹ Read *jinasya* (= Tib. *rgyal ba'i*).

² Read *yuktīpathā*^o (= Tib. *rigs pa'i lam*).

³ Read *ihāyam*.

⁴ Read *paramaprasādā*^o (=Tib. *dad pa mchog gi*).

¹ DC 'brang.

² = Scherrer-Schaub 1991; PNDC *rnams*.

³ PN om.

⁴ PN om.

The newly found folio of the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti*:

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>¹(sarvam asṭīti vaktavyam
ādau tattvagaveṣiṇaḥ
paścād avagatārthasya
niḥsaṅgasya viviktatā 30)¹</p> | <p>de nyid tshol¹ la thog mar ni
thams cad yod ces brjod par bya
don rnam s rtogs shing² chags med² D20a7
nas
de yi 'og tu dben pa'o (30)
[...]
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
ngu³ bzhin du'am mar me'i 'od bzhin du
bstan⁴ te gyur pa de las⁵ gzhan du ma yin D20b5
te de ltar na nye bar bzung ba'am brten
par⁶ zad do P23b1
don rtogs zhes bya ba ji lta bu zhe na
'bras bu rnam s kyī 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
du⁷ rgyu'i tshogs pa gcig nas gcig tu D20b6
brgyud pa'i mtha' mi mthong ba'i phyir
'bras bu'i rtsom pa la 'jig⁵ par lta bas
rgyu'i tshogs pa gcig⁶ nas gcig tu⁶ brgyud
pas bsgrubs pa'i 'bras bu rkyen du ma las
byung ba grub ma thag tu 'jig par rtogs
shing skye ba ni shin tu 'bad pas bsgrub
par⁷ bya ba yin la shin tu 'bad pas D20b7
bsgrubs pa 'jig pa ni 'bad pa med par yang
'byung bar rtogs nas 'dus byas kyī chos
nyid la sgyid lug pa byis pa skye bo'i
spyod pa la mngon par mi bstod pa skye
ba la mngon par mi dga' ba 'jig pa la mi
'phrod par 'dzin pa 'khor⁷ ba rnam s la D21a1
chags pa 'dor bar 'dod pa 'khor ba spong
bar 'dod pa bdag la chags pa lhod par
gyur pas de ltar don khong du chud pa la
de'i 'og tu dben pa ni rigs kyī snga rol tu⁷
ni ma yin no </p> |
| <p>r1¹ pasvabhāvad² bhaven nānyathety evam
upādāya vā pratītya vā < ></p> <p>katham avagatārthasya < ></p> <p>kāryāṅgām aparyavamānatvāt*
ekaikasya ca ○ kāryasyāneka-
pratyayatvād ekaikasya ca pratyayasya
nirūpyamāṅgasya vādi³ saṃsāravat
kāraṇasāmagriparasparāyāḥ ○
paryantādarśanāt kāryārambhahaya-
darśinaḥ kāraṇasāmagriparasparasyo-
pārjitānekapratyaya(jātakāryasyā)ṭma-
lābhānantaravināśitā{ }m
a[dhī]tyātiprayatnasādhyam udaya<ṃ>
prayatnasādhitasyāyatnopanataṃ
vināśaṃ cādhitā saṃskṛ○ta-
dharmatām ⁴anusō[va] .. .aḥ⁴
bālaṅjanacaritam <an>abhinandataḥ
udaye 'nabhiratasya vināśe
'pratikūlavarttinaḥ ○ saṃsāreṣu
saṃgaṃ tityoktoḥ⁵ saṃsāraṃ
prahātukāmasya śīthilikṛtātma-
snehasya evam ava(gatārthasya tata)
r3¹ uttarakālaṃ viviktatā yujyate na
prāk* </p> | <p>[...]
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
ngu³ bzhin du'am mar me'i 'od bzhin du
bstan⁴ te gyur pa de las⁵ gzhan du ma yin D20b5
te de ltar na nye bar bzung ba'am brten
par⁶ zad do P23b1
don rtogs zhes bya ba ji lta bu zhe na
'bras bu rnam s kyī 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
du⁷ rgyu'i tshogs pa gcig nas gcig tu D20b6
brgyud pa'i mtha' mi mthong ba'i phyir
'bras bu'i rtsom pa la 'jig⁵ par lta bas
rgyu'i tshogs pa gcig⁶ nas gcig tu⁶ brgyud
pas bsgrubs pa'i 'bras bu rkyen du ma las
byung ba grub ma thag tu 'jig par rtogs
shing skye ba ni shin tu 'bad pas bsgrub
par⁷ bya ba yin la shin tu 'bad pas D20b7
bsgrubs pa 'jig pa ni 'bad pa med par yang
'byung bar rtogs nas 'dus byas kyī chos
nyid la sgyid lug pa byis pa skye bo'i
spyod pa la mngon par mi bstod pa skye
ba la mngon par mi dga' ba 'jig pa la mi
'phrod par 'dzin pa 'khor⁷ ba rnam s la D21a1
chags pa 'dor bar 'dod pa 'khor ba spong
bar 'dod pa bdag la chags pa lhod par
gyur pas de ltar don khong du chud pa la
de'i 'og tu dben pa ni rigs kyī snga rol tu⁷
ni ma yin no </p> |

¹ Quoted from Lindtner 1982, 110.

² Read (*pradī*)*paprabhāvad* (= Tib. *mar me'i 'od bzhin du*)?

³ Read *nādi* (= Tib. *thog ma med pa*).

⁴ Read *anutsāhahetoḥ* or *anutsāhinaḥ*? Tib. *sgyid lug pa*.

⁵ Read *tityakṣoḥ* (= Tib. *'dor bar 'dod pa*)?

¹ DC *tshul*.

² DC *pa*.

³ = PNDC; Scherrer-Schaub 1991 *du*.

⁴ PN *brten*.

⁵ PN *'jigs*.

⁶ DC *om*.

⁷ D *du*.

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>evam hi nācāryasya viphalah
 śūnyatopadeśo bhavati na cāopi
 śiśyānām pratikṣema-
 viparītāvagamābhyām vinipātaḥ {{pā}}
 syāt*
 evam nv akriyamāṇe samvṛti-
 paramārtha○satyadvayavyavasthā-
 vaicakṣaṇyābhāvād¹ vinipātayaiva
 śūnyatopadeśaḥ syāt tathā hy a(śaktā
 r4 akuṣa)lam prahātuṃ śūnyam idaṃ
 jagad iti avidagdhābuddhayaḥ
 samadhityāvaśyopārjaniye kuṣale
 kaOrmaṇi nirutsāhā e[v]a syuḥ
 śūnyam ced etat kim anena karttavyam
 iti ta[dva]d a[j]ātapakṣasyeva śakuneḥ
 sva○nīḍaparityāgenotpatanam
 vināśāyaiva syāt*</p> <p>tathā hi pratyātmādhigamavihārāt*²</p> <p>vi[v]i(ktārtham ajānantaḥ)
 vśrutamātrāvalambinaḥ <
 ye na kurvanti puṇyāni
 hatās te puruṣādhamāḥ (31)</p> <p>lauOkika eva hi paramārthasthitvā
 samvṛddhāvīparītavavadānapakṣasya
 pratyātmādhitaśūnyatāmatatvasya³
 puṇyāpu○ṇyayor akāraṇam⁴ nyāyaḥ </p> | <p>de ltar byas na slob dpon gyis stong pa
 nyid ▽stan pa yang 'bras bu med par mi D21a2
 'gyur slob ma rnams kyang spong ba
 dang phyin ci log tu 'dzin pas log par
 ltung bar mi 'gyur ro
 de ltar ma byas na kun rdzob dang don
 dam pa'i bden pa gnyis rnam par gnas¹ pa
 dang ²mi mthun par gyur pa'i² phyir
 stong pa nyid bstan ▽ pas log par ltung bar D21a3
 'gyur ro³ de ltar gyur na mi dge ba
 spong⁴ mi nus so mi mkhas pa'i blo can
 dag 'gro ba 'di'i stong pa'o snyam du
 'dzin zhing⁵ '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 </p> <p>'di ltar so so rang gis rtogs pa dang bral
 ba'i phyir
 rnam par dben don mi shes la
 thos pa tsam la ▽ 'jug byed cing P24a1
 gang rnams bsod nams⁶ mi byed pa
 skyes ▽ bu tha shal de dag brlag (31) D21a5
 'jig rten pa nyid kyi don dam pa la gnas te
 phyin ci ma log pa rnam par byang ba'i
 phyogs phun sum tshogs shing stong pa
 nyid kyi de kho na so so rang gis rtogs pa
 na bsod nams dang bsod nams ma yin pa
 mi bya ba ni rigs so </p> |
|---|---|

¹ *saṃvṛti-paramārtha-satya-dvaya-vyavasthā-vaicakṣaṇyābhāvād*, “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?*). Cf. *Prasannapadā* (la Vallée Poussin 1903–1913, 69.3) so *'ham saṃvṛtisatya-vyavasthāvaicakṣaṇyāt*, Tib. *kho bo ni kun rdzob kyi bden pa rnam par 'jog pa la mkhas pa'i phyir* | (D no. 3860, dBu ma, 'a 23b2).

² Read *'viharāt*.

³ Read *pratyātmādhigataśūnyatāmatatvasya* (= Tib. *stong pa nyid kyi de kho na so so rang gis rtogs pa na*)?

⁴ Read *akaranam*.

¹ C *gnos*.

² See note 1 on the left.

³ P om.

⁴ NDC *spang*.

⁵ PN *cing*.

⁶ C *rnams*.

ye tu pratyātman anavetya śūnyatām
 śūnyatāśabdaśravaṇamātr(āṃ
 r6 kṛtakṛtyānā)ñ caritam anukurvānāḥ
 pravarttante {} akuśa<la> eva karmaṇi
 na kuśale | niyatam te labdhapakṣānām
 pakṣiṇām pravyaktim
 anurodhyaḾmānā a[j]ātapakṣā iva
 śāvakaḥ vyaśanai<r> aniṣṭā¹ bhavanti |

na hy udakaśrutim[ā]trām pipāsām
 v1 a)ḥpahanti | na cāpy annaśrutimātrām
 jiḥghatsām | tannikāyasevayā tu te
 hanyatā(m)² | tadvad etad iti matvāha

hatās [t(e) puruṣ[ā]dhamā iti |
 ekāntākuśalaḾpravṛtṭyā
 puruṣādhamatvam eṣām |
 ata eva[ñi cai]tad doṣam pari jihīrṣatā
 bhagavatā śrotiṇ[ā](m samvṛtisatyād
 v2 aparihī)n[ārtham]³ pūrvam eva tāvad

gatayaś ca samākhyātāḥ {}
saphalatvam ○ ca karmaṇām |
 (32ab)

pañcagatayo bhagavatā yatra sthitvā
 satvāḥ karmāṇi kurvanti [ta](tta)t-
 phalaṃ copabhuṃjate | tata uttaḾra-
 kālam eṣām idaṃsatyābhiniveśa-
 parāmarśakāyagranthaparipakṣeṇa⁴

tatsvabhāvaparijñān(am
anupādaś ca deśitaḥ ||) (32cd)

v3 ḡgatyādayo hi praṭītyasamutpannatvāt
 svabhāvānutpannās **tatsvabhāva-**
parijñānam mārgaḥ | mārgaḾjñāna-
 labhyo gatyādīnām **anupādaś ca**
deśitaḥ |

¹ Read *aniṣṭair?*

² Read *hanyetām.*

³ Read *(aparihī)nārtham?*

⁴ Read *ḡpratipakṣeṇa (= Tib. gnyen por).*

gang dag stong pa nyid¹ so so rang gis D21a6
 rtogs pa¹ med par stong pa nyid kyi sgra
 thos pa tsam gyis bya ba byas pa² rnams
 kyi spyod pa ltar rjes su 'chos pa ni mi
 dge ba'i las nyid la zhugs pa yin gyi | dge
 ba la ni ma yin te | de dag gdon mi za bar
 sgro gshog rdzogs pa'i bya'i tshul byi'u
 phrug sgro gshog¹ ma skyes pas bya ba D21a7
 bzhin du nyon mongs pa'i mthar 'gyur ro||
 chu thos pa tsam gyis skom³ pa mi phyid⁴
 la | zas thos pa tsam gyis kyang bkres pa
 mi phyid⁵ de | de bsten⁶ na de dag phyid⁷
 pa bzhin du 'di rtogs nas

skyes bu tha shal de dag brlag go
 zhes brjod do || gcig tu mi dge ba¹ la 'jug D21b1
 pas de dag ni skyes bu tha shal lo ||
 de ltar de'i nyes pa yongs su spang bar
 bzhed nas | bcom ldan 'das kyis nyan⁸ pa
 rnams la kun rdzob kyi bden pa las yongs
 su ma nyams pa'i don re zhid thog ma
 nyid du |

las⁹ kyi 'bras bu yod pa dang ||
'gro ba rnams kyang¹ shin tu brjod || D21b2
 (32ab)

sems can rnams gang la gnas nas las
 rnams byed cing de'i 'bras bu yang za
 ba'i 'gro ba lnga bcom ldan 'das kyis
 gsungs so || de'i 'og tu de dag gi 'di bden
 no snyam du mngon par zhen pa mchog tu
 'dzin pa lus kyi mdud pa 'di'i gnyen por |
de yi rang¹ bzhin yongs shes dang || D21b3
skye ba med pa dag kyang bstan ||
 (32cd)

'gro ba la sogs pa yang rten cing 'brel par
 'byung ba yin pas ngo bo nyid kyis ma
 skyes pa'o || de'i rang bzhin yongs su shes
 pa lam dang 'gro ba la sogs pa rnams kyi
 skye ba med pa lam gyi ye¹⁰ shes thob par
 bya¹ ba yang bstan to || D21b4

¹ N om. ² Scherrer-Schaub 1991 om. ³ PN *sgom.*

^{4, 5, 7} DC *phyed.* ⁶ DC, Scherrer-Schaub 1991

bstan. ⁸ C *nyen.* ⁹ DC *lus.* ¹⁰ C *yi.*

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>tad evam ubhayātmikāyā[n
de]śa[m]nāyāṃ vyavasthitāyāṃ kā
khalv atra ○ deśanā kāryānurodha-
pravṛttā kā nu khalv ārthānurodha-
pravṛtteti atra vicāre niścīya(t)[e] </p> | <p>de bas na 'di ltar gnyi ga'i bdag nyid
bstan pa rnam par gzhag¹ pa 'di la dgos
pa'i ched du bstan pa ni² gang don gyi P24b1
ched du bstan pa ni² 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 D21b5
phung po khams dang skye mched
rnam
de bzhin dgos pa'i dbang gis gsungs
(33)</p> |
| <p>v4 (mamety aham iti) ▽ [pro]ktaṃ {}
yathā kāryavaśāj jinaiḥ
tathā kāryavaśāt proktaḥ¹
skandhāyatanadhātavaḥ (33)</p> | <p>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 zhes gsungs pa de bzhin du dgos
pa'i dbang gis phung po dang skye
mched dang khams 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
ji ltar dgos pa'i dbang du phung po dang
skye mched dang khams rnam bshad ▽ D21b7
kyi de kho na'i don du ni ma yin par 'di ji
ltar shes par⁴ nus pa⁴ 'di ni 'thad pa dang
lung gis nges par rung ste de la re zhig
'thad pa'i dbang du byas nas
'byung 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)</p> |
| <p>prahīnāhamkāramamaOkārā api buddhā
bhagavanto yathā lokānurodhenāham
iti mameti co[ktava]nto viva[kṣ]itasyā-
rthasya tena dvāreOṇa pratipādanāt*
evam kāryāvaśāt proktāḥ skandhā-
yatanadhātavaḥ tadvibhāgo-
v5 pade[ś](ena vinā lokasya) ▽
tatvāvatāropāyāsambhavāt*</p> | <p>pa'i phyir ro
ji ltar dgos pa'i dbang du phung po dang
skye mched dang khams rnam bshad ▽ D21b7
kyi de kho na'i don du ni ma yin par 'di ji
ltar shes par⁴ nus pa⁴ 'di ni 'thad pa dang
lung gis nges par rung ste de la re zhig
'thad pa'i dbang du byas nas
'byung 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)</p> |
| <p>kathaṃ punar etad evam niścituṃ
śakyate yathā kāryavaśāt skandhā-
yatanadhātavo ○ deśitāḥ na tatvārthā-
nurodhāḥ iti upapattiyā hy etad āgamāc
ca niścīyate tatropapattin tāvad
adhikṛtyāOha </p> | <p>pa'i phyir ro
ji ltar dgos pa'i dbang du phung po dang
skye mched dang khams rnam bshad ▽ D21b7
kyi de kho na'i don du ni ma yin par 'di ji
ltar shes par⁴ nus pa⁴ 'di ni 'thad pa dang
lung gis nges par rung ste de la re zhig
'thad pa'i dbang du byas nas
'byung 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)</p> |
| <p>mahābhūtādi vijñāna²
proktaṃ samavarudhyate
³tajjñāneti gamam³ yāti
nanu mithyā vi(kalpitaṃ) (34)</p> | <p>zhes bya ba smos so rnam par shes pas
dmigs pa gang gi rnam pa 'dzin cing skye
ba'i dmigs 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 'byung 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</p> |
| <p>v6 (vijñānaṃ) ▽ yad ālambanākara[m]⁴
vibhramad⁵ utpadyate tad vijñānākāro-
pārjitaṃ ātmabhāvam āsādyā
mahābhūtādikaṃ ○ padārtharūpatvena
parikalpyate na hi vijñāne
anāropitākārasya kasyacil lokaḥ śakto
'stitāsty aOvasthāpayituṃ vandhyā-
pu{.}trādīnām apy astitvaprasaṃgāt*
tasmād vijñākār.</p> | <p>zhes bya ba smos so rnam par shes pas
dmigs pa gang gi rnam pa 'dzin cing skye
ba'i dmigs 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 'byung 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</p> |

¹ Read *proktāḥ*, cf. Lindtner 1982, 110.

² Read *vijñāne*, cf. Lindtner 1982, 110.

³ Read *tajjñāne vigamaṃ*, cf. Lindtner 1982, 110.

⁴ Read °*ākāraṃ*.

⁵ ≠ Tib. 'dzin.

¹ PN *bzhag*.

² PN om.

³ DC *kyi*.

⁴ = PNDC; Scherrer-Schaub 1991 *nus* /.

pa nyid du rnam par gzhang 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
 ldan pa ma yin pa rnams ni rnam par shes
 pa'i rnam 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 rnam par shes par yang dag[▼] par 'du D22a4
 zhing khongs su chud do ||

SYMBOLS USED IN THE transliteration

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| () | restored <i>akṣara</i> (s) |
| (<i>italic</i>) | uncertain restoration or back-translation from Tibetan |
| [] | <i>akṣara</i> (s) whose reading(s) is(are) uncertain |
| < > | omitted (part of) <i>akṣara</i> (s) without gap in the manuscript |
| « » | interlinear insertion |
| { } | superfluous <i>akṣara</i> (s) |
| {{ }} | deleted <i>akṣara</i> (s) |
| .. | one illegible <i>akṣara</i> |
| . | illegible part of an <i>akṣara</i> |
| * | <i>virāma</i> |
| ' | <i>avagraha</i> (not used in the original manuscript) |
| ○ | string hole |

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

- C Cone blockprint edition of the Tibetan Tipiṭaka
 D Derge (sDe dge) blockprint edition of the Tibetan Tipiṭaka
 Gokhale, Vasudev V.
 1958 “The Vedānta-Philosophy Described by Bhavya in his *Madhyamaka-hṛdaya*.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 2, no. 3: 165–180.
 Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan
 2006 “Some remarks on the Sanskrit manuscript of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Prātimokṣasūtra* found in Tibet.” In *Jaina-itihāsa-ratna: Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90. Geburtstag*, Indica et Tibetica 47, edited by Ute Hüsken, Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Anne Peters, 283–337. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
 La Vallée Poussin, Louis de
 1903–1913 ed. *Madhyamakavṛttih: Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (Mādhyamakasūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*, Bibliotheca Buddhica 4. St. Petersburg:

- Commissionnaires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1992.
- Lindtner, Christian
 1982 *Nagarjuniana: Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nāgārjuna*. Copenhagen: Institute for indisk filologi. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1987.
- Loizzo et al.
 2007 Joseph John Loizzo, Robert A.F. Thurman, Thomas F. Yarnall and Paul G. Hackett. *Nāgārjuna's Reason Sixty with Chandrakīrti's Reason Sixty Commentary*. New York: American Institute of Buddhist Studies at Columbia University, co-published with Columbia University's Center for Buddhist Studies and Tibet House US.
- Luo, Zhao 罗炤
 1985 “布达拉宫所藏贝叶经目录” [A Catalogue of the Manuscripts Preserved at the Potala Palace]. Unpublished manuscript.
- N Narthang (sNar thang) blockprint edition of the Tibetan Tipiṭaka
 P Peking blockprint edition of the Tibetan Tipiṭaka
- Sāṅkṛtyāyana, Rāhula
 1937 “Second Search of Sanskrit Palm-leaf Mss. in Tibet.” *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 23, no. 1: 1–53.
- Scherrer-Schaub, Cristina Anna
 1991 *Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti: Commentaire à la soixantaine sur le raisonnement ou Du vrai enseignement de la causalité par le Maître indien Candrakīrti*, Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques 25. Bruxelles: Institute Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises.
- Ye, Shaoyong
 2007 “The *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* and Buddhapālita's Commentary (1): Romanized Texts Based on the Newly Identified Sanskrit Manuscripts from Tibet.” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 10: 117–147.
 2008 “The *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* and Buddhapālita's Commentary: Romanized Texts Based on the Newly Identified Sanskrit Manuscripts from Tibet (2).” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 11: 105–151.
 2011 *Zhungleunsong Yu Fohushi: Jiyu Xinfaxian Fanwen Xieben de Wenxianxue Yanjiu* 《中论颂》与《佛护释》——基于新发现梵文写本的文献学研究 [*Mūlamadhyamakakārikā and Buddhapālita's Commentary: A Philological Study on the Basis of Newly Identified Sanskrit Manuscripts*]. Shanghai: Zhongxi Book Company 中西书局.

**Diplomatic Transcription of Newly Available Leaves
from Asaṅga's *Abhidharmasamuccaya*
—Folios 1, 15, 18, 20, 23, 24—***

LI Xuezhū (Beijing)

Until recently, only the Sanskrit manuscript of *Jinaputra's commentary (*Bhāṣya*) to Asaṅga's *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (= AS) was available in full; the text of AS itself was known only through fragments, and the related Sanskrit manuscripts of Sthiramati's *Vyākhyā* were thought to be lost. I previously reported newly available folios of AS and the *Vyākhyā* (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 Sāṅkrtyāyana 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 *Abhidharmasamuccaya* manuscript]

Newly available eleven folios:

Fols. 1, 15, 18, 20, 23, 24, 29, 33, 39, 43, 44.

Previously available seventeen folios photographed by Sāṅkrtyāyana:

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 *Vyākhyā* 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 *Abhidharmasamuccaya* research group, who have supported to complete the present paper.

¹ Two manuscripts of the *Vyākhyā* 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 *Vyākhyā* (together with the help of the AS research group in Kyoto).

A Description of the Manuscript

The size of the folios is, according to Sāṅkrtyāyana's report (Sāṅkrtyāyana 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 (Sāṅkrtyāyana calls it *Māghadī*). 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:

| | |
|-------|--|
| ○ | string hole |
| + | one lost <i>akṣara</i> |
| .. | one illegible <i>akṣara</i> |
| * | <i>virāma</i> |
| ‡ | gap filling sign before a string hole or end of a line |
| | <i>daṇḍa</i> |
| | double <i>daṇḍa</i> |
| [] | unclear/damaged <i>akṣara</i> (s) in the manuscript |
| < > | <i>Akṣara</i> (s) inserted by the scribe in the manuscript |
| { { } | <i>Akṣara</i> (s) cancelled by the scribe in the manuscript |
| () | <i>Akṣara</i> (s) restored by the present editor |
| < > | omitted (part of) <i>akṣara</i> (s) without gap in the manuscript |
| { } | superfluous <i>akṣara</i> (s) or a <i>daṇḍa</i> |
| /// | A broken point at the right/left end of the palm leaf |
| ac/pc | The raised letters ac (<i>ante correctionem</i>) and pc (<i>post correctionem</i>) after manuscript sigla indicate readings before and after scribal correction. |
| Ch. | The Chinese translation of the <i>Abhidharmasamuccaya</i> , namely 大乘阿毘達磨集論, Taisho No. 1605 |
| r | <i>recto</i> |
| s.e. | scribal error |
| Tib. | The Tibetan translation of the <i>Abhidharmasamuccaya</i> , namely <i>Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa</i> , Peking No. 5550, Derge No.4049 |
| v | <i>verso</i> |

Diplomatic Transcription

1r (cover folio)

mngon pa kun las btus kyī '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] sarvabuddhebhyaḥ saśrāvakaṣaṃghebhyaḥ namo namaḥ ||

«uddānaṃ»

kati kasmād upādānaṃ lakṣaṇaṃ ○ tadvyavasthitiḥ
karmārthaupamyabhedās ca saṃgrahādi catuṣṭayaṃ ||
saṃgrahaḥ saṃprayogaś ca samanvāgama eva ca |
viniścayaś caturbhedaḥ piṇḍoddānaṃ samuccaye ||
satyadharmmāptisāṃkathyaviniśca(ya)vibhedataḥ

kati skandhāḥ [kati dhātavaḥ katy āya](1v2)tanāni ||
pañca skandhāḥ | rūpaskandho vedanāskandhaḥ saṃjñāskandhaḥ saṃskāraskandho
vijñānaskandhaḥ ||

a○ṣṭādaśa dhātavaḥ | cakṣurdhātuḥ | rūpadhātuḥ | cakṣurvijñānadhātuḥ | śrotradhātuḥ
śabdadhātuḥ (l) śrotravijñānadhātuḥ | ghrāṇadhātuḥ (l) gandhadhātuḥ (l) ghrāṇavijñānadhātuḥ
| jihvādhātuḥ (l) rasadhātuḥ | jihvāvijñānadhātuḥ | kāyadhātuḥ spraṣṭavyadhātuḥ (l)
kāyavi(1v3)jñānadhātuḥ | manodhātuḥ | dharmmadhātuḥ | manovijñānadhātuḥ ||

dvādaśāyatanāni | cakṣurāyatanam | rūpāyatanam | śrotrāyatanam | śabdāyatanam |
ghrāṇāyatanam | gandhāya<ta>nam | jihvāyatanam | rasāyatanam | kāyāyatanam |
spraṣṭavyāyatanam | ma○nāyatanam | dharmmāyatanam ||

kasmāt pañcaiva skandhāḥ (l) pañcākārātmavastūdbhāvanatām upādāya |
saparigra(1v4)hadehātmavastūdbhāvanatām upādāya | upabhogātmavastūdbhāvanatām
upādāya | vyavahārātmavastūdbhāvanatām upādāya | dharmmadharmmābhisaṃskārātma-
vastūdbhāvanatām upādāya | tadāśrayātmavastūdbhāvanatām upādāya ||

kasmād aṣṭādaśaiva dhātavaḥ | dehaparigrahābhyām {l} ṣaḍākārāṭītavarttamānopabhoga-
dhāraṇatām upādāya |

kasmād dvādaśaivāya(1v5)tanāni | dehaparigrahābhyām eva ṣaḍākārānāgatopabhogāya
dvāratām upādāya ||

kasmād upādāna○skandhā ity ucyante | upādānena yuktās tasmād upādānaskandhā ity
[u]cyante | upādānaṃ katamat | yo (')tra cchandarāgaḥ kena kāraṇena cchandarāga
evopādānaṃ | anāgataavarttamānaskandhābhini(r)vṛt(t)yaparityāgatām upādāya |
anāgatābhilāṣato varttamā(1v6)nādhyaivasānataś ca ||

kena kāraṇena dhātava āyatanāni ca {l} sopādānā dharmmā ity ucyante | tatra skandhavan
ni○rdeśaḥ ||

kiṃlakṣaṇo rūpaskandhaḥ | rūpaṇālakṣaṇaḥ | dvividhayā rūpaṇayā | sparśarūpaṇayā | deśani{rūpaṇa}rūpaṇayā ca | sparśarūpaṇā katamā | pāṇisaṃsparśena spr̥ṣṭo rūpyate | loṣṭasaṃsparśena | daṇḍasaṃsparśena | śastrasasaṃsparśena | (1v7) śītenoṣṇena | jighatsayā pipāsayā daṃśamaśakavātātāpasarīr̥spasaṃsparśaiḥ spr̥ṣṭo rūpyate | deśanirūpaṇā{rūpaṇā} katamā | yā deśe idaṃ cedaṃ ca rūpam iti «evaṃ caivaṃ ca rūpam»² {||} samāhitena manasā asamāhitena vā tarkasaṃprayuktena citrīkārātā ||

kiṃlakṣaṇā vedanā | yā rūpeṇānubhavana śubhāśubhānām karmmaṇām phalavipākam + +
+

Fol. 15: [Hayashima, p. 292; Derge No. 4049, 75b7-78a2; Taisho No. 1605, 672c13-673b15]

(15r1) (bahirmu)khaprabhedaḥ katamaḥ (l) yadbhūyasā kāmāvacara{ḥ kāmācaraḥ}prabhedaḥ³
|

antarmukhaprabhedaḥ katamaḥ | samāhitabhūmikaḥ⁴ ||○

āyatakālaprabhedaḥ katamaḥ (l) pṛthagjanānām ||

paricchinakālaprabhedaḥ katamaḥ (l) śaikṣāṇām aśaikṣāṇāṃ ca caramāṇi {||}
skandhadhātṅvāyatanāni sthāpayitvā |

tatkālaprabhedaḥ katamaḥ | aśaikṣāṇām cara{r}māni⁵ {||} skandhadhātṅvāyatanāni ||

saṃdarśanaprabhedaḥ katamaḥ | (15r2) yad buddhāḥ pāramiprāptāś ca bodhisatvāḥ
skandhadhātṅvāyatanāni sandarśayanti ||

saṃgrahaḥ katamaḥ (l) ekādaśavi○dho draṣṭavyaḥ | lakṣaṇasaṃgrahaḥ {||} dhātusaṃgrahaḥ
{||} jātisaṃgrahaḥ {||} avasthāsaṃgrahaḥ {||} sahāyasaṃgrahaḥ {||} deśasaṃgrahaḥ {||}
kālasaṃgrahaḥ {||} ekadeśasaṃgrahaḥ sakalasaṃgrahaḥ {||} itaretarasaṃgrahaḥ
paramārthasaṃgrahaś ca ||

lakṣaṇasaṃgrahaḥ katamaḥ | skandhadhā(15r3)tvāyatanānām pratyekaṃ yat svalakṣaṇam |
tair eva teṣāṃ saṃgraho draṣṭavyaḥ |

dhātusa(m)grahaḥ katamaḥ (l) skandhadhātṅvāyata○nānām yad bījam āla«ya»vijñānam | sa
eṣāṃ dhātusaṃgrahaḥ |

jātisaṃgrahaḥ katamaḥ | bhinnalakṣaṇāny api skandhadhātṅvāyatanāni skandhārtham
pramāṇīkr̥tya dhātṅvāyatanārtham pramāṇīkr̥tya sarvāṇy anyonyaṃ saṃgrhītāni ||

avasthāsaṃgrahaḥ katamaḥ (l) sukhāvasthāni (15r4) skandhadhātṅvāyatanāni tair eva
saṃgrhītāni | e«vaṃ» duḥkhāvasthāny aduḥkhāsukhāvasthāni tair eva saṃgrhītāni | ○

sahāyasaṃgrahaḥ katamaḥ | rūpaskandhas ta[d]anyaiḥ skandhaiḥ sahāyaiḥ saporivārah
sahāyasaṃgrahaṇa saṃgrhītāḥ | evan tadanyāni skandhadhātṅvāyatanāni veditavyāni |

deśasaṃgrahaḥ katamaḥ (l) yāni pūrvvasyāṃ diśi skandhadhā○tvāyatanāni tāni [tair e]va
saṃgrhītāni(15r5)tāni | evaṃ tadanyāsu dikṣu veditavyāni ||

kālasaṃgrahaḥ katamaḥ | atītāni skandhadhātṅvāyatanāni ○ tair eva saṃgrhītāni | evam
anāgatāni pratyutpannāni {||} tair eva saṃgrhītāni ||

² Cf. Vyākhyā: yā deśe idaṃ cedaṃ ca rūpam evaṃ caivaṃ ca rūpam iti.

³ Cf. Tib. *phal cher 'dod 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 *caramāṇi*.

ekadeśasaṃgrahaḥ katamaḥ (l) yāvanto dharmāḥ skandhadhātāvāṠyatanaiḥ saṃgrhītāḥ {} teṣāṃ anyatamasāṃgrahaḥ ekadeśasaṃgraho veditavyaḥ |

«sakalasaṃgrahaḥ katamaḥ |» yāvanto dharmmāḥ skandhadhātāvā(15r6)yatanaiḥ saṃgrhītāḥ {} teṣāṃ aśeṣataḥ saṃgrahaḥ sakalasaṃgraho veditavyaḥ ||

itaretarasāṃgrahaḥ kaṠtamaḥ | rūpaskandhaḥ katibhir dhātubhiḥ katibhir āyatanaiḥ saṃgrhītāḥ | daśabhir ddhātubhir daśabhir āyatanair ekasya ca dhātāvāyatanasyaikadeśena || vedanāskandhaḥ katibhir ddhātubhiḥ katibhir āyatanaiḥ saṃgrhītāḥ | ekasya dhātāvāyatanasyaikadeśena | yathā veda(nā)(15r7)skandhaḥ evaṃ saṃjñāskandhaḥ {} saṃskāraskandhaḥ | vijñānaskandhaḥ katibhir ddhātubhiḥ katibhir āyatanaiḥ saṃgrhītāḥ | saptabhir ddhātubhir ekenāyatanena saṃgrhītāḥ | cakṣurddhātuḥ katibhiḥ skandhaiḥ katibhir āyatanaiḥ saṃgrhītāḥ | rūpaskandhaikadeśena {} ekenāyatanena | yathā cakṣu(r)dhātur evaṃ śrotadhātuḥ {} ghrāṇadhātuḥ {} jihvadhātuḥ kāyadhātuḥ | rūpadhātuḥ ka(15v1)tibhiḥ skandhaiḥ katibhir āyatanaiḥ saṃgrhītāḥ | rūpaskandhaikadeśena {} ekenāyatanena | yathā rūpadhāṠtur evaṃ śabdadhātur gandhadhātuḥ rasadhātuḥ spraṣṭavyadhātuḥ | cakṣurvijñānadhātuḥ katibhiḥ skandhaiḥ katibhir āyatanaiḥ saṃgrhītāḥ | vijñānaskandhamanāyatanayor ekadeśena | yathā cakṣurvijñānadhātur evaṃ śrotagrhrāṇajihvākāyamanovijñānadh[ā]tavaḥ || (15v2) dharmadhātuḥ katibhiḥ skandhaiḥ katibhir āyatanaiḥ saṃgrhītāḥ | tribhiḥ skandhair ekasya caikadeśena eṠkena cāyatanena saṃgrhītāḥ || cakṣurāyatanam katibhiḥ skandhaiḥ katibhir ddhātubhiḥ saṃgrhītāḥ | rūpaskandhaikadeśena ekena ca dhātunā | yathā cakṣurāyatanam evaṃ śrotagrhrāṇajihvākāyāyatanāni {} rūpaśabdagandharasapraṣṭavyāyatanāni ca || (15v3) [mana]āyatanam katibhiḥ skandhaiḥ katibhir ddhātubhiḥ saṃgrhītāḥ | ekena skandhena saptabhir ddhātubhiḥ saṃgrhītāḥ | dharmāyatanam katibhiḥ skandhaiḥ katibhir ddhātubhiḥ saṃgrhītāḥ | tribhiḥ skandhaiḥ ekasya caikadeśena ekena dhātunā saṃgrhītāḥ | evaṃ ye tadanye dharmāḥ skandhanirdiṣṭā dhātāvāyatananirdiṣṭā(h) {} ye ca tathānirdiṣṭā(h) tadyathā dravyasantāḥ prajñāptisa[ntaḥ](15v4)saṃvṛtisantaḥ paramārthasantaḥ jñeyā vijñābhijñeyā⁶ rūpiṇo (')rūpiṇiḥ⁷ sanidarśanā anidarśanā iṠty evamādayaḥ {} teṣāṃ api skandhadhātāvāyatanaiḥ saṃgraho yathāyogaṃ veditavyaḥ (l) sa ca pūrvam eva nirddiṣṭaḥ |

paramārthasaṃgrahaḥ kaṠtamaḥ | yā skandhadhātāvāyatanānān tathatā |
evaṃ saṃgrahakuśalaḥ |

katham anusaṃśa(m) labhate | ālambanābhisam(15v5)kṣepam anusaṃśa(m) labhate | yathā yathā cālambanābhisamkṣepas tathā tathā kuśalamūlābhivṛddhiḥ ||

saṃpraṠyogaḥ katamaḥ (l) ṣaḍvidho draṣṭavyaḥ | avinirbhāgasamprayogaḥ {} miśrībhāvasamprayogaḥ {} samavadhānasamprayogaḥ {} sahabhāvasamprayogaḥ {} kṛtyānuṣṭānasamprayogaḥ {} saṃpratipattisamprayogaś ca |

avinirbhāgasamprayogaḥ katamaḥ (l) para(15v6)māṇudeśe sarveṣāṃ deśinām avinirbhāgaḥ ||

miśrībhāvasamprayogaḥ katamaḥ | paramāṇo(r) ūr[dh]van deśiṠnām miśrībhāvaḥ ||

⁶ Tib. *rnam par shes par bya ba dang | mngon par shes par bya ba dang*. We can emend the phrase to **vijñeyā abhijñeyā* according to Tib.

⁷ Read: *'rūpiṇaḥ*.

samavadhānasamprayogaḥ katamaḥ | deśinām eva samudāyinām anyonyasamavadhānaṃ ||
sahabhāvasamprayogaḥ katamaḥ | yāni skandhadhātāvāyatanāni sahabhāvena varttante {l}
ekotpādāny ekasthāyīny ekanirodhāni ||

kṛtyānuṣṭhānasamprayogaḥ (15v7) katamaḥ | tadyathā dvau bhikṣū anyatamasminn
adhikaraṇe (')nyonyaṃ samprayuktau ||

sampratipa[tti]samprayoḡgaḥ⁸ katamaḥ | cittacaitasikānām dharmāṇām ekālambanā
sampratipattiḥ sa punaḥ sampratipattisamprayogaḥ | parabhāvena na sva[bhā]vena
aviruddhayaḥ na viruddhayaḥ samānāśrayayo(h) sadṛśakālayoḥ {l} na visadṛśa[dhātukālayoḥ]

Fol. 18r1: [Hayashima, p. 340; Derge No. 4049, 75a7-77a5; Taisho No. 1605, 674c5-675b14]

(asallakṣaṇaṃ vināśalakṣaṇaṃ vipariṇatilakṣaṇaṃ viyogalakṣaṇaṃ sannihitalakṣaṇaṃ) (18r1)
dharma«tā»lakṣaṇaṃ {l} kṣaṇalakṣaṇaṃ {l} prabandhalakṣaṇaṃ {l} vyādhyādilakṣaṇaṃ {l}
cittacitrākāravṛttikalakṣaṇa[m] {l} ○ [bhoga]samṣattivipattikalakṣaṇaṃ {l} bhājanasamṣatti-
vipattikalakṣaṇaṃ [ca] (ll)

asallakṣaṇaṃ katamat | yan nityakālaṃ skandhadhātāvāyatanānām ātmātmīyatayā asatvam ||
vināśalakṣaṇaṃ katamat | yad utpannānām sam[skā]rāṇām vināśaḥ ||
vipa[rina](18r2)tilakṣaṇaṃ katamat | yaḥ saṃskārāṇām anyathānyathā cotpādaḥ ||
viyogalakṣaṇaṃ katamat | ○ saṃskāreṣv ādhipatyabhraṃśaḥ paraiḥ svīkaraṇaṃ ||
sannihitalakṣaṇaṃ katamat* | samārūḍhā anityatā ||
dharmatālakṣaṇaṃ katamat | bhāvi[nī] anityatā hetuto (')nubaddhā |
kṣaṇalakṣaṇaṃ katamat | saṃskārāṇām kṣaṇād ūrdhvam anavasthānaṃ ||
prabandhalakṣa(18r3)ṇaṃ katamat | anādikālikānām saṃskārāṇām janmaprabandhān-
upacchittiḥ ||

vyādhyādilakṣaṇaṃ kaḡtamam* | dhātuvayojīvitānām vipariṇāmaḥ ||
cittacitrākāravṛttikalakṣaṇaṃ katamat | ekadā sarāgaṃ cittaṃ {l} ekadā vigatarāgaṃ {l} evaṃ
sadveṣaṃ vigatadveṣaṃ {l} samohaṃ⁹ saṃkṣiptaṃ vikṣiptaṃ līnaṃ pragṛhīta{m}m
[uddhatam anuddhatam¹⁰ a](18r4)vyupaśāntaṃ vyupaśāntaṃ {l} samāhitam asamāhitam
ityevamādinā ākāreṇa yā cittasya vṛḡtitiḥ |

bhogasamṣattivipattikalakṣaṇaṃ katamat | sarvvā samṣattivipattiparyavasānatā ||
bhājanasamvarttavivarttalakṣaḡṇaṃ katamat | t{r}israḥ samvarttanyaḥ | agnināpbhir¹¹
vāyunā ca | trīṇi samvarttanīśīrṣāṇi (l) dvitīyaṃ [dhyā](18r5)naṃ tṛtīyaṃ caturthaṃ |
sahavimānair utpādanirodhena caturthe dhyāne samvarttavivarttaḥ | trayo ○ (')ntarakalpāḥ |
durbhikṣāntarakalpāḥ {l} rogāntarakalpāḥ {l} śāstrāntarakalpāś ca | yaiḥ kalpasya niryāṇaṃ
bhavati | ekottarakalpāḥ | apakarṣakalpāḥ | aṣṭādaśotkarṣāpakarṣāḥ | eka-utkarṣaviṃśatim
antarakalpāl loko vivarttate || (18r6) viṃśatim antarakalpāt samvarttas tiṣṭhati | viṃśatim
antarakalpāl loko vivarttate | viṃśatim antaḡrakalpā[d v]jivṛttas tiṣṭhati | te bhavanti aśtīr
antarakalpāḥ sa ca mākākalpāḥ | tayā kalpagaṇanayā rūpāvacarāṇā{m}m ārūpyāvacarāṇā ca

⁸ Read: *sampratipatti*°.

⁹ Pradhan inserts here *vigatamohaṃ*.

¹⁰ Cf. Tib. *rgod pa dang mi rgod pa dang*.

¹¹ Read: °*abbhir*.

devānāṃ āyuspramāṇaṃ | āyuhkṣayāt punyakṣyāt karmakṣayāt teṣāṃ satvānān tasmāt ta(18r7)smāt sthānāc cyu(ti)r bhavati || katham āyuhkṣayāt (l) kālamaraṇena || katham puṇyakṣayād (l) akālamaraṇena | tathā hi teṣāṃ satvānāṃ samāpattim āsvādayatāṃ puṇyakṣayo bhavati | yenākāle mriyante || katham karmakṣayāt | tatropapadya-vedanīyasyāparaparyāyavedanīyasya ca karmaṇaḥ paryādānāt* | (18v1)

duḥkhalakṣaṇaṃ katamat* (l) tisro duḥkhatā aṣṭākāram vā duḥkhaṃ duḥkhatety ucyate || kena kāraṇena yad aOnityan tad duḥkham ity uktam | dvayāṃśikī anityatā {} udayāṃśikī vyayāṃśikī ca | udayāṃśikīm anityatāṃ praṭītya duḥkhaduḥkhatā prajñāyate | vyayāṃśikīm anityatāṃ praṭītya vipariṇāmaduḥkhatā prajñāyate | tadubhayāśikīm anityatāṃ praṭī(18v2)tya saṃskāraduḥkhatā prajñāyate | idaṅ ca sandhāyoktam bhagavatā saṃskārānityatāṃ saṃskāravipariṇāmatāṃ sandhāyoktam mayā | yat kiñcid veditam idam atra duḥkhasyeti | api khalu udayavyadharmanānubandheṣu saṃskāreṣu {} jātyādikam aṣṭākāram duḥkham prajñāyate | tad ucyate yad anityam tad duḥkham iti ||

śūnyalakṣaṇaṃ katamat* (l) yady a(18v3)tra na bhavati {} tat tena śūnyam iti {} samanupaśyati | yat punar atrāvasiṣṭam bhavati {} tat sad ihāstīti ○ yathābhūtam prajānāti | iyam ucyate śūnyatāvagrāntir yathābhūtā aviparītā |

kiṃ kutra na bhavati (l) skandhadhātāvāyatanēṣu nityo dhruvaḥ śāśvataḥ {} avipa[ri]ṇāmadharmā ātmā vātmīyaṃ vā na bhavati | tasmāt tāni tena śūnyāni (l) kiṃ punas tatrāvaśi(18v4)ṣṭam bhavati | yat tad eva nairātmyam ity ātmanaś cābhāvo nairātmyasya ca bhāvaḥ śūnyatā pratyetyavā | ○ idaṃ ca sandhāyoktam bhagavatā sarvvasa[to] yathābhūtam prajānāty asarvvāsata iti ||

api khalu trividhā śūnyatā | svabhāvaśūnyatā {} ○ tathābhāvaśūnyatā {} prakṛtiśūnyatā ca | prathamō¹² parikalpitaṃ svabhāvam upādāya draṣṭavyā || dvitīyā pa(18v5)ratamtrasvabhāvam upādāya | tṛtīyā pariniṣpannasvabhāvam upādāya draṣṭavyā¹³ |

anātmalakṣaṇaṃ katamat* | yathātmavādina ātmānaṃ pra[jñā]payanti | tena lakṣaṇena skandhadhātāvāyatanānāṃ vilakṣaṇatā iti | skandhadhātāvāyatanāny ātmalakṣaṇena anātmā | idaṅ ca saṃdhāyok[ta]ṃ bhagavatā sarvve dharmā anātmāna iti |

yad u(18v6)ktam bhagavatā sarvvaṃ naitat mama naiṣo (')ham asmi{n} naiṣa me ātmety evam etad yathābhūtam samyak*pra○jñāyā draṣṭavyam iti | asya bhāṣitasya ko (')rthaḥ | «bāhye vastuni naitan mameti»¹⁴ ādhyātmike vastuni naiṣo (')ham asmi naiṣa me ātmeti sandhāyoktam | tathā hi bāhye vastuni {} ātmīyākāraḥ pratisiddhyate¹⁵ | ādhyātmike punar ā<tmā>tmyākāraḥ |

yad uktam kṣa(18v7)ṇikalakṣaṇā anityateti tat katham | yathā cittacaitasikāḥ kṣaṇikā evamrūpam api kṣa○ṇikaṃ draṣṭavyam | cittopāttatāṃ upādāya {} cittaikayogakṣematāṃ

¹² Read: *prathamā*.

¹³ Read: *draṣṭavyā*.

¹⁴ Cf. Tib. *phyi'i dngos po 'di ni bdag gi ma yin no*.

¹⁵ Read: *pratisiddhyate*. Tib. bkag, Ch. 遣.

upādāya «cittavikāratadvikāratām upādāya» cittāśrayatām upādāya {1} cittādhipatya«sambhūta»tām upādāya {1} cittavaśavarttināś copādāya || api khalv ante vikāropalambitām upādāya |

Fol. 20: [Hayashima, p. 372; Derge No. 4049, 78b5-80b1; Taisho No. 1605, 676b3-677a6]

(lakṣaṇaṃ katamat | yo dharma utpadyamāno 'praśāntalakṣaṇatā utpa)¹⁶(20r1)dyate {1} tasya cotpādād apraśāntā cittasantatiḥ pravarttate tat kleśalakṣaṇaṃ ||

utthānaṃ katamat* | kleśānuśayaś cāprahīṇo bhavati kleśasthānīyaś ca dharma ābhāsaḡato bhavati | tatra cāyoniśomanasikāraḡ pratyupasthito bhavaty (l) evaṃ kleśasyotpādo bhavati ||

ālambanaṃ katamat | sarvvakleśaḡ sarvvakleśālambano draṣṭav[ya](h | kle) (20r2)śavastvālambanaś¹⁷ ca kāmāvacarakleśaḡ sthāpayitvā avidyāṃ dṛṣṭiṃ vicikitsāṃ corddhvāṃ bhūmiṃ nāḡlambate | ūrdhvhvabhūmikasya kleśasyādharabhūmir a«nā»lambanaṃ | yaḡ punar nirodhamārgālambanaḡ kleśaḡ so (')tadālambanād draṣṭavyaḡ | tatparikalpa«va»stv asyālambanaṃ | avastukālambanaḡ kleśo dṛṣṭir dṛṣṭisaṃprayuktaś ca | tadanyaḡ sava(20r3)stukālambanaḡ ||

saṃprayogaḡ katamaḡ | rāgaḡ pratighena na sa(m)prayujyate | yathā pratigheḡnaivaṃ vicikitsayā (l) śiṣṭais tv asya saṃprayogaḡ | yathā rāgaḡ pratighenaivaṃ pratigheḡ rāgeṇa mānena dṛṣṭyā ca na saṃprayujyate | mānaḡ pratighena vicikitsayā ca | avidyā sarvakleśasaṃprayoginī āveṇikī ca | (20r4) āveṇikī punaḡ satyeṣv ajñānaṃ | dṛṣṭiḡ pratighena vicikitsayā ca na saṃprayujyate | viciḡkitsā rāgeṇa mānena dṛṣṭyā ca na saṃprayujyate | krodhādaya upakleśā anyonyaṃ (na) saṃprayujyate | āhrīkyam anapatrāḡpyaṇī ca sarvatrākuśale saṃprayujyate | styānam auddhatyaṃ sarvatra kliṣṭe | āśraddhyaṃ kauśīdyam pramāda(20r5)ś ca ||

paryāyaḡ katamaḡ (l) sa(m)yojanāni bandhanāny anuśayā upakleśaḡ paryavasthānāni {1} oḡghā yogā {1} upādānāni granthā nivarāṇāni khilā malā nighāḡ śalyāḡ kiñcanāni duścaritāni {1} āśravā vighātāḡ paridāhā upāyāsā raṇā jvarā vanasāḡ {1} vinibandhā iti ||

kati saṃyojanāni {1} kathaṃ kutra (20r6) saṃyojayanti | nava saṃyojanāni | anunayasamyojanaṃ | pratighasamyojanaṃ | mānasamyojanaṃ | avidyāsamyojanaṃ | dṛṣṭisamyojanaṃ | parāmarśasamyojanaṃ | vicikitsāsamyojanaṃ | īrśyāsamyojanaṃ | mātsaryasamyojanaṃ |

anunayasamyojanaṃ {1} traidhātuko rāgaḡ | anunayasamyojanaṃ saṃyuktam¹⁸ {1} traidhātukān nodvijate | (20r7) anudvignaś cākuśalam ācarati kuśalam nācarati | yenāyatyaṃ duḡkham abhinivartta«ya»n duḡkhena ḡ saṃyujyate ||

pratighasamyojanaṃ satveṣu duḡkhe duḡkhasthānīyeṣu ca dharmeṣu cetasa āghātāḡ (l) pratighasamyojanaṃ saṃyuktaḡ {1} pratighanimittāc cittaṃ nādhyupekṣate | yenākuśalam ācarati kuśalaṇī ca nācarati | yenā(20v1)yatyaṃ duḡkham abhinivarttaya[n] duḡkhe[na]

¹⁶ Gokhale mistakenly transcribes here as *praśāntalakṣaṇa utpadya*.

¹⁷ Cf. Tib. *dmigs par blta'o* | *nyon mongs* ...

¹⁸ Read: *saṃyuktaḡ*.

samyujyate ||

mānasamyojanaṃ sapta mānāḥ | māno (‘)timāno ○ mānātimāno (‘)smimāno ’bhimāna
un*māno mithyāmānaś ca |

mānaḥ katamaḥ (l) hīnād asmi{m} śreyān* sadṛśena vā sadṛśa iti yā ci(tta)syonnatih |
atimānaḥ katamaḥ | sadṛśād asmi{m} śreyān* śreyasā vā sadṛśa iti yā cittasyonnatih |
(20v2)

mānātimānaḥ katamaḥ | śreyasaḥ śreyastaro (‘)smīti yā cittasyonnatih ||
asmimānaḥ kata○maḥ | pañcopādānaskandhān ātmata ātmīyato vā samanupaśyato yā
cittasyonnatih ||

abhimānaḥ katamaḥ | aprāpte uttari viśeśādhigame prāpto me uttari viśeśādhigama iti {l} yā
cittasyonnatih ||

un*mānaḥ katamaḥ | baha(20v3)vo (‘)ntaraviśiṣṭād alpāntarahīno (‘)smīti yā cittasyonnatih
||

mithyāmānaḥ katamaḥ | aguṇa○vato guṇavān asmīti yā cittasyonnatih ||
mānasamyojanena samyuktaḥ {l} ahaṃkāramamakārān na pariḥajāti | aparijānann
ahaṃkāramamakārābhiniḥṣṭaḥ {l} akuśalam samācarati{h} | yenāyatyām duḥkham
abhinivarttayan* (20v4) duḥkhena samyujyate ||

avidyāsamyojanena samyukto duḥkhadharmām samudayadharmān (na) adhyavasyati¹⁹ | ○
tada(na)dhyavasitah²⁰ akuśalam ācarati {l} kuśalam nācarati | yenāyatyām duḥkham
abhinivarttayan duḥkhena samyujyate |

drṣṭisam○yojanaṃ tisro drṣṭayaḥ | satkāyadrṣṭir antagrāhadṛṣṭir mithyādrṣṭiś ca |
drṣṭisamyojanena samyu(20v5)kto mithyāniḥsaraṇaṃ paryeṣate {l} abhinivīṣate |
mithyāniḥsaraṇābhiniḥṣṭaḥ {ll} ○ akuśalam ācarati {l} kuśalam nācarati | yenāyatyām
duḥkham abhinivarttayan* duḥkhena samyujyate ||

parāmarśasamyo○janaṃ {l} drṣṭiparāmarśaḥ śīlavrataparāmarśaś ca | parāmarśa-
samyojanena samyuktaḥ {ll} mithyāniḥ(20v6)saraṇopāyaṃ kalpayaty abhinivīṣate |
mithyāniḥsaraṇopāyābhiniḥṣṭaḥ {l} akuśalam ācarati {l} kuśalam nācarati | yenāyatyām
duḥkham abhinivarttayan* duḥkhena samyujyate |

vicikitsāsamyojanaṃ satyeṣu vimatiḥ | vicikitsāsamyojanena samyuktaḥ {l} buddharatne
kāṃkṣati {l} dharmaratne kāṃkṣati {l} sam[gha](20v7)ratne kāṃkṣati | kāṃkṣānti²¹ ratneṣu
na samyak pratipadyate | ratneṣu asamyakpratipadyamānaḥ {l} ○ akuśalam ācarati {l}
kuśalam nācarati | yenāyatyām duḥkham abhinivarttayan* duḥkhena samyujyate ||

īrṣyāsamyojanaṃ lābhasatkārādhyavasitasya parasampattāv amarākṛtaś cetaso vyāroṣaḥ |
īrṣyāsamyo[ja] ///

Fols. 23-24: [Hayashima, p. 442; Derge No. 4049, 86b4-89b2; Taisho No. 1605, 679b28-681a14]

(23r1) satvā anyonyādhipateyā ity ucyante || tathā hi [n]āsau satvaḥ sulabharūpo yad anyeṣāṃ
{l} satvā○[nā]m anyonyaṃ darśanādibhir [n]opabhogaḥ ||

¹⁹ Cf. Ch. 集法不能解了.

²⁰ Cf. Ch. 不解了故.

²¹ Read: *kāṅkṣan*.

balavatkarma katamat | pratipakṣyabalikasya pudgalasya yat sa[m]cetanīyam akuśalakaṃ karma tat pratipakṣabalādhānatayā {} yan narakavedanīyan [t]ad dṛṣṭadharmavedanīya(m bhava)(23r2)ti | yad vā dṛṣṭa«dharma»vedanīyaṃ tad avedanīyaṃ bhavati | iti prātipakṣ[i]kaṃ karma balava○t | sarvvañ ca kuśalaṃ karma sām̐cetanīyaṃ | idaṃ ca sandhāyok(t)am bhagavatā apramāṇavipulasvabhā[vini] khalv āryaśrāvakasya citte yat pramāṇakṛtaṃ karma na ma²² tena nīyate {} na sa tatrāvatiṣṭhate na tena ta[sya] (saṃkhyā) (23r3) bhavātīti | pratipakṣadurbalasya punaḥ pudgalasya yad akuśalaṃ sām̐cetanīyaṃ karma ta○d balan bhavati | yac ca sām̐cetanīyaṃ karma niyatavipākaṃ tad aprahīṇam aparījñātam ity ayam [atrā]bhisandhiḥ | a○pi khalu yat kām̐pratisaṃyuktam akuśalaṃ karma tat prakṛtyā balavat | yad api pū[rvvābhyastam]²³ (23r4) yad api padaṣṭhaṃ {} yad apy asādhyam aparinirvṇādharmakāṇām {} kṣetrato (')pi {} cittābhisam̐skā○rato (')pi balavat karma veditavyaṃ || api khalu navabhir ākārair balavat karma veditavyaṃ | kṣetrato (')pi vastuto (')pi svabhāvato (')py āśrayato (')pi manasikārato (')py āśayato (')pi [sahā]yato (')pi bahulī[kṛto (')pi bahuja](23r5)nyato (')pi²⁴ | etadviparyaye[ābalavat karma] veditavyaṃ²⁵ |

yad uktaṃ bhagavatā yad idaṃ vaded ya○thā yathāyaṃ puruṣapudgalaḥ karma karoty upacinoti | tathā tathā vipākaṃ pratisaṃvedayatīty (l) evaṃ sati {} brahmacaryavāso na bhavaty avakāśāś ca {} na pra[jñā]yate samyagduḥkha(kṣayāya duḥkha)[syānta]kriyāyai²⁶ [l yas tv evaṃ vaded yathā] (23r6) vedanīyaṃ yathā vedanīyaṃ ayam puruṣapudgalaḥ karma karoty upacinoti | tathā vedanī○yan tathā vedanīyaṃ ayam vipākaṃ pratisaṃvedayatī (l) evaṃ sati {} brahmacaryavāso bhavaty avakāśāś ca prajñāyate samyagduḥkhakṣayāya duḥkhasyāntakriyāyai | iti tatra ko (')bhisandhiḥ (l) sukhasahagatasya karmaṇaḥ sukha(23v1)sahagato vipākaḥ prati[s]iddho (')tra bhagavatā | evaṃ duḥkhasahagatasya duḥkhasahagataḥ | aduḥ○khāsukhasahagatasyāduḥkhāsukhasahagataḥ || api khalu sukhasahagatasya karmaṇaḥ sukhavedanīyasya sukho vipāko (')nujñātaḥ | duḥkhavedanīyasya duḥkhaḥ | aduḥkhāsukhavedanīyasyādu[ḥkhā](23v2)sukhaḥ | duḥkhasahagatasya sukhavedanīyasya sukho vipāko (')nujñātaḥ | duḥkhavedanīya○sya duḥkhaḥ | aduḥkhāsukhavedanīyasyāduḥkhāsukhaḥ | aduḥkhāsukhasahagatasya sukhavedanīyasya sukho vipāko (')nujñātaḥ || duḥkhavedanīyasya duḥkhaḥ | aduḥkhasukhavedanīyasyāduḥkhāsu(23v3)kha²⁷ ity ayam atrābhisandhiḥ ||

karmaprabhedāḥ punaḥ samvarakarma {} asamvarakarma {} naivasa○mvaranāsamvara-karma ca |

samvarakarma katamat* (l) prātimokṣasamvarasaṃgrhītaṃ {} dhyānasamvarasaṃgrhītaṃ {} anāsravasamvarasaṃgrhītaṃ ca |

prātimokṣasamvarasaṃgrhītaṃ karma katamat* | aṣṭanaikāyi(23v4)kaṃ²⁸ bhikṣusamvaraḥ

²² Read: *sa*. Cf. Tib. *de*.

²³ Cf. Tib. *gang sngon goms par byas pa dang*; Ch. 先所串習.

²⁴ Cf. Tib. *lan mang du byed pa dang l skye bo mang pos*; Ch. 與多衆生共所行故.

²⁵ Cf. Tib. *'di las bzlog pa ni stobs dang mi ldan pa'i las so*; Ch. 與此相違是劣力.

²⁶ Fol. 23r6 has the exactly same phrase.

²⁷ Read *aduhkhasukha*°.

²⁸ Cf. Ch. 七衆.

{|} bhikṣuṅīsamvaraḥ śikṣamāṅāsamvaraḥ śrāmaṇerasamvaraḥ śrāmaṅḡerīsamvaraḥ upāsakasamvaraḥ upāsikāsamvaraḥ upavāsasamvaraś ca |

pravrajitasamvaraḥ kīdṛśam puḡdgalam adhikṛtya vyavasthāpitaḥ | duścaritavivekacaritaṃ {|} kāmavivekacaritañ ca |

u(23v5)pāsakopāsikāsamvaraḥ {|} kīdṛśam pudgalam adhikṛtya vyavasthāpitaḥ | duścaritaḡvivekacaritaṃ no tu kāmavivekacaritaṃ ||

upavāsasamvaraḥ kīdṛśam pudgalam adhikṛtya vyavasthāpitaḥ | naiva duścaritavivekacaritaṃ | na kāmavivekacaritaṃ²⁹ | upāsakaḥ śikṣāpadaikadeśaśikṣamāṅ[ah] (23v6) upāsakasamvarena samanvāgato vaktavyaḥ {|} asamanvāgato vaktavyaḥ (|) samanvāgato (|) ḡ duḥśīlas tu vaktavyaḥ | kiṃ ṣaṅḡhapaṅḡakānām upāsakasamvaraḥ pratiśiddhaḥ | nopāsakasamvaraḥ pratiśiddhaḥ | upāsakatvan tu pratiśiddham bhikṣubhikṣuṅīpakṣayor upāsanāyogyatām upādāya (|) paṅḡakāḥ (24r1) pañca | jātipaṅḡakāḥ {|} Irṣyāpaṅḡakāḥ {|} pakṣapaṅḡakāḥ {|} āsiktapaṅḡakāḥ {|} lūnapaṅḡakāś ca ||³⁰

dhyānasamvaraḥ katamaḥ | dauḥśīlyasamutthāpākānām kleśānām {|} bījopaghātakāle kāmavītarāḡasy(a)³¹ {āpāyavītarāgena}³² prathamadhyānavītarāḡasya dvitīyadhyānavītarāḡasya tṛtīyadhyānavītarāḡasya (24r2) ca yā viratiḥ || ḡ ||

anāsravasamvaraḥ katamaḥ | dṛṣṭasatyasyānāsraveṇa manasikāreḡṇa yā viratiḥ || ḡ ||

asamvaraḥ katamaḥ | ya āsamvarikānām aurabhikānām māṃsikānām mṛḡalubdhakānām śākunikānām śaśavāḡurikānām vairāṅām vadhyaghātakānām goghātakānām nāḡabandhakānām nā(24r3)gamaṅḡalīkānām bandhanapālakānām sūcakānām kāraṅḡākāraḡānām {|} abhijanmato vā ḡ tatkarṃsamudācārato vā tatkarṃmadhyācārānīścayāḥ || ḡ ||

naivasamvaronāsamvaraḥ³³ katamaḥ | naivasamvaranāsamvarasthasya yat kuśalam akuśalam vā karma |

sukhavedanīyaṃ karma katamat (|) yat kuśalam kāma(24r4)dhātau triṣu ca dhyāneṣu | duḥkhavedanīyaṃ karma katamat (|) akuśalam ||

aduḥkhāsukhaḡvedanīyaṃ karma katamat | tṛtīyād dhyānād ūrdhvaṃ kuśalam ||

dṛṣṭadharmavedanīyaṃ karma katamat | yasya dṛṣṭe dharme vipāḡko vipacyate | tad yathā maitrīsamādhher vyutthite yad upakārāpakāramayaṃ (|) yathā maitrīsamā(24r5)dher evam araṅḡasamādhher nirodhasamāpatteḥ {|} śrotaāpattīphalād arhattvaphalāc ca vyutthiḡte buddhapramukhe ca (bhi)kṣusaṅḡhe iti | yad vā punar atyantatīvrāśayaprayogeṇa kuśalam akuśalam vā ācaritaṃ ||

upapadyavedanīyaṃ karma katamat | yasyānantare janmaṅī vipāko vipacyate | tad yathā paṃcā(24r6)nantaryāṅī karmāṅīti | yad vā punar anyakuśalākuśalam ||

aparaparyāyavedanīyaṃ ḡ karma katamat | yasya tata ūrdhham vipāko vipacyate ||

²⁹ S.e. for *kāmavivekacaritaṃ*.

³⁰ Cf. 根本薩婆多部律攝, Taisho vol. 24, 597c25-a1; and *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*, Wogihara ed., p. 94.20-21.

³¹ Read: *rāḡasya*.

³² The phrase {āpāyavītarāgena} is to be deleted in view of the present context and of the Chinese and Tibetan translations.

³³ Read: *naivasamvaranāsamvaraḥ*.

kṛṣṇaṃ kṛṣṇavipākaṃ karma katamat | yad akuśalaṃ ||
 śuklaṃ śuklavipākaṃ karma katamat* | traidhātukaṃ kuśalaṃ ||
 kṛṣṇaśuklaṃ kṛṣṇaśuklavipākaṃ karma katamat (l) ya(t) (24r7) kāmapratisaṃyuktaṃ
 vyāmiśraṃ | āśayataḥ kṛṣṇaṃ prayogataḥ śuklaṃ | prayogato vā kṛṣṇaṃ āśayataḥ śuklaṃ ||
 akṛṣṇaśuklāvīpākaṃ karma karmakṣayāya saṃvarttate katamat | prayogānantaryamārgeṣv
 anāsravaṃ karma ||

dānakarma katamat | tan nidānataḥ (24v1) samutthānataḥ {} adhiṣṭhānataḥ svabhāvataś ca
 veditavyaṃ | nidānam alobhādveśāmohāḥ ○ (l) samutthānan tatsahagatā cetanā | adhiṣṭhānaṃ
 deyaṃ vastu | svabhāvaḥ pratipādane kāyakarma vākkarma |

kathaṃ dānaṃ saṃpannaṃ bhavati | abhīkṣṇadānatām upādāya {} apakṣapātadānatām
 upādāya {} icchāparipūra(24v2)ṇadānatām copādāya || api khalv anīśritadānatayā {}
 viśadadānatayā muditadānatayā {} abhīkṣṇadānatayā {} pātrādānatayā {}
 susamvibhaktaparijanātithidānatayā ca dānaṃ saṃpannaṃ veditavyaṃ ||

kathaṃ deyaṃ saṃpannaṃ veditavyaṃ | anabhidrugdhadeyavastutām upādāya {}
 aparāhṛtadeyavastutā(24v3)m upādāya {} akuthitavimaladeyavastutām upādāya {}
 kalpikadeyavastutām uopādāya {} dharmārjitadeyavastutām copādāya |

kathaṃ śīlavān* bhavati (l) samāttāśīlānurakṣaṇatām upādāya ||
 kathaṃ prātimokṣasamvarasamvṛto bhavati | nairyāṇikaśīlatām upādāya ||
 katham ācārāgo(24v4)carasampanno bhavati | anupā[kru]ṣṭaśīlatām³⁴ upādāya ||
 katham aṇumātreṣv avadyeṣu ○ bhayadarśi bhavati | tīvrագauraśikṣaṇaśīlatām upādāya ||
 kathaṃ samādāya śikṣate | śikṣāpadeṣu {} pa○ripūrṇaśikṣāśikṣaṇaśīlatām upādāya ||
 kathaṃ kāyena vācāsamvṛto bhavati | sa(ṃ)praja(24v5)nyapariḡtatām upādāya ||
 kathaṃ kāyavākkasampattyā saṃpanno bhavati | āpattyānādhyāpadyanatām upādāya |
 kathaṃ pariśuddhakāyavāksamudācāro bhavati | avipratisāradyānupūrvvyā yāvat
 samādhisanniśrayatām upādāya ||

kathaṃ kuśalakāyavāksamudācāro bhavati | kliṣṭavitarkavya(24v6)vakīrṇatām upādāya ||
 katham anavadyakāyavāksamu{pā}dācāro bhavati | praṇidhāyabrahmacaryavāsa-
 vivarjitatām upādāya ||

katham anyāvadhyaḥkāyavāksamudācāro bhavati | parānamanya(mā)nasukhasaṃvāsātām
 upādāya³⁵ ||

katham ānulomikakāyavāksamudācāro bhavati | nirvāṇaprā(24v7)ptyanukūlatām upādāya ||
 katham ānucchavikakāyavāksamudācāro bhavati | ○ praticchannakalyāṇatām vivṛta-
 pāpakāṃ copādāya ||

katham aupayikakāyavāksamudācāro bhavati | sabrahmacāryupagrahaśīlatām upādāya ||

³⁴ Cf. Tib. *ma smad pa'i tshul khrims yin pa*; Ch. 具淨尸羅難為毀責。

³⁵ Cf. Tib. *gzhan la brnyas thabs mi byed cing 'grogs na bde ba'i phyir ro*, Ch. 不輕陵他易共住故。

Bibliography

Gokhale, V. V.

1947 “Fragments form the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* of Asaṅga,” in: *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, Bombay Branch, New Series 23, pp.13-38.

Hayashima, Osamu 早島 理

2003 *Bonzōkan Taikō E-text: Abhidharmasamuccaya, Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa*, 『大乘阿毘達磨集論』 and *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya, Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i rnam par bshad pa*, 『大乘阿毘達磨雜集論』, 3 vols., Shiga, Japan: Yugagyō Shisō Kenkyūkai 瑜伽行思想研究会 (Online at <http://www.shiga-med.ac.jp/public/yugagyō/AS.html>).

Li, Xuezhū 李学竹:

2011 “Abhidharmasamuccayaおよびその注釈(Vyākhyā)の新出梵文写本について (Newly Available Sanskrit Manuscripts of Asanga's *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and Sthiramati's *Vyākhyā* from the Tibet Autonomous Region),” in: *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 60-1, pp. 403-406.

Sāṅkrtyāyana, Rāhula

1937 “Second Search of Sanskrit Palm-leaf Mss. in Tibet,” in: *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 23-1, pp. 1-57.

A Newly Identified Manuscript of Āryaśūra's *Pāramitāsamāsa* in the *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*¹

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 *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra*.² However, due to the poor condition

¹ In autumn 2011, the National Archives of India (New Delhi) and the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University (Tokyo) agreed on publishing a new facsimile edition of the Gilgit manuscripts — except those of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikāsūtra* — 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 *Saddharmapuṇḍarikāsūtra* (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: *Saddharmapuṇḍarikam: 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法華經写本 [*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.

² For example, editors of the *GBM*, Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra, classified this manuscript as follows: “57. Bhaiṣajyaguru-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 *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra* 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 *Bhg.* [= *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra*, 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 *Bhaiṣajyaguru-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 *Saddharmapuṇḍarikāsūtra*. In the margin of the pasteboard of the fragment, a remark concerning its attribution is written as “[Bhaiṣajya ...] (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 *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra* 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 *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra*.

Moreover, a text of the *Pāramitāsamāsa* 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 *Pāramitāsamāsa* 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),⁴ 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.

so bad and thus illegible (1982: 77).

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 / Bhaishajanya [*sic.*] Guru Sutram / bhaiṣajyaguru 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 Hackin’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 *Vinayavastus*); ‘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 *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* 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/Bāmiyan 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* literatures, non-Mahāyāna *sūtras*, *avadāna* texts, *gāthās* and so on. There are some exceptions of which Gilgit/Bāmiyan Type II or Protośāradā is used for transcribing the Mahāyāna texts, for example, *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra* (No. 32, one folio = Dutt’s A and Schopen’s V), *Samghāṭasūtra* (No. 39, fifteen folios), *Pratītyasamutpādahṛdayakārikā* 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.

⁶ Cf. Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 36.

The author is Āryaśūra but he is not the same person as the author of the *Jātakamālā*.⁷ The date of this ‘Āryaśūra’ is not fixed; Meadows (see below) places the *Pāramitāsamāsa* “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”⁸, its exact dating is difficult to settle. According to paleographical studies, the script of this manuscript (Protośāradā) was used in 7th and 8th century⁹. If this dating is accepted, this would mean that this Gilgit manuscript is earlier than its Nepalese counterpart (13–14th century)¹⁰ 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 *Pāramitāsamāsa*.

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 Newārī¹² (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

⁷ As to the author, see Meadows 1986: 1-21; Hahn 1982: 321-324; Saito 2005.

⁸ Meadows *op. cit.*, p. 21. Tibetan translation was done by Vairocanarakṣita; on his date, see Saito 2005: 9.

⁹ As to the dating of the script, see Sander 1986, 1989 (especially p. 111); Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 37-40.

¹⁰ See Meadows 1986: 22.

¹¹ Meadows *op. cit.*, p. 21.

¹² According to the Nepalese-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project (NGMCP), its script is classified as ‘Magadhi,’ see http://catalogue.ngmcp.uni-hamburg.de/wiki/A_39-2_Pāramitāsamāsa [accessed: 20 Feb., 2013].

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 copy¹⁴ 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."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 Vairocanarakṣita for correction but Ferrari "does not mention which particular edition of Tanjur was used"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'."¹⁷ Saito (2005) published a comprehensive study of the Tibetan translation of the *Pāramitasamāsa*. In editing the Tibetan text, he uses editions from the Chone, Derge, Ganden, Narthang and Peking Tanjur along with a quotation in the *Lam rim chen mo* by Tsoñ 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.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.¹⁹

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).

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 F co 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).

¹⁶ Meadows' comment on Ferrari (Meadows 1986: 21).

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.

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 *Pāramitāsamāsa* into Japanese with annotations.

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.

| M, S | G | Tibetan |
|------|----|---------|
| 26 | 28 | 27 |
| 27 | 26 | 25 |
| 28 | 27 | 26 |
| 33 | 34 | 33 |
| 34 | 33 | 32 |

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 Vairocanarakṣita, see Saito 2005.
 () restored *akṣara*(s)
 [] damaged *akṣara*(s)
 .. one illegible *akṣara*
 . illegible part of an *akṣara*
 / *daṇḍa*
 // double *daṇḍa*
 * *virāma*
 • punctuation mark

II.60-65, III.13, IV.7, V.28, 62, see Saito 2005.

²⁰ The first verse in Sanskrit has no equivalent in Tibetan; thus the corresponding Tibetan translation starts from the second verse in Skt.

²¹ Saito 2005: 92.

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?"

| | |
|---|---|
| : | <i>visarga</i> used aspunctuation |
| ' | <i>avagraha</i> (not written in manuscript; it is added in brackets in the transliteration) |
| ○ | string hole |
| ḥ | <i>upadhmanīya</i> [<i>visarga</i> + <i>p/ph</i>] |
| ḥ | <i>jihvāmūliya</i> [<i>visarga</i> + <i>k/kh</i>] |

[Pāramitāsamāsaḥ Chapter 1: Dānapāramitāsamāsaḥ]

TRANSLITERATION:

[2r1]yadā [ni]sr̥ṣṭo jagato mayāyam kāyo (')pi tattyāgakṛto (')pi dharmmaḥ (/)
bāhye tadā vastuni saṅgacittaṃ na me gajasnānam ivānurūpaṃ* (// 6²³ //)

a: K *tisr̥ṣṭo*²⁴, S *yadātisr̥ṣṭo*²⁵; M, S *jagate*

māṃsārthino māṃsam idaṃ harantu majjānam apy uddharatāṃ tadarthī •
ahaṃ hi lokārtham idaṃ bibharmmi śārīrakam kiṃ bata vastu bāhyam* (// 7 //)

b: M *uddharaṇāt*²⁶, KS *uddharatāt*, T *brus te khyer*²⁷

yathā hi bhaiṣajyama[2r2]hīruhasya tvakpatrapuṣpādi janā haranti •
maḍīyam ete (')paharanti caivaṃ [nai]naṃ vikalpās 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 (/)
duḥkhe kṛtaghne satatāśucau ca dehe parasmāy upayujyamāne • (// 9 //)

ādhyātmike caiva mahījalādye bāhye ma[2r3]hābhūta[ga]ṇe ca tulye •
idaṃ mamedam na mameti ko (')yam ajñānapaṃkāṅkavidhir mmamāpi • (// 10 //)

d: M, S *mayāpi* for *mmamāpi*²⁸

gr̥hṇīta gātrāṇy api me yatheṣṭam mā kārṣur asmim̐ parakīyabuddhim* (/)
yuṣmākam eva svam idaṃ hi sarvaṃ na svābhīmāno mama kaścid attra : (// 11 //)

c: M, S *kim arthaṃ* for *hi sarvaṃ*, K *him arthaṃ*²⁹, d: M, S *nātmābhīmāno* for *na svābhīmāno*

²³ Verse number is not given in the manuscript.

²⁴ de Jong [1991: 181] reads K by himself and says: “The text of 6ab according to K is: *yadābhisr̥ṣṭo jagate mayāyam / kāyo 'pi tattyāgakṛto 'poi dharmmaḥ //*”; see also Sato 1991: 113, note on v. 6-2.

²⁵ See S’s textual note, p. 340, fn. 1; also cf. S. p. 79.

²⁶ Cf. de Jong 1989: 237.

²⁷ S’s textual note, p. 340, fn. 2.

²⁸ See S’s textual note (p. 340, fn. 3): “*bdag gi* für das dreimalige *mama* (in c und d) T”; cf. de Jong 1991: 181-2. According to de Jong, K reads *mamāpi*; F reads *mayāpi*. Also cf. Sato 1991: 112, note on v. 10-1.

²⁹ See M p. 158, 11c; cf. S p. 325, 1.19) 1.11c.

ity adbhutā yasya bhavanty abhīkṣṇaṃ sambuddha[2r4]bhāvānugūṇā vitarkāḥ (/)
taṃ bodhisatvātīśayaṃ vadanti buddhā mahāsatvam aciṀntyasatvāḥ (// 12 //)

a: K *bhavanti bhīkṣṇaṃ*³⁰

evaṃ sa dānapratipattiśūraḥ karoti kāye (')pi na jātv apekṣām* /
tasyāprayatnād upayānti śuddhiṃ karmmaṇi vākkāyamanomayāni • (// 13 //)

viśuddhakarmma ca hitaṃ pareṣāṃ[2r5]m āyāsaduḥkhena vinā karoti •
itthaṃ ca ś/mantyāyam abhiprapanno nayānaye kauśaṀlam abhyupaiti • (// 14 //)

a: K *vahitaṃ* for *ca hitaṃ*³¹, c: M, S *sa sattvārtham* for *ca śantyāyam*; KS
*abhiprapanno*³², M *abhiprayatno*

bhūyastaraṃ prāpya phalaṃ sa dānāt saddharmmadānena tataḥ karoti •
bhavāndhakāre bhramatāṃ janānāṃ sūryodayāt spaṣṭataraṃ prakāśam* (// 15 //)

a: M, S *balam* for *phalam* T 'bras bu T (= *phalam*)³³

sādhāraṇā lokahitārtha[2r6]siddhis sarvajñabhāvābhyudaya pratiṣṭhā •
ato (')sya puṇyākṣaya tābhyudeti praṀbheva bhānor udayasthitasya • (// 16 //)

a: M, S *sādhāraṇī* for *sādhāraṇā*

ity adbhutā dānamayā guṇaughā ye bodhisatvābharaṇībhavanti •
yasmāt tadīyaṃ parikarmma cittaṃ dānasya kāruṇyapurassarasya • (// 17 //)

c: M, S *tasmāt* for *yasmāt*; S *citraṃ*, T *rnam pa maṃ*³⁴

āyu[2r7]ḥpratībhānabalādi bauddhaṃ niṣpādayeyaṃ jagatāṃ anena /
satvā mayā cāmiṣasaṃgrhītā saddharmmapātrāṇy api me bhaveyuh (// 18 //)

c: M, S *-saṃgrhītāḥ* for *-saṃgrhītā*³⁵

ity annadānaṃ pratidāti vidvān na tas svasampattiparigrahāya :
pānāny api kleśatṛṣaś śamāya lokasya lokārthacaro dadāti • (// 19 //)

a: M *pradadāti* for *pratidāti*, b: M, S *vidvān na svarga-* for *vidvān na tas sva-*, T *raṇ gi*
phun sum tshogs pa (= *svasya sampatti*^o)³⁶

bauddhasya caivarddhivi[2r8]ceṣṭitasya nirvāṇasaukhyasya ca sarvalokaḥ (/)
lābhī kathaṃ syād iti lokanātho yānaṃ mahāyānamatir ddadāti (// 20 //)

³⁰ M notes [158, 12a]: “yat prabhavanty F; (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 (tn- / nn-).

³³ See S’s textual note (p. 341, fn. 4); also cf. Sato 1991: 112, note on v. 15-1.

³⁴ See S’s textual note (p. 341, fn. 5); also cf. S p. 326, 2.1. 1.17c.

³⁵ M notes [160, 18c]: “*rthasamgahīnāḥ*, F co.”; cf. S p. 330 2.2. 2)a) 1.18c.

³⁶ See S’s textual note (p. 342, fn. 1).

a: M, S °*viceṣṭitasya*, K °*vicestitasya*³⁷, d: M, S *mahāyānaratir* for *mahāyānamatir*³⁸

sambuddhavarṇasya ca hemabhāso lajjāmayasyaiva ca bhūṣaṇasya³⁹ (/)
niṣpattaye vastravidhīn udārām • satkṛtya kālānugunām dadāti (// 21 //)
d: M, S *kālānugunām* for *kālānugunām*

sambodhimaṇḍāsanam āsanā[2r9]ni • śayyās ca śayyātrayam īkṣamānas (/)
sarvajñacakṣuḥpratīlabdhaye ca caityeṣu rathyāsu ca dīpadānaṃ (// 22 //)
d: M, S *dīpamālām* for *dīpadānaṃ* (T. reads: *mar me dbul*)

vādyāni divyaśrutisaṃgrahārtha[m*] sambuddhaśīlāya ca gandhadānaṃ⁴⁰ •
sabhāprapārāmavihāragehām ccharaṇyadānābhīmukho dadāti • (// 23 //)
d: M, S *śaraṇyabhāvābhi-* for *ccharaṇyadānābhi-*

dānaṃ rasānām ca susaṃskṛtāṇām [2v1] rasārasajñatvapariḡrahāya :
bhaiṣajyadānāny ajarāmaratvaṃ lokān imān prāpayi + + + (// 24 //)
a: M, S *tu* for *ca*, b: M, S *rasārasāgratva-* for *rasārasajñatva-*⁴¹
d: M, S *prāpayituṃ dadāti* // 24 //

+ .. + .[u] tām ātmasamaṃ n[i]n. ṣur ddās. kṛtān kleśagaṇena lokān* (/)
sa dāsādānāni sadā dadāti dāsānudāsān⁴² aparān karo .i (// 25 //)
a: M, S *bhujīṣyatām ātmasamaṃ ninīṣur*, b: M, S *dāsīkṛtān*
c: M, S *dāsādāsyādi* for *dāsādānāni*,⁴³ d: M, S *aparākariṣyan* for *aparān karo(t)i*⁴⁴

.. .. ti puttr. + + +⁴⁵ [vi]drumādīṃ dadāti sallakṣaṇasampadartham* (/)
[2v2] ratnapradīpāni ca bhūṣaṇāni cittrāny anuvyañjanasauṣṭhavāya : (// 26 // = M, S 27)
a: M, S v.26: *dadāti putrān duhitṛḥ*. M, S v.27: *suvarṇamuktāmaṇi-*.
c: M, S *ratnapradīptāni* for *ratnapradīpāni* (T reads: *sgron ma ‘lamp’*)⁴⁶

³⁷ M notes [162, 20a]: “... the K ms. reading of °*vicestitasya* ...”; 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,”

³⁹ Cf. de Jong 1989: 238 points out M’s mistranslation; also Sato 1991: 112, note on v. 21-1.

⁴⁰ Cf. M notes [162, 23b]: “*pānthadānaṃ*, F (F co.)”; S p. 329, 2.2. 1) c) 1.23b [*gāndha°/pānthā°*] 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]: “*dāsānadāsān* K, F co. (*dādānudāsān* F).”

⁴⁴ Cf. S’s textual note (p. 343, fn. 2): “wie *aparā°* dann zu emendieren ist: *aparā<n>*, *amarā<n>* oder ähnlich.”

⁴⁵ Although verse 26 seems to start here, namely “(*dadā*)ti puttr(ān)”, 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 utpādyā tapovanāni saddharmakoṣāya ca vittakoṣam* (/)
munīndrarājyāya dadāty akhinno rājyāni cājñāpanamaṇḍitāni • (// 27 // = M, S 28)

a: M, S *udyāna-* for *utpādyā*, d: M *-maṇḍitāni*, K *-paṇḍitāni*, S *-paṇḍitāni* (S notes [343, fn. 3]: *brgyan* T (= °*maṇḍitāni*))

dadāti puttrān duhittrīḥ pṛyaś ca bodhipriyatvād anavadyadānam* (/)
ekāntasaddharmaratipṛyaś ca krīḍā[2v3]viśeṣān ratihetubhūtān* (// 28 // = M, S 26)

a, c: M, S *priyaś* for *pṛyaś*

cakrāṅkitābhyāṃ caraṇottamābhyāṃ saṃbodhimaṇḍākramaṇotsukatvāt* (/)
sa nirvicāraś caraṇapradānam lokārthanīṣattikaro dadāti • (// 29 //)

a: M, S *nirvikāraś* for *nirvicāraś*⁴⁷

duḥkhāpagāyām atiśīghragāyām magnasya lokasya kathan nu dadyām* (/)
saddharmmahastān iti sa pradatte⁴⁸ hastān vikoṣāmburuhaparakāśān* (// 30 //)

b: M, S *katham na* for *kathan nu*, c: M, S *saṃpradatte* for *sa pradatte*

śraddhe[2v4]ndriyādeḥ paripūraṇārtham sa karṇanāsādi dadāty akhinnaḥ (/)
cakṣuś ca cakṣur vimalīkariṣya○n lokasya sarvāvaraṇaprahāṇāt* (// 31 //)

a: M, S *śraddhendriyādiprati-* for *śraddhendriyādeḥ pari-*

utkr̥tya māṃsāni saṣonitāni dadāti kārūnyavaśena nāthaḥ (/)
bhūmyagnivāyambuvad eva me syāl lokopajīvyaḥ katham eṣa kāyaḥ // (32 //)

⁴⁹majjānam apy adbhutavī[2v5]raceṣṭo dadāti lokasya katham na kuryām* (/)
tāthāgataṃ vigrahaṃ apradhṛṣyaṃ vṛṣṭyāpi va○jrojalayā patantyā • (// 33 // = M, S 34)

lokottamajñānasamāpanārtham sa uttamāṅgair api satkaroti •
abhyāgatasyārthijanasya yācñāṃ prāḡ eva gātrāvayavais tadanyaiḥ // (34 // = M, S 33)

d: M, S *dehāvayavais* for *gātrāvayavais* [*deha* = *gātra*, ‘body’] (T reads: *lus*)

ity evamādyam̄ satatānavadyam̄ tad bo[2v6]dhisatvāmbudharapramuktam* (/)
prahlādyā dānāmbu jagat samagram̄ sarvajñātāsāgaram̄ abhyupai○ti • (// 35 //)

c: S *prahlādyā* for *prahlādyā*⁵⁰

⁴⁷. See S’s textual note (p. 344, fn. 1). Cf. M’s translation note on v. 29.3 (p. 272) ; Sato 1991: 112, note on v. 29-1.

⁴⁸. For *sampadatte*? However, a drop of *anusvāra* is hardly seen in this manuscript.

⁴⁹. The sequence of verses in the extant Sanskrit version of the Nepalese manuscript is 33-34-35 but our G has different one 34-33-35. This sequence of G corresponds to that of the Tibetan translation (see S p. 97; Sato 1991: 3, note 6).

⁵⁰. It is not known why he emends so.

anviṣya bhogān viṣameṇa nāsau dadāti notpīdanayā parasya⁵¹ •
na ttrāsalaṅgajāpratīkārāhetor na dakṣiṇīyān parimārgamāṇaḥ (// 36 //)⁵²

na ca praṇīte na ti rūkṣadānam adakṣiṇīyān i[2v7]ti vāvamanya :
vipākakāṅkṣākṛpaṇīkṛtaṃ vā satkārahīnaṃ vijugupsitaṃ vā • (// 37 //)
a: M, S *sati* for *na ti*⁵³; b: M, S *adakṣiṇīyā iti* for *adakṣiṇīyān iti*

naivānatiṃ śīlavate prayacchan viparyayaṃ gacchati netarasmai •
nātmānam utkarṣati naiva nindāṃ karoti so (')nyasya samaprayogaḥ (// 38 //)
a: M, S *naivonnatim* for *naivānatiṃ* [T reads: *mtho (mthoṇi)* Skt. *unnati*]⁵⁴

na cāsya mithyāśayadānam asti naivāsty anadhyāśayadānam asya (/)
na krodhadoṣopa[2v8]hataṃ dadāti naivānutāpaṃ kurute sa datvā • (// 39 //)

na ślāghamāno vipulaṃ dadāti glāyaṃ na caivāvipulaṃ dadāti •
na yācakānām upaghātadānaṃ yadvā bhaved vipratipattihetuḥ (// 40 //)
a: M, S *ślāghyamāno*⁵⁵ for *ślāghamāno*, K *ślāghamāno*; b: M *nāślāghyamāno*
'nyataram dadāti, K *nāślāghamāno* (')*lpataram dadāti*, S *nāślāghyamāno* 'lpataram, T *ñuñ*
bar (= *alpataram*)⁵⁶

nākāladānaṃ sa dadāti kiñcid dadāti kāle viṣame (')pi naiva :
na devabhāvāya na rājyahetor nna hīnayānasprhayālubhāvā • (// 41 //)
d: M, S *-bhāvāt* for *-bhāvā*

nāsau [2v9] mukhālokanayā dadāti • na kīrtiśabdāya na hāsyahetoḥ (/)
paryāyam etac ca mamaiva naivaṃ • yadvā vihiṃsāsahitaṃ pareṣāṃ (// 42 //)
a: M, S *mukhollokanayā* for *mukhālokanayā*⁵⁷
c: M, S *paryāptam* for *paryāyam*, M, S *mameti* for *mamaiva*; d: M, K
*vihiṃsāhasitaṃ*⁵⁸ for *vihiṃsāsahitaṃ*, S *vihiṃsāsahiutaṃ*⁵⁹

sarvajñabhāvāpariṇāmitaṃ vā • sadgarhitaṃ vā sa dadāti naiva (/)
tato (')sya tat pāramitābhīdhānam* parāṃ viśuddhiṃ samupaiti dānaṃ (// 43 //)

51. Cf. de Jong [1989: 238] points out M's mistranslation of this verse; Sato 1991: 112, note on v. 36-1.

52. Verses 36-39 in T are differently composed, see S p. 99. G corresponds to M, S.

53. *na ti*: a scribal error? Cf. Sato 1991: 111, note on v. 37-1.

54. See S p. 102; see also Sato 1991: 111, note on v. 38-1.

55. See S's textual note (p. 345, fn. 1): *gcam byas bkur zes* (= *ślāghyamāno*). Cf. S p. 326, 2.1. 1.40ab [*ślāgha-/ślāghya-*].

56. See S's textual note (p. 345, fn. 2-3).

57. Cf. de Jong [1989: 238] points out M's mistranslation of this verse; also Sato 1991: 109-110, note on v. 42-1.

58. Cf. de Jong [1991: 184] proposes to read *vihiṃsāsahitaṃ* instead of *vihiṃsāhasitaṃ*; 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 [*°hasitaṃ/°sahitaṃ*].

b: M, S *sagarhitam* for *sadgarhitam*

dānodbhavaṃ tasya ca puṇyārāśiṃ • lokāt samagrā[2v10]n api piṇḍitāni (/)
puṇyāni naivābhibhavanti yasmāt* lokottamatvaṃ sa tato (')bhyupaiti • // (44 //)

b: M, S *samagrād api* for *samagrān api*

pañcasv abhijñāsu ca niścītātmā lokāya yad varṣati dānavarṣam* (/)
samtatā tasya kutaḥ pramāṇaṃ parikṣayo vā satataḥ pravṛtteḥ // (45 //)

a: M, S *vinīścītātmā* for *ca niścītātmā*, d: M, S *satatapravṛtteḥ* for *satataḥ pravṛtteḥ*

tad akṣayāṇaṃ jagatāṃ hitāya jñānasya hetuś ca tad akṣayasya •
ttraidhātukena kṣayiṇā [2v10 ends] (na tac ca saṃlipyate vyomavad ambudena // 46 //)

a: M, S *yad* for *tad*, b: M, S *yad* for *tad*

Abbreviations and Bibliography

F F co: A copy of the manuscript used by Ferrari (1946).

G: Gilgit manuscript of the *Pāramitāsamāsa* in the National Archives of India, serial no. 57, a birch-bark manuscript, in Proto-śāradā, one folio, 38.4 x 6.8 cm.

GBM: *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, the facsimile edition edited by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra.

K: A palm-leaf manuscript in the National Archives of Nepal, No. 5-145, microfilm A 39/2, in Newārī (Magadhi) script, 10 folios, 7 lines/side, 57 x 5.5 cm. 13-14th century.

M: Meadows' Sanskrit text, see Meadows 1986.

S: Saito's Sanskrit text, see Saito 2005: 337ff.

T: Tibetan translation by Vairocanarakṣita, see Saito 2005.

Bapat, P. V.

1961/62 "Gilgit Manuscripts and Numerical Symbols," in: *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, vol. XI, pp. 127-131.

Chandra, Lokesh

1959 "A Note on the Gilgit Manuscripts," in: *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, vol. IX.2, pp. 135-140.

Dutt, Nalinaksha

1939 *Gilgit Manuscripts*. Vol. I, Srinagar [*Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra*. Introduction pp. 47-57, text pp. 1-32].

Ferrari, Alfonsa

1946 "Il compendio delle Perfezioni di Āryaśūra," in: *Annali Lateranensi*, vol. 10 (1946), pp. 9-102 [not available to present writer].

Hahn, Michael

1982 *Die Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā. Einspätbuddhistischer Text zur Verdienstlehre*, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Kl., Nr. 9, pp. 311-374.

Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan

1994 *Das Poṣadhavastu. Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*, Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikationen.

de Jong, J. W.

1989 Review on Meadows 1986, in: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 32, pp. 234-239.

1991 "Notes on the Text of the *Pāramitāsamāsa*," in: 『前田惠學博士頌壽記念・佛教文化學論集』東京: 山喜房佛書林 (*Mayeda Egaku hakushi shōjukinen: Bukkyō bunkagaku ronshū* [*Studies in Buddhism and Culture in honour of Professor Dr. Egaku Mayeda on his sixty-fifth birthday*])

- (Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin), pp. 181-187 [(600)-(594)].
- Lévi, Sylvain
 1932 “Note sur des manuscrits sanscrits provenant de bamiyan (afghanistan) et de gilgit (cachemire),”
 in: *Journal Asiatique*, Janvier-Mars 1932, pp. 1-45.
- Matsumura, Hisashi 松村 恒
 1982 「薬師経の諸伝本」 『佛教學』 13, pp. 73-103 (“Recensions of the *Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra*,” in:
Bukkyo-gaku [Journal of Buddhist Studies] 13, pp. 73-103).
- Meadows, Carol
 1986 *Ārya-Śūra's Compendium of the Perfections: Text, Translation and Analysis of the Pāramitāsamāsa*.
 (Indica et Tibetica 8), Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
 Reviewed by J. W. de Jong 1989.
- Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra
 1959-74 *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*. Śata-Piṭaka Series Volume 10, parts 1-10, Delhi:
 The International Academy of India (reprinted as: *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, revised and
 enlarged compact facsimile edition*. Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series 150, 151, 152, Delhi 1995 in
 three parts).
- SAITO, Naoki
 2005 *Das Kompendium Der Moralischen Vollkommenheiten by Āryaśūra, Vairocana and
 Vairocanarakṣitas Tibetische Übertragung Von Āryaśūras Pāramitāsamāsa Samt Neuauflage Des
 Sanskrittextes*. (Indica et Tibetica 38), Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- SATO, Seiji 佐藤 誠司
 1991 「伝 Ārya Śūra 作 『波羅蜜の要約 (Pāramitāsamāsa)』 第1章和訳」 『論集』 18, pp. 1-16.
 [“Ārya Śūra's ‘Compendium of the Perfections (*Pāramitāsamāsa*)’ The 1st chapter. A Japanese
 translation,” in: *Ronshū [Studies in Religions East and West]*, 18, pp. 1-16].
- Sander, Lore
 1968 *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung, Franz Steiner Verlag
 GMBH, Wiesbaden, 1968*.
- 1983 “Einige neue Aspekte zur Entwicklung der Brāhmī in Gilgit und Bamiyan (ca. 2.–7. Jh. n. Chr.),”
 in: *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien: Vorträge des Hamburger Symposiums vom 2. uli bis 5.
 Juli 1981*, ed. K. Röhrborn and Wolfgang Veenker, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, pp. 113-124.
- 1989 “Remarks on the Formal Brāhmī of Gilgit, Bāmiyān, and Khotan: with an Appendix of Selected
 Inscriptions from Thor North (Pakistan),” in: *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan — Reports and
 Studies*, vol. 1: Rock Inscriptions in the Indus Valley, Text, ed. by Karl Jettmar, pp. 107-130.
- 2007 “Confusion of Terms and Terms of Confusion in Indian Palaeography,” in: *Expanding and
 Merging Horizons. Contributions to South Asian and Cross-Cultural Studies in Commemoration of
 Wilhelm Halbfax*. ÖAW Denkschriften, 351 Band. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie
 der Wissenschaften, pp. 121-139.
- Schopen, Gregory
 1977 “Sukhāvāṭī as a generalized religious goal in Sanskrit Mahāyāna Sūtra literature,” in: *Indo-Iranian
 Journal* 19, pp. 177-210 [Appendix I: Gilgit Mss. of *Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra* (p. 205-207), Appendix II: Gilgit
 Ms. of *Samādhirāja-sūtra*, Appendix III: Dutt's edition of *Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra* (p. 208-210)].
- 1978 *The Bhaiṣajyaguru-Sūtra and the Buddhism in Gilgit*. (Unpublished PhD thesis, submitted to
 Australia National University, Canberra.)
- 2009 “On the Absence of Urtexts and Otiose Ācāryas: Buildings, Books, and Lay Buddhist Ritual at
 Gilgit,” in: *Écrire et transmettre en Inde classique / sous la direction de Gérard Colas et Gerdi
 Gerschheimer*. (Études thématiques 23), Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient, pp. 189-219.

<key words: *Pāramitāsamāsa*, Āryaśūra, Gilgit manuscripts>

Candrakīrti and the Pūrvaśailas: A Note on *Triśaraṇasaptati* v. 51

Peter Skilling (Bangkok) and Saerji (Beijing)

“Seventy Verses on the Three Refuges” (*Triśaraṇasaptati*, *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 Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (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 *Triśaraṇasaptati* 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 Abhayākara Gupta (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 Blo gros mtha’ yas (1813–1899)⁵ to the present.

¹ The Sanskrit at the beginning of all versions consulted is *Tri-śaraṇa-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 *Triśaraṇa[-gamana]-saptati*: see Palmyr Cordier, *Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale. Troisième partie, Index du Bstan-ḥgyur (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 °*śaraṇasaptati*, while the “Index de Saint-Pétersbourg” (not available to us) gives °*saraṇasaptati*; for the second he notes that both the original and the “Index de Saint-Pétersbourg” read °*saraṇasaptatika*, for which he suggests a corrected form °*śaraṇa[gamana]sāptatika* (with a question mark). Modern catalogues like those of D and P also give *Triśaraṇa[-gamana]-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 Kuijp, “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 Triśaraṇasaptati, the Septuagint on the Three Refuges*, 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/Aparaśaila 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 *sāstras* like Haribhadra's (c. eighth century)⁶ *Abhisamayālaṅkāralokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā*, the text does not survive in Sanskrit.⁷ Verse 33 also occurs – again in connection with refuge – in the *Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṅgrahaṭīkā*. 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:

shā ri'i lung las dgra bcom pas ||
byang chub sems dpa' phyag byas nyid ||
'di dag dkon mchog gsum gzhan min ||
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:

Part Four: Systems of Buddhist Tantra, The Indestructible Way of Secret Mantra, tr. by Elio Guarisco and Ingrid McLeod, Ithaca: Snow Lion, 2005, p. 74.

⁶ Date after Nakamura (1980), p. 260.

⁷ As Sørensen notes, two verses (12, 13) are identical to *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* 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 Śrīghanācārasaṅgrahaṭīkā*, 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 Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha and the Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṅgrahaṭīkā," *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 *Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha* and Jayarakṣita were not Mahāsāṃghikas, but belonged to a *nikāya* that was related to the Mahāsāṃghikas."

| | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | <i>shā ri'i lung las dgra bcom pas</i>
<i>byang chub sems dpa' phyag byas nyid</i> | G 3365 ⁹ | N ₁ ¹⁰ | P 5366 ¹¹ | |
| 2 | <i>shar ri'i lung las dgra bcom pas</i>
<i>byang chub sems dpa' phyag byas nyid</i> | C ¹² | TCRC ¹³ | D 3971 ¹⁴ | |
| 3 | <i>shar ri'i lung las dgra bcom pas</i>
<i>byang chub sems dpa' phyag 'tshal nyid</i> | 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 N₁ 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 kṛta*) 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 Āgamas” 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 *Dharmaskandha* 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 51*b*, *byang chub sems dpa' phyag byas nyid*, which does not really make good sense grammatically. Here Abhayākara Gupta and Gung thang pa III Dkon mchog bstan pa'i sgron me (1762–1823)¹⁹ read *byang chub sems 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 bsdur 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 bstan slob gling bod brgyud nang bstan zhib 'jug khang, *Jo bo'i chos chung brgya rtsa*, Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2002 (Gang can rig brgya'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 (*Sarvākārajñatā*) of 'Jam dbyang shes pa's exegesis on the Prajñāpāramitā,”²⁰ which cites and comments on the verse:

zla ba'i skyabs 'gro bdun cu pa las kyang |

shar ri'i lung las dgra bcom gyis |
byang chub sems dpar phyag bya ste ||
de ni dkon mchog gsum gzhan min ||
sangs rgyas khungs su gtogs par 'dod ||

*ces nyan thos dgra bcom 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 sems dpa' rnam kyis rdzu 'phrul ji lta ba de ltar yang | nyan thos dang rang sangs rgyas rnam kyis yul yang ma lags pas | byang chub sems 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 sems dpa' rnam dgra bcom gyis kyang phyag 'os su sgrub snang ba der ltos.*²¹

Furthermore, according to Candra[kīrti]'s *Trisaraṇasaptati*:

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*, *liṅga*) of a Buddha at the conventional level (**saṃvṛti-buddha*). Abhay[ākaragupta] 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

rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2002, pp. 510–512.

²⁰ Dkon mchog bstan pa'i sgron me, “Phar phyin skabs dang po'i mtha' dpyod kyis mchan 'grel rtsom 'phro,” *Dkon mchog bstan pa'i sgron me'i gsung 'bum*, Lhasa: Zhol par ma, 2000. TBRC W22112. 2, 7–226.

²¹ Ibid. 98b4–99a1.

²² For a similar citation from the *Bodhisatva-piṭaka* 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 *Munimatālanākāra*,²³ which gives us an alternate translation of verse 51, as well as more context:²⁴

shar ri'i lung las dgra bcom gyis ||
byang chub sems dpa' phyag bya ste ||
dkon mchog gsum las phyi rol min ||
*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 sems dpa' rnams kyi rdzu 'phrul ji lta ba de lta yang nyan thos dang rang sangs rgyas rnams kyi yul yang ma lags pas byang chub sems dpa' la phyag 'tshal lo zhes shar gyi ri la gnas pa'i byang chub sems 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 Aparāśailas listed by Candrakīrti in *Triśaraṇasaptati* verses 57–59.

Reading verse 51 as cited in Dkon mchog bstan pa'i sgron me and the *Munimatālanākāra* citation, and taking into account the variants listed above, we can propose a revised reading of *Triśaraṇasaptati*:

| <i>Munimatālanākāra</i> | <i>Triśaraṇasaptati</i> |
|--|---|
| <i>shar ri'i lung las dgra bcom gyis </i>
<i>byang chub sems dpa' phyag bya ste </i>
<i>dkon mchog gsum las phyi rol min </i>
<i>sangs rgyas nang du 'dus par dgongs </i> | <i>shar ri'i lung las dgra bcom pas </i>
<i>byang chub sems dpa' phyag 'tshal nyid </i>
<i>'di dag dkon mchog gsum gzhan min </i>
<i>sangs rgyas khongs su gtogs par 'dod </i> |
| Dkon mchog bstan pa'i sgron me | |
| <i>shar ri'i lung las dgra bcom gyis </i>
<i>byang chub sems dpar phyag bya ste </i>
<i>de ni dkon mchog gsum gzhan min </i>
<i>sangs rgyas khungs su gtogs par 'dod </i> | |

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

²⁷ See Peter Skilling, “A Citation from the **Buddhavaṃsa* of the Abhayagiri School,” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XVIII (1993), pp. 165–175; “Citations from the Scriptures of the ‘Eighteen Schools’ in the Tarkajvālā,” in Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann (eds.), *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, Swisttal-Odendorf, 1997 (Indica et Tibetica 30), pp. 605–614. See also Eckel, (2009) pp. 164–173.

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 *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, of which the *Daoxing Banre¹ 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 inadvertently. 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 Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 道行般若經詞典,² a glossary of the *Daoxing Banre jing* 道行般若經 by Lokakṣema (Lk). I selected approximately 1500 words from this translation, focussing 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 *Aṣṭasāhasrikā 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 (Zfn), 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 ruo* or *ban re*, should be pronounced *ban re*, due to its being originally a transliteration of the Gāndhārī form *prañā* 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 Buddhology 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 鳩摩羅什 (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 Prajñāpāramitā* 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* 大度經 (T. 8, no. 225), translated by Zhi Qian 支謙 (fl. ca. 220~257 C.E.)³

Zfn = *Mohebanre chao jing* 摩訶般若鈔經 (T. 8, no. 226), translated by Tanmopi 曇摩婢 or Dharmapriya and Zhu Fonian 竺佛念⁴ 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 Chusheng 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. 晝夜弊魔常索佛便，常亂世間人。

AS.39.20 = R.78.16 = AAA.243.22. *Māra*~ *pāpīyas*~ (“*Māra*, the Evil One”); ZQ.484c7. 邪; Zfn.516a20.-; Kj.544a11. 魔; Xz(I).778b27. 惡魔; Xz(II).875b28. 惡魔; Sh.599b9. 諸魔衆

本無 “nothingness; non-existence; non-existent; absolutely does not exist”

Lk.449c29. 恒薩阿竭知色之本無。如知色本無，痛痒、思想、生死、識亦爾。

AS.134.12 = R.271.3 = AAA.557.9. *tathatā* (“Suchness”); ZQ.491c23. 本無; Zfn.-; Kj.558b10. 如; Xz(I).816c4. 眞如; Xz(II).893c17. 眞如; Sh.631b15. 如

當來 “future, in the future”

Lk.431c28. 過去、當來、今現在佛、天中天皆爲人中尊，悉於其中作佛。

AS.28.19 = R.56.11 = AAA.206.14. *-anāgata-* (“future”); ZQ.484a8. 當來; 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. 未來

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-existing 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* 摩訶般若鈔經 and Kumārajīva’s *Xiaopin Banreboluomi jing* 小品般若波羅蜜經, 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，我終不斷功德法。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，不斷功德也。悉欲使取經中極尊法，使上至佛。(No. 225, 482b14f.)

Zfn. 正使是輩人索菩薩道，我亦勸助之，不斷其功德。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。終不斷其功德。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 jing* 維摩詰經 (T. 14, no. 474) is the oldest extant translation. However, according to the catalogues of the Chinese Tripiṭaka, namely the *Lidai Sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀 and *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄,⁵ 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 *Sukhāvativyūha*⁷, namely the (*Da*) *Amituo jing* (大)阿彌陀經 (T. 12, no. 362)⁸ and the *Wuliangqingjing Pingdengjue jing* 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* 樓夷亘羅 (*Lokeśvara*), 曇摩迦 (*Dharmākara*) are used in the former, while, in the latter, the translations *Wuliangqingjing* 無量清淨, *Shiraowang* 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 jing* 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* 歷代三寶紀, 57a21f., Zhi Qian's *Weimojie jing* 維摩詰經 is described as follows: “*Weimojie Suoshuo Busiyi Famen jing* 維摩詰所說不思議法門經, three *juans*. It is also entitled *Foshuo Purudaomen jing* 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* 魏吳錄 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 *Amitābhavyūha*, *Amitābhasya vyūha* or the like in the original texts of the Chinese, Tibetan translations as well as in the older Sanskrit manuscripts, and the name *Sukhāvativyūha*, 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 Sanyesāfo Salou{fo}tan Guodu Rendao jing* 阿彌陀三耶三佛薩樓{佛}檀過度人道經 —— the second *fo* 佛 is to be deleted according to ancient catalogues —, while some editions read *Amituo jing* 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 薩樓{佛}檀 is a corruption of *hélougèn* 盧樓亘, which is an incomplete transliteration of *Avalokitasvara*. This title, then, may mean that “*Amitā(b)ha* **samyāsambuddha* (and) *Avalokitasvara* 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(b)ha*'s *parinirvāṇa*, *Avalokitasvara* will succeed him as a Buddha and begin to rescue (*guòdù* 過度) human beings and other various sentient beings as *Amitā(b)ha* does. The title *Amituo jing* 阿彌陀經, as some editions read, might have been the original translation of the title of its underlying text, which was presumably **Amitāha*(< *Amitābha*)-*vyūha*. Only after the appearance of the translation of the *Smaller Sukhāvativyūha* by Kumārajīva, which was eventually entitled *Amituo jing* 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 jing* 大阿彌陀經 came into being. In this article, I shall, therefore, use the designation “(*Da*) *Amituo jing* (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's⁹.

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 黠 to 慧, 智

The character 黠 (*xiá*) 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 *xiá* 黠 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. “譬若男子得象，觀其脚。於須菩提意云何？是男子爲黠不？”須菩提

⁹ Cf. Harrison 2002:179~181. The counter-arguments by Fujita (2007: 39f.), who credits it to Zhi Qian, are awkward.

¹⁰ The *Hanyu Dacidian* 漢語大詞典 quotes examples from the *Baopuzi* 抱樸子 and the *Houhanshu* 後漢書 (HD.12.1363a[1]).

¹¹ Cf. note 1.

言：“爲不點。”

ZQ.490c2. 點(←點); KJ.556a19. 智; Xz(I).810c16. 點; 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，無有能過是點者。

ZQ.495c13.-(無能過者); Zfn.528b17.-(無有能過); 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. 譬如工匠點師剋(v.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. 工匠點師; KJ.576a16. 工匠; Xz(I).851a8. 巧匠 = 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；諸未得歸者爲得自歸；爲人故作法舍；無目者使得點目。”

ZQ.502a22. 慧眼; KJ.576c7. 光明 = Xz(I).852c26 = Xz(II).916b8 = Sh.662c18

Lk.475b8f. 般若波羅蜜者，…… (c4f.)亦入於好中，亦入於不好中，亦入於善中，亦入於不善中，亦入於點中，亦入於不點中，亦入於明中，亦入於不明中，……

ZQ.506c4. 智不智

Lk.476b21f. 所以作佛像者，但欲使人得其福耳。不用一事成佛像，亦不用二事成。有金，有點人，若有見佛時人。

ZQ.507a27. 智(人)

Lk.477c7f. 諸所有經法，阿難！若干種所見相、種種所行、若干種根、若干種點、若干種癡、若干種慧、人民輩所求盡、所求慧、但薩阿竭，悉都盧，阿難！悉從般若波羅蜜中出。

ZQ.508a1.-

Lk.437a18f. 般若波羅蜜當點慧學。其福倍益多。

ZQ.486a6. 景明; Zfn.518c27. 點慧; 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，常於善人點慧中生，在工談語、曉經書家生。

ZQ.495c6. 大明(卿八正談)(?); Zfn.528a28. 點慧; KJ.565b13. 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，其人遠離八惡處生，其人點慧信於佛。

ZQ.507b17. 慧(信於佛)

(1.2) From 曉 to 知

In the *Daoxing Banre jing* (Lk), the word *xiǎo* 曉, 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 Banreboluomi jing* (Kj), it does not occur at all and, instead, its synonym *zhī* 知 is used. E.g.:

Lk.465a15f. 未得道者，愚癡，不曉是法，不見是事。

ZQ.500c27f. 未得道者，愚癡，不曉是法，不見其事。; KJ.574b7f. 凡夫不知不見一切法本清淨相。

(1.3) From 索 to 求

In the *Daoxing Banre jing* (Lk), the word *suǒ* 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.470c23f. 須菩提白佛言：“薩陀波倫菩薩本何因緣索般若波羅蜜？”

ZQ.503c-4. 彼何因索明度？； KJ.580a-5f. 薩陀波倫菩薩云何求般若波羅蜜？；

Sh.668a24f. 常啼菩薩摩訶薩作何方便，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* 摩訶般若鈔經 (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:

| | | |
|---|---|-----------|
| 我 | <i>Daoxing Banre jing</i> (Lk) | 375 times |
| | <i>Da Mingdu jing</i> (excluding the first <i>juan</i>) (ZQ) | 224 times |
| | <i>Mohebanre chao jing</i> (Zfn) | 170 times |
| | <i>Xiaopin Banreboluomi jing</i> (Kj) | 432 times |
| 吾 | <i>Daoxing Banre jing</i> (Lk) | 0 |
| | <i>Da Mingdu jing</i> (excluding the first <i>juan</i>) (ZQ) | 20 times |
| | <i>Mohebanre chao jing</i> (Zfn) | 0 |
| | <i>Xiaopin Banreboluomi jing</i> (Kj) | 0 |

E.g.:

Lk.461c19f. 使我無得生是惡心。一切使我心無瑕穢。我設有是不善，疾使我棄。

ZQ.499b4f. 使吾無生穢濁惡心； Zfn.534c17. 使我無得生是惡心； KJ.571b13f. 我當如是勲行精進，得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提時，無如是惡； Xz(I).839b11. 我不應起如彼惡人所起過患 = Xz(II).910a18; Sh.653c18f. 願我當於一切時一切處遠離如是一切魔事

Lk.473a14f. 自念言：“我曹義不可於車上載。當下步入國耳。”

ZQ.505a28. 吾等義當下車步行入城； KJ.583b14f. 我等不應載車趣曇無竭菩薩； Sh.672c12. 我等

Lk.473b10f. 薩陀波倫菩薩及五百女人……(13f.)爲曇無竭菩薩作禮。遶八百匝已，作是言：“我曹亦當復逮得尊經，亦當復如是。”

ZQ.505b13. 願吾等進高行獲尊經； KJ.583c18f. 我等以是善根因緣於未來世當得作佛； Sh.673b12. 我

Lk.474b-8f. 是時弊魔自念言：“未嘗有是。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.506a9. 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 *wú* 吾, meaning “I”, never occurs:

- No. 280: *Dousha jing* 兜沙經: 我(43 times); 吾(0)
 No. 313: *Achufoguo jing* 阿闍佛國經: 我(122 times); 吾(0)
 No. 350: *Yiyue Monibao jing* 遺日(←日)摩尼寶經: 我(41 times); 吾(1 time¹²)
 No. 807: *Neicang Baibao jing* 內藏百寶經: 我(3 times); 吾(0)

On the other hand, in Zhi Qian’s translations, *wú* 吾 occurs quite often:

- No. 6: *Bannihuan jing* 般泥洹經: 我(87 times); 吾(42 times)
 No. 185: *Taizi Ruiying Benqi jing* 太子瑞應本起經: 我(85 times); 吾(39 times)
 No. 281: *Pusa Benye jing* 菩薩本業經: 我(4 times); 吾(1 time)
 No. 474: *Weimojie jing* 維摩詰經: 我(173 times); 吾(39 times)
 No. 632: *Huiyin Sanmei jing* 慧印三昧經: 我(44 times); 吾(12 times)
 No. 198: *Yizu jing* 義足經: 我(146 times); 吾(4 times)

Dharmarakṣa used *wú* 吾 more often than Zhi Qian.

- No. 222: *Guangzan jing* 光讚經: 我(255 times); 吾(89 times)
 No. 266: *Aweiyuezhizhe jing* 阿惟越致遮經: 我(53 times); 吾(85 times)
 No. 263: *Zheng Fahua jing* 正法華經: 我(247 times); 吾(213 times)
 No. 285: *Jianbei Yiqiezhide jing* 漸備一切智德經: 我(47 times); 吾(48 times)
 No. 292: *Dushipin jing* 度世品經: 我(32 times); 吾(46 times)
 No. 381: *Dengjizhongde Sanmei jing* 等集衆德三昧經: 我(38 times); 吾(26 times)

In contrast to Zhi Qian and Dharmarakṣa, Kumārajīva scarcely used *wú* 吾 as the first person pronoun.

- No. 286: *Shizhu jing* 十住經: 我(121 times); 吾(0)
 No. 223: *Mohe Banreboluomi jing* 摩訶般若波羅蜜經:
 我(1186 times); 吾(9 times: all “吾我” *ātman*)
 No. 382: *Ji Yiqie Fude Sanmei jing* 集一切福德三昧經: 我(76 times); 吾(1 time)
 No. 1509: *Da Zhidu lun* 大智度論: 我(3838 times); 吾(68 times: all “吾我” *ātman*)
 No. 475: *Weimojie Suoshuo jing* 維摩詰所說經: 我(215 times); 吾(9 times)¹³
 Cf. Zhi Qian’s *Weimojie jing* 維摩詰經: 我(173 times); 吾(39 times)
 No. 262: *Miaofa Lianhua jing* 妙法蓮華經: 我(621 times); 吾(11 times)¹⁴

¹² 吾, rendering of Skt. *ātman* or *pudgala*, occurs in the following phrase: 無吾、無我、無人。

¹³ All the nine instances of *wú* 吾 in No. 475 (Kj) are none other than borrowings from Zhi Qian’s translation of the same sutra, namely the *Weimojie jing* 維摩詰經(No.474; abbr. ZQ): T.14, No.475, Kj.541a27f. 我即答言: “仁者! 吾見此釋迦牟尼佛土三千大千世界如觀掌中菴摩勒果。” = T.14, No.474, ZQ.522c29f. 我答言: “仁者! 吾於是三千大千佛國, 如於掌中觀寶冠耳。”; Kj.542c13f. 答我言: “吾從道場來。” = ZQ.524a24f.; Kj. 544c7f. 一切衆魔及諸外道皆吾侍也 = ZQ.525c23f. 一切衆魔皆是吾養, 彼諸轉者亦吾養也; Kj. 546b17. 此座高廣, 吾不能昇 = ZQ.527b6f. 此座為高廣, 吾不能昇; Kj. 548a10f. 解脫者無所言說。故吾於是不知所云 = ZQ.528c7f. 眞解者無所言取。故吾於是不知所云; Kj. 548b1. 吾止此室十有二年 = ZQ.528c23f. 十有二年吾止此室; Kj. 548c10f. 佛化所生, 吾如彼生 = ZQ.529a29f.; Kj. 555b18f. 吾當不起于座接妙喜國鐵圍、山川、溪谷、江河…… = ZQ.535a4f. 吾當止此師子座不起, 為現妙樂世界鐵圍、山川、溪谷、江湖……; Kj. 556a13f. 佛言: “善哉, 善哉! 天帝! 如汝所說。吾助爾喜。” = 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 *wú* 吾 as the first person pronoun is hardly ever used, in his translation of the Lotus Sutra, namely the *Miaofa 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 *wú* 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* 佉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 *wú* 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* 佉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 竺法護 in the catalogues, while some modern scholars assume that it was translated by Lokakṣema. In this translation, the word *wǒ* 我 occurs 12 times, while *wú* 吾 does not appear at all. Therefore, we may assume that this translation was not by Dharmarakṣa, who was fond of using *wú* 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 *Sukhāvativyūha*.

No. 361: *Wuliangqingjing Pingdengjue 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 *wú* 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 *wú* 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

word occurs 213 times: Kj.12c26f. 今此幼童皆是吾子, 愛無偏黨 = Dr.75b28f. 今此幼童皆是吾子, 寵敬等愛, 意無偏黨. The other instances differ from the sentences in Dharmarakṣa's translation: Kj.5c1f. 吾從成佛已來, 種種因緣、種種譬喻廣演言教 = Dr.68a6.-; Kj.7a6f. 吾當為汝分別解說 = Dr.69b18. 吾當解說; Kj.11b9f. 吾今於天、人、沙門、婆羅門等大衆中說 = Dr.74a22f. 今吾班告天上世間沙門、梵志、諸天、人民、阿須倫; Kj.14b22f. 吾為汝等 造作此車 隨意所樂 可以遊戲 = Dr.77b17f. 遊戲之具 子所好慕 吾皆辦之 調隱音節; Kj.14c20f. 一切衆生 皆是吾子 深著世樂 無有慧心 = Dr.77c24f. 一切衆庶 皆是我子 為三界欲 所見纏縛; Kj.14c26f. 今此三界 皆是我有 其中衆生 悉是吾子 = Dr.77c29f. 則常應時 將護三處 彼見燒炙 皆斯(v.l. 斯皆)吾子; Kj.15a15f. 告, 舍利弗! 汝諸人等 皆是吾子 我則是父 = Dr.78b2f. 佛則於彼 諸仁(←人)者父; Kj.17b10f. 此是我子, 我之所生. 於某城中, 捨吾逃走, 伶俜辛苦五十餘年. 其本字某. 我名某甲. 此實我子. 我實其父. = Dr.80c21f. 斯是吾子, 則吾所生. 名字為某. 捨我流迸二三十年. 今乃相得. 斯則吾子. 吾則是父. ; Kj.22a17. 吾今當說 汝等善聽 = Dr.88b15.-; Kj.31a25. 吾滅後惡世 能持是經者 = Dr.88b15.-. It is presumable that Kumārajīva's assistant(s) or somebody in his translating team of the Lotus Sutra preferred the classical form *wú* 吾. The word *wú* 吾 occurs three times also in the chapter, *Devadatta (Tīpodaduo pin* 提婆達多品), of the text in question (No.262): 34b24f. 吾於過去無量劫中, 求法華經無有懈倦 = Dr.105a28f. 吾往無數難稱限劫, 求法華經; 34c2f. 誰能為我說大乘者, 吾當終身供給走使 = Dr.105b4f. 有能為吾演天典者, 吾當為僕, 供給走使; 34c16. 若能修行者 吾當為汝說 = Dr.105b16.-. However, this chapter is not a translation by Kumārajīva but a later interpolation (cf. Karashima 1992: 332, 2001: 393).

¹⁵ T.12, No.361, (translated by Zhi Qian?; abbr. ZQ[?]).280b21. 吾誓得佛者 普速得此事; 288b11. 吾等類得是德 諸此利獲所好; 288b24. 佛授盧樓亘決 今吾說仁諦聽; 288c02. 吾所願皆具足 從衆國來生者. These verses are wanting in the (*Da*) *Amituo jing*.

interpolated part.

(1.5) Lokakṣema 汝 > Zhi Qian and Zhu Fonian 若 > Kumārajīva 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. Kumārajīva used *rǔ* 汝 again in his translation.

| | | |
|---|--|-----------|
| 汝 | <i>Daoxing Banre jing</i> 道行般若經 (Lk) | 100 times |
| | <i>Da Mingdu jing</i> 大度經 (ZQ; excluding the first <i>juan</i>) | 3 times |
| | <i>Mohebanre chao jing</i> 摩訶般若鈔經 (Zfn) | 4 times |
| | <i>Xiaopin Banreboluomi jing</i> 小品般若經 (Kj) | 176 times |

E.g.:

Lk.454c29f. 弊魔復化作其師被服，往到菩薩所，詭語：“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”)莫復說是事，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. 汝若捨離，不復聽受，我當常至汝所。汝所聞者非佛所說

Lk.468c10f. 佛語阿難：“持是般若波羅蜜囑累汝。阿難！我爲汝所說經，捨置般若波羅蜜、摩訶漚瑟拘舍羅及諸摩訶惟日羅，我每所說餘經汝所受。……”

ZQ.502c16f. 持是明度囑累若(v.l. 汝)，我所說餘經若所受； Kj.577c18. 我今以般若波羅蜜囑累於汝

Lk.468c23f. 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。

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. 囑累汝般若波羅蜜，以爲信。

ZQ.502c22. 囑累若； Kj.578a9. 以般若波羅蜜囑累於汝

Lk.469a6. 汝日日教人。

ZQ.502c26. 若日(←日)教人； Kj.578a28. 汝若因小乘法爲小乘人說； Xz(I).856a26. 假使汝爲聲聞乘人說聲聞法 = Xz(II).918b28

However, Zhi Qian and Zhu Fonian used *rǔ* 汝 quite often in their translations of other texts.

Zhi Qian

| | |
|--|----------|
| No. 6: <i>Bannihuan jing</i> 般泥洹經, 2 <i>juans</i> : | 51 times |
| No. 68: <i>Laizhaheluo jing</i> 賴吒和羅經, 1 <i>juan</i> : | 31 times |
| No. 185: <i>Taizi Ruiying Benqi jing</i> 太子瑞應本起經, 2 <i>juans</i> : | 32 times |
| No. 198: <i>Yizu jing</i> 義足經, 2 <i>juans</i> : | 28 times |
| No. 474: <i>Weimojie jing</i> 維摩詰經, 2 <i>juans</i> : | 49 times |

Zhu Fonian

| | |
|--|-----------|
| No. 212: <i>Chuyao jing</i> 出曜經, 30 <i>juans</i> : | 394 times |
|--|-----------|

No. 309: *Zuisheng Wen Pusashizhu Chugouduanjie jing*

最勝問菩薩十住除垢斷結經, 10 juans: 66 times

No. 385: *Zhongyin jing* 中陰經, 2 juans: 47 times

No. 384: *Pusa Cong Doushutian Jiangshen Mutai Shuo Guangpu jing*

菩薩從兜術天降神母胎說廣普經, 7 juans: 146 times

It is not clear why Zhi Qian and Zhu Fonian changed *rǔ* 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 *rǔ* 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？諸佛教汝令問我耶？若自從智出乎？

Lk(?).300b7f. 汝所問者，甚深大快，多所度脫

ZQ(?).279c20. 若所問者，甚深快善，多所度脫。

Lk(?).300b12f. 汝所問者甚深，汝乃慈心於佛所，……

ZQ(?).279c24f. 若所問者大深，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. 儻有疑意不解經者，復前問佛。爲汝解之。

ZQ(?).294c12f. 儻有疑意不解經者，復前問佛。佛當爲若解之。

Lk(?).317a7. 汝欲知者，明聽著心中。

ZQ(?).299a8f. 若欲知者，明聽著心中。

Lk(?).317c3f. 我般泥洹去後，汝曹及後世人，無得復言：“我不信有阿彌陀佛國。”

ZQ(?).299c6f. 我般泥洹去後{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 *ruòcáo* 若曹 occurs three times consecutively in No. 362 (abbr. Lk[?]) but is replaced by *rǔcáo* 汝曹 in No. 361 (abbr. ZQ[?]):

Lk(?).317c6f. 我具爲若曹道說經戒、慎法。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. 我具爲汝曹道說經戒、慎(←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 *rǔ* 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, focussing 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 *cí* 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 *Liji* and Wang Yinglin’s *Kunxuejiwen*: 《莊子·漁父》：“事親則慈孝。”；《禮記·內則》：“父子皆異宮，昧爽而朝，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 *cí* 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 *cí* 慈, *cíxiào* 慈孝, *cíxīn* 慈心 and so on, meaning “respect for (the Buddha or the Buddha’s Dharma)”.

(2.1) *cí* 慈¹⁶

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。其人即自了知諸天所不解者，便自解。

AS.42.3 = R.83.21 = AAA.252.6f. *dharmā-gauravena* (“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。汝持是慈孝恭敬於般若波羅蜜中。如是，阿難！汝恭敬於是中，悉為供養諸佛已。……”

AS.260.23f. = R.528.12f. = AAA.990.13f. *paricarito 'smi ... tvayā maitrena kāyakarmanā manaāpena maitrena vākkarmanā manaāpena maitrena manahkarmanā manaāpena ... tvayā mamaitarhi tiṣṭhato dhriyamānasya yāpayato 'smin samucchrāye prema ca prasādaś 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

¹⁶ Cf. Krsh 2010: 90~91.

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。心所念句當令了了分明。心所念，餘悉棄之，……”

ZQ.508a28f. 若慈於佛不？…… 若以弘慈報<佛>恩備矣。；Zfn.-；Kj.-

(2.2) *cíxīn* 慈心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。

AS.228.15 = AAA.871.3. *hitaisitayā premato vā gauravato vā* (“with solicitude, affection, respect”); ZQ.502c20. (若有)慈心(於佛者); Zfn.-; Kj.577c25. (欲)以慈心(恭敬供養我者); Xz(I).855c5. (起)殷淨心 = Xz(II).918a12; Sh.664b29. (於我生)歡喜心

(2.3) *cíxiào* 慈孝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。…… 汝慈孝於佛，恭敬、思念於佛，不如恭敬於般若波羅蜜。

AS.228.22 = AAA.871.13. *yadi te ... aham priyo manāpo 'parityaktas tathāgatas* (If I, being the *Tathāgata*, am dear and pleasing to you, and you do not abandon me”); ZQ.502c21f. 若慈孝於佛; Zfn.-; Kj.577c29f. 汝若愛重不捨於我; 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. 是時薩陀波倫菩薩及五百女人各自取刀，處處刺身出血，持用灑地。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。”

AS.258.10 = AAA.984.5. *dharmakāma* (“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！汝恭敬於是中，悉為供養諸佛已。……”

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。……”

ZQ.508a11. 用慈孝於佛故

Cíxiào 慈孝 in the above-quoted sentences is a compound of two synonyms, meaning “(filial) respect”.

(2.4) *zhòngjìngcí* 重敬慈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。

¹⁷ Cf. Krsh 2010: 92~93.

¹⁸ The *Hanyu Dacidian* quotes the following example from the *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.

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。

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) *cíxīn* 慈心, *xiàocí* 孝慈 and *cíxiào* 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[?]), *cíxīn* 慈心 and *xiàocí* 孝慈, both meaning “respect”, occur quite often.

(2.5.1) *cíxīn* 慈心

This expression occurs 18 and 17 times in No. 362 and No. 361, respectively. E.g.:
Lk(?).300b10f. 佛言阿難：“……汝所問者甚深。汝乃慈心於佛所。……”

ZQ(?).279c24f. 若所問者大深，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. 佛甚難得值，經道甚難得聞，我曹皆慈心於佛所。

Lk(?).313a16f. 佛告阿逸菩薩：“若言是實當爾。若有慈心於佛所者，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. 皆悉見無量清淨佛光明，莫不慈心，歡喜作善者。

(2.5.2) *xiàocí* 孝慈

Lk(?).317c12f. 佛言：“師開導人耳目，智慧明達，度脫人，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，即得道疾。”

ZQ(?).299c15. 常當慈孝於佛如父母

The expression *xiàocí* 孝慈 is a compound of two synonyms, meaning “filial respect for one’s parents”.²⁰ The translator of No. 361, probably Zhi Qian, altered it to *cíxiào* 慈孝, which we shall now consider.

(2.5.3) *cíxiào* 慈孝

The expression *cíxiào* 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，爲善，慈孝，布施恩德。

ZQ(?).295c8f. 皆其前世宿命，爲善，慈孝，布恩施德。

Lk(?).315a12f. 如是曹人男子、女人，心意俱然違戾反逆，……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 Dacidian* (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).

Lk(?) .316a6f. 齋戒清淨, 莫不歡喜, 和順義理, 歡樂慈孝, 自相約檢, = ZQ
(?) .298a12f.

Cíxiào 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.

Bibliography, Abbreviations and Signs

- AAA = *Abhisamayālaṅkāra'āloka Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā: The Work of Haribhadra*, together with the text commented on, ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo 1932: The Toyo Bunko; Reprint: Tokyo 1973: Sankibō Busshorin.
- AS = *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā with Haribhadra's Commentary called Āloka*, edited by P.L. Vaidya, Darbhanga: The Mithila Inst. of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1960 (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, no. 4).
- Dr = Dharmarakṣa 竺法護
Fujita, Kotatsu 藤田宏達
2007 *Jōdo Sanbukyō no Kenkyū* 淨土三部經の研究 [A Study of the Three Pure Land Sūtras], Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Harrison, Paul, Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Kazunobu Matsuda
2002 “Larger Sukhāvativyūhasūtra”, in: *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 2, ed. Jens Braarvig et al., Oslo 2002 (Hermes Publishing), pp. 179-214.
- HD = *Hanyu Dacidian* 漢語大詞典, 13 Bde, Shanghai 1986~1994: Hanyu Dacidian Chubanshe 漢語大詞典出版社.
- Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋靜志
1992 *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra — in the light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions*, Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin (Bibliotheca Indologica et Buddhologica 3).
2001 *A Glossary of Kumārajīva's Translation of the Lotus Sutra* 妙法蓮華經詞典, Tokyo 2001: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica IV).
2010 “*Amida Jōdo no Genfūkei*” 阿彌陀淨土の原風景 [The Original Landscape of Amitābha's "Pure Land"], in: *Bukkyū Daigaku Sōgōkenkyūjo Kiyō* 佛教大学総合研究所紀要 [Bulletin of the Research Institute of Bukkyo University], vol. 17 (2010), pp. 15~44.
- Kj = Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什
Krsh 2010 = *A Glossary of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 道行般若經詞典, Tokyo 2010: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XI).

Lamotte, Étienne

1994 *The Teaching of Vimalakīrti: (Vimalakīrtinirdeśa)*, from the French translation with introduction and notes (L'enseignement de Vimalakīrti) by Etienne Lamotte, rendered into English by Sara Boin, Oxford: The Pali Text Society (Sacred Books of the Buddhists, vol. 32).

Lk = Zhi Loujiachen 支婁迦讖 or Lokakṣema (fl. ca. 170~190 CE)

Nattier, Jan

2008 *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods*, Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica X).

R = *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, ed. Rajendralala Mitra, Calcutta 1887~1888: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal (Bibliotheca Indica 110).

Sh = *Fomuchushengsanfazang 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~(?).

T = *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, ed. Junjirō Takakusu, Kaikyoku Watanabe, 100 vols., Tokyo 1924~1934.

v.l. = varia lectio (variant reading)

Xz = Xuanzang 玄奘

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.

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

Zfn = Zhu Fonian 竺佛念

ZQ = Zhi Qian 支謙

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

- = absence of the parallel(s)

← = $\alpha \leftarrow \beta$: the Chinese character β should be changed to α

{ } = superfluous Chinese character

< > = omitted Chinese character(s)

The Meaning of *Yulanpen* 盂蘭盆 — "Rice Bowl" on *Pravāraṇā* Day*

Seishi KARASHIMA

(1) *Yulanpen* 盂蘭盆, *Yulanpen jing* 盂蘭盆經 and *Yulan jing* 盂蘭經

Yulanpen 盂蘭盆 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* 盂蘭盆經 (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 text¹. 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 *Chusanjangji ji* 出三藏記集, which was compiled in the Liang Tianlan Period (502~519 C.E.)². The *Lidai Sanbao ji* 歷代三寶記 (597 C.E.) was the first to ascribe this text to Dharmarakṣa³. 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* 聞如是 occur in it.⁴ However, these old expressions themselves, which are, in fact, found in pre-Kumārajīva translations⁵, 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.⁶

* 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. 盂蘭經一卷.

³ T. 49, 64a28. 盂蘭經一卷.

⁴ Iwamoto 1979: 9f.

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. Krsh(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* 聞如是 instead of *wowenrushi* 我聞如是. Thus, Iwamoto's doubts concerning this sutra are groundless.

⁶ See Seishi Karashima "A Study of the Language of Early Chinese Buddhist Translations: A Comparison between the Translations by Lokakṣema and Zhi Qian", § 1.4, in this volume.

From the sixth century onwards, various references to this text and the festival began to appear. Quotes from the former were used first in the *Jinglü 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.⁷ 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)⁸. A portion of this text is quoted as well in Du Gongzhan (杜公瞻; fl. 600~?)’s commentary on Zong Lin (宗慄)’s *Jingchu Suishi ji* 荆楚歲時記 (A Record of the Seasonal Activities in the Jing-Chu Region; ca. 561 C.E.)⁹. According to Zhipan’s *Fozu Tongji* 佛祖統紀 (compiled between 1258~1269), Emperor Wu of Liang (梁武帝) visited Tongtaisi Temple (同泰寺), which was constructed upon his orders, and held the Yulanpen (盂蘭盆齋) ceremony there in 538 C.E.¹⁰ 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 *Jinglü Yixiang* 經律異相, the text appears to have been originally entitled *Yulan jing* 盂蘭經¹¹. The title *Yulanpen jing* 盂蘭盆經 appears only in relatively later catalogues¹² and texts¹³.

(2) English Translation of the *Yulanpen jing* 盂蘭盆經

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.htm>):

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 Yuezhi (月氏)

Thus have I heard¹⁴. 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 *Śrāvastī*.

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 eyes¹⁵ 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》“有時齋供，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, 351a26.

¹¹ The *Chusanrangji ji* 出三藏記集 (502~519 C.E.), T. 55, 28c2. 盂蘭經一卷; the *Lidai Sanbao ji* 歷代三寶記 (597 C.E.), T. 49, 64a28. *do.*; the *Datang Neidianlu* 大唐內典錄 (664 C.E.), T. 55, no. 2149, 235a17. *do.* (= 242c15); the *Gujin Yijing Tuji* 古今譯經圖記 (664 + C.E.), T. 55, no. 2151, 354a13f. *do.*; *Jinglü Yixiang* 經律異相 T. 53, no. 2121, 74a5. 出盂蘭經 (“From *Yulan jing*”).

¹² The *Dazhou Kanding zhongjing Mulu* 大周刊定衆經目錄 (695 C.E.), T. 55, no. 2153, 431c5. 盂蘭盆經一卷 (= 469b24); the *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 (730 C.E.), T. 55, no. 2154, 494c2. 盂蘭盆經一卷亦云盂蘭經 (“*Yulanpen jing*, one *juan*”, also entitled “*Yulan jing*”) (= 685a23, 707b15); the *Zhenyuan Xinding Shijiao Mulu* 貞元新定釋教目錄 (800 C.E.), T. 55, no. 2157, 791c31. 盂蘭盆經一卷亦直云盂蘭經 (“*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 *Māra* (邪魔¹⁶), heretics and ascetics¹⁷ 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 (盆器) for drawing and pouring water, incense, oil, lamps, candles, mattresses and bedding; place the tastiest food in the world in bowls (盆); 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 (鉢和羅飯) 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 (呪願 *dakṣiṇā*) at first for the parents of seven generations for the sake

¹⁶ 邪魔：A rendering of *Māra~pāpīyas~*. Zhi Qian (fl. ca. 220~257 C.E.) constantly rendered *Māra~pāpīyas~* as 邪, 弊邪; cf. Kṛsh(2010) 37f. s.v. 弊魔; *ib.* 757. Dharmarakṣa used the word 邪魔 in another of his translations: T. 15, no. 598, 154a20.

¹⁷ 道士：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)¹⁸ 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*, *bhikṣuṅīs*, 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)¹⁹, they should all, for the sake of their present parents who bore them²⁰ (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 *Pravāraṇā* (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 *Pravāraṇā*, 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 said²¹: “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 to²² seven generations. Every year, on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, they should²³, out of filial respect²⁴,

¹⁸ 應奉盂蘭盆: The *Koryō* (or Korean) Canon and the Taishō Edition have 應奉此盂蘭盆 instead, while the other editions read 應奉盂蘭盆. 此 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* 大度經 by Zhi Qian 支謙), 488b1f. 善業問: “謗誹斷經者, 凡用幾事。” 佛告: “斯士、女無戒。為邪所中故。不樂深經。以斯二事斷明度矣。…… 是為四事。” 善業白佛言: “不觀深歸少有信者。”

²² 乃至: The *Koryō* (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): 當, 常 as well as 嘗 interchange with one another through their common simplified form 尚.

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 (作盂蘭盆施佛及僧) 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 disciples²⁵ 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* (自恣), 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 *Pavāraṇā*), *zizi* 自恣 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. *Āśvina* (September-October) or *Kārttika* (October-November) respectively — the year 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.²⁶ Proceedings of the *Pravāraṇā* day are prescribed in various Vinaya texts.²⁷

The Pāli *Vinaya Piṭaka* states that, on the *Pavāraṇā* 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 Dharmarakṣa’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 四眾 or 四部眾 instead; cf. Krsh(2001) 253, s.v. 四部眾.

²⁶ Cf. Upasak 1975: 147f.; Chung 1998; Kieffer-Pülz 2006.

²⁷ Vin I 157~178; T. 22, no. 1421 (the Vinaya of the Mahīśāsakas), 130c~133c; T. 22, no.1425 (the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghikas), 451a~452a; T. 22, no.1428 (the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka), 835c~843b; T. 23, no. 1435 (the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādins), 165a~173a; the *Pravāraṇāvastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, 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 aññatarasmim āvāse tadahu pavāraṇāya manussehi dānaṃ dentehi yebhuyyena ratti khepitā hoti.*

The Tibetan and Chinese translations²⁹ of the Mūlasarvāstivādins' *Pravāraṇā-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 *Pravāraṇā* day, the king, the queen, prince(s), minister(s), commander(s), city people and village people altogether come to the monastery (*ārāma*). 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.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 *Pravāraṇā* day, and all want to go (to the city), they should perform the *Pravāraṇā* on the fourteenth day and after that go there.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 7th century C.E. for 25 years and later returned in China, translated many Vinaya texts as well as sutras, described the *Pravāraṇā* ceremony, which he witnessed, in detail in his *Nanhai Jigui Neifa zhuang* 南海寄歸內法傳 (A Record of the Buddhism sent Home from the Southern Sea; 691 C.E.). Takakusu translated it as follows³²:

³³Chapter XV Concerning the pravāraṇa-day.

The day on which the summer-retreat ends and the season (lit. the year) closes should be the Sui-i³⁴ (lit. ‘according to one’s wish’ or ‘indulgence,’ *Pravāraṇa*), i.e. pointing out the faults of others, as one likes, according to the three points (i. e.

²⁹ No Sanskrit fragment of this portion is found.

³⁰ Chung 1998: 196f. ‘*di litar yang dgag dbye bco lnga pa de nyid la rgyal po dang / btsun mo dang / gzhon nu dang / blon po dang / khrom gyi ru ba dang / grong mi dang / yul mi dag dang thabs cig tu kun dga’ ra bar lhags la / der rgyal pos kyang dge ’dun la gos dang zang zing gi rnyed pa mang du phul / btsun mo dang / gzhon nu dang / blon po dang / khrom gyi ru ba dang / grong mi dang / yul mi dag gis 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，并諸眷屬。或有大臣、官屬、城內外人亦皆來集，將諸飲食及衣物等，奉施苾芻僧伽，令其呪願。苾芻竟夜呪願，極大辛苦。

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。

³² Takakusu 1896: 86~88.

³³ T. 54, no. 2125, 217b19~c10: 十五隨意成規。凡夏罷歲終之時，此日應名隨意，即是隨他於三事之中，任意舉發，說罪除愆之義。舊云自恣者，是義翻也。必須於十四日夜，請一經師，昇高座，誦佛經。于時俗士雲奔，法徒霧集，燃燈續明，香花供養。明朝總出，旋繞村城，各並虔心，禮詣制底。棚車輿像，鼓樂張天，幡蓋縈羅，飄揚蔽日，名爲三摩近離，譯爲和集。凡大齋日，悉皆如是，即是神州行城法也。禺中始還入寺；日午方爲大齋。過午咸集，各取鮮茅可一把許。手執足蹈，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。被他舉罪，則准法說除。當此時也，或俗人行施，或衆僧自爲，所有施物將至衆前。其五德應問上坐云：“此物得與衆僧爲隨意物不？”上坐答云：“得。”所有衣服、刀子、針錐之流，受已均分。斯其教也。此日所以奉刀針者，意求聰明利智也。隨意既訖，任各東西。即是坐夏已周，無勞更經一宿。廣如餘處。此不詳言。

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 *Pravâraṇa* was *Sse-sse*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 *Sûtra*, 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* (*Sâmagrî*), 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 *Bhikshunîs*; 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 *Pravâraṇa*-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. *Sthaviras*) : ‘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 *Prâvaraṇa* 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 *Pravâraṇā* day, as it is said in the *Yulanpen jing*.

In Theravāda Buddhism, the *Pravâraṇā* (Pāli *Pavâraṇā*) 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. *varṣa* “the rainy season retreat”) in Thai and *Boun Awk Phansa* in Lao. It is also referred to as *Mahāpavâraṇā*. 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

³⁵ 自恣.

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.³⁶

(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 *Siṅgālovāda-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 (*petānaṃ kālakatānaṃ dakkhiṇaṃ anuppadaṣṣāmi*). (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 *pūjā* for (our) deceased, dead parents! May it be an act of *pūjā* 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*.

³⁶ 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* (精霊流し).

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 Sarvāstivādins; T. 1, no. 26, the *Shansheng jing* 善生經 of the same school; T. 1, no.16, the *Shijialuoyue liufangli jing* 尸迦羅越六方禮經 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 Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins. Cf. Hartmann/Wille 2006: 3.

³⁹ Cf. Schopen 1984: 115f. = 1997: 62f.; Irisawa 1989: 4f.; IBInsc I 961f. (Gandhāra I), 1006f. (Taxila 1).

⁴⁰ *saghana danamukhe madapidara[n]a adhvadi<da>na kalagadana puyae bhava(tu) uajayasa sagharamasa adhvadida[saj] puyae] bhavatu (= *saṃghānāṃ dānamukhe mātāpitr̥ṇāṃ adhvātītānāṃ kālagatānāṃ pūjāyai bhavatu! upādhyāyasya saṃghārāṃsya adhvātītasya pūjāyai 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 mātupetiṅvatthu* (“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 (*uddisāhi 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 (*mātu dakkhiṇāya ādisi*). 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” (*chandakabhikṣaṇam*)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 (*asmākaṃ nāmnā dakṣiṇādeśanām kārayitvā*)⁴⁴, so that they could be liberated from the existence of *pretas*⁴⁵. 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 *ganḍī* to be struck. As the *ganḍī* 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 (*dakṣiṇām ādisati*) 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. *dakṣiṇādeśanā*.

⁴⁵ Avś I 257.8f. *teṣāṃ asmākīnāṃ karmaṇaṃ nivedya chandakabhikṣaṇam kṛtvā buddhapramukhaṃ bhikṣusaṃghaṃ bhojayitvā asmākaṃ nāmnā dakṣiṇādeśanām kārayitvā cāsmākaṃ pretayoner mokṣaḥ 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* 盂蘭盆

(5.1) Xuanying’s Interpretation

The meaning of *yulanpen* 盂蘭盆 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 *Yiqiejing Yinyi* 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 盂蘭盆. This word is corrupted. The correct form is *wulanponu* 烏藍婆拏, meaning “hanging upside down”. According to Indian custom, on the *Pravāraṇā* 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 descendent, 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*⁴⁶ is a vessel, in which to store food. This explanation is wrong.⁴⁷

(5.2) Modern Interpretations

In modern times, Buddhist scholars have been speculating for the last 130 years about the Sanskrit form of *wulanpona* 烏藍婆拏 as well as *yulanpen* 盂蘭盆, starting with Bunyiu Nanjio (南條文雄) who reconstructed 烏藍婆拏 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 盂蘭盆 might be Sogdian *urvan* (“soul”), Iranian *ulavān* (<

⁴⁶ The manuscript reads 孟盆, which is presumably a scribal error for 盂蘭盆. In Huilin’s quotation, it reads 盂蘭盆 instead.

⁴⁷ 盂蘭盆：此言訛也。正言烏藍婆拏，此譯云倒懸。案西國法，至於衆僧自恣之日，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，無人祭神請救，則於鬼處受倒懸之苦。”佛雖順俗，亦設祭儀，乃教於三寶田中深起功德。舊云孟盆 (read 盂蘭盆) 是貯食之器，此言誤也。(Zhonghua Dazangjing 中華大藏經, vol. 56, no. 1163, 1014c19f.). This explanation is quoted in Huilin (慧琳)’s *Yiqiejing Yinyi* 一切經音義 as follows: 盂蘭盆：此言訛也。正言烏藍婆拏。此譯云倒懸。案西國法，至於衆僧自恣之日，云先亡有罪，家復絕嗣，亦無人饗祭，則於鬼趣之中受倒懸之苦。佛令於三寶田中，俱具奉施佛僧，祐資彼先亡，以救先亡(←云)倒懸飢餓之苦。舊云孟蘭盆是貯食之器者，此言誤也。(T. 54, no. 2128, 535b13f.).

⁴⁸ Nanjio 1883: 78, no. 303.

artavān māh; 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* 盂蘭盆. The first is that scholars trusted Xuanying (玄應)’s *Yiqiejing Yinyi* 一切經音義 too credulously. As Xuanzang’s assistant, he participated in translating Sanskrit Buddhist scriptures into Chinese and compiled the *Yiqiejing 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 elsewhere⁴⁹. For example, his comments on *manao* 馬腦 = 瑪瑙 are as follows:

manao 馬腦 : In Sanskrit 謨薩羅揭婆 (*musalagarbha*). 謨薩羅 (*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 摩娑羅伽隸 (*masāragalla*) or 目薩羅伽羅婆 (*musāragalva*). It is translated as *manao* 馬腦. 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 碼腦 in order to show that it is a kind of stone.⁵⁰

Thus, Xuanying interpreted *manao* 馬腦 as a translation of Skt. *musalagarbha* (= *musāragarbha*, *masāragarbha*, *musāragalva*; amethyst?)⁵¹, 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.⁵² However, in actual fact, *manao* 馬腦 (“agate”) is a rendering of Skt. *aśmagarbha* (“emerald”) and its variant form *aśvagarbha*, found in older manuscripts.⁵³ An ancient Chinese translator probably interpreted this word as consisting of *aśva* (“horse”) and *garbha* (“womb; the interior of anything; an inner room; embryo”) and so, translated it as *manao* 馬腦, meaning literally “the brain of a horse”. He may have translated *garbha* as *nao* 腦 because the shape of the brain resembles an embryo in the womb.

Xuanying also interpreted *cha* 刹, 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* 刹 is a transliteration of Skt. *chattrā* (“parasol; a disc-shaped structure above a *stūpa*”)⁵⁴.

⁴⁹ Karashima 2007: 451f. = 2008: 150f.

⁵⁰ 馬腦：梵言謨薩羅揭婆。謨薩羅，此譯云杵；揭婆，此言藏。或言胎者，取其堅實也。舊云摩娑羅伽隸，或言目薩羅伽羅婆。譯云馬腦。案此寶或色如馬腦，因以為名。但諸字書旁皆安石作碼腦二（read 字）。謂石之類也。（*Zhonghua Dazangjing* 中華大藏經, vol. 56, no. 1163, 905c11f.).

⁵¹ Cf. Karashima 2007: 451, n. 31 = 2008: 161, n. 32.

⁵² E.g. *Foguang Dacidian* 佛光大詞典, pp. 5839, 6738.

⁵³ Cf. Krsh(2001) 170.

⁵⁴ Karashima 2007: 447f. = 2008: 146f.

Thus, Xuanying's knowledge of Indian languages is quite doubtful. His interpretation of *yulanpen* 盂蘭盆 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* 盂蘭盆 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 以百味飲食安盂蘭盆中 “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* 盂蘭盆

As we have seen above, this scripture had been entitled *Yulan jing* 盂蘭經, while the name *Yulanpen jing* 盂蘭盆經 appeared first no earlier than 695 C.E. in the *Dazhou Kanding zhongjing Mulu* 大周刊定衆經目錄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* 盆.

As mentioned earlier, the word *yulanpen* 盂蘭盆 occurs three times in the text, namely:

- (1) 應奉盂蘭盆 “(Those who wish to practise filial piety,) should also offer *yulan* bowls (to the assemblage of monks).”
- (2) 以百味飲食安盂蘭盆中 “(Those who wish to practise filial piety, should) place food and drink of a hundred flavours in *yulan* bowls”
- (3) 作盂蘭盆施佛及僧 “(Those who wish to practise filial piety, should) prepare *yulan* bowls and offer them to the Buddha and the Community.

From the second phrase, it is evident that 盂蘭盆 is a sort of vessel in which food is placed. Therefore, *pen* 盆 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 *Pravāraṇā*, is called “a *yulan* bowl” (盂蘭盆).

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 ɣjwo > 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* 虞 rhyme in Middle Chinese, namely *qu* 瞿 (also pronounced as *ju*; EH gj(w)o, kj(w)o > MC gju, kju). Dharmarakṣa and other earlier translators used this character *qu* 瞿 to render Skt. *go* and *ko*; e.g. 瞿曇彌 (Pā. *Gotamī*, Skt. *Gautamī*; T. 9, no. 263 by Dharmarakṣa; 286 C.E.), 瞿曇摩 (Pā. *Gotama*, 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. *Gopikā*; *ib.* 63c3), 瞿波梨 (BHS. *Kokālika*; *ib.* 126a16).⁵⁷ Consequently, from *yulan* 盂蘭, one may assume **olān(ā)*, **olāṅ(ā)*, **orān(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 *vyañjana* (“condiments”) as being offered to monks as alms.⁵⁸ *Odana* as alms appears everywhere in Pāli and Sanskrit literature⁵⁹. *Odana* is boiled rice without fluid⁶⁰, though it is defined sometimes as “rice-porridge”.

In Middle Indic, including Pāli and Gāndhārī (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 拘文羅 (EH. kou[kjou] mjən la; Gā. *kumula* < Skt. *kumuda*) in Lokakṣema’s translation (179 C.E.) of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*⁶². The following are examples from the Chinese translation of the *Dīrghāgama* (T. 1, no. 1; 413 C.E.): 伽伽羅(MC. lā)(13a13, 34b8), 伽拘羅(MC. lā) (128a1) < BHS *Kakuda*, Skt. *Kakudha*; 那羅(MC. lā) (34c27) < Pā. *Nādikā*; 伽藍(MC. lām)浮(115b26) < *kadamba*; 波那摠(MC. lwo) (80a11) < Pā. *Panādo*, Skt. *Praṇādaḥ*; 布吒婆樓 (MC. ləu) < Pā. *Poṭṭhapādo*⁶³.

In early Chinese translations, the last vowel of a word was generally not transliterated, e.g. 阿舍 (EH. ʔa gəm) < Skt. *Āgama*; 阿難 (EH. ʔa nan) < Skt. *Ānanda*; 泥洹 (EH. niəi ɣwan) < Skt. *nirvāṇa*; 安般 (EH. ʔan pan) < Skt. *ānāpāna* 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

⁵⁷ Cf. Karashima 1994: 58f.; 1996: 37f.

⁵⁸ 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.

⁵⁹ Cf. CPD, s.v. *odana*; DP, s.v. *odana*; SWTF, s.v. *odana*; Geiger 1960: § 34.

⁶⁰ Cf. Vism 70.18. *odana-piṇḍa* (“a lump of boiled rice”); Harivaṃśa 60.16. *prakāśaudanaparvata* (“a mountain of shining cooked rice”; my thanks are due to Ms. Hiromi Oikawa for drawing my attention to this reference).

⁶¹ Cf. Pischel § 244, Brough 1962: § 43b, 229, 255~256; von Hinüber 2001: § 200.

⁶² Cf. Krsh 2010: 281f.

⁶³ Cf. Karashima 1994: 19, 64, n. 38.

⁶⁴ 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* 孟蘭盆經 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 Kumārajīva’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 ḡwa la > MC pwât ḡwâ lâ) of Skt. *pravāra(nā)*, which occurs only in this sutra and its adaptation, i.e. the *Baoen 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-Kumārajīva times.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Abhis = *Die Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ: Verhaltensregeln für buddhistische Mönche der Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādīns*, herausgegeben, mit der chinesischen Parallelversion verglichen, übersetzt und kommentiert, unter Mitwirkung von Oskar von Hinüber, Tokyo 2012: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University, (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XIII), 3 vols.

Ashikaga, Ensho

1951 “Notes on Urabon (“Yü Lan P’ên, Ullambana”)”, in: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, New Haven, 71.1: 71~75.

Avś = *Avadānaśataka: A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna*, ed. J. S. Speyer; St.-Petersbourg: Académie Impériale des Sciences, 1902 (Bibliotheca Buddhica 3/a), 2 vols; Reprint: Tokyo, Meicho-Fukyū-kai, 1977.

Avś(tr) = *Avadāna-ṣataka: Cent légendes bouddhiques*, traduite du Sanskrit par Leon Feer Paris: Leroux, 1891 (Annales du Musée Guimet, tom. 18); Reprint: Amsterdam 1979: APA-Oriental Press.

BHSD = Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*, New Haven, 1953: Yale University Press; Repr. Delhi, 1970: Motilal Banarsidass.

Brough, John

⁶⁵ There is another archaic transliteration of the same Sanskrit word, namely 鉢和蘭 (EH pat ḡwa lan > MC pwât ḡwâ lân; = Skt. *pravāra(nā)*), which is found also only in pre-Kumārajīva translations: namely the *Xinsui jing* 新歲經 by Tan Wulan 曇無蘭 (fl. 381?~394 C.E.), T. 1, no. 62, 859, 860c12, 13, 24, 28 etc.; the *Chuyao jing* 出曜經 by Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 (fl. during the Eastern Jin Dynasty [317~420 C.E.]), T. 4, no. 212, 775b17; the *Zishisanmei jing* 自誓三昧經 allegedly by An Shigao 安世高 (fl. 148~168 C.E.) but probably a translation made in the 3rd~4th century, T. 15, no. 622, 346a3, 5; the *Rulai Duzheng Zishisanmei jing* 如來獨證自誓三昧經 by Dharmarakṣa (fl. 265?~311 C.E.), T. 15, no. 623, 348a20.

- 1962 *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, London 1962: Oxford University Press (*London Oriental Series*, vol. 7).
- Chung, Jin-Il
 1998 *Die Pravāraṇā in den kanonischen Vinaya-Texten der Mūlasarvāstivādin und der Sarvāstivādin*, bearbeitet und herausgegeben, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 7).
- Coblin, W. South
 1983 *A Handbook of Eastern Han Sound Glosses*, Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.
- CPD = *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, begun by V. Trenckner, ed. D. Andersen *et al.*, Copenhagen, Bristol, 1924~2011.
- DN = *The Dīgha Nikāya*, ed. T.W. Rhys Davids and J. E. Carpenter, 3 vols., London 1890~1911: The Pali Text Society.
- DP = *A Dictionary of Pāli*, by Margaret Cone, Oxford 2001~: The Pali Text Society.
- EH = reconstructions of the Eastern Han (25~220 C.E.) Chinese sound system, posited by Coblin (1983)
- Fujimoto Akira 藤本 晃
 2003 “Bussetsu Urabonkyō no Genryū — Petavatthu II.2. Sāriputtatherassa mātupeṭṭivatthu tonon Hikakukōsatsu” 『佛説孟蘭盆經』の源流 —— Petavatthu II.2 Sāriputtatherassa mātupeṭṭivatthuとの比較考察, in *Pārigaku Bukkyōbunkagaku* パーリ学仏教文化学 [Journal of Pali and Buddhist Studies], vol. 17: 47~54.
- Geiger, Wilhelm
 1960 *Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times*, ed. Heinz Bechert, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz; 2., unveränderte Aufl. Wiesbaden 1986: Steiner Verlag.
- Guang Xing 廣興
 2005 “Filial Piety in Early Buddhism”, in: *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, vol. 12: 82~106.
- Harivaṃśa = *The Harivaṃśa: Being the Khila or Supplement to the Mahābhārata*, ed. Parashuram Lakshman Vaidya, Poona 1969: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 2 vols.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe and Klaus Wille
 2006 “A Version of the Śikhālakasūtra/Siṅgālovādasutta”, in: *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection: Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. III (2006), ed. Jens Braarvig *et al.*, Oslo: Hermes Publishing, pp. 1~6.
- von Hinüber, Oskar
 2001 *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*, 2., erweiterte Auflage, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- IBInsc = Keishō Tsukamoto (塚本啓祥), *Indo Bukkyō Himei no Kenkyū* インド仏教碑銘の研究 [A Comprehensive Study of Indian Buddhist Inscriptions], part I, Text, Notes and Japanese Translation; part II, Indices, Maps and Illustrations; part III, Inscriptions in Northern Areas, Pakistan, Kyoto 1996~2003: Heirakuji Shoten.
- Irisawa, Takashi 入澤 崇
 1989 “Ekō no Genryū” 廻向の源流 [The Origin of Merit Transference], in: *Seinan Ajia Kenkyū* 西南アジア研究 30: 1~20.
 1990 “Bussetsu Urabonkyō Sciritsukō” 佛説孟蘭盆經成立考 [The Formation of the Yūlan-pên-ching], in: *Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 仏教学研究 45/46: 145~172.
- Iwamoto, Yutaka 岩本裕
 1979 *Jigoku Meguri no Bungaku* 地獄めぐりの文学, Tokyo: Kaimeishoyin 開明書院 (*Bukkyō Setsuwa Kenkyū* 佛教説話研究 IV).
- Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋静志
 1994 *Jō-agonkyō no Gengo no Kenkyū — Onshago Bunseki o Chūshin tosite* 「長阿含經」の原語の研究——音写語分析を中心として [A Study of the Underlying Language

- of the Chinese Dīrghāgama—Focusing on an Analysis of the Transliterations*], Tokyo: Hirakawa Shuppansha, 1994.
- 1996 “Vernacularisms and Transcriptions in Early Chinese Buddhist Scriptures”, in: *Vernacularisms in Medieval Chinese Texts* by Erick Zürcher, Seishi Karashima, and Huanming Qin, *Sino-Platonic Papers*, no. 71, Department of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, University of Pennsylvania, pp. 32–42.
- 2007 “Kan-yaku Butten no Gengo no Kenkyū” 漢訳仏典の言語の研究 [A Study of the Language of the Chinese Buddhist Translations], in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University*, vol. 10: 445–460.
- 2008 “Hanyi Fodian de Yuyanyanjiu (3)” 漢譯佛典的語言研究 (三) [A Study of the Language of the Chinese Buddhist Translations (3)], in: *Yuyanxue Luncong 語言學論叢* vol. 37, Beijing: Commercial Press, pp. 144~168.
- Kieffer-Pülz, Petra
- 2006 “Old and New Ritual: Advancing the Date of the Invitation Ceremony (*pavāraṇā*) with Regard to the Mahinda Festival”, in: *Jaina-Itihāsa-Ratna. Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von Ute Hüsken, Petra Kieffer-Pülz und Anne Peters, Marburg 2006 (*Indica et Tibetica*. 47.), pp. 339~349.
- Krsh(1998) = Seishi Karashima, *A Glossary of Dharmarakṣa’s Translation of the Lotus Sutra* 正法華經詞典, Tokyo 1998: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University (*Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica I*).
- Krsh(2001) = Seishi Karashima, *A Glossary of Kumārajīva’s Translation of the Lotus Sutra* 妙法蓮華經詞典, Tokyo 2001: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University (*Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica IV*).
- Krsh(2010) = Seishi Karashima, *A Glossary of Lokakṣema’s Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 道行般若經詞典, Tokyo 2010: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University (*Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XI*).
- MC = Middle Chinese reconstruction: a reconstruction of the *Qieyun* 切韻 System. In this article, the *Qieyun* System forms, reconstructed by Karlgren and revised by F. K. Li are used. The following further notational changes, made by Coblin (1983: 41), are also adopted here: (1) ‘- will be written as ʔ-; (2) ẽ will be written as e.
- Nanjio, Bunyiu 南條文雄
- 1883 *A Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist Tripiṭaka : The Sacred Canon of the Buddhists in China and Japan*, comp. by order of the secretary of state for India, by Bunyiu Nanjio, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pātim = *The Patimokkha*, edited by William Pruitt, translated by K. R. Norman, Oxford 2001; Reprinted with corrections 2003: Pali Text Society.
- Pischel = Richard Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, Straßburg 1900: Karl J. Trübner (*Grundriß der Indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde I*, 8).
- PrMoSū(Ma-L) = *Prātimokṣasūtram of the Lokottaravādimahāsāṅghika School*, ed. Nathmal Tatia, Patna 1976 (*Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series* 16).
- PrMoSū(Sa.v.Si.) = Georg von Simson, *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*, Nach Vorarbeiten von Else Lüders und Herbert Härtel herausgegeben, Teil II: Kritische Textausgabe, Übersetzung, Wortindex sowie Nachträge zu Teil I, Göttingen 2000 (STT 11; AAWG 238).
- Pv = *Petavatthu*, in: *Vimānavatthu and Petavatthu*, new edition by N.A. Jayawickrama, London 1977: The Pali Text Society.
- Pv-a(tr) = *Elucidation of the Intrinsic Meaning: so named The Commentary on the Peta-Stories (Paramattha-dīpanī nāma Petavatthu-aṭṭhakathā)* by Dhammapāla, translated by U

Ba Kyaw, edited and annotated by Peter Masefield; London 1980: PTS; Lancaster 2007: PTS (Sacred Books of the Buddhists, v. 34).

Schopen, Gregory

1984 "Filial Piety and the Monk in the Practice of Indian Buddhism: A Question of "Sinicization" Viewed from the Other Side", in: *T'oung Pao* 70: 110~126 = 1997: 56~71.

1997 *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press (Studies in the Buddhist Traditions 1).

T = *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, ed. Junjirō Takakusu, Kaikyoku Watanabe, 100 vols., Tokyo 1924~1934.

Takakusu, Junjirō (高楠順次郎)

1896 *A Record of the Buddhist Religion, as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (AD 671-695)*, by I-Tsing, trans. Junjirō Takakusu, London 1896; Reprint: New Delhi 1966, 1982: Munshiram Manoharlal.

Teiser, Stephen F.

1988 *The Ghost Festival in Medieval China* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tib(D) = Derge (sDe dge) Canon; 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).

(2) *The Tibetan Tripitaka*: Taipei Edition, ed. A. W. Barber, Taipei 1991: SMC Publishing.

Tib(Pk) = *The Tibetan Tripitaka: Peking Edition* 影印北京版西藏大藏經, ed. Daisetz T. Suzuki, 168 vols., repr. under the Supervision of Otani University, Kyoto, Tokyo 1955~1961: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute.

Upasak, Chandrika Singh

1975 *Dictionary of Early Buddhist Monastic Terms (Based on Pali Literature)*, 1st ed., Varanasi: Bharati Prakashan.

Vism = *The Visuddhi-magga of Buddhaghosa*, ed. C. A. F. Rhys Davids, 2 vols., London 1920~1921; Reprinted 1975: London: The Pali Text Society.

The Case of the Missing Author: Who wrote the anonymous Epilogue to Faxian's *Foguoji*¹?

Haiyan Hu-von HINÜBER (Freiburg)

§1.1 The two versions of the *Foguoji*

In two previous articles² I attempted to determine the meaning of “border” in Faxian's (法顯)³ *Foguoji* 《佛國記》 (A Record of Buddhist Kingdoms)⁴ as well as to re-interpret several of its ambiguous expressions and passages. The focus of this article is the anonymous epilogue of the *Foguoji*, 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 *Foguoji* 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 *Foguoji* (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 *Foguoji* 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.⁵

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 *Foguoji*.

² Hu-v. Hinüber 2010 and 2011.

³ On Faxian's biography see 僧祐 Sengyou (approx. 445-518), 《出三藏記集》 *Chu Sanzang Jiji*, Taishō vol. 55: 111b26-112b26 (法顯 Faxian), and 慧皎 Huijiao (approx. 497-554), 《高僧傳》 *Gaoseng Zhuan*, Taishō vol. 50: 337b16-338b25 (法顯 Faxian); cf. also Deeg 2005: 22f. and Hu-von Hinüber 2010: 415f.

⁴ Citations from the *Foguoji* 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》 *Foguoji* or 《高僧法顯傳》 *Gaoseng Faxian Zhuan* (Biography of the eminent Buddhist monk Faxian).

⁵ The *Sui annals* 《隨書·經籍志》 confirm this and list two titles: 《法顯傳》二卷、《法顯行傳》一卷. Cf. Zhang 1985: 8 and Yang 2005: 21.

According to 《出三藏記集》 *Chu Sanzang Jiji*⁶ one can assume that both the first⁷ 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 *Daochangsi* in the *Foguoji*, 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.⁸

§1.2. Faxian's conclusion in the first version of the *Foguoji*

There is no reason to doubt that the first version of the *Foguoji* dates from 414,⁹ 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:

法顯發長安六年到中國。停六年還¹⁰。經三年達青州。凡所遊履減三十國。沙河已西迄于天竺，眾僧威儀法化之美不可詳說。竊惟諸師未備聞，是以不顧微命浮海而還¹¹，艱難具更。幸蒙三尊威靈，危而得濟。故將竹帛疏所經歷，欲令賢者同其聞見。是歲甲寅。[866b17-23]

“After (I) Faxian set out from Chang'an, it took (me) six years to reach the country in the centre (Central India),¹² 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.¹³ From the desert¹⁴ westwards on to India, the sublime dignity and internalization of the

⁶ See 僧祐 Sengyou, 《出三藏記集》 *Chu Sanzang Jiji* [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，就外國禪師佛陀跋陀於道場寺譯出六卷泥洹、摩訶僧祇律、方等泥洹經、經、雜阿毘曇心。On the same note 慧皎 Huijiao, 《高僧傳》 *Gaoseng Zhuan* (Faxian 法顯): 338b14-17.

⁷ In *Foguoji* 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 *Foguoji* 866b14-17: 到青州請法顯一冬一夏。夏坐訖，法顯離諸師久，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 出 *chu* (here abbreviated for 譯出 *yichu*) to mean “show”: “(Faxian) zeigte ihm (Buddhabhadra) die Sūtras und Vinayas”.

⁹ See Adachi 1940: 236. Zhang (1985: 178, n. 11) agrees with Adachi.

¹⁰ Deeg's edition of the text (2005: 610) 停經六年，還經六年達青州 is not correct; cf. Zhang 1985: 177, n. 1.

¹¹ The reading of the Taishō-Edition 淨海而還 is evidently false; I follow Zhang 1985: 177.

¹² On Vinaya terms *majjhima-desa* (Sanskrit *madyhama-deśa*) and *paccantimesu janapadesu* (Sanskrit *praty-antima-deśa*), which correspond to 中國 *zhongguo* and 邊地 *biandi* in the *Foguoji*, 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 鄯善 Shanshan on the western side of the Lop desert, see Hu-von Hinüber

Dharma in all Buddhist communities¹⁵ 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 jewels¹⁶ 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 故將竹帛疏所經歷 we can assume that the first version of the *Foguoji* 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 *Foguoji* is clearly formulated in a narrative manner. This has to be taken into account when analyzing the text.

§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:

Paragraph 1

(Invitation extended to Faxian and plea for his completion of the *Foguoji*)

晉義熙十二年，歲在壽星。夏安居末，迎法顯。道人既至，留共冬齋。因講集之余，重問游歷。其人恭順，言輒依實。由是，先所略者，勸令祥載。顯復具敘始末。[866b23-27]

“In the twelfth year of the reign (called) Yixi of the Jin-Dynasty, the year-star

2010: 419.

¹⁵ 眾僧 *zhongseng* includes more than “monkhood” (Legge 1965: 116); that is *catuṣpariṣad*, “the fourfold Buddhist communities”, which consist of the order of monks and nuns as well as the assembly of male and female laity.

¹⁶ 三尊 *sanzun* corresponds to *tri-ratna* in Sanskrit, see Hirakawa 1997:25a s.v.; this means Buddha, his community (*saṃgha*) and his teachings (*dharmā*). 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 Saṃgha with that of the Avalokiteśvara.

being in Canopus¹⁷, Faxian was cordially welcomed¹⁸ at the close of (the period of) the rains retreat¹⁹. On the arrival of the wise monk, he was asked to stay (with us) during the winter fasting period.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.”²¹

Paragraph 3

¹⁷ On 壽星 *shouxing* see Rüdberg & 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，在十二支中为辰。義熙十二年（公元416年）為丙辰歲，故云“歲在壽星”；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”.

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 Upāliṃ bhikṣubhiḥ sūtradharavinayadharamātrkādhārānām bhikṣūnām arthāya ardhatrīyāni chatradhvajapatākābhiḥ pratyudgantavyaṃ/ sacet sampadyate 'y evaṃ kuśalaṃ/ nocet sampadyate pañca krośāni chatradhvajapatākābhiḥ pratyudgantavyaṃ/ sacet sampadyate 'y evaṃ kuśalaṃ/ nocet sampadyate trīṇ krośān ardhakrośam antataḥ pariṣaṇḍām api chatradhvajapatākābhiḥ pratyudgantavyaṃ*. See also Huijiao in Biography of Shi Chaojin, Taishō vol. 50: 374b7-9, 《高僧傳》釋超進傳：時平昌孟顛守在會稽，藉其風猷，迺遣使迎接，安置山陰靈嘉寺。

¹⁹ 夏安居 *xia anju* is the Chinese translation of the Sanskrit term *varṣāvāsana* “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.

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”.

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 *Foguoji*;
- 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”²² without justifying this assumption. I agree with Zhang²³ that it is much more likely to be the work of a Buddhist lay supporter or benefactor (檀越 *tanyue*, *dānapati*) 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 慧遠迎法顯 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: 此所云迎者，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鶉火三月十日, 於揚州司空謝石所立道場寺, 請天竺禪師佛度跋陀羅, 手執梵文, 譯胡爲晉。沙門法業親從筆受。時, 吳郡內史孟顓, 右衛將軍褚叔度爲檀越。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 揚州. 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 孟顓, 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 Tripiṭaka, there are many references to Meng Yi 孟顓 (384-432) as a generous and tireless patron of Buddhism.²⁷ During his lengthy term in various high offices, Meng

²⁴ Taishō vol. 55: 61a1-6, also vol. 9: 788b3-9. Hironaka (2008: 195) discusses this passage in a different context.

²⁵ 謝石 (327-388) was the fifth younger brother of the influential chancellor 謝安 Xie An (320-385). The Daochang monastery was also named 謝寺 or 謝司空石寺. On 謝石 Xie Shi, 謝安 Xie An, 褚叔度 Chu Shudu and 孟顓 Meng Yi see Zang 1921 s.vv.

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 *Foguoji* in 414 (是歲甲寅). Here, he completed the *Foguoji* 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 Zhuan* contains many references to Meng Yi as a devotee lay follower highly dedicated to the support of Buddhist scholars, see Taishō vol. 50: 335c5-8 (佛跋陀羅傳): 至義熙十四年, 吳郡內史孟顓、右衛將軍褚叔度即請賢為譯匠, 乃手執梵文, 共沙門法業、慧嚴等百餘人於道場譯出。337a17 (曇無讖傳): 初出彌勒、觀音二觀經, 丹陽尹孟顓見而善之, 深加賞接。343a6-8 (曇摩密多傳): 會稽太守平昌孟顓深信正法, 以三寶為己任。素好禪味, 敬心殷重。343c19-21 (曇良耶舍傳): 平昌孟顓承風欽敬, 資給豐厚。顓出守會稽, 固請不去。369c17-18 (釋僧詮傳): 後平昌孟顓於餘杭立方顯寺, 請詮居之。374b7-9 (釋超進傳): 時平昌孟顓守在會稽, 藉其風猷, 迺遣使迎接, 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.

LITERATURE

- Adachi Kiroku 足立喜六, 法顯傳·中亞-印度-南海紀行の研究 (*Hokkenden-Chūa-Indo-Nankaikikō no kenkyū*), Tokyo 1940.
- Deeg, M., *Das Gaoseng-Faxian-Zhuan als religionsgeschichtliche Quelle. Der älteste Bericht eines chinesischen buddhistischen Pilgermönchs über seine Reise nach Indien mit Übersetzung des Textes*, Wiesbaden 2005.
- Faxian 法顯 (approx. 342-423), *Foguoji* 《佛國記》 bzw. *Gaoseng Faxian Zhuan* 《高僧法顯傳》, Taishō (大正新修大藏經) No. 2085, vol. 51, p. 857-866.
- Hirakawa, A. 平川彰 (ed.), *Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary* 佛教漢梵大辭典, Tokyo 1997.
- Hironaka, T. 廣中智之, “求法僧眼中的于闐佛教(3-4世紀). 兼及和田出土佛教寫本” (“Buddhism in Khotan, Seen by Chinese Pilgrims Toward West (3-6 Century A.D.): Also Referring to Buddhist Manuscripts Excavated from Khotan Area”), in: 朱玉麒主編《西域文史》(*Literature & History of the Western Regions*, ed. by Zhu Yuqi), vol. II, Peking 2008, p. 183-216.
- Huijiao 慧皎 (approx. 497-554), *Gaoseng Zhuan* 《高僧傳》, Taishō (大正新修大藏經) No. 2059, vol. 50, p. 322-423 (p. 337b16-338b25: Faxian 法顯).
- Hu-von Hinüber, H., “Chinesische buddhistische Indienpilger als Grenzgänger. Ansätze zu einer neuen Deutung von Faxians Reisebericht”, in: *From Turfan to Ajanta. Festschrift for Dieter Schlingloff on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday*, ed. by Eli Franco and Monika Zin, Lumbini 2010 (Lumbini International Research Institute, Nepal), vol. I, p. 413-434.
- Hu-von Hinüber, H., “Faxian’s (法顯 342-423) Perception of India. Some New Interpretations of His Fuguoji 佛國記”, in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2010*, vol. XIV, Tokyo-Hachioji 2011, p. 223-247 and plate 17.
- Legge, J., *A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms. Being an Account by the Chinese Monk FĀ-Hsien of his Travels in India and Ceylon (A.D. 399-414) in Search of the Buddhist Books of Discipline*, translated and annotated with a Korean Recension of the Chinese text, New York 1965 (Oxford 1886).
- Lüders, H., “Zur Geschichte des Ostasiatischen Tierkreises”, in: *Philosophica Indica. Ausgewählte kleine Schriften. Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag*, Göttingen 1940, p. 727-751 (originally in: *BSB Phil.-Hist. Klasse 1933*, S. 998-1002).
- Mathews, R. H., *Chinese-English Dictionary* (revised American Edition), Cambridge, Massachusetts 1943 (Shanghai 1931).
- Rüdenberg&Stange, *Chinesisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch* (von W. Rüdenberg. Dritte erweiterte, völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage von H.O.H. Stange), Hamburg 1963.
- Sengyou 僧祐 (approx. 445-518), 《出三藏記集》 *Chu Sanzang Jiji*, Taishō (大正新修大藏經) No. 2145, vol. 55, p. 111b26-112b26 (Faxian 法顯).
- Yang, Zengwen 楊曾文, “東晉佛教翻譯家法顯及其在中國文化史上的貢獻” (“Dongjin Fojiao Fanyijia Faxian jiqi zai Zhongguo Wenhushi shang de Gongxian”), in: 戒幢佛學 *Jiezhong Foxue*, ed. by

嘉寺。399a20-21 (釋慧覽傳): 吳興沈演、平昌孟顛并欽慕道德, 為造禪室於寺。408a17-19 (釋弘明傳): 元嘉中, 郡守平昌孟顛重其真素, 要出安止道樹精舍。後濟陽江, 於水興邑立昭玄寺, 復請明住往。Etc.

戒幢佛学研究所 (Jiezhong Foxue Research Institute), Changsha (岳麓書社) 2005, vol. 3, p. 8-24.

Zang, L. 臧勵蘇, 《中國人名大辭典》 *Zhongguo Renming Dacidian*, Peking 1921.

Zhang, X. 章異, 《法顯傳校註》 *Faxian Zhuan Jiaozhu*, Shanghai (古籍出版社) 1985.

The Tocharian *Udānālamkāra**

Tatsushi TAMAI (Tokyo)

There are already excellent studies concerning the present topic by H. Lüders (1926), S. Lévi (1933), Sieg/Siegling (1933; 1949), Kogi Inoue (1972)¹ 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 *Udānālamkāra*

The *Udānālamkāra* is a Tocharian commentary (*alamkāra*) of the *Udānavarga*. First it is necessary to look into the format of this text. It was found in manuscripts of the Kuci language (Tocharian B) housed in Berlin. The events associated with the Buddha in the *Udānavarga* 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 *Udānavarga* X.2 (about a miser, THT 23 v3~v8), which include:

- i) the story of Ājīvika's disciple opposing Ānanda's alms (Toch. meter² 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: *dharmasomaññe udānalankārne mārgavārgāntse parweṣṣe pāke* “the first part of the Mārgavarga in the *Udānālamkāra* of the Dharmasoma (version)” (THT 28 a4).

This method of metrical commentary evokes the language of the *Vāsavadattā* of Subandhu (cf. Lévi, BEFEO III, 45 sq. and *Mahāyāna-Sūtrālamkāra* II, Introd. 15 sq.), in which we read *bauddhasaṃgatim ivālamkārabhūṣitaṃ*. Lévi suggests that *-saṃgatim* could stand for *-saṃgītim* in connection with the *Mahāyānasamgīti* of Dharmakīrti or the *Mahāyānābhīdharmasamgītiśāstra* of Asaṅga. Narasiṃha cited one half-strophe, in which *alamkāra* means *bauddhasāstra*. Subandhu states that the *bauddhasamgīti* is adorned with an *alamkāra*, i.e. *alamkāra* is an addition to the *bauddhasamgīti*. Therefore, *alamkāra* can be

* I should like to express my thanks to those who corrected my unidiomatic 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.

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 *udānalankārne cittavārg(g)ā(nt)s(e)* and A4 “Douldour Aqour 29. En marge du feuillet, les chiffres LX.IX.” (p. 76).

Pinault states (1990, p. 55): “l'Udānālaṃkāra – “l'Ornement de l'Udāna” – est un commentaire versifié, qui se rattache au genre littéraire connu en pāli sous le nom *aṭṭhakathā* (sur le Dhammapada, par exemple): une narration d'un épisode de la vie du Buddha expose les circonstances où fut prononcée une strophe (ou davantage) de l'Udv; la citation de ces paroles de la loi est ensuite accompagnée d'un de exégèse littérale (cf. Lévi 1933, p. 40).”

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:

| | Udl. | Udv. |
|------------|-----------|-------------|
| PK AS 6A | str. 9-15 | XXXI. 6-7 |
| 6B = A1 | 76-82 | XXXI. 11-12 |
| 6C = A2 | 82-88 | XXXI. 11-12 |
| 6D = A4 | 102-107 | XXXI. 27 |
| NS 22 = A3 | 114 | |
| | | |
| | 1-6 | XXXI. 28 |
| AS 6 E | 11-15 | XXXI. 33-34 |

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 *daṇḍa*, we read *udānalankārne cittavārg(g)ā(nt)s(e)* without *dharmasomaṅṅāṇṇe*, 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 reconnaître 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 pelaiṅne ś³ mā ykemanentse laṅse*

³ Lévi's convention could mean a kind of punctuation (vertical double-point), but I need to check it in the

ta(k) ///

Udv.XXXI.28ab: anavasthitacittasya saddharmam avijānataḥ |

Udv.XXXI.28cd: pāriplavaprasādasya prajñā na paripūryate ||

If A3 b6 corresponds to Udv.XXXI.28, there will be no Skt. words which is identified with Toch. *mā ykemanentse*. I suppose that because of b7 *ślokne* “in the strophe” b6 shows the end of the *Cittavarga* in the Udv. In this case A3 b6 should correspond to Udv.XXXI.60 (the end of *Cittavarga*), but there is no Skt. words from which *mā ykemanentse* is translated, and it is unclear what the gen. form of *ykemane*?

Pinault further gives a transcription of PK AS 6A and Udv.XXXI 6, 7, which he compares with the *Rgveda* I, 105. It would be very interesting if there was a relation between the *Rgveda* and the *Udānavarga*, and I would like to see other examples in the *Udānavarga*. Indeed, my hope is to examine the Paris manuscripts on the basis of digitised images in order to check for accuracies.

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 2011⁴. 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 *Stadthöhle* in Šorcuq, *D* from Qizil, and *E* from the *Nakṣatra-Höhle* 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 *Stadthöhle* in Šorcuq, but not from the exact same spot in *Stadthöhle*, i.e. they represent different series.

Sieg/Siegling arranged these manuscripts according to the sequence of the *Udānavarga*. The same method was applied in F. Bernhard's *Udānavarga* (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 series⁵.

manuscript.

⁴ Tamai 2011b pp. 81-125, 2011.

⁵ See for example *Abweichung von der Strophenanordnung des Udānavarga* (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 Udv.I, 1-7. Another resource is a commentary on the *Udānavarga*, namely, the canonical episode of Upaga in the Tibetan canon⁶.

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:

*Sabbābhibhu sabbavidu (')ham asmi Sabbesu dhammesu anūpalitto,
Sabbañjaho taṇhakkhaye vimutto Sayam abhiññāya kamuddiseyyam*

Mahāvastu III.326:

*sarvābhibhū sarvavidu (')ham asmi sarvehi dharmehi anopalipto |
sarvajño (')ham tṛṣṇākṣaye vimukto ahaṃ abhiññāya kim uddiseyyam ||*

and at the same time parallel with *Udānavarga* XXI.1:

*sarvābhibhūḥ sarvavid eva cāsmi sarvaiś ca dharmaiḥ satataṃ na liptaḥ |
sarvaṃjahaḥ sarvabhayaḍ vimuktaḥ svayam hy abhiññāya kam uddiseyyam ||*

In the light of the original Skt. and Pāli texts, the A-Toch. translation of THT 850v6-v7⁷ is assumed to have been as follows:

: *ptāñkat kaṣṣi we⁸ pūk, ly(utā)r (nāntsu pūk knānmām śkam) nasam*, pūkyo sne
lop[l]une wra[mā]mny[o]*

(: *puk lek tarkoraṣ. tsa)l(p)o p(ra)s[k]i(ntw)ä(ś) [mā]t[ta]k nū [yn](e)ś [karso](raṣ.) āṃ
ṣarpñim*, ślok we muna(k, || 12 || āṃ)*

THT 850v7 *ṣa[rp]ji |||* would be (*āṃ*) *ṣa[rp]ji(ñim*)* for Skt. *kam uddiseyam* in the beginning of *Udānavarga* XXI.2, and the rest (including THT 851r1) is lost or not readable.

pa[ñc](āṃ) in THT 851r2 would stand for *pa[ñc](āṃ ślok we)* “he spoke the fifth strophe” as *ṣkaśśām ślok we* “he spoke the sixth strophe” in the next line. Following *pa[ñc](āṃ ślok we)*, the Toch. text contains the translation of *Udānavarga* XXI.5:

*jinā hi mādrśā jñeyā ye prāptā hy āsrava kṣayam |
jitā me pāpakā dharmās tato aham upagā jinaḥ ||*

⁶ Cf. Rockhill 1883, p. 209.

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 mādr̥sā jñeyā* would be translated by Toch. *(y)uk(o)ṣ ñi t(ā)skm(ām) k̄ar̥sn(ā)[ly](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 */// (tā)par̄k, yāt, āṣānik**, “now you go, oh venerable!” (THT 851r3), it should have contained *tāṣsi* or *tā nu* 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 *Udānavarga* XXI.6 reads:

bārānasīm gamiṣyāmi haniṣye (')mṛtadundubhim |
dharmacakram pravartayisyē lokeṣv aprativartitam ||

The A-Toch. translation for this is found in THT 851r3-r4:

(bārānas) yac yām koṣtam, onkra[c]i ku[m]p̄ac[.f]*
(m̄arkampalši wār̄kant spārtwam ṣoṣyam mā ne)ṣ sāṣpartwṣūnt, : 14¹⁰*

Immediately thereafter the Toch. translation for *Udānavarga* XXI.7 reads:

na hi santah prakāsyante viditvā lokaparyāyam |
ādeṣayanto virajaḥ padaḥ sānta manīṣiṇaḥ ||

The A-Toch. translation for this is (in THT 851r4):

mā nū kraṣ palkiñc, ārkisōṣṣis(.) [y]m(e) k̄arsoraṣ¹¹
mā āksisamām sne twe lame knānm[ā]ṣ. (←knānmāṣ¹²)

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 */// weñam tāpar̄k, ślok aṣsi wrām*, kosne ime kalkaṣ ñi :*

“I will say now the strophe matter actually, as far as my memory would go (= work)”

ptāñktaṣ tarkoraṣ, saṃsāram wrassaṣ, p̄kaṣ, (lyutār nasam)*

“leaving aside the Buddhas (= except for former Buddhas) I am the furthest from (= in) all the living beings in Samsāra”

6 */// pruccamñeyo ūpage¹³ : ṣūr̄m, try asaṃkhesam k̄ant*, kalpsam krope el pāpṣūne tsraṣṣūneyntu knānmūneyntu sny āk, pñī(ntu 15)*

“by excellence, oh Upaga! The cause (is as follows): in the three *asaṃkhyeya* (-periods and) hundred *kalpas* I gathered the generosity (*dāna*), the morality (*śīla*), the energies (*vīrya*) and the knowledge (*prajñā*, that constitute) endless merits. 15”

7 */// yo spantālune¹⁴ śtwar imeyis, śmoññesyo pe trī wāknā : isopatsam kārūm oktuk yetwesyo taryāk-we-pi lakṣaṃñāsyō*

“(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]p̄ac* “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 wār̄kant* “good wheel”.

¹⁰ The verse number is written additionally under the line with the cross over the line.

¹¹ *k̄arsoraṣ* corresponds to Skt. *viditvā* 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. *manīṣiṇaḥ* (nom. pl. m.), but there existed no pl.-form of the present middle participle in Toch. In fact, *mā āksisamām* stands for the Skt. nom. pl. *ādeṣayanto* (*ā-* should be privative *a-*). Therefore I prefer *knānmām*, and in the photo it can be seen as *knānm[ā]ṣ*. Although *ṣ* is not normal usage, I recognize a cross inside the *aṣara* for Toch. *ṣa*.

¹³ There is no phonological difference between *u* and *ū* in Toch. Originally the language had no /u/ in its phonological inventory, but only /wā/. Later *u* 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*.

(*anuvyañjana*), by thirty-two characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*)”

8 ||| *lkālyo skam**, *ylaṅkam ymeyo tkam ñāktā yoṃ tāluneyo lyutār nasam pūk wrasas*, : *prūccamñeyo pe [p_u]kaṣ(.) 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_ukaṃ śk(aṃ) śāk lokadhātuntwaṃ* : «16» *asinaṭ, lkālyo wsokone tmaṃsam**, *hwāśsi okāk, ācośy okāk nervāṃ oko eṣa(m)taṃ (:)*

“by ... and in all ten world regions : 16 With not-satiable glance I generate the joy (of) giving *nirvāṇa*-fruit for animals and embryos inclusively.”

2 ||| *[l]w[o]ntāp*,¹⁵ *hwāśy upage pñi tamnaṣñi*¹⁶ *kucyo ne yiñc*, *ñāktasac*, : *koyāṣ wrasem śmaṣ, tpar ñāktasac ñi tarneñc*, *ykorñe*

“Upaga creates for the animals his own(?) merit, with which they go to the gods : if breath (= *udāna*?) emerges from the mouth (= if I pray?) to high gods, they dismiss my negligence”

3 ||| *c paltsak, cem*, : *mā ñi wāsklune mā rake paltsak, paramāñū kṣam yārmam naṣ**, *kusne ālu s_ukac mā tāṣ*, «17» : *pūk**, *knānm[ā]m*

“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 ṣotreyo śyak**, *ṣotreyo lyāklyāṣ, lykāly pūk, kākkñāññu*¹⁷ : *pūk tri praṣtantwaṃ sne āk saṃsāram pūk sūr[ma]m(twaṃ?)*

“together with ... characteristic, with the finest characteristic, all known (= Buddha?). In all three times, in endless *saṃsāra*, in all causes ...”

5 ||| *o knāmmune* : *pūk tri dhātuntwaṃ pūk śkam wrasaśsi pūk**, *emoḷ, indris ciñcroneyntu lkām**, *ṣñ(‘) āleyam wramm o[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) loplune nasam**, *‘page*¹⁸ *mantne ākāś wiskāñeyo* : (18) *(ka)[p.] mā [ka]lp, kāsū mā kāsū ñom**, *kl(yu) nāka(m)*

“I am fleckless, oh Upaga! Like the sky (untained) by dirt. Gain (or) no gain, goodness (or) no goodness, fame (or) blame”

7 ||| : *ñā(ktañ nap)eñi okā[k] (sa)msāraṣ [tsa]l(p)o + + + + + Lo ... + + ... + + + +*
“As far as the gods (and) human beings, released from *saṃsāra* ...”

¹⁵ Here *pāda b* ends. Sieg/Siegling read this part as *s wāntāṣ*, which is incorrect. Possibly this word is a gen. sg. of a nominal pp. of √lu- “to send”, but the context is unclear.

¹⁶ Here *pāda c* ends. The personal pronoun gen. sg. 1. pers. *ñi* “my” is incomprehensible. I cannot decide whether this is suffixed or stands alone, and likewise the syntax is unclear. It can be a reflexive pronoun *ṣñi* “own”, if the 3. sg. ending -ṣ and *ṣñi* are fused (haplography).

¹⁷ The word *kākkñāññu* is taken in TEB II p. 98 as a pp. of *kñāñ-* (?). In my opinion this is a pp. of √knā- “to know” (pres. *knā-nā-*), which has a supplemental stem *kñāñ-* for subj. and pret. /ñ/ 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* (dieresis over *kā-*) shows the vowel-balance in A-Toch. and is written because of the normal *k* (also *lykāly*, *ka* needs no dieresis actually). The writing of *kā* is ditto-graphical in order to maintain the loss of voice of /k/, and *ññ* could be an influence of the adj. suffix -ññe or of *kā*.

¹⁸ The *ū* is not written syllabically (*metri causa*). Concerning *u* and *ū*, see fn.13 supra.

Not only the verses of the *Udānavarga*, but also the explanations or statements are written metrically. Our *Udānālaṃkāra* 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 *Udānālaṃkāra* in the colophons:

THT 8r7 (Š 92.48, no photo) 40 || *dharmosoma[ññe]* ||||

THT 28r4 (Š 68.30, no photo) [7]2 || *dharmosomaññe udānalaṃkārne mārgavārgāntse parweṣṣe pāke* || ||

THT 33r2 (Š 87.3, no photo) (56?) || *dharmosomaññe udānalaṃkārne satkāravārgāntse parw[e](s)ṣe pāke* || ||

THT 64b7 (Š 80.29) 76 || *dharmosomaññe udā*

THT 68r(?)3 (Š 97 Frag.) |||| *[ma]ññe (udā)nalāṃkārne* ||||

PK NS¹⁹22r3 (Lévi A 3) 14 || *udānalāṃkārne cittavārg(g)ā(nt)s(e)* ||||

We can read *dharmosomaññe* only in THT 64 b7, because the other manuscripts are lost, and only *ñe* of *[ma]ññe* 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 *-ññe* is used originally in order to build asjectives, and it is not suffixed to personal names. *dharmosomaññe* (as a personal name with the possessive suffix *-ññe*) is found only here, in the Paris collection there is no such name. I propose to take *dharmosoma* (*-a-* is anaptyxis) not as a personal name, but as a section-name or the name of a work of Dharmasoma, like *riññe* “people of the town” or *pudñāktāññe* “belonging to Buddha”. If a possessive adjective were required, it would have been *dharmosomeṣṣe*, like *pudñākteṣṣe* (*-ṣṣe* is attached to the obl.).

Skt. *alaṃkāra* means “adornment” and it translates into Chinese as 莊嚴 *zhuāng-yán*. The name *alaṃkāra* is used often for Buddhist texts deemed “commentaries”, but as far as I can see, there exists no *Udānālaṃkāra* in Sanskrit or Chinese²⁰. Perhaps the Tocharians did not understand the original meaning “adornment”, but only “commentary”. Our Toch. *Udānālaṃkāra* 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 *aśubhabhāvanā* “die Meditation über die Abscheulichkeit des Körpers”, THT 30v3 *dharmacakrapravartana* “das Drehen des Gesetzesrades” and THT 41 *ānāpānasmṛti* “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. 出曜經 (T. Nr. 213), in Tib. *Udānavargavivarāna* and the Mongolian translations of the Tib. text, but there is no relation with our Toch. *Udānālaṃkāra*.

²¹ Cf. Tamai p. 6 and p. 284-286.

Udānālamkāra associated with *Udānavarga*.

i) THT 9-10 *aśubhabhāvana*

THT 9r (no photo, group A from *Stadthöhle*)

1 *mā enkl aknātsaññe tu sp, (pre)kare : bhavā²² ///*

“no passion (or) ignorance, and they asked (about) it. The meditations”

2 *me makte camcer,²³ enkalntse warḥṣal, tañtsi : stwā(ra) ///*

“how can you hamper the power of passion? : Four ...”

3 *(ke)ktseñe ykāṃṣe lkāṣya aśubh, ṣek, waraṣṣa(l)[l](e) ///*

“the body should be seen as an abomination, *aśubha*(-meditation) should always be practised.”

4 *(spaktā)nīkemṭs, dhatunma ṣkas yāknesa lkāṣlona ○ ///*

“The base materials of servants (Skt. *yogin*) are regarded with six ways”

5 *(wsa)ṣṣam cewk, paltakne : ṇumem ṣak, kauṃ lyaṣam ○ ///*

“(he dwells) only in the drop (of water). : For nine to ten days he lies ...”

6 *(dhātu)nma ṣesa tswarwa prutkauwa po klokaṣṣi : mātri sū(kkar) ///*

“the base materials joined together, all pores closed. : The reproductive fluid for the mother ...”

7 *ku wī pwārine kl(utk)au (ra)mt, wsasṣam lklessu 11 yeli ///*

“... like being situated between two fires, the misery dwells. 11 The worms”

8 *[y]et[s]e[s]a lyel[y]. + + mīsasa ost astāṣṣe : ///*

“the worms over the skin ... , within the flesh (and) bone house. :”

THT 9v folio Nr. 42

1 *k(e)ktseñ, ṇike sp[ā](rta)sk(em) makte lkāsk[em] aiś[au]my ā(śc.) ///*

“they turn the body now, as if the wise men see the (head).”

2 *sesīnoṣo 13 k_use slakkari kauc āñmo cemṭs, nauṣ, ///*

“oppressed. 13 They who are sorrowful ... their high(?) desire early”

3 *(pa)lsko pannatsiś, rupne yparwe : parwān(‘) epīnkt ānte(ne) ///*

“in order to stretch the spirit at first within the shape. : Between the brows (on) the forehead”

4 *klīye rano trenksate rūpn(‘) enwentse : tū ○ (ypārwe) ///*

“again the woman adhered to the man’s figure. : Thereupon”

5 *wnolmi taryā yākne²⁴ weweñoṣ, yogācā(ri) ///*

“males, yogins are denominated in (= as) three subjects”

6 *(per)rneñco : ṣememṭs, aurtse lkātsy²⁵ āñme al[y]e(nkaṃts) ///*

“glorious (pl.). : Some wish to see widely, others ...”

7 *stastaukkauwa āmpauwa sparḥauw ere : .ai ///*

“tired and rotted ..., elapsed appearance. : ...”

²² Sieg/Siegling have supplemented *bhavā(nānta)* 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*, *kṛtaparijaya* and *atīkrāntamanaskāra* (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 *c[w]i pals[k]o kaskātrā waip̄tār, aunt[rā] maka(tsi) ///*

“his spirit is scattered apart (and) begins to run”

THT 10r (T III Š19.4, group E from *Nakṣatra-Höhle*)

1 *//// k(ar)sts(i tom) yk(e po)stā 15 aśubh er[tsi]ś[‘], kr[e]ñc[‘], wn[o](lmi) //// (= 9v5)*

“to know (them) step by step. 15 In order to evoke the *Aśubha*(-meditation), the good people ...”

2 *//// (ādikā)rm(i)k[i] taryā yākie maśkentṛa cai perneñco : ṣemeṃts, aurt[s]e lkātsy āñme // (= 9v6)*

“Ādhikārmikas are (sorted out in) three ways, they are glorious. : Some wish to see widely, others ...”

3 *//// (waip̄t)ār (k)e(ts)eñān, stastaukkauwa āmpauwa sp̄arkauw ere : .ai .. //// (= 9v7)*

“separately tired (and) rotted bodies, elapsed appearance. ...”

4 *//// [c]wi palsko k[ā]s[k]ā(trā)waip̄t)ār, auntrā makatsi //// (= 9v8)*

“his spirit is scattered (= torn) apart (and) begins to run (= flee)”

5 *//// .e + .. + + + + + k[ā] .[e] ////*

THT 10v

5 *//// [ā]rṣāklaṃ p. .. + + + .k. ma[n]je : [y]akṣ[e]m̄t[s], ////*

“the snakes ... : Of the *yakṣas* ...”

6 *//// .. + (e)pyac, klāṣle ente tem(e)ñ, sta[mā]ṣle antsa(nene)²⁶ [k]_u[s](e) ////*

“he should remember where he should stand consequently, who ... on/of the mass (?) ...”

7 *//// (2)5 ce kl[au]tkesa yke postam̄ āst(‘) āstāntso s[ai]m, lkāṣṣam̄ tarne tañtsi ////*

“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]pmeṃ pal(sk)o [ta]l[ā]ṣ[ṣa]m̄ ś[tw]āra y[m]entse śmoñ[ñ]am̄ // //*

“... : 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 *Nakṣatra-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 *Udānavarga*, but rather with the *Abhidharmakośa*, and thus I would like to refrain from calling these manuscripts *Udānālaṃkāra*.

ii) THT 30 (no photo, group B from *Stadhöhle*, Udv.XII.14-16)

1 (*la*)klenta 21 te klyauṣāre makāykne tu yparwe palsko kaun(←t)āñm(←t)e : mā neṣam̄ laklentameṃ tsalpālñe poyknes(‘) eṃṣketse : cai toṭ, wrocci rṣāki mā lkenta nauṣar eṃṣketse : 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 *antsane* (loc. sg.) or *antsentse* (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_u, tne neṣaṃ yārye ksa lakle nautṣṣeñca* : 22 *cetṣ, ce_u, silñe paḥskontse lakle ṣpa wiḥassi* *poyṣi* : *tom ślokanma wertsyaine ākṣa cetṣ, paḥsko tsār_wāssiṣ*, • (XII.14 begins) *eṃṣke-*

“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 āratsiṣco yātatsiṣ, astarñeṣ, ṣeko* : *s[e]rke cmelñe srukalñents eṃṣketse nautalñe yāmtsi* 23 *snai keṣ, cmela karsatsiṣco ṣpa tne yārye sā ṣpālmeṃ* : *sai-*

Udv.XII.14ab: atyantaniṣṭhāya damāya śuddhaye saṃsārajātīmaranākṣayāya |

Udv.XII.14cd: anekadhātupratīṣaṃvidhāya mārgo hy ayam lokavidā prakāśitaḥ ||

“(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 *ṣṣe [ka]r(s)aucāisa apākarṭse yāmusa klyomña* (XII.14 ends) : (XII.15 begins) *gaṅkne kekmu maḥkte yaiku nāki ṣe[sa] reṣṣaṃ war*, • *samudrampa taiknesa yārye sa(←ā) oktats(’)* *ākṣusa* 24

Udv.XII.15ab: gaṅgāgataṃ yadvad apetaḥsaṃ saṃsyandate vāri tu sāgareṇa |

Udv.XII.15cd: tathaiva mārgaḥ sugatapradeśitaḥ saṃsyandate ayam hy amṛtasya 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 (*ṣesa reṣṣaṃ*) *onuwaññe yānmātsiṣ*, (Udv.XII.15 ends) *ce wace ślok*, : *ñāktetṣ, ñakte ākṣ(’)* *omte tsār_wāssiṣ, ceṃ wnoḥmeṃ* : *te ramṭ, sārsame neṣaṃ yārye tne saṃsārmeṃ*

“(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 *saṃsāra* :”

6 (*ṣaiṣṣe* : *eṃṣke*)*t[s]e laklentameṃ tsalpatsiṣ, oktatsa klyomña* 25 *po kleśanma nākṣeñca po cmel[atṣ.] āke yāṃṣeñca* : *teki ktsaitṣñe srukalñe cmelñe ṣpa 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 tetricoṣ, yāri wnoḥmi*) *[ta]llāñco wrocci ra rṣāki* : *aṅkaiṃ yāra(←i)sa mo[k]ṣ cai* *ñāskenṭar, tu(sa) m[ā] klpāskem* 26 *ñi no yārye ākṣusa oktatsa cmela nautṣeñca* : *ṣukt*,

“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. : Seven”

8 (*bodhyaṅgānta*) + + + + + *yānmāṣṣaṃ* : *maḥkte wranta ckentameṃ kārpaṃ kwri* *gā[ñkn]e (ait)t(a)ñka* : *po pernenta māskentar, po yanem samudīarṣc aiwoḥ*, 27 *manṭ, 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 *dharmacakrapravartana*, v5-7 pāda 31c-32d, cf. Inoue p. 55)

1 (*lokaś*) /// [:] *n(e)rvā(n)[āś.] po aiwołyci māskentar, lna[sk](em osta)m(em) : puđnāktentse kektsemne lkāšyem cai yetwem lakšānta : keše aiksnar, wā-*

“(they) all direct (= turn) into *nirvāna*, (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 (*ntoś, rupne swāñcaintsa ye*)*t(se) ysāšše 28 śle were po kleśanna yaiko[ś.] yukoš, śtwer m(a)[raṃ] : śaṅ, kartse k_uce yāmsate tu wnołmi keklyaušoś, šeyem : k_uce (')knesa ket ra*

“(beam) the golden (skin), 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 yāmsa*)*[t](e) śakk(e)ññe ršāke : ce_u, skloḳ, pkāte śaiššentse karstati ce ślok akšāme 29 [k_us]e pelaiknešše krent, ce_u, yerkwantai enklyaušacce nauš, • spyārta po ono-*

Udv.XII.16ab: *yo dharmacakraṃ hy ananuśrutam purā prāvartayat sarvabhūtānukampī | Udv.XII.16cd: taṃ tādṛśaṃ devanārāgrasatvaṃ nityaṃ 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 (*lmem taṅwa*)*[ñ]ñ(e)ñca ket ra santāṃne : ce_u, tu yāknesa ñakteṃ sāmnane śpālmem onolme{m} : šek, wināšši cmelše ce_u, samudtar, totte ykuwešo 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 (*l(ai)kn(eš)[ś](e) yerkwantai spārtslñesa tsyālpāte wnołmem : śaṅ, śl(') ālyenkaś, kartse(ne) spelkkessu šek, sū wināšle : pelaiknešše yerkwantai²⁷ k_use westar,*

“By turning the Wheel of 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 *darśanamārḳ, ñem, ²⁸ • śak, piś, kṣanam²⁹ epinte pīs āntsi³⁰ dharmacākḳar, ñem, 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 Darśanamārga heißt” (1949 p. 51, also Inoue 1972 p. 55) with gen. because of the obl. case of this word and *spārtslñesa* “by the turning” in line 3. However, [Das Drehen] (回轉) has no connection with *darśanamārga* (見道). I suppose that *pelaiknešše yerkwantai k_use westar*, is one sentence or clause, and a new (nominal) sentence begins from *darśanamārḳ*, 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”. *Darśanamārga* 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 *kṣāṃ* (from Skt. *kṣāṇa*), -a (-ā) of pl. sign -*nma* is omitted *metri causa*.

³⁰ *āntsi* “shoulders” corresponds to the pl. of BHS *skandha* “mass” (Edgerton p. 607), and the end of one sentence for *darśanamārḳ*, (cf. *Mahāvīyutpatti* 1310 p. 100, 見道 Nakamura p. 411).

*ette kluttāṅkentāṅ, toṃ pwentā cākr ente spārtam*³¹ : *k_wse (')tte tākam*³² *kauc*”, *toṃ kluttāṅkentāṅ, kaucmeṃ*

“*Darśanamārga*, namely, the five aggregates (五蘊) 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 *nnok, etteṅ, pelaikneṣṣepi spālmēṃ cakkartse ṣe yerter yeksnaṅ, • stwāra pwentā mārgāṅganta ṣem ramt, ywārškane 32 pelaikneṣṣe yerkwantai taiknesa eṣpirtacce nauṣ, • pudñā-*

“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,) *mārgāṅga* (= 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 eṅklyauṣacce sparttaṣṣaṃ mā (')lleṅ, tu campam : tu yparwe ṅakti śāmna tṣalpāre piṣ toṃ emelameṃ : taiknesa ket ra kartseṅ, paspārtau poyṣi <wi>nāṣe 33 alyeṅ, 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: *dharmasoṃāṅṅe udānalaṅkārne mārgavārgāntse p_rweṣṣe pāke* “the first part of *Mārgavarga* in the *Udānālaṅkāra* 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 *Udānālaṅkāra*.

The problematic part, THT 30 v5-7, is argued by Inoue (1972 p. 55-56) to belong to the *Dharmacakrapravartana*. 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. *Udānālaṅkāra* has some of the characteristics of *Abhidharma* as Inoue argued:

After the question 見道名法輪 “Does *Darśanamārga* mean *Dharmacakra*?” (p. 911c29), the answer 動轉不住義是輪義 “moving, turning and unstableness 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” 最爲隨順故獨名法輪 “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 *pwenta*, 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 隨順 “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” 猶如車輪或上或下 “like the wheel (moves) up or down” 如是見道緣境上下 “so the rim of Darśanamārga 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 *ānāpānasmṛti* (no photo)

This is the longest portion in Inoue’s article (1972 p. 44-55). He stated that the manuscript comes under “UA (*Udānālaṃkāra*) XV Smṛtivarga”, but such a name (or a title) is nowhere mentioned. Udv.XV *Smṛtivarga* exists, where *ānāpānasmṛti* 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納息第三之四 (T 1545 No. 27 p.132 sqq.) with 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 *kektseñ palskoś sasaimu anāṣṣalñe satā(ṣl)ñ(e :)* + + + + + + [l]m. [Nā] .tw + [t]w.
mp(a) + + + + + .k. [n]. *kālṣw.* + + + + +

“8 The inhaling (and) exhaling leaned on the body (and) the spirit (:) ... with ...”

2 *no yneś yāmoṣ, mā satāṣṣam*³³ 9 *starce dhyām k_wse yneś yāmtar, palsko msketar, lyask*³⁴
*attsaiḳ, • enenkaṣ, paspārtau cwi maim, palskw*³⁵ *attsaiḳ, • sanmetsa*³⁶ *ṣ, cwi k(ek)ts(eñe 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/Sigling and Inoue have translated, but if this part corresponds to Chin. 雖有一事而闕三事故息不轉, verse 9 ends here.

³⁴ A scribal error for *lykaṣke* “fine, small”?

³⁵ This is a binominal representing one concept by two words (*maim* “measure” and *palsko* “thought”), so the predicate is sg. *paspārtau*.

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 輕安 (Skt. *praśrabdhi*) “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”.

3 *māsketar*, • *tom śarmnasa satāślñe mā cets*, *neṣam* 10 *mākce*,³⁷ *ykeṣṣa kektseñe tā*,³⁸ *kenāṣṣe satāślñe* : *naiṣyandik no sā*, *yente karsanālyā* : *neṣam yent aupacayik*,

“with (= for) these reasons they have no exhaling (= 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 *naiṣyandika* (等流 “outcome or result”) should be known as the (breath-)wind : The (breath-)wind is *aupacayika* (長養 or 增長 “accumulation”)

4 *ślek*, *vipākaḥ*,³⁹ • *mā no sā*, *satāślñene yaṃ ṣa(m)śalne*⁴⁰ 11 *aiśamñe tentse ṣaiññe* *kūśalamūltse te pkarsaṣ*, • *īme no maiyya kalpau ce*, *kraupene*⁴¹ : *tu-*

“the same as well of *vipāka* (異熟 or 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 śarmts*(') *ānāpānasmṛti westra* : *omwaññentse se twere tikṣṇendryeṣ*, 12 *yśelmeccē* *ernāssonto śaiṣṣempa se rittowo* : *yśelmetse śaiṣṣe cwi*⁴² *ste*

“With (= For) this reason (it) is called *Ānāpānasmṛti*. : 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 *ānāpānasmṛti*). :”

6 *aiśai yyāmsle* : *piṣ*, *bhūmintā saim yāmu yātaṃ ertsi* : *upekṣindrintampa s*(') *eri pont* *prekeṃ* 13 *ṣkaṣ*, *yāknesa se westar*, *anāṣṣalñe satāślñe* : *ṣamśalñ ompo-*

“One who sustained the five grounds (= *Ānāpānasmṛti*⁴³) would be able to be evoked : This would always evoke (the breath) together with the indifferent senses (捨根) 13 This inhaling and exhaling is said (= described) with (= in) six ways: (i. e.) counting (數)”

³⁷ From the Chin. 何地繫 隨身繫耶 隨心繫耶 “Which field ties (the breath)? Does it tie (according to) the body? Does it tie (according to) the heart?” *mākce*, 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 *ykeṣṣa* “place- (adj.)” is fem. correlating to *kektseñe* “body” (nom. sg. fem.). If *mākce*, is a scribal error for *māktā*, (fem.), it seems to be no problem, but I suppose that *mākce*, 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 *tā*, is a demonstrative pronoun obl. fem. correlating with *keṃ* “earth” fem., and *kenāṣṣe* is a nom. sg. masc. correlating with *satāślñe* “exhaling”. *keṃ* could be 界 in 欲界身欲界入出息.

³⁹ *-k*, of *vipākaḥ*, is not *-ja* as Sieg/Siegling (1949 p. 60 with “ic”) and Inoue transcribed, but a particle for intensification. The antecedent *ślek*, contains also the same *-k*. Phonologically, the Skt. /j/ 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 *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* (cf. Nakamura p. 754). I think that the Skt. *rāśi* “group, collection” is suitable, which is found in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* of Vasubandhu, ed. by P. Pradhan, p. 13 as *rāśy-arthahḥ skandha-ārtha iti*. 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 √yām “to make” (*aiśai yyāmsle* “it should be perceived”), if *yśelmetse śaiṣṣe* is a theme. Another possibility is that it is a function of the dative “for it”. Given 諸有欲令入出息 “various desires order to take breath”, and taking *yśelmetse śaiṣṣe* as the subject, I prefer the latter.

⁴³ Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* VI 12a-c, La Valle Poussin Tome IV p. 153 “L’*ānāpānasmṛti* est *prajñā*, appartient à cinq terres, a pour objet le vent, est pratiquée par des êtres du Kāmadhātu”.

7 *staṃ yalñ(‘) etsñ(←w)ai palkalñe : stamaṣṣalñe klautkaṣṣlñe astarāññe : ṣaṣkaṣ, klautkem*⁴⁴
se westar, ompalskoññe 14 ṣaṃṣalñe su tne westra piṣ, klautkemntsa ṣaṃ-

“going after (隨行), looking outward (觀), : 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 *ṣalñe : meṅki olypo trīwāṣṣlñe astarñe ṣpa : ṣaṃṣalñe ṣe wī trai stwer, piṣ, ṣak, taṅtsi ṇnok*
alya(←e)ṅkaṃ satāṣṣlñe ṣkar ṣkar, ṣaṃṣtar, 15 meṅki no ṣaṃṣalñe t[n]je ṣuk(ṭ).

“less (減數), more (增數), mixing (亂數) and pureness (淨數). : Counting one, two,
 three, four, five until ten, again (and again), 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, ṣak, wat, satāṣṣa<ṃ> : ṣkas piṣ, (←ṣukt) ṅu wat no ṣaṃṣtar, mā po solme : olypo no*
ṣaṃṣalñe tne kos satāṣṣaṃ : meṅki(←olyapo) tumem satāṣṣlñe keṣ yāmastar, 16 trī-

“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 *wāṣṣlñe⁴⁵ ka,ce satāṣṣaṃ tu anāṣṣlñe eṅkastar, • anāṣṣaṃ wat, satāṣṣlñe keṣ yamastar, •*
astarñe piṣ, anāṣṣaṃ piṣ tu ṣaṃṣtra satāṣṣaṃ wat, piṣ, lykwarwa tuk ṣ(←p)is, ṣaṃ-

“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 *ṣtar, 17 yent(‘) ompostaṃ no yalñe ent(‘) anāṣṣaṃ melentsa : yent(‘) eneṅka yopamne yaṃ*
tw ompostaṃ : im(‘)⁴⁶ aiṣamñeṣ(‘) ompostaṃ yaṃ su yente : korne kelen(‘) ārañcāṣ paine

“17 Well, the going after (= following 隨) 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 *taṅtsi 18 eṃṣke paiñe mokociṣ, āṣṣaṃ ime tumem toṃ : ṇnaskemane mokocmem yentem*
lkāṣṣaṃ : ywārtsa tāna kwāñcīṣai kwāñcīṭ, yarm wat, : prāri

“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, lauке ykuwa 19 koṣ, cwi maiyy(‘) aiṣamñeṣṣa kos ṇdrinta toṭ, lkāṣṣaṃ :*
tumem no stamaṣṣalñe maṅkte yentets, • meleṃtsa yaipwa 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. /ime/ translates Skt. *smṛti* (TEB p. 169), it is better to see this word as the subject of the sentence, because the topic is *ānāpānasmṛti*. And thereafter Inoue’s translation “he (the practitioner) goes after the wind” – is somewhat strange. Toch. *su* should be a demonstrative pronoun for *ime* (masc.) and is written here *metri causa*.

knowledge, however much (his power of) sense organs, so much he sees. : Well then, how about the standing (止) of the winds? The winds that have entered through the nose”
 6 ntem korne stamsam : arañcne keleś, paiñe mokocne wat, 20 kauc, ykwa yenten stamsam tarnen(’) emške po yentem : kektsenne stmauwa lkāssam prutkauwa ram, • wamer ram, serk[n]e sta<mau>-

“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 winds stand in the body, as if (they are) closed off, he sees the body like a jewel (which is) situated in a chain.”

7 sai kektseñ, lkāssam : ce teyknesa stamaññe yentets, pkarsas, 21 etswai palkañe yentem melemnts enem yaipwa tom : korne kekmwa lkāssamme keleś, ke(kmwā : arañcā)-

“: With (= In) this manner (you must) know the standing (止) of the winds! 21 As for the observance (觀): the winds that entered inside the nose : he sees come into the throat (and) to the navel, : to the heart”

8 ś, emške paiñe mokoc, tañsi : tumem cfwji mant, mas(k)e(tar.) ////

“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 雜蘊第一中補特伽羅納息第三之四

(T 1545 No. 27 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耶。依心轉耶。乃至廣說。問何故作此論。答爲令疑者得決定故。謂契經說。佛告長者。此入出息是身法身爲本繫屬身依身而轉。施設論說。何緣死者入出息不轉耶。謂入出息由心力轉。死者無心但有身故。此入出息一說依身一說依心。或有生疑。如是二說俱不了義。或俱(132a16)了義。欲顯此二真實義趣故作斯論。

(132b12)雖有一事而闕三事故息不轉。問何故在第四靜慮息不轉耶。答彼心細故。謂入出息依心轉。第四靜慮以上諸地心極微細故息不轉。復次內門轉故。謂息必依外門心轉。第四靜慮以上諸地心內門轉故息不轉。復次內事轉故。謂息必依外事心轉。第四靜慮以上諸地心內事轉故息不轉。復次寂寂靜故。謂息必依躁動心轉。如人涉路躁則動塵心若躁動起入出息。第四靜慮以上諸地心極寂靜故息不轉。尊者世友作如是說。入第四靜慮便得轉依。謂所依身。有第四靜慮微妙大種令諸毛孔一切密合無竅隙故非息所依。由此爾時息不復轉。大德說曰。入第四靜慮心便不動。心不動故身(132b26)亦不動。身不動故息不復轉。

(133a5)問入出息。何地繫隨身繫耶。隨身地繫。諸有欲令入出息隨身地繫者。彼說生欲界者若欲界心現在前。彼欲界身欲界入出息隨欲界心轉。即此心所觀。即彼若初靜慮心現在前。彼欲界身欲界入出(133a10)息。隨初靜慮心轉。即此心所觀。

(134a10)問此入出息爲是長養。爲是異熟。爲是等流。答唯是等流。身中雖有異熟生風及長養風。然入出息唯是等流如契經說。佛告阿難。若如射箭管管相續調入出息令不亂者。應知彼名殊勝飲食。問何故世尊說入出息名飲食耶。答能損益故。謂無上妙飲食益身。如有方便調入出息。亦無能惡飲食損身。如無方便調入出息。是故世尊說爲飲食。問如射箭管管相續者是何義耶。答如以後箭射於前箭後觸前管是此中義。有說此中但顯前後無間斷義。不說後箭觸前箭義。又不定說如以後箭射前箭義如契經說。有持來有持去有持來持去念有修持來持去念。此中持來者。謂入息。持去者(134a25)謂出息如施設論說。吸風入內名持來。引風出外名持去。如鍛金師囊。囊開合風隨入出。此亦如是。有作是說。出息名持來。入息名持去有餘師說。煖息名持來。冷息名持去。復有說者。上息名持來。下息名持去。評曰。此中初說爲善。能緣彼念名持來持去念。即於此念及此相應俱有諸法。若修若習若多所作。名修持來持去念。問此持息念自性是何。答慧爲自性。然此聚中念力增故說名爲念。如四念住及宿住念本性念慧爲自性。然彼聚中念力增故說名爲念。如除色想慧爲自性。然彼聚中想力增故說名爲想。此亦如是。若并眷屬四蘊五蘊爲其自性。此持息念界者謂欲色界非無色界。地者五地謂欲界靜慮中間及下三靜慮近分。諸有欲令下三根本靜慮地亦有捨根者。彼說此念通八地。謂前五及下三靜(134b13)慮。所依者。唯依欲界。非色無色界。

(134c26)復次此持息念由六因故應知其相。一數二隨三止四觀五轉六淨。數有五種。一滿數二減數三增

數四亂數五淨數。滿數者。謂從一數至十。減數者。謂於二等數爲一等。增數者謂於一等數爲二等。亂數者。謂數過十。有餘師說。於入謂出於出謂入名爲亂數。復有說者。數無次第故名亂數。淨數者。於五入息數爲五入。於五出息數爲五出。問爲先數入息爲先數出息耶。答先數入息。後數出息。以生時息入死時息出故。又如是觀身心安隱非顛倒故。又如是觀顯於生死先入後出非顛倒故。隨者繫心隨息從外入內。謂從口鼻流至咽喉。復從咽喉流至心胸。復從心胸流至臍輪。如是展轉乃至足指心皆隨逐心復隨息從內出外。半麻一麻。半麥一麥。半指節一指節。半指一指。半擦手一擦手。半肘一肘。半尋一尋。乃至廣說。隨根勢力。息去近遠心皆隨逐。止者。謂觀息風初住口鼻。次住咽喉。次住心胸次住臍輪。展轉乃至後住足指。隨息所止心住觀之。有說。止者。住心觀息遍住身中如珠中纒。觀者。謂此息風若至口鼻能審觀察。若至咽喉亦審觀察。如是展轉乃至足指亦審觀察。觀息風已。復作是念。此風聚中有四大種。此四大種生諸造色。此所造色是心心所依止處。如是行者。觀息爲先展轉遍能觀五取蘊。

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 *Udānālamkāra* 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 *Udānavarga* and its commentary. Thus, these can be regarded as *Udānālamkāra* manuscripts. Paleographically they pertain to the same sequence and display a slightly older style of Murtuq⁴⁷.

THT 299r (T III M175.6, *Udānavarga* XVI 9-24 *Prakīrṇakavarga*, word to word Toch. translation, not bilingual, corresponding the Skt. text with underlines below, in meter 4x7/8)

- 1 ||| (ke)t[e] yolo (yām)[u] yāmor*, kremtsa |||
- 2 ||| aiśaumye • sṛūkalñentse āke(ne) |||
- 3 ||| (mā) memstar, 12 k,se śaulne mā |||
- 4 ||| (yaik)[o]rmeṃ arkwīna pīraṭ, 48 ṣa(māni) |||

Toch.B 299v

- 1 ||| onolmi • t[us](ā)ksa |||
- 2 ||| yokaināśco • āyor*, ma(sketrā) |||
- 3 ||| (we)strā 22 rīye no astāṣṣi po[ṣ]ī |||
- 4 ||| (ce)_u, mā lkā(ske)mane sū no causa |||

Udv.XVI.9ab: yasya pāpakrtam karma kuśalena pithīyate |

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. √wār- “to make practice” (hapax) and is used for the causative of Skt. √bhū- “to effect” (Udv.XXVI.14ab *bhāvayata*). This word represents a semantic translation of the Buddhist term. Cf. Tamai p. 208-209.

Udv.XVI.11cd: sa vai dṛṣṭa pado dhīro maranānte na śocati ||
 Udv.XVI.12cd: sa vai dṛṣṭa pado dhīraḥ śokamadhye na śocati ||
 Udv.XVI.13ab: yo jīvite na tapate maranānte ca sarvaśaḥ |
 Udv.XVI.14ab: kṛṣṇaṁ dharmam viprahāya śuklām bhāvayata bhiksavaḥ |
 Udv.XVI.20ab: kṣetrāni tṛṇadoṣāni lobhadoṣā tv iyam prajā |
 Udv.XVI.20cd: tasmād vigatalobhebhyo dattaṁ bhavati mahāphalam ||
 Udv.XVI.21cd: tasmād vigatatsnebhyo dattam bhavati mahāphalam ||
 Udv.XVI.22cd: arakte virajā bhavati rakte bālo nirucyate ||
 Udv.XVI.23ab: nagaram hy asthiprākāram māmsaṣaṇitalepanam |
 Udv.XVI.24ab: hetuprabhavam sadā hi duhkhaṁ tad apaśyam sa hi tena tatra baddhaḥ

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 yamas)k(e)[m](anen)[t]s(e) 6 makte ra(no) ///
 2 /// (makte kroṅṣe) pyapyaimem ere were mā mī(yāṣṣam) ///
 3 /// (aṅmantse) [n]o sām, pal[sk]oytra • sām* ///

THT 300v

1 /// [n](a)no makte pyāpyo no [po]⁴⁹ /// (commentary? See fn. 52 below)
 2 /// n[fo] cmītar*, astre were pals(k)o ///
 3 /// (akalṣa)l[y]r⁵⁰ (c)e(y'') 13 pyapyaim ///

Udv.XVIII.6cd: evam subhāṣitā vācā niṣphalā (')sāv akurvātah ||
 Udv.XVIII.7ab: yathāpi ruciram puṣpaṁ varṇavat syāt sugandhavat |
 Udv.XVIII.8ab: yathāpi bhramaraḥ puṣpād varṇagandhāv ahethayan |
 Udv.XVIII.9cd: ātmanas tu samīkṣeta samāni viṣamāni ca ||
 Udv.XVIII.10ab: yathāpi puspa(?)rāśibhyaḥ kuryān mālāguṇaṁ bahūn |
 Udv.XVIII.12cd: padmaṁ tatra tu jāyeta śucigandhi manoramam ||
 Udv.18.13cd: prajñayā vyatirocante samyaksambuddhaśrāvākāḥ ||
 Udv.18.14ab: puspāny eva pracinvantaṁ vyāsaktamanasaṁ 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 /// tanāñña ///

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 Gāndhārī *Dharmapada* 293a *yada vi puṣpa-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 *bhikṣavaḥ*”, but (akalṣa)l[y]r⁵⁰ “students (ger. of *vākl* ‘to study’)” is a correct translation for the actual Skt. *śrāvākāḥ*.

2 /// .. r.m̄, ñāṣṣe ///
 3 /// (pū)[t](a)neṃmpa kaṭapūtanem., ///
 4 /// .. || klā ... ///

THT 301v?

1 /// [d]urdume .. ///
 2 /// .e waṭ*, upāsakentse wa(t*,) ///
 3 /// yakṣañña wa[t*], ///
 4 /// koyle wa(t*,) ///

THT 302r? (T III M145.12)

1 /// kne : weña bhadremś, ka[ru](ntsa) ///
 2 /// (pa)[au]nasa makāyke : [p]. ///
 3 /// .. maim, pals(k)o .i ///

THT 302v?

1 /// (is)p[e]k, ly(ā)ka [p]u(dñākte) ///
 2 /// (snai pa)rmañk, : kṛstau stām ra ///
 3 /// sa : po ykentane lyakā[w](a) ///

THT 303 (Frgm.)

ar1 /// oṣṣalem̄ ///
 ar2 /// rtse ts[m]etarne [w]i ///
 av1 /// wa aiśamñe .. ///
 av2 /// kutsanem̄ po trai ///

br1 /// aṣeñcai ya .. ///
 br2 /// .. [li] ///
 bv1 .t. .k. ///
 bv2 śaumoṣṣe [ā] ///

cr1 /// yknesa ///
 cr2 /// .. stu .. ///
 cr3 /// paḷ*, yo .o ///
 cv1 /// .. uwe [n]. ///
 cv2 /// [o]nolmi ///
 cv3 /// ..ṣ, a ///

dr1 /// .. mo pw. ṣṣ. [s]l. ///
 dr2 /// .ñ. ṣṣempa ṣ.e ///
 dv1 /// maiyyam • .. ///
 dv2 /// .. warkaṃñe ñi ///

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 *kaṭapūta*

(301r3) in the *Mahāvvyūtpatti* (No. 4759), but not in the *Udānavarga*. Hence I would not count these manuscripts as reflecting either the *Udānavarga* or the *Udānālaṃkāra*.

Conclusion:

According to Lüders *alaṃkāra* is a so-called embellishment for *baudhasaṃgīti*, “the singing of the Buddha”. Therefore *alaṃkāra* would be correlated with a certain class of Buddhist scriptures, and Dharmasoma’s *Udānālaṃkāra* 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 Udṅ.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 *Udānālaṃkāra* as a “work with verses” like other Toch. literatures, and the meaning of *alaṃkāra* “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 *dharmasomaññe udānalāṅkārne mārgavārgāntse parweṣṣe pāke* (THT 28 a4) “the first part of the Mārgavarga in the *Udānalāṅkāra* 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 *-ññe* 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 *Udānālaṃkāra*, 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 *Udānālaṃkāra* fragments in the Berlin collection and published them under the title of “Die Udānālaṅkāra-Fragmente” (I find *ñ* before *k* not in THT, but in Lévi’s transcription), and found an Abhidharma annotation in THT 9-10 *aśubhabhāvana* “die Meditation über die Abscheulichkeit des Körpers”, THT 30v3 *dharmacakrapravartana* “das Drehen des Gesetzesrades”, and THT 41 *ānāpānasmṛti* “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 *Udānālaṃkāra*, i.e. “prelude – main theme (*Udānavarga*) – postlude”. THT 30 could be an *Udānālaṃkāra*, 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 Udānālaṅkāra-Fragmente” (THT 1-70) are not always *Udānālaṃkāra*.

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 Udṅ.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. *Udānālaṃkāra*)⁵¹.

Abbreviations and Symbols:

Skt.: Sanskrit

T: Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō

THT: Tocharische Handschriften aus
Turfan

Toch.: Tocharian

Udv.: *Udānavarga*

Udl.: *Udānālaṃkāra*

r: recto

v: verso

phoneme interpretation: //

damaged *akṣara*(s): []

restored *akṣara*(s): ()

correction: (←) or (→)

interlinear insertion: « »

omitted *akṣara*(s): < >

superfluous *akṣara*(s): { }

lost *akṣara*: "+"

adj.: adjective

subj.: subjunctive

fn.: foot note

gen.: genitive

nom.: nominative

obl.: oblique (case)

pp.: past participle

pl.: plural

pres.: present

illegible *akṣara*: ".."

illegible part of *akṣara*: ". "

traditional diaeresis over *akṣara*^a: "''"

string hole: ○

non-syllabic *u*: "u"

virāma line: ", "

virāma sign over *akṣara*: "*"

punctuation: • and :

⁵¹ The diachronical and synchronical standpoint of paleography (II-1 → II-3 or MQ → Murtuq) is shown in Tamai 2011a p. 82 sqq.

Bibliography:

- Adams, Douglas Q. 1999: *A Dictionary of Tocharian*, Amsterdam-Atlanta.
- Bernhard, Franz 1965: *Udānavarga*, Göttingen.
- Brough, John 1962: *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, London.
- Edgerton, Franklin 1953: *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, rep. 1985 Delhi.
- Inoue, Kogi 1972: “トハラ語仏典 Udānāṅkāra におけるアピダルマ的注解” 『仏教学研究』 第29号, 昭和47年 龍谷大学仏教学会 [“*Abhidharma-Annotations of Udānāṅkāra in the Tocharian*,” in: *Study for Buddhology*, No. 29], pp. 37-62.
- Krause, Wolfgang 1952: *Westtocharische Grammatik Bd.I Das Verbum*, Heidelberg.
- Krause, Wolfgang & Thomas, Werner 1960: *Tocharisches Elementarbuch (TEB)*, Heidelberg.
- de La Vallée Poussin, Louis 1980: *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, Bruxelles.
- Nakamura, Hajime 1978: 『ブツダの真理のことば 感興のことば』 (*Dhammapada Udānavarga*), Tokyo.
- 2001: 『広説佛教語大辞典』 (*Kōsetu Bukkyōgo Daijiten*) 4 Vols. Tokyo.
- Lévi, Sylvain 1933: *Fragments de Textes Koutchéens*, Cahiers de la Société Asiatique II, Paris.
- Lüders, Heinrich 1926: *Bruchstücke der Kalpanāmaṅḍitikā des Kumāralāta* Leipzig.
- Pinault, George-Jean 1990: “Compléments à l'Udānāṅkāra et à l'Udānastotra en Koutchéen,” in *Documents et Archives provenant de l'Asie Centrale*, Association Franco-Japonaise des Études Orientales, Kyoto, pp. 51-69.
- Poucha, Pavel 1955: *Thesaurus Lingue Tocharichae Dialecti A*, Praha.
- Rockhill, W. Woodville 1883: *Udānavarga: A Collection of Verses from the Buddhist Canon. Compiled by Dharmatrāta*.
- Sakaki, Ryozauro 1916: *Mahāvūtpatti* (rep. 1981, Tokyo).
- Sieg, Emil & Wilhelm Siegling 1921: *Tocharische Sprachreste I. Band Die Texte A. Transcription, B. Tafeln*, Berlin und Leipzig.
- 1933: “Bruchstücke eines Udānavarga-Kommentars (Udānāṅkāra?) im Tocharischen,” in *Festschrift für Moriz Winternitz*, Leipzig.
- 1949: *Tocharische Sprachreste Sprach B Die Udānāṅkāra-Fragment*, Göttingen.
- Thomas, Werner 1953: *Tocharische Sprachreste Sprach B* (im Auftrag der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Berlin hrg. von E. Sieg und W. Siegling) *Heft 2 Fragmente Nr. 71-633*, Göttingen.
- Śāstri, Swāmī Dwārikādās 1998: *The Abhidharmakośa & Bhāṣya of Vasubandhu with commentary of Yaśomitrā*, Varanasi.
- Tamai, Tatsushi 2011a: *Paläographische Untersuchungen zum B-Tocharischen*, Innsbruck.
- 2011b: “Transliterations of the Tocharian B *Udānāṅkāra* Fragments in the Berlin Collection,” in: *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism XIV*, pp. 81-125.

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 Dīpaṃkara Story

This story's panel belongs apparently to the Swat school.

On the left, we see the gate of the city of Dīpavaṭī, 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 *brāhmaṇa* 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 *brāhmaṇas* having a meal, but in Fig. 3, only women, preparing and serving the meal, can be seen. In figs. 4 and 5, we see *brāhmaṇas* 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.

¹ Isao Kurita, *Gandhāran Art I. The Buddha's Life Story, A revised and enlarged edition, Tokyo 2003: Nigensha; Gandhāra Art II. The World of Buddha, A revised and enlarged edition, Tokyo 2003: Nigensha.*

■ 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-Siṃha 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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Prefatory | 343 |
| Table of Contents | 344 |
| 0. Abbreviations, including some unabridged short titles | 345 |
| 1. Proper Names, Organizations, Some Works, and the like | |
| 2. Serial Publications | |
| 3. Periodicals | |
| 4. Commemoration Volumes | |
| 5. Miscellaneous Words | |
| I. Monographic Publications | 352 |
| Ia. Monographics | |
| Ib. Monographic Pamphlets | |
| Ic. Pamphlets Written and/or Edited Anonymously | |
| Id: Commemoration Volume Received on the Occasion of the 65th Birthday | |
| II. Papers and Articles in Chronological Order | 359 |
| III. Reviews – Introducing New Publications – Short Notices | 379 |
| IV. Articles to Dictionaries, Prefaces, Bulletins, Essays & Tripartite Talks | 380 |
| A. Contributions to Dictionaries (either specific or bibliographic) | |
| B. Prefaces / Postscripts to Academic Publications | |
| C. Bulletins: Reports of Academic Activities | |
| I. Reports of the RL & IIBS Academic Activities published in the <i>Myōhō</i> | |
| II. Reports of Some Other Academic Activities published in the <i>BRI</i> | |
| D. Essays for the General Public (Written in Japanese) | |
| E. Tripartite Talks for the General Public | |
| V. Articles / Essays either in press or gone astray | 383 |
| VI. Editorships in chief of Serial Works | 383 |
| VII. Advisory to some textual / philological works | 383 |
| VIII. Books published under my supervision | 383 |
| Appendix: | |
| <i>Curriculum Vitae - A Succinct Autobiographical Record - As of 1 January 2013</i> | 384 |
| Personal Records | |
| Educational Records | |
| Academic Degrees | |
| Academic Scholarships | |
| Academic Award | |
| Academic Honour | |
| Academic Posts Held | |
| <i>Permanently Employed / Full-time Posts</i> | |
| <i>Temporary / Part-time Appointments</i> | |
| I. Guest Professorships | |
| II. Part-time Lectureships in Japan | |
| III. Guest Research Fellowship | |
| IV. Honorary Memberships of Academic Institutions and Learned Societies | |
| V. Memberships on Editorial Boards of Academic Publications | |

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.

Bibl.SP 1970 = A. Yuyama, *A Bibliography of the Sanskrit Texts of the SP* (Canberra 1970).

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.

CPD = *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, begun by Wilhelm Trenckner, continuing the work of Dines Andersen, Helmer Smith, Ludwig Alsdorf, Kenneth Roy Norman, Oskar von Hinüber, et al.

Dbh. = *Daśabhūmika-sūtra*, *Daśabhūmīśvara-*°.

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.

IIBS = 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).

ISBN = International Standard Book Number.

IsMEO = Istituto per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente (Roma).

ISSN = International Standard Series Number.

Jap. = Japan, Japanese.

JAIBS = Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Tokyo).

KN = Hendrik Kern & Bunyiu Nanjio (*SP*, ed. KN, St. Petersburg, 1908-1912).

Lat. = Latin.

LC = United States Library of Congress (Washington D.C.).

MInd. = Middle Indic.

Mong. = Mongol, Mongolian.

MvAv = *Mahāvastu-Avadāna*.

NLA = National Library of Australia (Canberra).

PIE = Proto-Indo-European.

Pkt = Prākṛt(a), Prakrit.

Pras. = *Prasannapadā* of Candrakīrti.

PTS = Pali Text Society (London – Oxford – Bristol).

Rgs = *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*.

RgsGr = Yuyama, *A Grammar of the Rgs (Sanskrit Recension A)* (= *OMS*, XIV) (Canberra 1973).

RL = The Reiyukai Library/霊友会図書館 (*see* IIBS, so renamed since 1982).

Skt = Sanskrit.

SP = *Saddharmapundarikasūtra*.

SUB = Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek (Göttingen).

Suv = *Suvarṇa(pra)bhāsottama-sūtra*.

T or Taisho = *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* (大正新脩大藏經).

Tib. = Tibet, Tibetan.

Tohoku = *A Catalogue of the Tohoku University Collection of Tibetan Works on Buddhism*, ed. Y. Kanakura, R. Yamada, T. Tada & H. Hadano [西藏撰述佛典目錄] (Sendai 1953). — *Cited by the number of texts.*

UL = University Library / University Libraries.

UP = University Press.

UvDh = *Uṣṇīṣa-vijayā Dhāraṇī* (佛頂尊勝陀羅尼).

Vkn = *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-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).

BSSS = *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).

BPBSM = *Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica: Series Maior* (Tokyo: The Reiyukai [for vol. I alone] and after vol. II published by IIBS).

BPBB = *Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica* (Hachioji/Tokyo: IRIAB).

COSOPS = *Centre of Oriental Studies Occasional Paper Series* (ANU, Canberra).

CSM = *Corpus Scriptorum Mongolorum, Instituti Linguae et Litterarum Academiae Scientiarum Republicae Populi Mongoli* (Ulaan Baator).

GOS = *Groningen Oriental Series* (Groningen: Egbert Forsten Publishing).

IT = *Indica et Tibetica: Monographien zu den Sprachen und Literaturen des indo-tibetischen Kulturraumes*, hrsg. Michael Hahn unter Mitwirkung von Jens-Uwe Hartmann et alibi (Swisttal-Odendorf – Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag).

JL-SM = *Janua Linguarum: Studia Memoriae Nikolai van Wijk, Series Maior* (Den Haag-Paris: Mouton).

OLA = *Orientalia Lovaniensia, Analecta* (Leuven: Departement Oriëntalistiek, Universiteit te Leuven).

OMS = *Oriental Monograph Series* (Centre of Oriental Studies / Faculty of Asian Studies in association with ANUP, Canberra).

PhA = *Philologica Asiatica: Monograph Series* (Tokyo: Chūō Academic Research Institute).

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).

SBT = *Studies in the Buddhist Tradition: A Publication of the Institute for the Study of Buddhist Traditions, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor*, ed. Luis O. Gómez (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press).

SOR = *Serie Orientale Roma* (Rome: IsMEO).

SPB = *Studia Philologica Buddhica* (Tokyo: Reiyukai Library - IIBS).

SPBOPS = *Studia Philologica Buddhica: Occasional Paper Series* (RL / IIBS, Tokyo).

ŚPS = *Śatapitaka 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).

SÜBSL = *Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur / A Systematic Survey of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature*. Im Auftrage der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, hrsg. Heinz Bechert (Göttingen / Wiesbaden-Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag).

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).

ABORI = *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* (Poona).

ALB = *Adyar Library Bulletin* (Madras, renamed Chennai since 1996).

AM = *Asia Major* (London-Leipzig –Princeton NJ, et al.).

AO = *Archiv Orientalní* (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 Australia and New Zealand* (Melbourne).

BEI = *Bulletin d'études indiennes* (Paris: Association française pour les études sanskrites).

BJSEAHs = 東南アジア史学会会報 · *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).

BSO(A)S = *Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies* (London).

BSR = *Buddhist Studies Review* (London).

Bukkyōgaku = 佛教學: *Journal of Buddhist Studies (Organ of the Japanese Association of Buddhist Thought)* (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin/山喜房佛書林).

Chūgai Nippō = 中外日報, a newspaper specializing mainly in religious activities (Kyoto).

EB = *The Eastern Buddhist* (Kyoto).

EW = *East and West* (Rome).

HJIPBS = 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, Rishso University, Tokyo/立正大學法華經文化研究所).

HBK = *Hokke Bunka Kenkyū* 法華文化研究 (Institute for the Comprehensive Study of the Lotus Sutra, Rishso 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).

IJ = *Indo-Iranian Journal* (The Hague – Paris / Dordrecht / Leiden).

IJBS = *Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies* / ॥ बौद्ध अध्ययन की भारतीय अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय

पत्रिका ॥ (Sarnath-Varanasi).

IT = *Indologica Taurinensia: Official Organ of the International Association of Sanskrit Studies* (Torino / Turin).

JA = *Journal Asiatique* (Paris).

JAOS = *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (New Haven – Ann Arbor).

JIBS = IBK, q.v

JICSCUHK = *The Journal of the Institute of Chinese Studies of the Chinese University of Hong Kong* (Hong Kong).

JOSA = *Journal of the Oriental Society of Australia* (Sydney).

JRAS = *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (London).

JRS = *Journal of Religious Studies* (Patiala).

JSAS = *Journal of South Asian Studies* (Perth).

MAS = *Modern Asian Studies* (Cambridge).

Meicho Tsūshin = 名著通信: *A monthly public relations bulletin of the publishing company named Meicho Fukyūkai* [名著普及会] (Tokyo).

Myōhō = 妙法・本部だより [靈友會]: *A quarterly bulletin published by the Reiyukai Headquarters* (Tokyo).

Nan-ya Yen-chiu = 南亞研究 (Institute of South Asian Studies, University of Peking and The Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Peking).

OLZ = *Orinetalistische Literaturzeitung* (Berlin).

PO = *Przeglad Orientalistyczny* (Praha).

RBS = *Revue bibliographique de sinologie* (Paris).

REB = *Rivista de Estudios Budistas* (México – Buenos Aires).

RSR = *Religious Studies Review* (Hanover USA).

SBKN = 三康文化研究所年報: *Annual of the Sanko Research Institute for the Studies of Buddhism* (Tokyo).

SGZN = 鈴木學術財団研究年報: *Annual of Oriental and Religious Studies, Suzuki Research Foundation* (Tokyo).

Shih-chieh Tzung-chiao Yen-chiu = 世界宗教研究 (Peking: Chinese Social Sciences Press).

Shitennōji = 四天王寺: a monthly periodical publication of the Temple Shitennō-ji, Osaka.

Shūkyō Kenkyū = 宗教研究: An organ of the Japanese Association of Religious Studies (Tokyo).

Shunjū = 春秋: A monthly public relations bulletin of the publishing company named Shunjūsha (Tokyo).

TBS = 東洋文庫書報: *Annual Bulletin of the Toyo Bunko (Oriental Library)* (Tokyo).

TGK = 東洋學術研究: *Journal of Oriental Studies* (Hachioji, Tokyo).

TG = 東洋學報: *Journal of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* (Tokyo).

TJ = *Tibet Journal*: an international publication for the study of Tibet (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1975-).

Tōhōgaku = 東方學: *Eastern Studies, a biannual journal* (Tokyo: Tōhō Gakkai/東方學會).

WZKSO = *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens, I-XIII* (Wien 1957-69) (Cf next).

WZKS = *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens und Arciv für indische Philosophie [Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften]* (Leiden: Brill).

ZAS = *Zentralasiatische Studien des Seminars für Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft Zentralasiens der Universität Bonn* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).

ZDMG = *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (Leipzig –Wiesbaden).

4. Commemoration Volumes:

Bagchi Volume = *India and China: Interactions through Buddhism and Diplomacy. A Collection*

- of Essays by Professor Prabodh Chandra Bagchi*. Compiled by Bangwei Wang & Tansen Sen (= AICS) (London-New York-Delhi 2011).
- Bapat Volume = Amalā Prajñā: Aspects of Buddhist Studies – Professor P. V. Bapat Felicitation Volume*, ed. N. H. Samtani (Assoc. ed.: H. S. Prasad) (= BIB, LXIII) (Delhi 1989).
- Bechert Volume = Bauddhavidyāsudhārakah: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, eds. Petra Kieffer-Pülz & Jens-Uwe Hartmann (= IT, XXX) (1997).
- Conze Volume = Prajñāpāramitā and Related Systems: Studies in Honor of Edward Conze*, ed. Lewis Lancaster (Assoc. ed.: Luis O. Gómez) (= BBSS, I) (Berkeley 1977).
- Eggermont Volume = India and the Ancient World: History, Trade and Culture before A. D. 650*, ed. Gilbert Pollet: *Professor P. H. L. Eggermont Jubilee Volume Presented on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday* (= OLA, XXV) (Leuven 1987).
- Eimer Volume = Festgabe für Helmut Eimer*, hrsg. Michael Hahn, Jens-Uwe Hartmann & Roland Steiner (= IT, XXVIII) (1996).
- Frauwallner Volume = Festschrift für Erich Frauwallner* (= WZKSO, XII-XIII) (Wien 1968-1969).
- 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)].
- Heissig Volume = Serta Tibeto-Mongolica: Festschrift für Walther Heissig zum 60. Geburtstag am 5.12.1973*, hrsg. R. Kaschewsky, K. Sagaster & M. Weiers (Wiesbaden; Otto Harrassowitz, 1973).
- Hirakawa Volume = 平川彰博士古稀記念・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 Zennō 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・大乘仏教から密教へ* (東京・春秋社, 昭和56年) [*From Mahāyāna Buddhism to Tāntrism: A Volume in Honour of Dr. Shunkyō Katsumata on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday* (Tokyo: Shunjū-sha, 1981)].
- Kuiper Volume = Pratiḍānam: Indian, Iranian and Indo-European Studies Presented to Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus Kuiper on His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. J. C. Heesterman, G. H. Schokker & V. I. Subrahmoniam (= JL-SM, XXXIV) (The Hague-Paris 1968).
- Kumārajīva Anniversary Volume = 鳩摩羅什生誕1650年・平安京建都1200年記念・第5回日中仏教学術会議・発表論文集: テーマ『仏教史における鳩摩羅什の巨大な業績』* (京都・中外日報社, 平成5/1993年10月17日) [*“The Gigantic Achievements of Kumārajīva’s Work in the History of Buddhism” in commemoration of the 1650th Anniversary of Kumārajīva’s Birth, in commemoration of the 1200th Anniversary of the Relocation of the Capital of the Heian Era, and the Fifth Sino-Japanese Academic Conference on Buddhist Studies”, held under the auspices of the Chūgai Nippō Newspaper Company in Kyoto on 17 October 1993*].
- 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 = Sauhr̥dyamaṅgalam: Studies in Honour of Siegfried Lienhard on his 70th*

- Birthday*, ed. Marja Juntunen, William L. Smith & Carl Suneson (Stockholm: The Association of Oriental Studies, 1995).
- Macdonald Volume* = *Les habitants du Toit du monde / Hommages à Alexander W. Macdonald*. Études recueillies par les soins de Samten Karmay et Philippe Sagant (= *RHA*, XII) (Nanterre 1997).
- Mayeda Volume* = 前田惠學博士頌寿記念・佛教文化学論集 (東京・山喜房仏書林, 平成3年) [*Essays on Buddhist Cultural Studies in Honour of Dr. Egaku Mayeda* (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 1991)].
- Mette Volume* = *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka: Festgabe für Adelheid Mette*, hrsg. Christine Chojnacki, Jens-Uwe Hartmann & Volker M. Tschannerl (= *IT*, XXXVII) (Marburg 2000).
- Mikasa Volume* ⇒ *Prince Miakasa Volume*.
- Mikogami Volume* = 神子上惠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)].
- Mori Volume* = *Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Sodo Mori* [森祖道博士頌寿記念・仏教学インド学論集] (Hamamatsu: Kokusai Bukkyoto Kyokai / 国際仏教徒協会 / International Buddhist Association, 2002).
- Nagao Volume* = *Wisdom, Compassion, and the Search for Understanding: The Buddhist Studies Legacy of Gadjin M. Nagao*, ed. Jonathan A. Silk (= *SBT*) (Honolulu 2000).
- 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* = 奥田慈応先生喜寿記念論集・仏教思想論集 (京都・平楽寺書店, 昭和51年) [*Buddhist Thought: Volume in Honour of Reverend Jiō Okuda on the Occasion of his 77th Birthday* (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1976)].
- Okuda Seio Volume* = 奥田聖應先生頌寿記念・インド学仏教学論集 (東京・佼成出版社, 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)].
- Raghu Vira Volume* = *Commemoration Volume on the 70th Birthday of Acharya Raghu Vira*, Part II, ed. Perala Ratnam (= *Studies in Indo-Asian Art and Culture*, Volume II) (= *SPS*, XCVI) (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1973).
- Schlingloff Volume I* = *Festschrift Dieter Schlingloff zur Vollendung des 65. Lebensjahres dargebracht von Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen*, hrsg. Friedrich Wilhelm (Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen, 1996).
- Schlingloff Volume II* = *From Turfan to Ajanta: Festschrift for Dieter Schlingloff on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday*, ed. Eli Franco & Monika Zin (Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute, 2010).
- Smith Volume* = *The Pandita and the Siddha: Tibetan Studies in Honour of E. Gene Smith*, ed. Ramon N. Prats (Dharamsala: Amnye Machen Institute / Tibetan Centre for Advanced Studies, 2007).
- 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)].

Upadhyaya Volume I = *Śramaṇa-Vidyā: Studies in Buddhism: Professor Jagannath Upadhyaya Commemoration Volume, I*, ed. N. H. Samtani (= SVS, III) (Sarnath, Varanasi 1987).

Warder Volume = *Studies on Buddhism in Honour of Professor A. K. Warder*, ed. N. K. Wagle & F. Watanabe (= SASP, V) (Toronto 1993).

Watanabe Memorial Volume = 渡邊文磨博士追悼記念論集・原始仏教と大乘仏教 (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!

* * * * *

TB60A Volume = 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.

hrsg. = herausgegeben (von).

ill., ill. = 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., qq.v. = *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. Monographics:

1. *Indic Manuscripts and Chinese Blockprints (Non-Chinese Texts) of the Oriental Collection of the Australian National University Library, Canberra. With Bibliographical Notes (= COSOPS, VI) (Canberra 1967), viii, 124 p.*

— ISBN 0-7081-0840-7 / LC Call No. DS2 A9 no 6 / ANU Call No. DSZ6605.15Y8.

[Contents: Catalogue References (Sanskrit Mss; Tibetan, Chinese, Mongolian and Hsi-hsia texts; Indic Mss (*Cānakya-sāra-saṃgraha*; a palm-leaf Ms in Oriyā); Chinese blockprints (non-Chinese texts from the collection of Hsü Ti-shan / 許地山 / 1893-1941) - *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*, *Samantabhadra-praṇidhāna-rāja*, *Mañjuśrī-nāma-saṃgīti*, *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā*, *Rgya-dkar-nag rgya-ser kasmi-ra bal bod hor-gyi yi-ge dañ dpe-ris mam-graṅs mañ-ba*].

2. *A Bibliography of the Sanskrit Texts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra (= OMS, V) (Canberra 1970), XXXV, 115 p. (incl. 4 plates).*

— ISBN 0-7081-0840-7 / LC 69-16625, Call No. Z7862.7.S.23 Y88 / NLA: Aus 68-3204 / ANU Call No. Z7059.Y8.

[Contents: Catalogue References; Comparative Table of Chapters in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese Versions; Part I: Sanskrit Texts of the *SP* – Editions, Modern Translations, Skt. Mss. from Nepal & Tibet, Chin. blockprint, Skt. Mss. from Central Asia and Gilgit; Part II: Appendices – Rāhulabhadra's *SP-stotra*, Tib., Chin., Mongolian, Turkic & Hsi-hsia versions; Works on *SP*].

• Reviews •

Hisao INAGAKI [稲垣久雄], *AM*, N.S., XVII, 1 (London 1971), p. 126f.

P. V. Bapat, *ABORI*, LII, 1-4 (Poona 1971), p. 271f.

Jacques May, *III*, XV, 2 (The Hague-Paris 1973), p. 140-144.

VJ., *AO*, XLII, 2 (Praha 1974), p. 184.

Boris L. Ogibenin, *JRAS*, 1974, 1 (London 1974), p. 76-78.

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.

3. *A Grammar of the Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā (Sanskrit Recension A) (= OMS, XIV) (Canberra 1973), XXXII, 190 p.*

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 Naoshirō Tsujī, Emeritus Professor of Sanskrit at the University of Tokyo by the author (on page v).* — [Naoshirō TSUJII (辻直四郎: 18.XI.1899-24.IX.1979)].

— ISBN 0-7081-0843-1 / LC 72-89145, Call No. PK663.Y8 1973 / ANU Call No. BQ1929.Y8

• Reviews •

Thomas Burrow, *JRAS*, 1975, 1 (London 1975), p. 72f.

Mi., *AO*, XLIII, 4 (Praha 1975), p. 371.

Nancy R. Lethcoe, *JAOS*, XCVI, 2 (New Haven 1976), p. 353f.

Jacques May, *III*, XVIII, 1-2 (The Hague-Paris 1976), p. 132f.

Kenneth Roy Norman, *MAS*, XII (Cambridge 1977), p. 174-176 & 26.

Gregory Schopen, *III*, XX, 1-2 (The Hague-Paris 1978), p. 110-124.

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 /*

London-New York-Melbourne: Cambridge UP, 1976), lxxii, 214 p., 1 frontisp. (*Photomechanic reproduction of the Calcutta MS. Folio 2B & 3A*).

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)].

— ISBN 0-521-21081-X/ Cambridge UL Classmark 834:1.c95.328/ LC 75-032910, Call No. BQ1920.Y86 1976/294.3'8 = ANU Call Number.

[**Contents:** Introduction; Bibliographical Notes on Skt., Tib., Chin., Mong., Hsi-hsia texts; Modern translations; *Rgs* quoted by Candrakīrti; Commentaries; *Rgs-Dhāraṇī*; 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** •

J.-Chr. Coppieters, *JA*, CCLXV (Paris 1977), p. 424.

Edward Conze, *JRAS*, 1978 (London 1978), p. 89.

Paul Harrison, *JSAS*, N.S., I, 1 (Perth 1978), p. 128f.

Gregory Schopen, *III*, XX, 1-2 (The Hague-Paris 1978), p. 110-124.

長尾 雅人 [Gadjin M. Nagao], *ASRF*, XV (Tokyo 1978), p. 64-66 [in Japanese].

Adelheid Mette, *OLZ*, 76. Jahrgang, Nr. 1 (Berlin 1981), Sp. 75f.

4a. *Digital paperback reprint edition on demand* (Cambridge: Cambridge - New York - Melbourne - Madrid - Cape Town - Singapore - São Paulo - Delhi - Dubai - Tokyo - Mexico City, 2010), lxxii, 214 p., 1 frontisp.

— Hb-ISBN 978-0-521-21081-2 / Pb-ISBN 978-0-521-14320-2.

5. *Vinaya-Texte* (= *SÜBSL*, Teil I) (Wiesbaden 1979), XXIII, 54 p. — *Said to have been reprinted several times*.

— ISBN 978-3-515-02837-4/ DNB No. D79/4635 (Frankfurt), 1979 A 4604-1 (Leipzig)/ SUB Göttingen – Signatur KKD 600 Bu:K = FA 9670.1/ LC Call No. Z7860.S94.

[This series *SÜBSL* under the editorship of Heinz Bechert (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, Mahīśāsakas, Mahāsāṃghikas, Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins, Kāśyāpiyas, Saṃmitiyas, & *Vinaya* unbekannter Schulen; *Appendix* – Ausgewählte bibliographische Angaben; Liste der chin. & jap. Personennamen].

• **Reviews** •

Lal Mani Joshi, *JRS*, VII, 2 (Patiala 1979), p. 134.

G.B., *ZDMG*, CXXXI, 1 (Wiesbaden 1981), p. 216f.

Siegfried Lienhard, *NVMEN*, XXVIII, 1 (Leiden 1981), p. 93f.

Marek Mejer, *PO*, CXVIII, 2 (Warszawa 1981), p. 184f.

Charles S. Prebish, *RSR*, VIII, 1 (Hanover USA 1982), p. 98.

Oskar von Hinüber, *WZKS*, XXVI (Wien 1982), p. 208.

S. Kratzsch, *OLZ*, 78. Jahrgang, Nr. 4 (Berlin 1983), Sp. 402f.

* So verified by Luciano Petech, *Mediaeval History of Nepal (c. 750-1480)* (= *Materials for the Study of Nepalese History and Culture*, III) (= *SOR*, X) (1958), p. 183; also D. R. Regmi, *Medieval Nepal*, I (Calcutta 1965), p. 183; so concludes also Claus Vogel, “On the Date of the Calcutta Manuscript of the *Ratnaguṇasaṃcayagāthā*”, *ZAS*, X (1976), p. 675f., contra Richard O. Meisezahl, “Zwei alttibetische *Ratnaguṇasaṃcayagāthā*-Handschriften und andere Prajñāpāramitā-Texte im Victoria and Albert Museum, London”, *Heissig Volume* (1973), p. 209 fn. 1: ‘NS 396 = 1276 CE’!

D. Seyfort Ruegg, *JAOS*, CIII, 3 (New Haven 1983), p. 650f.

J. C. Wright, *BSOAS*, XLIII, 2 (London 1980), p. 422.

Cf. J. W. de Jong, *III*, XXIII, 3 (Dordrecht 1981), p. 231f.

6. *Sanskrit Fragments of the Mahāyāna Mahāparivāṇasūtra, I: Koyasan Manuscript* (= *SPBOPS*, IV) (Tokyo 1981), vii, 46 p.

Dedicated to Dr. J. W. de Jong, Professor of South Asian and Buddhist Studies at the Australian National University of Canberra on the occasion on his sexagenarian anniversary - 15 February 1981 (p. v). — [Jan Willem de Jong (15.II.1921-22.I.2000)]

— ISBN 4-906267-11-4 / LC Call No. BQ1747.Y89 1981 / ANU Call No. BQ1741.Y88 1981.

[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 法顯: T. 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 •

Oskar von Hinüber, *ZDMG*, CXXXIII, 1 (1983), p. 222.

J. R. Joshi, *ABORI*, LXIII, 1-4 (1982), p. 303-305.

R. TSUCHIDA [土田龍太郎], *OLZ*, 80. Jahrgang, Nr. 4 (1985), Sp. 391f.

Paul Harrison, *III*, XXX, 2 (1987), p. 150-152.

Jens Braarvig, *WZKS*, XXXI (1987), p. 206f.

7. *Kacchapa-Jātaka: Eine Erzählung von der Schildkröte und dem Kranzwinder* (= *SPBOPS*, V) (Tokyo 1983), xxii, 42 p.

— ISBN 4-906267-15-7 / LC Call No. BQ1470.K337 Y88 1983 / ANU Call No. BQ1470.K320 1983.

[Contents: Vorbemerkungen zu den Schildkröten-Erzählungen; Einleitung zu Skt.-Versionen in Vergleichung mit der chin. Version]. — *Cf. for further details II.26 below!*

• Reviews •

(Bhikkhu) Pāsādika, *BSR*, I, 2 (London 1983-4), p. 179-182.

J. W. de Jong, *III*, XXVIII, 3 (Dordrecht 1985), p. 230-232.

Christian Lindtner, *OLZ*, 82. Jahrgang, Nr. 1 (Berlin 1987), Sp. 90.

8. *The Works of Vasubandhu in Sanskrit Manuscript: The Trisvabhāvanirdeśa, the Vimśatikā with its Vṛtti, and the Triṃśikā with Sthiramati's Commentary*, eds. Katsumi MIMAKI, Musashi TACHIKAWA & Akira YUYAMA (= *BCA*, I) (Tokyo 1989), xix, 159 p. (plates).

— ISBN 4-89656-600-9 / LC Call No. BQ2921.V382 1989 Sans.

• Reviews •

Christian Lindtner, *ALB*, LV (Madras 1991), p. 125.

Oskar von Hinüber, *ZDMG*, CXLIV, 1 (1994), p. 218f.

Mangala R. Chinchore, *ABORI*, LXXVII: 1996 (1997), p. 327.

9. *The Lotus of the Wonderful Law*, translated into English from the Chinese of Kumārajīva's Version by Tsugunari KUBO & Akira YUYAMA (= *BDK English Tripiṭaka*, XIII, 1) (Tokyo-Berkeley 1991), xiv, 332 p.

9a. - - (Tokyo: Reiyukai, 1991), xiv, 332 p. (with revised preface and introduction).

9b. - - (Berkeley CA: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1993), xii, 353 p. — ISBN 0-9625618-0-0.

9c. - - (Tokyo: Reiyukai, 1994), viii, 353 p. — ISBN 4-947677-11-2.

• Review •

J. W. de Jong, *EB*, N.S., XXVIII, 1 (Kyoto, Spring 1995), p. 155-161, esp. 157f. (*ad 9b*).

9d. - - *Revised second edition* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press for the Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 2007), xvi, 362 p. — ISBN 978-1-88643939-9.

— A digital edition available at BDK.

9f. *Le Soutra du Lotus: Le Lotus Blanc du Merveilleux Dharma*, traduit par Claudette Charles et Claudine Shinoda de *The Lotus Sutra: The White Lotus of the Marvelous Law*, traduit de la version chinoise de Kumārajīva, par Tsugunari KUBO et Akira YUYAMA (Nantes: Le Reiyukai, 1999), V, (viii), V, 382 p. — A French translation of 9c above.

— BN n° FRBNF37090972 / Dewey Classification (22nd ed.) 294.382.3.

10. *Eugène Burnouf: The Background to his Research into the Lotus Sutra* (= BPPB, III) (Hachioji/Tokyo 2000), xiv, 192 p.

— ISBN 4-9980622-2-0/LC Call No. BQ942.U79 Y89 2000.

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 Buddhism; 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 •

Eugen Ciurtin, *Archævs*, IV, 4 (Bucharest 2000), p. 241-245.

Gyula Wojtilla, *AOH*, LIII, 3-4 (2000), p. 282b-284a.

Li-ying Kuo, *RBS*, XVIII (2000), p. 65.

11a. *The Mahāvastu-Avadāna in Old Palm-Leaf and Paper Manuscripts*. With Introductory Remarks by Akira YUYAMA (= BCA, XV) (Tokyo 2001) [actually published in March 2003], Volume I. *Palm-Leaf Manuscripts*, lxxvi, 1, 217 p. (incl. 431 plates): 37 x 26.5 cm.

— ISBN 4-89656-614-9/LC Call No. BQ1590.Y88 2001.

... 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 (季羨林: 06.VIII.1911-11.VII.2009)]

[Contents: Mss in facsimile, with Introductory Remarks: Prefatory – The composition and formation of the *MvAv* – Editions of the *MvAv* – Modern translations – Mss used by Senart in his edition – Rare Skt. Mss in facsimile in the present volume – Other extant Skt. Mss. – Addenda bibliographica – a comparative tables of contents: chapter titles with reference to Edition Senart, Mss Sa & Sb & Jones' Eng. translation].

11b. *The Mahāvastu-Avadāna in Old Palm-Leaf and Paper Manuscripts*. With Introductory Remarks by Akira YUYAMA (= BCA, XVI) (Tokyo 2001) [actually published in March 2003], Volume II. *Paper Manuscript*, iv, 1, 224 p. (incl. 447 plates): 37 x 26.5 cm.

— ISBN 4-89656-615-7/LC Call No. BQ1590.Y88 2001.

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, Ryūkoku 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:

1. *A Bibliography of J. W. de Jong's Works (1949-1966)* (Canberra: Department of South Asian and Buddhist Studies, Faculty of Oriental Studies, ANU, December 1966), i, 17 p. (in mimeograph).

— ANU Menzies Library: Pamphlet No. DSZ8456.598Y8; — IIBS-Library 180.323.

2. *The Huntington Fragment F of the Saddharmapundarikasūtra*, by Akira YUYAMA and Hirofumi TODA (= *SPBOPS*, II) (Tokyo 1977), VI, 15 p. (including 2 plates).

— ISBN 4-906267-02-5/LC & ANU Call No. BQ2051.Y89.

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)].

3. *A Select Bibliography on the Sanskrit Language*. Provisionally prepared for the use of students in Sanskrit (Tokyo: IIBS Library, 1977), iv, 17 p.

• **Review** •

Boris Oguibénine, *III*, XXVIII, 3 (Dordrecht 1985), p. 207f.

3a. *A Select Bibliography on the Sanskrit Language for the Use of Students in Sanskrit* (= *BIBPS*, I) (Tokyo 1982), iv, 17 p. — LC Call No. Z7090.Y88 1983.

3b. *A Select Bibliography on the Sanskrit Language for the Use of Students in Buddhist Philology*. A Revised Edition (= *BIBPS*, I) (Tokyo 1992), viii, 24 p.

— ISBN 4-906267-28-9/LC Call No. Z7090.Y87 1992.

In praise of Johannes Gildemeister (27 July 1812-11 March 1890), who published a useful bibliographical work: ... (on page viii).

Contents: Reference works on — I. History of Skt. studies (p. 1f.). II. History of Skt. (p. 2-4). III. Grammar of Skt. (p. 4-9). IV. Skt. syntax/stylistics (p. 9f.). V. Skt. dictionaries (p. 10-19). Appendix I: Some Jap. publications (p. 20f). II. Some publications on indigenous Buddh. Skt. grammarians (p. 22f.). III. Two recent publications containing articles on Buddh. Skt. (p. 24).

[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.]

4. **बौद्धसंस्कृतभाषालिखितपुस्तकालयाः/ Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections: A Bibliographical Guide for the Use of Students in Buddhist Philology** (= *BIBPS*, II) (Tokyo 1992), ix, 28 p.

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. Petesburg), 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), Ryūoku 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 Sāṃkrtyāyana Collection, Buddhist Skt. Ms. Fragments and traditional studies in Japan, Buddhist Skt. Mss. in Microform Collections.

— ISBN 4-906267-31-9 / LC Control No. 04168173, but LC Call Number information unavailable.

Id: 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).

2. *The International Institute for Buddhist Studies / 國際佛教學研究所*. A Brief Description, Second Revised Edition (Tokyo: IIBS, 1992), ii, 28 p. (incl. 1 photo), 2-page frontisp. with 4 photos; - 2 maps on p. 28.

— *An English version prepared in collaboration with the then Research Fellow, Dr. Tadeusz Skorupski*: — ISBN 4-906267-26-2.

3. *The International Institute for Buddhist Studies / 國際佛教學研究所* (Tokyo: IIBS, 1993), i, 21 p. (incl. 1 photo), 2-page frontisp. with 4 photos; - 2 maps on p. 21.

— *A Japanese version*: — ISBN 4-906267-32-7.

Id: Commemoration Volume Received on the Occasion of the 65th Birthday:

Sūryacandrāya: Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday. Edited by Paul Harrison & Gregory Schopen (= *IT*, XXXV) (Swisttal-Odendorf 1998), xiv, 265 p., 1 frontisp. (col. photo). — *Published without my knowledge!*

— ISBN 3-923776-35-7, ISSN 0723-3337.

— Tübingen 39-A-4210 (Neuerwerbungen 1999,3, p. 100a), Staatsbibliothek Berlin - Signatur: 1 A 366326, SUB Göttingen – Signatur: A 99 A 35344.

• **Contents** •

Paul Harrison and Gregory Schopen, “Preface”, p. vii-ix;

“Akira YUYAMA: Major Publications”, p. x-xii;

“Contents”, p. xiii-xiv.

Heinz Bechert (*Göttingen*), “Remarks on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature in Sri Lanka from the 9th Century until the End of the Dambadeniya Period”, p. 1-8.

Siglinde Dietz (*Göttingen*), “Notes on *Udānavarga* 14.5-16”, p. 9-21.

Helmut Eimer (*Bonn*), “The *dKar chag* to the ‘Supplementary’ (*kha skong*) Volume added to the Narthang Kanjur”, p. 23-32.

Ronald E. Emmerick (*Hamburg*), “More Verses from the *Mañjuśrīnairātmyāvatārasūtra*”, p. 33-42.

Richard Gombrich (*Oxford*), “Organized Bodhisattvas: A Blind Alley in Buddhist Historiography”, p. 43-56.

Michael Hahn (*Marburg*), “On the hapax legomenon *upoko* (Patna Dharmapada II.30)”, p. 57-66.

Jens-Uwe Hartmann (*München*) & Paul Harrison (*Stanford*), “A Sanskrit Fragment of the *Ajātaśatru-kaukṛtya-vinodanā-sūtra*”, p. 67-86.

Yoshiro Imaeda (*Paris*), “À propos du manuscrit Pelliot tibétain 999”, p. 87-94.

J. W. de Jong (*Canberra*), “Notes on the Text of Indrabhūti’s *Jñānasiddhi*”, p. 95-106.

Lewis R. Lancaster (*UC Berkeley*), “Narratives of Exemplars: Perspectives on Doctrine and

- Practice in Early Buddhism”, p. 107-124.
- Marek Mejer (*Warsaw*), “The *Ārya-dharma-dhātu-garbha-vivarāṇa* Ascribed to Nāgārjuna”, p. 125-133.
- K. R. Norman (*Cambridge*), “Does Māra Have Flower-tipped Arrows?”, p. 135-142.
- Lambert Schmithausen (*Hamburg*), “Das *Jñānaprasthāna*-Fragment SHT VII 1752”, p. 143-156.
- Gregory Schopen (*UC Los Angeles*), “Marking Time in Buddhist Monasteries: On Calendars, Clocks, and Some Liturgical Practices”, p. 157-179.
- Tadeusz Skorupski (*London*), “An Analysis of the *Kriyāsaṃgraha*”, p. 181-196.
- Tilmann Vetter (*Leiden*) and Paul Harrison (*Stanford*), “An Shigao’s Chinese Translation of the *Saptasthānasūtra*”, p. 197-216.
- Albrecht Wezler (*Hamburg*), “Medhātithi on the Role of Manu, the *Prayojana* of the Manusmṛti and the Incentive of the Brahmins to Study it”, p. 217-240.
- Klaus Wille (*Göttingen*), “Weitere kleine *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*-Fragmente aus der Sammlung Hoernle (*London*)”, p. 241-256, incl. b/w ill. on p. 253-256.
- Peter Zieme (*Berlin*), “The Conversion of King Śubhavyūha: Further Fragments of an Old Turkish Version of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*”, p. 257-265.
- **Reviews** •
- Bhikkhu Pāsādika, *TJ*, XXIX, 1 (Spring 2004), p. 99-102.
- Jean-Marie Verpoorten, *BEI*, XIX (2001), p. 415-419.

II. Papers and Articles in Chronological Order:

1. “Mahāvastu-Avadāna i.2.16-4.10”, *JIBS*, XI, 2 (1963), p. 838 (39)-834(43).

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: *iii mahāvastu-avadāne nidāna-vastu-gāthā samāptā* (*MvAv* ed. Senart i.4.11). The question is how the portion could be reconstructed in verses.

Cf. L. Alsdorf, “Verkannte Mahāvastu-Strophen”, *Frauwallner Volume* (Wien 1968-1969), p. 13-22, esp. 13-19. — see Yuyama, *ARIRIAB*, XV:2011 (2012), p. 218: §4.2.6.

— Cf. further *infra* No. 76!

2. “四天王寺貝葉について”, *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-prajñāpti* (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 (*Samghārāma*) system in Osaka [四天王寺伽藍再興特輯号]. — cf. also No. 32 & 44 below!

Cf. further e.g. Kazunobu MATSUDA on the Skt. palm-leaf fragments of the *Lokaprajñāpti* preserved in Japan: 松田和信, “梵文断片Lokaprajñāptiについて — 高貴寺・玉泉寺・四天王寺・智恩寺貝葉: インド所伝写本の分類と比定”, *Bukyōgaku*, XIV (1982), p. *1-21.

See also Siglinde Dietz, “Remarks on the Textual Transmission of Four Stanzas from the Lokaprajñāptiśāstra”, *Eimer Volume* (1996), p. 7-15.

3. “J. W. ドウ・ヨング著：オランダのインド學佛教學”, *IBK*, XIV, 1 (Dec. 1965), p. 382(73)-359(96).

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 (Bombay, 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 YOROI (鏗淳) in 1965.

Mentions made among others to e.g. Abraham Rogerius (17 c.), Herbert de Jager (1636-1694), Antonie Rutgers (?-?), Hendrik Arent Hamaker (1789-1835), Johan Hendrik Caspar Kern (1833-1917), Jacob(us) Samuel Speijer (1849-1913), Willem Caland (1859-1932), Jean Philippe Vogel (1871-1958), Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus Kuiper (1907-2003), Frederic David Kan Bosch (1887-1967), Barend Faddegon (1874-1955), Nicolaas Johannes Krom (1883-1945), Jan Gonda (1905-1991), Jacob Ensink (1921-2005), Theodor Paul P. Galestin (*1907), Johanna Engelberta van Lohuizen-de Leeuw (1919-1983), Adriaan Alberik Maria Scharpé (?-?), Jan Willem de Jong (1921-2000); also Frits (Johan Frederik) Staal (1930-2012), Johannes Adrianus Bernardus van Buitenen (1928-1979).

4. “Supplementary Remarks on ‘Fragment of an Unknown Manuscript of the Saddharmapundarīka from the N. F. Petrovksy Collection’ by G. M. Bongard-Levin and E. N. Tyomkin”, *IJJ*, IX, 2 (1966), p. 85-112.

Fragment $SP^{P/62A}$ (A1-B6) = Kashgar Ms fols. 141b7-142b7 = *SP* ed. Kern-Nanjio 145.7-146.12.

— Cf. G. M. Bongard-Levin & E. N. Tyomkin, “*op.cit.*”, *ibid.*, VIII, 4 (1965), p. 268-274.

5. “チベットのヴェーターラ物語 (I)” *Shitennōji*, No. 319 (1967), p. 36-41.

A rather free Japanese translation of the *Vetāla Story* from Tibet: *Tale I*, with the prefatory story. — Based on the text published in: *Tibetan and Mongolian Tales of Vetala*, ed. Ts. Damdinsuren. 2 vols. (= *CSM*, II) (1962 [cover-page 1963]-1964). — *Regrettably, this serial publication of mine was suspended.*

6. “A Bibliography of the *Mahāvastu-Avadāna*”, *IJJ*, XI, 1 (1968), p. 11-23.

A bibliographical information related to the *MvAv*, such as bibliographical works, Skt. Mss., editions &

translations, varied studies on *MvAv*. — Cf. *supra* I.11ab; also *infra* No. 25!

7. “Bibliography of F. B. J. Kuiper (*Upto and including the Year 1967*)”, *Kuiper Volume* (1968), p. xv-xxiv.

Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus Kuiper (s-Gravenhage 07.VII.1907 - Leiden 14.XI.2003):

Cf. further e.g. Michael Witzel, “F. B. J. Kuiper (1907-2003)”, *IJ*, XLVII, 3-4 (2004), p. 173-191.

8. “The Bodhi Tree in the *Mahāvastu-Avadāna*”, *Kuiper Volume* (1968), p. 488-492.

Examples: *sambodhi-*; *bodhi-*, °-*mūla-*, °-*samīpa-*, °-*maṇḍa-*; *asvattha-*; *vara-pādapa-*; *pādapendra-*, *vara-*, °, *siṃha-*; *druma-*, °-*vara-*, °-*rāja-*, °-*vara-pādapendra-*; *bodhi-druma-*, °-*drumottara-*, °-*yaṣṭi-*, °-*vrkṣa-*; *vrkṣa-mūla-*, °-*bodhi-*°. — Much attention is paid to *sambodhi-*.

- 8a. “El árbol de la bodhi en el *Mahāvastu-Avadāna*”, *REB*, Año I: No. 1 (1991), p. 97-105.

A Spanish translation done by Fernando Tola and Carmen Dragonetti.

9. “キャンベラのオーストラリア国立大学における東南アジア研究の近況”, *BJSEAHS*, No. 10 (1969), p. 17-20.

“The recent state of Southeast Asian historical studies at the ANU of Canberra”.

10. “Kamalaśīla の *Bhāvanākrama* に引用された維摩經”, *Tōhōgaku*, No. 38 (1969), p. 108-90.---- *English summary on page *9*.

“The *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* quoted by Kamalaśīla in his *Bhāvanākrama*”:

In addition reference is made to the citation of the *Vkn* by Śāntideva in his *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (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 *Prasannapadā* (ed. L. de La Vallée Poussin, 333.6-9) and in the *Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra* (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. 6a6, cf. also 4a7-8 & 7a7-8). — cf. *infra* III.4!

11. “Candrakīrti の *Prasannapadā* に引用された *Prajñāpāramitā-Ratnaguṇasamcaya-gāthā*”, *Shūkyō Kenkyū*, Serial No. 201 (= Vol. XLIII, No. 2) (1970), p. 75(237)-92(254). ---- *English summary on page 124(286)-123(285)*.

“The *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-samcaya-gāthā* quoted by Candrakīrti in his *Prasannapadā*”.

The passage reading *uktam cāryasacaryagāthāsu* in the *Prasannapadā* of Candrakīrti had long puzzled serious scholars in the related fields of study until J. May, *Candrakīrti: ...* (Paris 1959), p. 130 n. 349; cf. J. W. de Jong, *IJ*, V (1961), p. 164. — I have discussed Candrakīrti's citations of the *Rgs* verses in his *Pras.*, ed. L. de La Vallée Poussin (St.-Petersburg 1903-1913), 166.11-167.2 (= *Rgs*. XX.5), 167.4 (= *Rgs*. II.3d). — cf. further *infra* 28!

12. “十二因縁呪覚え書き”, *IBK*, XX, 1 (1971), p. 448(48)-444(52).

“Remarks on the *Pratītyasamutpāda-gāthā*”: — in comparison with variant versions in Skt., Tib. & Chin., a verse found before the envoy of the *Rgs* Mss is to be reconstructed in an irregular *Āryā*-metre: *ye dharmā hetu-prabhavā hetuṃ teṣāṃ tathāgato hy avadat / teṣāṃ ca yo nirodha evaṃ-vādī mahā-śramaṇaḥ //*

13. “Some Glossarial Notes on the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-samcaya-gāthā*”, *Proceedings and Papers of the Fourteenth CAULLA held 19-26 January 1971 at the University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand*, ed. K. I. D. Maslen (Dunedin 1972), p. 30-37.

Some peculiar readings from the text-critical & lexicographical viewpoints: *anu-* (of *anu-mātra-*, so Rec.B) for *anu-*°, so Rec.A; *Anovatapta-*, for the mythological lake *Anav*°; *abhinirharate*, “attains”, *Ātmanepada*; *a-ṛaṇā-*, “non-passion”; *em*, MInd., always used with *eva*, for Skt. *evam eva*; a pejorative *ku-* in *ku-manyati*, “despises”; *kuśala-*, for °-*mūla-*, “wholesome root”; *kheṭa-*, “saliva, phlegm”; *ganṭhi-*, “knot”, a blend of Skt. *granthi-* & *gaṇḍa-*; *cūḍi-*, “crest, apex, top” (cf. Skt. *cūḍikā-*); *tātuka-*, “so much,

so many" (= Skt. *tāvat-*, *tāvataka-*); *-tu*, an adv. suffix (for Skt. *-tra*, not for *-tas*); *nāvā-*, f., "ship"; *nidāna(m)*, adverbially "for the sake of ..."; *niṣpratīkāṅkṣa-*, adj., "free from desire"; *pams-*, *pamsayati*, "blames": opt. *pamsayi*; *parigrāhikā-*, adj.f., "completely grasping" (cf. Tib. *yoṅs-su ḍzin-pa*); *paridīpana-*, "explanation"; *puṅgala-* (for *pudg*°); *puṭa-*, "packet", in *candana-putaṃ grahiyāna*, ger., "having taken a packet of sandal powder"; *poṭa-*, "clothes, garment"; *pratyā-*, followed by *-yāna-*, haplological for *pratyaya-* (cf. Skt. *pratyeka-*); *pratyaya-*, with or without *-buddha-*, *-jina-*, *-raha-* (q.v.), cf. also *raha-*°, *śrāvaka-*°, *sa-*°, *buddha-raha-śrāvaka-*°; *prāna-*, "animated being", for *prāṇin-*; *prekṣati*, "sets something on" (from *iṣ-*, "to send"?); °*muñcī-*, nom.sg.f.adj., "emitting"; *muha-*, "one who is perplexed", in °*andha-bhūtāḥ* (cf. Tib. *blun-moṅs*), cf. also *momuhānām* (cf. Tib. *blun-pa-rnams-la*); *yuga-mātra-prekṣin-*, adj., "looking ahead only a yoke"; *raha-*, regardless of *sandhi* rules, & also in cpds. (for Skt. *arhat-*), cf. *raṇya-* (for Skt. *araṇya-*); *loka-vidu-*, "world-knower (as an epithet of a Buddha)" (cf. Yuyama, *RgsGr.* 20.1-11); *vāli-*, *vālikā-* (for *vālikā-*), cf. Tib. *bye*; *vidyā-*, "existence", opp. to *a-*°, "non-existence"; *samāruta-*, "air" (cf. Yuyama, *RgsGr.* 8.11); *sukhuma-*, for Skt. *sūkṣma-*, used adv. as *sukhumam*, "subtly"; *hu*, "indeed" for *khu* (= *kho*, *khalu*).

14. "A Bibliographical Guide to the Study of Buddhist Sanskrit Texts", *BBSANZ*, IV (April 1972), p. 77-81.

A shortened version of a paper read at the Special Meeting of the XIV CAULLA held in Dunedin, January 1971.

15a. "法華經梵本拾遺 (1)", *Hokke Bunka*, No. 19 (March 1972), p. 7-5.

15b. "法華經梵本拾遺 (2)", *Hokke Bunka*, No. 22 (September 1972), p. 7-6.

Miscellaneous notes on the Sanskrit texts of the Lotus Sutra including a detailed note on W. Baruch's collation of *SP* Mss. then extant in Europe.

16. "Bibliographical Activities by Orientalists in Canberra", *AARL*, III, 2 (1972), p. 81-86.

17. "The Need for Systematic Bibliographies in Buddhist Sanskrit Philology", *JICSCUHK*, V, 2 (1972), p. 339-346 (Summary in Chin. on p. 346).

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.

18. "Remarks on the Metre of the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*", *Raghu Vira Volume*, Part II, ed. Perala Ratnam (1973), p. 243-253.

Rgs is composed exclusively in the metrical scheme *Vasantatilakā* (or also called *Uddharṣinī*, or *Siṃhonnatā*) 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.

19. "宝徳蔵般若に関する若干の問題", *Nakamura Volume* (1973), p. 271-282.

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. I.4 'Introduction'!

20. "On and Around the Japanese *Aisa*, 'Goose'", *JOSA*, X (1975), p. 81-92.

Discussing the Indic loanwords in Jap., and in particular OJap. *akisa* (秋沙, e.g. *Mannyōshū*, VII, 1122), a euphonized *aisa* (あいさ), 'goose', in relation to Indic *hamsa-* (PIE **ghans-*, Gr. *χίψ*, Lat. **hanser*, *ānsēr*, Germ. *gans*): Jap. *aisa*, cf. OMalay **angsa*, Tagalog *gansa*; Jap. **kadasa*, **kadsa* (賀捺婆^ニ), mispronounced *d(a)* for *n(a)*; Mandarin *o* (鵞/鶩), Tib. *nan!* — Cf. *infra* No.6!

— 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.

21. "仏典の編纂に用いられた言語の特質", *Okuda Jio Volume* (1976), p. 873-887.

“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!

22. “Some Grammatical Peculiarities in the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*”, *Proceedings of the XXVIII ICO held at ANU, Canberra, 6-12 January 1971*, ed. A. R. Davis with the assistance of A. D. Syrokoma-Stefanowska (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1976), p. 95-97.

Cf. *supra* Ia3 for further details: *A Grammar of the Rgs* (Canberra 1973).

23. “ドイツのインド学・仏教学の話題 (1)”, *Shunjū*, No. 174 (May 1976), p. 16-17; “ - - (2)”, *ibid.*, No. 176 (July 1976), p. 18-19; “ - - (3)”, *ibid.*, No. 178 (September 1976), p. 21-22; “ - - (4)”, *ibid.*, No. 181 (December 1976), p. 18-20. — *Regrettably discontinued!*

“Topics on Indian and Buddhist Studies past & present in Germany”.

— Beginning with the Göttingen scholars such as Theodor Benfey (1809-1881), Franz Kielhorn (1840-1908), Hermann Oldenberg (1850-1920), Emil Sieg (1866-1951), Jacob Wackernagel (1853-1938), Richard Fick (1867-1944), referring also to Alexander Csoma (1784-1842), Heinrich Ewald (1803-1875), Jacob Grimm (1785-1863), Wilhelm Grimm (1786-1859); — Christian Lassen (1800-1875), Friedrich Rückert (1788-1866), Franz Bopp (1791-1867), Eugène Burnouf (1802-1852), Johannes Gildemeister (1812-1890), Friedrich Max Müller (1823-1900), Rudolf Roth (1821-1895); — Establishment of the German Oriental Society (= DMG) in 1845 — Albert Grünwedel (1856-1935), Albert von Le Coq (1860-1930), Heinrich Lüders (1869-1943), Ernst Waldschmidt (1897-1985), Heinz Bechert (1932-2005); — DMG conference in Freiburg im Breisgau in early autumn 1975; — Arbeitstagung für buddhistische Studien, Göttinger Akademie der Wissenschaften in November 1975; — *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, a catalogue begun by E. Waldschmidt; — Herbert Härtel (1921-2005), Georg von Simson (*1932), Lore (Holzmann-)Sander, Wolfgang Voigt (1911-1982), Klaus Ludwig Janert (1921-1994), Claus Vogel (1933-2012), Ronald Eric Emmerick (1937-2001), Bernhard Kölver (1938-2001), *et alibi*.

24. “チベット学者チヨーマのゲッティンゲン留学”, *TBS*, No. 8 for the Year 1976 (March 1977), p. 87-91.

“The Tibetologist Alexander Csoma’s Study at Göttingen”: A hitherto unknown fact about the youth of Kőrösi 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!

25. “Mahāvastu-Avadāna に関する書誌学的雑録 (1)”, *Meicho Tsūshin*, No. 11 (August 1977), p. 7-6; “ - - (2)”, *ibid.*, No. 12 (September 1977), p. 9-8; “ - - (3)”, *ibid.*, No. 13 (October 1977), p. 19-18; “ - - (4)”, *ibid.*, No. 16 (January 1978), p. 17-16; “ - - (5)”, *ibid.*, No. 18 (March 1978), p. 12-11; “ - - (6)”, *ibid.*, No. 19 (April 1978), p. 15-14; “ - - (7)”, *ibid.*, No. 20 (May 1978), p. 15-14; “ - - (8)”, *ibid.*, No. 26 (November-December 1978), p. 37-28.

“Miscellaneous Bibliographical Remarks on the *Mahāvastu-Avadāna*”. — cf. *supra* Nos. I.11ab & II.6.

26. “Bemerkungen zur Sanskrit-Version des Kacchapa-Jātaka”, *Vorträge – XIX. DOT vom*

28. *September bis 4. Oktober 1975 in Feiburg im Breisgau*, hrsg. Wolfgang Voigt (= ZDMG, Supplementband III,2) (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1977), p. 1028-1036.

Textual problems on the *Kacchapa-Jātaka* of Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā* as Chapter XVII found in the manuscript, kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris (= Collection Burnouf, No. 95: Ms. No. 45-46, fol. 86a5-88a1; ed. H. Kern, 1891, p. 240f.: Appendix), in comparison with that found in the *Mahāvastu-Avadāna* (ed. E. Senart, II, 1890, p. 244.1-245.16). Cf. further a Chin. version in the *Fo-pên-hsing-chi-ching* (佛本行集經: ed. Taisho 190: III.797c17-798a27 / 797c25-798b4). — Cf. *supra* No. I.7!

27. “List of Edward Conze's Publications on the Prajñāpāramitā Literature”, *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*, by Edward Conze. 2nd., revised & enlarged ed. (= *BPBSM*, I) (1978), p. 127-138. — ISBN 4-89298-797-2.

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).

28. “*Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā* (Rgs) quoted by Candrakīrti in his *Prasannapadā* (Pras) (II)”, *JIBS*, XXVII, 1 (1978), p. 486(17)-483(20).

Detailed text-critical remarks on Candrakīrti's citations from the *Rgs.* in his *Pras.* ed. L. de La Vallée Poussin (1903-13), p. 353.7-354.2 (= *Rgs.* II.4), cf. trad. par J. W. de Jong, *Cinq chapitres de la Pras.* (Paris 1949), p. 14; *Pras.* ed. L. de La Vallée Poussin, *op.cit.*, p. 524.1-4 (= *Rgs.* XXII.6). — Cf. *supra* No. 11!

29. “Bibliographical Notes”, *Introduction to the “Bibliotheca Buddhica”* (Tokyo: Meicho Fukyūkai, Tokyo, 1978), p. 29-31, 4-42 & 74-76:

(a) *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, ed. H. Kern and B. Nanjio, p. 29-31.

(b) *Kuan-ṣi-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).

30. “Bu-ston on the Languages Used by Indian Buddhists at the Schismatic Period”, *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung / The Languages of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition* (= *SBF*, II) (= *AAWG*, III, 117) (1980), p. 175-181.

Tibetan text from *Bde-bar gśegs-pa'i bstan-pa'i gsal-byed chos-kyi 'byuñ-gnas gsuñ-rab rin-po-che'i mdzod* (or *Chos-'byuñ* in short) of Bu-ston (1290-1364): cf. *The Collected Works of Bu-ston*, ed. Lokesh Chandra, Part 24 (YA) (= *ŚPS*, LXIV) (New Delhi 1971), fol. 88b5-90a6.

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. Alsdorf (*Hamburg*), H. Bechert (*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. Waldschmidt (*Göttingen*), A. Yuyama (z.Z. *Göttingen*). — Cf. *supra* No. 21.

31. “The First Two Chapters of the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*”, *Conze Volume* (1977), p. 203-218.

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!

32. “巖松院貝葉顛末記”, *Katsumata Volume* (1981), p. 1269-1278.

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 (慈雲尊者・欽光: 1718-1804) with a photocopy (= 梵學津梁・卷第四十一／本詮第一之五十一: 城州宇治田原巖松院所藏貝葉); the text is also found in the *Asharajō* (阿叉羅帖／*The Book of Akṣaras*) of Shinna (眞阿・宗淵上人: 1786-1859). Textual analysis goes with reference to the **Saptasūryopama-sūtra*: cf. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam 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!

33. “仏教梵語文献学”, *Shih-chieh Tung-chiao Yen-chiu*, 1983: 3 (1983), p. 54-61 & 44.

Lecture delivered at the Institute for World Religions, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences on 1 June 1982: — Text in Japanese translated into Chinese by Shang Hui-p'êng (尚會鵬: *1953) under the supervision of Fang Kuang-ch'ang (方廣鎔: *1948). — cf. also No. 53-54 below.

34. “需要系統的梵文佛教文献目錄”, *Nan-ya Yen-chiu*, 1983: 3 (1983), p. 65-76.

A lecture on the need for systematic bibliographies in Buddh. 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!

35. “A Report on the Göttingen Project: A Systematic Survey of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature”, *BRI*, X (1983), p. 7-13.

A report presented to the Plenary Session “The Progress of Academic Projects Concerning Buddhism” at the V CIABS (Hertford College, Oxford, 17 August 1982): — Based on the handout distributed to the “Buddhologen-Konferenz, Göttingen 28.11.-1.12.1975): “Ein Göttinger Projekt: Eine systematische und kritische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskritliteratur”, 5 pages. — cf. *infra* IV.c.II.1!

36. “Scientific Projects in Progress in Japan”, *ibid.*, p. 14f.

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 Tanjur, an exhaustive index to the *SP* in Skt.-Tib.-Chin. under the editorship of Yasunori EJIMA (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 Stony Brook; a readable Eng. translation of the Chin. Tripiṭaka (Taisho 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* IV.c.II.2!

37. “The Academic Activities of the International Institute for Buddhist Studies”, *ibid.*, p. 15-20.

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:

Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka-Sūtra: Kashgar Manuscript, ed. Lokesh Chandra with a foreword by Heinz Bechert. 2nd ed. (1977; — 1st ed. New Delhi 1976).

Descriptive Catalogue of the Miao-fa-lien-hua-ching from Tunhuang Collected by Aurel Stein & Paul Pelliot, compiled by Shōkō KABUTOGI (兜木正亨) (1978).

The Kasuga Edition of the Lotus Sutra, a facsimile ed. Shōkō KABUTOGI (兜木正亨) (1978).

A New Fragmentary Gilgit Manuscript of the Saddharmapuṇḍarikāsūtra, ed. Oskar von Hinüber (1982) [photographs taken by A. Yuyama on the spot at Shri Pratap Singh Museum in Srinagar]. — cf. *infra* IV.c.II.3!

38. “中央アジアの梵語佛典”, *TGK*, XXIII, 1 (= Serial No. CVI) (1984), p. 68-92.

TGK, XXII, 1 = Special Number: “Problems in the Formation of Buddhist Scripture”, under the responsible editorship of Yūichi KAJIYAMA [特集・佛典成立の諸問題(梶山雄一責任編集)]: — “The Beginnings of research into the Buddh. Skt. literature; Explorations of and researches into Buddh. Skt. literature (Hamilton Bower, Sven Hedin, Jules Léon Dutreuil de Rhins, Aurel Stein, A. F. Rudolf Hoernle, Albert Grünwedel, Georg Huth, Theodor Bartus, Albert von Le Coq / German Expeditions: - Heinrich Lüders, Else Lüders-Peipers, Sylvain Lévi, Ernst Waldschmidt / Otani Expeditions / Paul Pelliot / Délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan: - André Gustave Citroën / Ellsworth Huntington / Carl Gustav Emil von Mannerheim / Emil Trinkler; et alib. — Gilgit Mss / Miranian Mss).

39. “演福寺銅鐘の梵語銘文覚書 — この小論を末松保和教授に捧ぐ —”, *TB60A* Volume = *TG*, LXVI, 1-4 (1985), p. 325-362, with an English summary on p. 13f.

“Remarks on the Sanskrit Inscriptions on the Bell Kept at the Temple Yeon-bog-sa in Kaesŏng, Korea”, dedicated to Yasukazu SUEMATSU (末松保和: 1904-1992).

Cf. also Suematsu's introductory remarks on the inscriptions, *ibid.*, p. 319-324.

Deciphering and identifying the Skt. inscriptions on the bell – transliteration 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 Jap. – Skt. *UvDh* texts inscribed on the stones extant in Jap. and the continental East Asia – *UvDh* texts published in the Chin. as well as Tib. Tripiṭakas – Other *UvDh* texts preserved in other scripts – *Mantradhāraṇīs* of the Temple Yeon-bog-sa bell. — Cf. further *infra* Nos. 51, 66, 73, 95, 107-108, 113!

40. “西洋人の大乘仏教研究史 (A History of Studies in Mahāyāna Buddhism by Westerners)”, *Lecture Series on Mahāyāna Buddhism*, X: *Mahāyāna and its Related Disciplines*, ed. Akira HIRAKAWA, Yuichi KAJIYAMA & Jikido TAKASAKI (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1985), p. 221-261.

大乘仏教とその周辺(平川彰・梶山雄一・高崎直道編集)(= 講座・大乘仏教, 第10巻)(東京・春秋社, 昭和60年).

• Discussing the prehistory of researches in Mahāyāna Buddhism in the West: — *Interests in the East, Catholic fathers*. • *The dawn of researches in Mahāyāna Buddhism: The beginnings of researches in Mahāyāna Buddhism, Sinology in Paris*: L. P. Abel Rémusat, S. Julien, E. Chavannes — C. J. de Harlez — B. Karlgren; *the beginnings of Tibetology*: Sándor Csoma • *The classical period of researches in Mahāyāna Buddhism: Buddhist studies in Russia*: e.g. B. Bergmann, I. J. Schmidt; F. A. Schiefner, O. M. Kowalevskij, V. P. Vasil'ev, S. F. Oldenburg — N. F. Petrovskij — I. P. Minaev, F. I. Ščerbatskoj, A. v. Staël-Holstein — A. I. Vostrikov, E. E. Obermiller, J. N. Rerix — N. A. Nevskij — V. S. Vorob'ev-Desjatovskij; • • • *in France*: E. Burnouf, E. Senart, S. Lévi, J. Bacot (— Theodor Benfey) — Ling Li-kouang [林黎光], S. YAMAGUCHI [山口益] — E. Foucaux, L. Feer — W. W. Rockhill — P. Cordier, M. Lalou — E. Huber — E. E. Guimet, J. Hackin, P. Pelliot — A. Foucher, L. Finot, J. Przyluski, P. Mus — A. Meillet, J. Bloch, H. Maspero, P. Demiéville, A. Bareaux (— J. W. de Jong) — J. Filliozat — W. Baruch; • • • *in Belgium*: L. de La Vallée Poussin, E. Lamotte; • • • *in Germany*: C. F. Köppen — H. A. Jäschke, E. Schlagintweit, H. Wenzel, G. Huth, H. Beckh, A. H. Francke — J. Dahlmann, P. Dahlke, H. F. Hackmann, G. Grimm, H. Haas, B. Petzold — A. Schopenhauer, P. J. Deussen — O. M. H. von Glasenapp, M. Walleiser, R. Garbe — E. Frauwallner — J. G. Bühler, F. Kielhorn, E. J. T. Hultzsch — H. Lüders — R. Pischel, W. L. Geiger — A. Weber, H. G. Jacobi, E. Leumann, W. Schubring, F.-R. Hamm, L. Alsdorf — H. Oldenberg, E. Sieg, W. Siegling, R. Fick — E. Waldschmidt, F. Bernhard, V. Stache-Rosen — F. W. K. Müller — F. W. Radloff — S. Lefmann — E. Windisch, F. Weller — J. A. J. Nobel — M. Winternitz; • • • *in Poland*: S. Schayer, A. Gawronski — C. Regamey; • • • *in Scandinavia*: R. K. Rask, N. L. Westergaard, V. Fausbøll, V. Trenckner, D. Andersen, H. Smith — P. Tuxen, S. Konow; • • • *in Italy*: G. Tucci; • • • *in The Netherlands*: J. H. C. Kern — J. Speijer, J. Ph. Vogel, J. J. M. de Groot, N. J. Krom; • • • *in England*: B. H. Hodgson — T. Watters, C. N. E. Eliot, L. A. Waddell, C. A. Bell — S. Beal, E. J. Eitel, W. E.

Soothill — J. Brough — E. J. W. Simon — J. Eggeling, C. Bendall — H. Bower, A. F. R. Hoernle — M. A. Stein — F. W. Thomas — L. Giles — J. Prinsep, J. Fergusson, A. Cunningham, H. Yule, J. Burgess, F. Fleet — F. Max Müller, B. NANJIO [南條文雄], K. KASAHARA [笠原研壽], J. TAKAKUSU [高楠順次郎] — M. Monier-Williams — E. H. Johnston — E. Conze; . . . *in America*: W. D. Whitney, C. R. Lanman, M. Bloomfield, F. Edgerton, M. B. Emeneau — E. W. Hopkins — E. Fenollosa, A. K. Reischauer, E. O. Reischauer, D. Goddard — F. D. Lessing — N. Poppe.

— Cf. a newly rebound reprint edition: *First impression* (1996).

41. “インド学仏教学の黎明”, *HJIPBS*, III (1986), p. 323-348.

“The Dawn of Indian and Buddhist Studies”. — Brief history with copious notes on such topics as intercultural 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!

42. “妙法蓮華經の蔵字音写による敦煌出土写本断簡”, *Kumoi Volume* (1985), p. 233-247.

“Two Ms fragments of the Chin. Text of Kumārajīva’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-parivarta: Avalokiteśvaravikurvaṇanirdeśa*) transliterated in Tib. script; 1) the very beginning of the Chap. (2) only 42 characters (ed. Taisho 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)”.

43. “梵文宝德藏般若木版本断簡”, *Hirakawa Volume* (1986), p. 443-453.

“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 Lañ-stha script (fol. *11a1-b6 = *Rgs. XIV*4-8). — Cf. for further details Nos. 65, 97, 99-100a below!

44. “Miscellaneous Remarks on the Lotus Sutra”, *Takasaki Volume* (1986), p. 720(119)-712(127).

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.

Cf. *ZDMG, Supplement IX: Proceedings of the XXXII CISHHAN, Hamburg, 25th – 30th August 1986*, ed. Albrecht Wezler & Ernst Hammerschmidt (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1992), p. xxxvii, & 144 (*Abstract*).

45. “Remarks on the Kōkiji Fragment of the *Lokaprajñapti*”, *Eggermont Volume* (1987), p. 215-227.

A paper in Eng. read on 8 August 1981 at the IV CIABS held at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, and a Jap. version on 26 August 1981 at the XXXII CJAIBS held at Dōhō University in Nagoya.

The Kōkiji fragment transcribed with detailed reference to variant readings found in the manuscripts by Jiun, 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 *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (Skt. & Tib.) & the *Saptasūryodaya-sūtra* in Pāli (*Aṅguttara-Nikāya*, LXII.8). — Cf. *supra* Nos. 2 & 32!

46. “The Six Perfections and the Bodhisattvas in the Lotus Sutra: An Example of Philological and Philosophical Questions”, *Upadhyaya Volume*, I (= SVS, III) (Sarnath 1987), p. 33-40.

Serious text-critical — philological & philosophical — questions on the reading ... *bodhisattvānām ca mahā-sattvānām ca ṣaṭ-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!

47. 湯山明・久保継成・久保克子共訳, “新訳・法華経”, *A Monthly Magazine ‘Human’*, from August 1987 to December 1994 (362 pages in toto with num. ill. & figs.).

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・挿画多数), 総計362頁.

SP, trsl. from the Skt. into Jap. by Akira YUYAMA, Tsugunari KUBO & Katsuko KUBO. — Special attention was made to the Indic versions, particularly those found in CAsia. — cf. the next item 48!

48. “新訳『法華経』Q&A”, *A Monthly Magazine ‘Human’*, No. 11 (November 1987), p. 43-46.

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!

49. “チベット学者チョーマのゲッティンゲン留学(補訂)”, *TBS*, No. 18 for the Year 1986 (March 1987), p. 89-92.

— Supplementary notes on Csoma’s study in Göttingen: — cf. *supra* No. 24!

50. “The Tathāgata Prabhūtaratna in the Stūpa”, *Bapat Volume* (1989), p. 181-186.

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 paryāṅkaṃ baddhvā pariśuṣka-gātraḥ samghatīta-kāyo* ... (*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.

51. “Die Sanskrit-Texte in Lañ-tsha und tibetischer (Dbu-can) Schrift auf der im Jahre 1346 gegossenen Glocke des Tempels Yeon-Bog-jeol in Korea”, *Ausgewählte Vorträge - XXIII. DOT vom 16. bis 20. September 1985 in Würzburg*, hrsg. Esnar von Schuler (= *ZDMG*, Supplementband X) (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden, 1989), p. 429-434.

The farthest eastern remnant of the Lañ-tscha script — 開城・演福寺 (Yeon-bog-sa in Kaesöng, Korea); — cf. for further details *supra* No. 39 & *infra* Nos. 66, 73, 95, 107-108, 113!

52. “逆路伽耶陀”, *Fujita Volume* (1989), p. 355-372.

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 (坂本日深學術賞) in 1991.

53. “仏教文献学の方法試論”, *Mizuno Volume* (1990), p. 125-152.

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!

54. “The Need for Philological Research in the Field of Buddhist Studies”, *Buddhism into the Year 2000: Proceedings of the First International Conference, held in Bangkok from 7 to 10 February 1990* (Patumthani near Bangkok: Dhammakāya Foundation, 1992/ actually appeared in 1996), Article No. 18, p. 219-235.

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

anniversary of Berkeley's Group in Buddhist Studies on 28-31 October 1993 (unpublished).

— 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 envoys 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 Buddhology (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!

55. “The Kacchapa-Jātaka in Bas-Relief at the Caṇḍi Mēndut in Central Java”, *Mayeda Volume* (1991), p. 251(530)-265(516), incl. 7 ills. (p. 263/514-265/516).

Pāli Jātaka No. 215 “A Tortoise and Two Geese”; variations of the *Kacchapa-Jātaka*, e.g. in the *Pañcatantra*, *Hitopadeśa*, *Kathāsaritsāgara*, Middle Javanese version of the *Pañcatantra*, etc.; cf. *supra* No. 1a7: *Kacchapa-Jātaka* (1983), p. xvi-xvii, for further details. — cf. the next item 55a!

55a. “El Kacchapa-Jātaka en bajo relieve en el Caṇḍi Mēndut en Java Central”, *REB*, VI (1993-1994), p. 63-79, 7 ills. (7 pages), 1 map (frontispiece).

A revised version of No. 55 translated into Spanish by Fernando Tola & Carmen Dragonetti (both in Buenos Aires).

56. “*Pañcāśatī*, ‘500’ or ‘50’ — with special reference to the Lotus Sutra —”, *The Dating of the Historical Buddha / Die Datierung des historischen Buddha*, hrsg. Heinz Bechert (= *SBF*, IV, 2) (= *AAWG*, III, 194) (1992), p. 208-233.

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, “佛滅年の再検討 — 論争史の回顧とベヒェルト説批判 —”]

The numeral *pañcāśatī*- may well have meant originally “50” rather than “500”, in e.g. ... *tathāgatasya parinirvṛtasya paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyām pañcāśatyām saddharma-vipralope 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*, *Suvikrāntavikrāmi-paripṛcchā*, *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 Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*); Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī's ordination and the duration of the true law (e.g. *Bhikṣunī-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* (*Śāntiparvan*, ed. S. K. Belvalkar, Poona 1954, p. 1349: XII.247.8 *pañcāśatam*, not *m.c.*) & *pañcāśatī*- in the *Rājataranginī* (ed. A. Troy 1840, V.71ab: *daśa-śatī pañcāśaty-*°; trsl. Troy, II p. 205: “mille cinq cents”; but trsl. Aurel Stein, Westminster 1900, p. 195: “ten hundred and fifty”!).

57. “印度学仏教学史研究資料雑録”, *HJIPBS*, VII (1992), p.299-314.

“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, Kiyozō KAZAMA (風間喜代三), Thomas A. Sebeok, Wilhelm Ludvig Peter Thomsen, Niels Ludvig Westergaard, Valentina Stache-Rosen, Dieter Schlingloff, Jan Willem de Jong, et alib. — cf. *supra* No. 41!

58. “An Appraisal of the History of Sanskrit Studies in East Asia”, *Warder Volume* (1993), p. 194-203.

Treated are some topics as “Kūkai, his predecessors and successors”, “Fa-hsien (法顯), Hsüan-tsang (玄奘), I-ching (義淨)”, “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), Shüen (宗淵), Jōgon (淨嚴), Donjaku (曇寂), Jakugon (寂嚴)”, “Ind. – Chin. – Jap.”.

59. “エジプトの仏教梵語研究の学史的背景”, *Watanabe Memorial Volume*, II (1993), p. 45-83.

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!

60. “中央亜細亜における仏教典籍の受容からみた鳩摩羅什の漢訳妙法蓮華経の特色”, *Kumārajīva Anniversary Volume* (1993), p. 80-97.

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!

60a. “中央亜細亜における仏教典籍の受容からみた鳩摩羅什の漢訳妙法蓮華経の特色”, *Chūgai Nippō*, No. 25072 (22 November 1993), p. 6-8.

The above article No. 60 reprinted in the Newspaper *Chūgai Nippō*, No. 25072.

60b. “從中亜地区対仏教典籍的接受情況来看羅什漢訳「妙法蓮華経」的特色”, *Shih-chieh Tung-chiao Yen-chiu*, 1994, 2, p. 50-63.

The above article No. 60 in Chin. translation made by Yao Ch’ang-shou (姚長寿), published in the Special Issue for the Fifth Sino-Japanese Academic Conference on Buddhist Studies (第5次中日仏教学術會議專輯): *Shih-chieh Tung-chiao Yen-chiu*, 1994, No. 2.

— cf. “Abbreviations”, under *Kumārajīva Anniversary Volume*!

61. “ビュルヌーフの法華経研究の学史的周辺 — 近代印度学仏教学の最初期を飾る人々 —”, *HBK*, XX (1994), p. 37-106 (incl. 10 figs.).

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

France, Julien particularly on geography, phonology, narrative lit.; Burnouf & Tibeto-Mongol materials; Burnouf & Senart on MInd.; Asiatic Society & Buddh. Skt. lit.; Arrival of Skt. Mss. of the Lotus Sutra; Burnouf's French trsl. of the *SP*; Burnouf & Hodgson again; Skt. Mss. of the Lotus Sutra & the translation, publication & revised editions. — Cf. *supra* I.10: *Eugène Burnouf* (2000).

— 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, Rishso University, Tokyo, under the direction of the Institute, Professor Ryūgen TAGA, in June 1992.

62. “Classifying Indic Loanwords in Japanese”, *Lienhard Volume* (1995), p. 381-393.

Loanwords brought to Japan via various routes: e.g. Buddhist technical terms via Chinese (e.g. *dhāraṇī* / 陀羅尼, ‘*darani*’), those used by lay people (e.g. *naraka*-, ‘hell’ / 奈落, ‘*naraku*; stage-cellar, trapdoor’); proto-Jap. words via Malayo-Polynesian (e.g. *haṃsa*- / 秋沙, ‘*akisa*, euphonized *aisa* of °-*kamo*; goose’ (cf. *supra* No. 20); Indic of non-IE origin via Chin.? (e.g. *kapāla*-, ‘cup, skull’ / 瓦, OJap. **kapara*, *kawara* = roofing tile); MInd. and/or CAsian Pkt. (e.g. Skt. *upādhyāya*- / 和上・和尚, *kashō*, *wajō*); NInd. via Anglo-Ind. (e.g. bungalow, ‘バンガロー’), etc. — Cf. *supra* No. 20!

62bis. “A Critical Survey of Philological Studies of the *Daśabhūmikāsūtra*”, *Eimer Volume* (1996), p. 263-282.

The fruit of a seminar offered in the winter semester 1995-1996 at the University of Hamburg (*Institut für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibets*) together with Professor Lambert Schmithausen.

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.

63. “安然の十地經引用にことよせて”, *Imanishi Volume* (1996), p. 343-360.

Detailed text-critical & philological examination of the citations by Annen (安然: *841 CE) from the *Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra* (or *Daśabhūmika*-°) in comparison with the Skt. & Tib. both in prose & verse — with detailed bibliographical notes: Annen's quotation “三界唯一心” in his 劃定草木成佛私記 (ed. F SUEKI, 1995, p. 706): cf. Chin. correspondence trsl. by Dharmarakṣa (Taisho 285: X.476b9-10), Kumārajīva (T. 286: X.514c26), Budhabhadra (T. 278: IX.558c10), Śikṣānanda (T.279: X.194a14) & Śīladharma (T. 287: X.553a11); cf. Skt. *Dbh.* e.g. ed. R. KONDO (1936), p. 98.8-9; further Tib. ed. Derge, No. 44, Text 31, Kha 221a4f., *et alibi*.

64. “Why Kumārajīva Omitted the Latter Half of Chapter V in Translating the Lotus Sūtra”, *Schlingloff Volume I* (1996), p. 325-330.

A revised version of the paper “An Interpretative Attitude towards Understanding Indic Buddhist Texts in Central Asia: A preliminary report with special reference to the Central Asian recension and Kumārajīva's Chinese version”, presented to *Buddhism across Boundaries: Sources of Chinese Buddhism*, a conference organized by John McRae & Jan Nattier, and held in Los Angeles 2-7 January 1993.

Seeking Kumārajīva's ‘interpretative’ attitude towards his Chin. translation of the *SP* (406 CE), taking Chapter V: *Oṣadhi-parivarta* [藥草喻品] as a significant example. — Cf. *supra* Nos. 60, 60a & 60b!

65. “The inspirational source of the Zhi-byed-pa doctrine”, *Macdonald Volume* (1997), p. 299-307.

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 Źi-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.

66. “The *Uṣṇīṣa-vijayā Dhāraṇī* Transliterated by Tz'ü-hsien”, *Bechert Volume* (1997), p. 729-742 (incl. 2 plates).

A text-critical study of the hitherto unknown *Uṣṇīṣa-vijayā Dhāraṇī* transliterated by Tz'ü-hsien (慈賢), found only among the Fang-shan Shih-ching (房山石經), XXI (Peking 1991), p. 499, photomechanically reproduced in the *Chung-hua Ta-ts'ang-ching* (中華大藏經), LXVIII (Peking 1993), p. 460: - further

reproduced in my paper on p. 741f. — On Tz'ü-hsien from Magadha (see *op.cit.*, p. 731: §0.6); cf. further *Bagchi Volume* (London-New York-Delhi 2011), p. 176. — cf. *supra* Nos. 39, 51 & *infra* Nos. 73, 95, 107-108, 113!

67. “國際佛教學高等研究所・開所式「開会の辞」”, *ARIRIAB*, I: 1997 (1998), p. 98-102.

Opening address delivered on the occasion of the Opening Ceremony of the IRIAB on 2 June 1997. — cf. *infra* IV.B.4!

68. “法華經の文献学的研究課題”, *ARIRIAB*, I: 1997 (1998), p. 29-47.

“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. Mss and the beginnings of Buddhist philology – Willy Baruch’s collation of Skt. Mss. – Some notes on the Romanization of Skt. Mss.

69. “仏教説話文学研究覚書 (1): 「注好選」 下巻第十話『雙鳧は渴せる龜を將て去る』雑録”, *ARIRIAB*, I: 1997 (1998), p. 69-90.

“Notes on Buddhist Narrative Literature: (1) ‘Remarks on the *Chūkōsen* (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 *Chūkōsen* — varied similar stories. — cf. *infra* No. 112!

- 69a. “仏教説話文学研究覚書 (2): 「注好選」 下巻第十話『雙鳧は渴せる龜を將て去る』試訳”, *ARIRIAB*, I: 1997 (1998), p. 91-95.

“Notes on Buddhist Narrative Literature: (2) «Two Geese and a Tortoise»: An Annotated English Translation: ‘Two Geese Flying Away with a Tortoise’ (*Chūkōsen*, III-10)”.

- 69b. “仏教説話文学研究覚書 (3): 「注好選」 下巻第十話『雙鳧は渴せる龜を將て去る』余滴”, *ARIRIAB*, II: 1998 (1999), p. 90-92.

“Notes on Buddhist Narrative Literature: (3) ‘Additional Remarks on ‘A Pair of Geese Flying with a Tortoise’ (*Chūkōsen*, III-10)”.

70. “*Mahāvastu-Avadāna* — 原典批判的研究に向けて —”, *ARIRIAB*, II: 1998 (1999), p. 21-38.

“Towards a New Critical Edition”: - Mainly bibliographical remarks on the critical editions, translations, Skt. Mss. — cf. *supra* I.11ab & *infra* No. 79!

71. “*A Critical Pāli Dictionary* — 学史的考察 — ”, *ARIRIAB*, II: 1998 (1999), p. 67-89.

“*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. Oskar von Hinüber, “The *Critical Pāli Dictionary*. History and Prospects”, *Lexicography in the Indian and Buddhist Cultural Field. Proceedings of the Conference at the University of Strasbourg 25 to 27 April 1996*, ed. Boris Oguibénine (= *ST*, IV) (1998), p. 65-73.

Also O. v. Hinüber, “Concluding Remarks”, *CPD*, III, 8 (Bristol 2011), p. XXXIII-XXXVII.

72. “パンチャタントラと今昔物語集”, A short essay on the *Pañcatantra* and the *Konjaku Monogatari*shū, published in the supplementary Monthly Bulletin No. 92 to the *New Anthology of Classical Japanese Literature*, XXXIII: *Konjaku Monogatari*shū, I (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, July 1999), p. 1-3.

新・日本古典文学大系, 第三十三卷: 今昔物語集, 一 (今野達編), 付録月報, 第 92号 (東京・岩波書店, 平成十一年七月).

— Cf. *supra* Nos. 69, 69ab & *infra* No. 112!

73. “An *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* Text from Nepal”, *ARIRIAB*, III: 1999 (2000), p. 165-175.

A text found in the *Kāraṇḍavyūha* and other texts: *Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal*, reproduced by Lokesh Chandra from the Collection of Prof. Raghuvira (= *ŚPS*, CCLXVIII) (1981), Ms fol. 11a-13a = Facs. fol. 332-336 (numbered by Lokesh Chandra):

A text-critical study in comparison with the versions at Chü-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): शुभमस्त्वार्यबुहाय ।

Cf. *supra* Nos. 39, 51, 66 & *infra* Nos. 95, 107-108. 113!

74. “*Mahāvastu* and *Mahāvastu-Avadāna*”, *Mette Volume* (2000), p. 533-540.

Philological examination of the usage of the *Mahāvastu* and *Mahāvastu-Avadāna*. — cf. *supra* No. I.11ab!

75. “Toward a New Edition of the *Fan-yü Tsa-ming* of Li-yen”, *Nagao Volume* (2000), p. 397-411.

Philological questions regarding the *Fan-yü Tsa-ming* (梵語雜名) 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.

76. “マハーヴァストウ・アヴァダーナ序偈再訪覚書”, *Taga Volume* (2000), p. (940)35-(932)43.

A paper for revisiting the *Nidāna-vastu-gāthā* of the *MvAv*: cf. *supra* No. 1 for further details.

77. “*Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā-Vyākhyā* of Haribhadra — Preliminary Remarks —”, *ARIRIAB*, IV: 2000 (2001), p. p. 27-42.

Article with reference to Chiang Chung-hsin (蔣忠新), “A Sanskrit Fragment of the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā-vyākhyā* of Haribhadra: A Romanized Text”, *ARIRIAB*, III: 1999 (2000), p. 115-123 (with a folded plate preceding the article)]. — Discussing the title of the text, In appraisal of Haribhadra, Textual questions, Textcritical hints from Haribhadra, Haribhadra's citations in comparison with Recensions A & B. — cf. further *supra* No. I.4 (Cambridge 1976), p. 1-li: ‘Introduction, §VIII: Commentaries’,!

78. “Random Remarks on and around the Mannerheim Fragment of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*”, *ARIRIAB*, IV: 2000 (2001), p. 53-69.

Random notes with reference to Klaus Wille, “The Sanskrit *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* fragment in the Mannerheim collection (Helsinki)”, *ibid.*, p. 43-52, followed by a plate: facsimile of the fragment. — Textcritical remarks — Aftermath notes on Mannerheim's travels 1906-1908. — Cf. *supra* Ia.2: Yuyama, *Bibl.SP* 1970, p. 29.

79. 神子上恵生・湯山明・松田和信・他共著, “サンスクリット仏教写本の文献学的研究 — 日本私立学校振興・共済事業団学術研究振興資金対象事業”, *Bulletin of Institute of Buddhist Cultural Studies, Ryukoku University*, Vol. XL (2001), p. (1)-(9).

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.

80. “ビュルヌーフ訳法華經藥草喻品の北米流伝 — 仏教文献学最初期の一面を探る —”, *Ishigami Volume* (2001), p. 349-363 [*Horizontally typeset pages from the back*].

“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 N America by Henry Thomas Thoreau (1817-1862). — Cf. *supra* No. Ia.10, No. II.61, & *infra* No. II.98!

81. “Some Philological Remarks on and around Kuladatta’s *Kriyāsamgraha(-pañjikā)*”, *ARIRIAB*, V: 2001 (2002), p. 27-41.

Indic original in old Mss., Tibetan versions, *Kriyāsamgraha* as a material on *caitya-/stūpa*-cult, Some more dated palm-leaf Mss. — Conclusion — Further additional remarks: *ARIRIAB*, VI: 2002 (2003), p. 341f.

Cf. now among others Ryugen TANEMURA, *Kuladatta’s Kriyāsamgrahapañjikā. A critical edition and annotated translation of selected sections* (= *GOS*, XIX) (2004), X, 373 p. — ISBN 90-6980-145-0.

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!

82. “Prabodh Chandra Bagchi (1898-1956): A Model in the Beginnings of Indo-Sinic Buddhist Philology”, *ARIRIAB*, V: 2001 (2002), p. 135-146.

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.

83. “Some Remarks on the Canonical Texts Quoted by Madhyamaka Masters”, *IJBS*, III (2002), p. 197-205.

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 *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and Prajñākaramati in his *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (cf. *MvAv*, ed. Senart, III.90.11-125.4); *Suvarṇa-prabhāsottama-sūtra*, ed. Nobel, p. 25.1-27.5, may be referred to Śāntideva’s *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, ed. Bendall, p. 160 n. 5; *Bhikṣu-prakīrṇaka* of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins, cited by Śāntideva in his *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, 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!

84. “Restoration - Translation - Emendation: Along the Way to Revisit the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa* Cited by Kamalaśīla in his *Bhāvanākrama III*”, *Mori Volume* (2002), 215-224.

One must distinguish restoration from translation and emendation, for example the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa* cited by Kamalaśīla in his *Bhāvanākrama III*, ed. Tucci, p. 13.7-9; Skt. words reconstructed in parentheses within translations. — cf. also *supra* No. 10 & *infra* 89!

85. “The *Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka* of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins Quoted by Śāntideva in his *Śikṣāsamuccaya*”, *ARIRIAB*, VI: 2002 (2003), p. 3-17.

*Dedicated to Josef Kolmaš (*06 August 1933), President, Oriental Institute, Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, in celebration of his seventieth birthday.*

The *Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka* text cited in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, ed. Cecil Bendall (St. Petersburg 1897-1902), p. 154.17-155.3; trsl. by C. Bendall & W. H. D. Rouse (London 1922), p. 153f. — cf. among others the trsl. Tib.: ed. Peking, No. 5336, *KI*, fols. 102b8-103a5; Chin., *Mahāsāṃghika-Vinaya*: Taisho No. 1425, p. 455b9-13; etc., etc. — cf. *supra* No. 83!

86. “Groundwork Layers for Buddhist Sanskrit Philology”, *ARIRIAB*, VI: 2002 (2003), p. 321-339.

To Wilhelm Halbfax (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 Bloomfield (1855-1928), William Norman Brown (1892-1975), Eugene Watson Burlingame (1876-1932), Hermann Colitz (1855-1935), Franklin Edgerton (1885-1963), Murray Barnson Emeneau (1904-2005), Edward Washburn Hopkins

(1857-1932), Charles Rockwell Lanman (1850-1941), Edward Elbridge Salisbury (1814-1901), Edward Sapir (1884-1939), Henry David Thoreau (1817-1862), Henry Clarke Warren (1854-1899), William Dwight Whitney (1827-1894). — cf. *supra* No. 59!

87. “Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica (I)”, *ARIRIAB*, VI: 2002 (2003), p. 343-352.

The following topics written in Jap.: — Topics on the difficult international projects (e.g. *ABIA* = *Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology*; *Bibl.bouddh.* = *Bibliographie bouddhique*), Projects under the sponsorship of the European academies (e.g. *SÜBS* = *Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur*), Projects under the umbrella of the Union Académique (e.g. *CPD* = *A Critical Pali Dictionary*, *SWTF* = *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!

88. “The Golden Light in Central Asia”, *ARIRIAB*, VII: 2003 (2004), p. 3-32.

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 *Suvarṇa(pra)bhāsottama-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 (Mannerheim fragments, Hoernle Mss, St. Petersburg fragments, Otani fragments; VIII. Aftermath remarks. – Appendix: Table of Contents.

89. “Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica (II)”, *ARIRIAB*, VII: 2003 (2004), p. 255-280.

The following topics written in Jap.: — §1. Buddhica Iranica, p. 255-259; §2. Buddhica Uigurica, p. 259-260; §3. Buddhist literature recovered from Tunhuang, p. 260-267; §4. *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* — Discovery of an Indic Manuscript, p. 267-269 (cf. also *supra* Nos. 10 & 84!); §5. Regarding Firdowsi’s *Shahname*, p. 269-271; §6. On Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin etc., p. 272-276; §7. Academic exchange between Russia & France, p. 276f; §8. On Yang I (楊憶: 974-1020 CE), p. 277f (cf. also Ia.4: Yuyama, *Rgs.*, p. xlii: N.B. 9!); §9. *Addenda bibliographica* to Chi Hsien-lin (季羨林), p. 278f; §10. Other miscellanea, p. 279f.

90. “楞伽島備忘襍記”, *Prince Mikasa Volume* (2004), p. 743-760.

“Miscellaneous Notes on the Island of Lañkā”:— *Ταπροβάνη* (< Skt. *tāmra-parṇi*, °-*varṇa*-, °-*vana*-?) in the classical world of Europe – *Periplus Maris Erythraei* - Dutch ‘Adamsberg’ in early modern Japan (e.g. ‘Gṛdhrakūṭa in Ceylon’ by Shiba Kōkan 司馬江漢: 1747-1818)! – variously meant *tāmra*-. A group of 500 merchants shipwrecked in the ocean, etc. — cf. *infra* Nos. 93 & 105!

91. “Some Remarks on Two Texts Related to the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins”, *IT*, XXVIII: 2002 (2004), p. 281-299.

In Celebration of Albrecht Wezler’s 65th Birthday on 2 March 2003: - St. Petersburg fragment of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* – Bhadravyūha’s *Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecana* & *Prakīrṇaka-caitya-lakṣaṇa* – *Stūpa-/Caitya-cult* in Icons – Mahāsāṃghikas & °-Lokottaravādins.

92. “マハーヴァストウ・アヴァダーナに表題のみ見せる長爪経の周辺”, *Mikogami Volume* (2004), p. 15-26.

“On and Around the *Dirghanakha-sūtra*: A Text Giving its Title alone in the *MvAv*”: - *dirghanakhasya parivrājakasya sūtraṃ kartavyam*, ed. Senart, III.67.7, cf. “Here is to be supplied the Sūtra ...”, trsl. Jones, III p. 70; “Et ici, il faut insérer le sūtra de D°”, Migot, *BEFEO*, XLVI, 2 (1954), p. 451! — Questions remain - *Truly? Why?*

93. “楞伽島備忘襍記の雜學的拾遺”, *ARIRIAB*, VIII: 2004 (2005), p. 3-20.

“Further Notes on the Island of Lañkā”: - World map by Aeudoo Denzen (亞歐堂田善: 1748-1822) in comparison to Kōkan SHIBA (cf. *supra* No. 90!) – Maps & illustrations in Europe, e.g. Athanasius Kircher (1602-1680) – Studies of Amane NISHI (西周: 1829-1897) in Holland – Philipp Franz von Siebold (1796-1866) – Colours again / Copper-coloured brown, cf. Skt. *tāmra*-, “copper”, etc. – Island of

Suqūṭrā on the Arabian Sea in the Yemen territory – Ch'üan-chou (泉州) & Trades in the South Seas – Oceanic trades / 500 merchants shipwrecked around the island of Rākṣasas – **Fa-hin-gala*, a grotto dwelt by Fa-hsien (法顯) etc. – The *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* – Robert Knox in the Island of Lankā (1659-1679); cf. *supra* No. 90 & *infra* No. 105!

94. “Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica (III)”, *ARIRIAB*, VIII: 2004 (2005), p. 377-394.

The following topics written in Jap.: — §1. Celebrating the publication of the *CIS = Corpus Iuris Sanscriticum*, p. 377-379; §2. Khotanese Summaries of the *Vkn* & *SP*, p. 379-381; §3. 雁が飛べば石龜も地團駄 / *Kariga tobeba Ishigamemo Jidanda*, ‘Seeing a goose flying over the sky, a pond tortoise stamps her feet bitterly in frustration!’ (a proverb originated from the narrative story of ‘The Tortoise and the Two Geese’) — Thinking over the History of Skt. Studies in Japan, after citing the proverb in my frustration, p. 381-391; §4. On the pretext of a Chin. study of Tib. narrative literature, p. 391f; §5. Historical materials of the University of Peking, p. 392f; §6. Miscellanea (Short notices on five new publications), p. 393f.

95. “不空音譯敦煌出土佛頂尊勝陀羅尼”, *ARIRIAB*, IX: 2005 (2006), p. 231-276.

“Amoghavajra’s *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* from Tunhuang”. — *Michael Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag am 7. Mai 2006*: Introductory – Amoghavajra’s *UvDh* from Tunhuang – The *UvDh* annotated by Amoghavajra – Appendices on various *UvDh* texts. — Includes “Index to Amoghavajra’s *UvDh* Texts.” — cf. *supra* Nos. 39, 51, 73 & *infra* Nos. 107-108. 113!

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.

96. “Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica (IV)”, *ARIRIAB*, IX: 2005 (2006), p. 277-296.

§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・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義), Amoghavajra’s comm. in Ms preserved once in the Temple Shinnyoin (眞如院) at Ueno; Ryōun-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).

97. “On and Around a Hitherto Unknown Indic Version of the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-samcaya-gāthā* in a Blockprint from Turfan”, *ARIRIAB*, X: 2006 (2007), p. 3-38.

To Ellis Gene Smith in Celebration of his 70th Birthday:— See ‘Prefatory’, p. 3-5.

— Cf. an obituary notice of Gene (Ogden, Utah, USA 10 August 1936 – New York City 16 December 2010) e.g. in the *Asian News Letter*, LVI, 1 (*Annual Conference Issue 2011*) (Ann Arbor: Association of Asian Studies), p.35a-36a.

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.

From the contents:— Prefatory (dedicatory words) – Introductory – Chin. Blockprint texts from Peking – Printing houses in Mongolia – Hsü Ti-shan (許地山) collection at ANU, Canberra – Peking blockprint bilingual *Rgs* texts – Some misgivings to be cleared in the future – Scientific analysis of Ms materials by way of conservation – Origins of Chin. paper, ‘Paper Road’ – Place of discovery & origin of the Turfan fragments – ‘Phags-pa script & Lañ-tsha script – A hitherto unknown blockprint text: a third Indic version? – *Rgs* XIV 4-8 — Transliterated text - Reconstructed text – Special features of the blockprint text – Haribhadra’s commentary – Tib. versions – Mong. Versions – Chin. version – *Appendices*: Hitherto unknown *Rgs* versions: A hitherto unknown blockprint Tibeto-Sinic text – A hitherto unknown Indic text from Tibet; *Afterword* – *Rgs* quoted by Candrakīrti in his *Prasannapadā* – *Rgs*, its canonical status.— Cf. also *supra* Nos. 43, 65 & *infra* Nos. 99-100a!

98. “Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica (V)”, *ARIRIAB*, X: 2006 (2007), p. 471-528.

§1. Thoreau or Peabody, or else – *Who has first introduced Burnouf's Lotus Sutra to America?* – §2. “*Bibliotheca Buddhica*” published by the Russian Academy — Under the pretext of its revival & reprints after the World War II. — §3. Looking around Indian & Buddhist studies in Munich in celebration of the inauguration of the “*Wörterbuch der tibetischen Sschriftsprache*” of the Bavarian Academy. — §4. Remembering the publishers & secondhand bookstores upon the pretext of the German biographical lexicon. — §5. On & around the long-established publishers & booksellers in Leiden with freewheeling pen.

Filling in the blank space with columnistic short notices - “Short Notices Using the Space” (遊余白): (1) ॥ राष्ट्रीय पाण्डुलिपि मिशन ॥ [= National Mission for Manuscripts (India)], p. 472. – (2) James Prinsep, p. 491. (3) Alexander Cunningham, & (4) The *UvDh* on the Bell cast in the Yüing-lê (永樂) era, p. 514. – (5) Rajendra Lal Mitra, p. 520. – (6) Inscription on Amitābha on the pedestal of a statue at the Mathurā Museum, p. 527. – (7) NGMCP: Nepal-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project at Hamburg, p. 528.

99. “A Hitherto Unknown Indic Version of the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-samcaya-gāthā*”, *Smith Volume* (2007), p. 304-313.

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!

100. “吐魯番博物館藏梵文宝德藏般若木版本断片 論攷追補”, *ARIRIAB*, XI: 2007 (2008), p. 335-341.

Dieter Schlingloff zum 80. Geburtstag am 24. April 2008:- “Supplementary Remarks on the Blockprint Text of the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-samcaya-gāthā* from Turfan”.

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: 李蕭主編/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・中国関係論説資料第五十号・第一分冊 (平成二十年分) (哲学・宗教・文化), 下卷 (東京・論説資料保存会, 2010), p. 157-160.

— No. 100 reprinted in this collection of articles on philosophy, religion and culture of China.

101. “Further Remarks on the Blockprint Text of the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-samcaya-gāthā* from Turfan”, *Schlingloff Volume II* (2010), p. 259-268.

A revised English version of the item No. 100 above. — With a laudatory preface on Dieter.

102. “Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica: Anecdotal Gleanings (I): 并伏鱒二と四天王寺貝葉などをめぐって — 本邦に遺る梵語佛典資料研究拾遺 —”, *ARIRIAB*, XIII: 2009 (2010), p. 259-268.

Masuji IBUSE (1898-1993), writer, recipient of the Order of Cultural Merit (文化勲章/1966), and Ind. Buddh. Materials found in Japan – with special reference to the Shitennō-ji palm-leaf fragment of the *Lokaprajñapti*. — Ibuse's interest in Ind. matters – Ibuse's images on the hells; — Appendix (1) My writings on the Buddh. Skt. materials kept in EAsia. (2) My writings on the Ind. materials preserved in EAsia.

103. “Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica: Anecdotal Gleanings (II): 旧大橋図書館・私立公共図書館の展開管窺 — 仏教文献学徒の視点から —”, *ARIRIAB*, XIII: 2009 (2010), p. 269-277.

“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 Buddh. Philology from abroad & at home.

104. “Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica: Marginal Anecdotalage (I)”, *ARIRIAB*, XIII: 2009 (2010), p. 279-294.

§1. Murray Barnson Emeneau (1904-2005) at Berkeley — what we learn from him – Hereditary academic tradition at Yale: Maurice Bloomfield (1855-1928) > Franklin Edgerton (1885-1963) > Emeneau — Emeneau’s idea of ‘linguistic area’ > ‘Beyond linguistic area!’ — §2. In celebration of the publication of the second series of the Mss of the *SP* / Lotus Sutra. — *Appendix*: List of A. Yuyama’s writings on the *SP*. — §3. Miscellanea as supplementing the historical materials on the University of Peking — In memory of the late Professor Chi Hsien-lin (季羨林).

105. “Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica: Anecdotal Gleanings (III): ロバート・ノックスのスリランカ — 楞伽島備忘襟記の雑學的餘滴 — ”, *ARIRIAB*, XIV: 2010 (2011), p. 249-258.

“Robert Knox (Father: ?-1666 / Son: 1641-1730): Miscellaneous supplementary notes on the Island of Lankā”, with an anecdotal story on the shipwreck on the Ind. Ocean; - Island of Squṭrā on the Arabian Sea in the Yemen territory – *λίβανος*, ‘frankincense’ – Some recent works on Sri Lanka. — cf. *supra* Nos. 90 & 93!

106. “Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica: Marginal Anecdotalage (II): マハーヴァストゥ・アヴァダーナ二題 / Two Topics on the *Mahāvastu-Avadana*”, *ARIRIAB*, XIV: 2010 (2011), p. 259-266.

§4. マハーヴァストゥ・アヴァダーナ全巻和訳刊行を慶んで (In celebration of the publication of a complete Jap. trsl. of the *MvAv* by Satoshi HIRAOKA [平岡聡]), p. 259-262; — §5. ジョーンズの英訳に纏わる逸話 — その書簡類から — (An episode related to the Eng. trsl. of the *MvAv* by John James Jones: 1892-1957 — From his posthumous correspondence in particular with Caroline Augusta Foley Rhys Davids: 1857-1942, p. 262-266).

107. “An Enlarged Version of the *Uṣṇīṣa-vijayā Dhāraṇī*: The Text Transmitted in the Yüan Period”, *ARIRIAB*, XV: 2011 (2012) p. 195.

— *To Lambert Schmithausen in Celebration of his Sixth Birthday in the Duodecimal Cycle* —

“Eine erweiterte Version der *Uṣṇīṣa-vijayā 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 (居庸關) and the bell found in the Temple Yeon-bog-sa (演福寺) in Gaeseong (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!

107a. 附記: 漢堡大學名譽教授施密特豪森博士漆秩貳華誕記念”, *ARIRIAB*, XV: 2011 (2012) p. 196-200.

To the above article 107 is appended in Jap.: “A personal laudatory remark on Lambert Schmithausen on the occasion of his 72nd birthday”.

108. “元代流布佛頂尊勝陀羅尼考 — 新出西夏流傳本に關連して — / Remarks on the *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* Transmitted in the Yüan Period — With Reference to the Newly Recovered Hsi-hsia Version — ”, *ARIRIAB*, XV: 2011 (2012), p. 201-208.

§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 Śūnyadiśya (指空, or Dhyānabhadra / 禪賢: 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!

109. “Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica: Anecdotal Gleanings (III): ハンブルクのインド学仏教学半世紀雑録／On and Around the First Half Century of Indian and Buddhist Studies in Hamburg”, *ARIRIAB*, XV: 2011 (2012), p. 209-234.

Describing the history of Hamburger Indology & Buddhology: e.g. §4. The beginnings of the University of Hamburg: — Sten Know (1867-1948), Walther Schubring (1881-1969), Ludwig Alsdorf (1904-1978), Biographies of the Buddha by German scholars, Studies on the Skt. texts brought from Turfan by the Prussian expeditions; prosodical studies of Alsdorf; Academic mantles of Hamburg — Frank-Richard Hamm (1920-1973), Jozef Deleu (1925-1994), Franz Bernhard (1931-1971), Ronald Eric Emmerick (1937-2001), Albrcht Wezler (*1938), NGMPP = Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project & NGMCP = Nepal-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project; NRC = Nepal Research Centre, Kathmandu); Lambert Schmithausen (*1939); etc.

Filling in the blank space with columnistic short notice on p. 234: Auf Grünwedels Spuren: Restaurierung und Forschung zu zentralasiatischen Wandmalerei (遊余白: XV-1: ドイツ・トゥルファン探検隊とグリューンヴェーデル).

110. “Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica: Marginal Anecdote (III): 無量寿経・阿弥陀経の梵本校訂版刊行を慶ぶ／*Gratefully Introducing a Critical Edition of the Sukhāvativyūhasūtras* (by Kōtatsu FUJITA／藤田宏達)”, *ARIRIAB*, XV: 2011 (2012), p. 235-236.

Cf. also Fujita's exhaustive work on his critical edition (in Jap.): *HJIPBS*, XXV (2010), p. 1-20.

Filling in the blank space with columnistic short notice on p. 236 (遊余白: XV-2: 関心を惹かれた最近の論著から): A fine work on the Sāṃmitīyas by Takayoshi NAMIKAWA (並川孝儀:*1947) (Tokyo 2011); *India and China* (— collected essays by Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, ed. Bangwei Wang & Tansen Sen (London-New York-Delhi 2011); Pāda & reverse pāda indexes to the *SP*, ed. Y. NISHI, S. KASAMATSU & Y. OUSAKA (Tokyo 2011) — one of those indispensable works in the serial publications of the *PhA*.

111. “Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica: Marginal Anecdote (IV): デンマーク王立図書館蔵梵語写本類目録刊行を慶んで／*Congratulating Upon the Publication of A Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Copenhagen* (by Hartmut Buescher)”, *ARIRIAB*, XV: 2011 (2012), p. 237-240.

Introducing the splendid publication of the subtle catalogue of Skt. Mss preserved in the Royal Library of Copenhagen, ed. Hartmut Buescher (Copenhagen 2011).

Filling in the blank space with columnistic short notice on p. 240 (遊余白: XV-3: 関心を惹かれた最近の論著から(2): チベットに伝承保存されてきた貴重な稀覯梵語佛典類): Introducing some fine work on the rare Buddh. Skt. Mss preserved in China: *Sanskrit Manuscripts in China*, ed. Ernst Steinkellner et al. (Peking 2009); E. Steinkellner, *A Tale of Leaves* (Amsterdam 2004); Two splendid studies of the *Mūlamadhyamakākārikā* by Ye Shao-yong (叶少勇) (Shanghai 2011).

112. “Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica: Marginal Anecdote (V): पञ्चतन्त्रम्／*كلیلة و دمنة*パンチャタントラのセム系文化圏への伝播／*Congratulating Upon the Publication of A Comparative Study of the Indic and Semitic Narrative Literature* by Yuka IWASE (岩瀬由佳)”, *ARIRIAB*, XV: 2011 (2012), p. 241-248.

A kind of a brief review article in praise of her fine dissertation on the comparative study of the narrative literature between the Semitic and Indic traditions – with special reference to the *Pañcatantra*.

Filling in the blank space with columnistic short notice on p. 248 (遊余白: XV-4: 関心を惹かれた最近の論著から(3): 仏教文献学徒必携の書の公刊を慶ぶ): Introducing Jin-il CHUNG (鄭鎮一) & Takamichi FUKITA (吹田隆道), *A Survey of the Skt. fragments corresponding to the Chin. Madhyamakāgama* (Tokyo 2011).

113. “西夏流伝佛頂尊勝陀羅尼 — 黒水城・北京・開城間の伝播考”, 奥田聖應先生頌寿記念・インド学仏教学論集 (“*The Uṣṇīṣa-vijayā Dhāraṇī Recovered Newly among the*

Tanguts — Remarks on the Transmission from Khara-Khoto to Peking and Kaesŏng —”), *Okuda Seio Volume (in the press — 2013?)*, p. 800-808.

— cf. *supra* Nos. 39, 51, 66, 73, 95 & 107!

III. Reviews – Introducing New Publications – Short Notices:

1. “A *Critical Pali Dictionary*, begun by V. Trenckner, Vol. II, Fasc. 3 (Copenhagen 1965)”, *IJJ*, XII, 1 (1969), p. 51f.

2. “Franz F Schwarz, *Die Nala-Legende I und II* (Wien 1966)”, *IJJ*, XII, 2 (1970), p. 140-143.

3. “*Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, hrsg. Ernst Waldschmidt, Teil I (Wiesbaden 1965)”, *IJJ*, XII, 4 (1970), p. 266-269.

4. “Giuseppe Tucci, *Minor Buddhist Texts*, III: *Third Bhāvanākrama* (Roma 1971)”, *IJJ*, XVII, 3-4 (1975), p. 265-270.

5. “*Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka-Sūtra: Kashgar Manuscript*, ed. Lokesh Chandra, with a Foreword by Heinz Bechert. 2nd impr. (Tokyo: The Reiyukai, 1977 / first published in New Delhi 1976)”, *SGZN*, XV (1978), p. 101b-104a.

— Published in the name of the Research Department of the Suzuki Research Foundation.

6. “特別寄稿・久保継成会長の学問的業績 — 文学博士の称号を祝して”, *Myōhō*, XXI (Spring 1985), p. 152-155.

“A special contribution regarding the academic achievements of President Tsugunari KUBO in celebration of his Doctorate in Letters – with reference to his dissertation *The Basis of the Bodhisattva Thought in the Lotus Sutra* (Tokyo: Shunjū-sha, 1987) [法華經菩薩思想の基礎].

7. “近刊書数行紹介 (1) / Introducing New Publications in Several Lines (1)”, *ARIRIAB*, IV: 2000 (2001), p. 70.

1) Michael Hahn, *Invitation to Enlightenment* (Berkeley 1999); — 2) Siegfried Lienhard, *Diamantmeister und Hausväter* (Wien 1999); — 3) *Buddhist Manuscripts*, I (= *Schøyen Collection*, I), ed. Jens Braarvig (Oslo 2000); — 4) *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*, hrsg. Georg von Simson (Göttingen 2000).

8. “近刊書数行紹介 (2) / Introducing New Publications in Several Lines (2)”, *ARIRIAB*, V: 2001 (2002), p. 153-156.

1) Margaret Cone, *A Dictionary of Pāli*, I: *a-kh* (Oxford 2001); — 2) Yuka IWASE, *Development of Selected Stories from the Pañcatantra / Kalilah wa Dimnah* (Osaka 1999); — 3) 丁敏, 佛教譬喻文學研究 (Ting Min, *Studies in Buddhist narrative literature*) (Taipei 1996); — 4) 梁麗玲, 《賢愚經》及其相關問題研究 (Liang Li-ling, *Studies on the ‘Sūtra of the Wise and the Fool’ & and its relevant materials in art & literature*) (Taipei 2001); — 5) 梁麗玲, 《雜寶藏經》— 及其故事研究 (Liang Li-ling, *Studies on the text /Taisho 203 / & the relevant stories in art and literature*) (Taipei 1998); — 6) *Images de Dunhuang*, éd. Jean-Pierre Drège (Paris 1999); — 7) *Archaeology of Seafaring: The Indian Ocean in the Ancient Period*, ed. Himanshu Prabha Ray (New Delhi 1999); — 8) Richard Salomon (with A. Glass), *A Gāndhārī Version of the Rhinoceros Sūtra* (Seattle-London 2000).

9. “近刊書数行紹介 (3) / Introducing New Publications in Several Lines (3)”, *ARIRIAB*, VI: 2002 (2003), p. 353-357.

1) *Buddhist Manuscripts*, II (= *Schøyen Collection*, II), ed. Jens Braarvig (Oslo 2002); — 2) 曹仕邦, 中國佛教史學史 (Ts’ao Shih-pang, *A history of the studies in the history of Chinese Buddhism*) (Taipei 1999); — 3) Dieter Schlingloff, *Ajanta: Handbuch der Materialien*. 3 vols. (Wiesbaden 2000); — 4) *Buddha and the Spread of Buddhism in India and Abroad*, eds. Mahendra & P.Mittal (Delhi 2002); — 5) Margaret Khačikjan, *The Elamite Language* (Roma 1998); — 6) Basanta Bidari, *Lumbini* (Lumbini 2000); — 7) Julius Klapproth, *Briefwechseln mit Gelehrten*, hrsg. Hartmut Walravens (Wiesbaden

2002); — 8) *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, XXVII (Oxford 2002).

10. “Introducing Three Recent Publications on the Dharmapada Literature”, *ARIRIAB*, VI: 2003 (2004), p. 340.

1) 引田弘道校註, 法句經 (*The Chin. Dhp* [T 210], trsl. into Jap. with annotations by Hiromichi HIKITA) (Tokyo 2000); — 2) 田辺和子校註, 法句譬喻經 (*The Chin. Dhp* [T 211], trsl. into Jap. with annotations by Kazuko TANABE) (Tokyo 2000); — 3) 神塚淑子・菅野博史・末木文美士・松村巧訳註／榎本文雄・引田弘道 — 偈文の解釈研究：真理の偈と物語・『法句譬喻經』現代語訳 (*The Chin. Dhp* [T 210], trsl. into Jap. with annotations by Yoshiko KAMITSUKA, Hiroshi KANNO, Fumihiko SUEKI, Takumi MATSUMURA & Fumio ENOMOTO), 2 vols. (Tokyo 2001).

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) “マハーヴァストウ／*Mahāvastu* (*MvAv*)”, p. 70a-71a.

b) “仏本行集経／*Fo-pên-hsing-chi-ching*”, p. 71a-b.

a) “Addenda” to the second edition (1986), p. 436b-437a “増補 (マハーヴァストウ)”.

2. Contributions of Articles to *Hayashima Volume* (1982):

a) “インド学／Indology”, p. 24b-25a.

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:

“近代仏教学／Modern Buddhology”, *The Grand Dictionary of Buddhism*, eds. Shōkin FURUTA, Shūyū KANAOKA & Shigeo KAMATA (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1988), p. 206f.

[*仏教大事典* (古田紹欽・金岡秀友・鎌田茂雄共編) (東京・小学館, 昭和63年)].

4. Contribution of an Article to a dictionary on linguistics:

“仏教梵語／Buddhist Sanskrit”, *The Grand Dictionary of Linguistics*, eds. Takashi KAMEI, Rokurō KŌNO & Eiichi CHINO (Tokyo: Sanseidō Publishing, 1992), p. 713-720.

[*言語学大辞典・第三卷: 世界言語編*, 下巻の一 (亀井孝・河野六郎・千野栄一編著) (東京・三省堂, 平成4年/1992)].

*A short period of editorial/compilatory collaboration, e.g.:

1) *Sinsho HANAYAMA's Bibliography on Buddhism* (Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, 1961).

2) *Unrai WOGIHARA's Skt.-Chin.-Jap. Dictionary* (cf. Revised & enlarged ed., Tokyo 1979).

B. Prefaces/Postscripts to Academic Publications:

1. “Preface” — Musashi TACHIKAWA in collaboration with Tshulkrim Kelsang & Shunzo ONODA, *A Catalogue of the United States Library of Congress Collection of Tibetan Literature in Microfiche* (= *Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica: Series Maior*, III) (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1983), p. vii-viii.

2. “Foreword” — G. M. Bongard-Levin and V. I. Vorovyova-Desyatovskaya, *Indian Texts from Central Asia (Leningrad Manuscript Collection)* (= *Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica: Series Minor*, V) (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1986), p. v.

3. “Preface” — *Buddhism and Nature: Proceedings of an International Symposium on the Occasion of EXPO 1990*, ed. Akira YUYAMA (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1991), p. 7-10.

3a. “Preface” (in Jap.) to this item, p. 61-65.

[“はじめに” — 上掲書和文部：国際シンポジウム・仏教と自然].

4. “Opening Address (in Jap.)”, to the inaugural issue of the *ARIRIAB*, I: 1997 (1998), p. 98-102 [= *supra* II.67].

5. “Greetings (written anonymously — on publishing the inaugural issue)”, *ARIRIAB*, I: 1997 (1998),

p. 114.

6. “Editorial Postscript (*in Jap.*)”, *ARIRIAB*, I: 1997 (1998), p. 115.

[“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 & IBS academic activities published in the *Myōhō* [“靈友会の学術活動”]:

“ — (1) • Internationally of High Appreciation [国際的にも高い評価]”, *Bulletin*, 1 (Winter 1979), p. 66.

<Three pillars of academic activities: 1) Collecting research materials on internationally high standard. 2) Academic intercourse with domestic & overseas scholars & institutions. 3) Academic publications>

“ — (2) • Collection of Buddhist Research Materials [仏教関係研究資料の蒐集]”, *Bulletin*, 2 (Spring 1980), p. 228.

<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 (一)]”, *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>

“ — (4) • *ibid.* (2) [同上 (二)]”, *Bulletin*, 4 (Autumn 1980), p. 240.

<Academic intercourse with not only renowned scholars but also young & promising scholars>

“ — (5) • Profiles of the Guest Scholars (1) [招聘学者の横顔 (一)]”, *Bulletin*, 5 (Winter 1980), p. 200.

<Introducing among others an invited young scholar, Dr. David A. Utz, a specialist in Sogdian Buddhist literature>

“ — (6) • *ibid.* (2) [同上 (二)]”, *Bulletin*, 6 (Spring 1981), p. 136.

<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>

“ — (9) • Intercourse with the National Library of Bhutan [ブータン国立図書館との交流]”, *Bulletin*, 9 (Winter 1981), p. 192.

<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 Reiyukai Library in November 1981>

“ — (10) • Establishment of the International Institute for Buddhist Studies: Receiving world-wide 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>

“ — (11) • Fifth Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies held at the University of Oxford [オックスフォード大学で第五回「国際仏教学会」]”, *Bulletin*, 11 (Autumn 1982), p. 84f.

“ — (12) • Publications of the academic works, e.g. Sanskrit texts of the Lotus Sutra, to the Pride of the Reiyukai (1) [法華経梵語原典の出版 — 世界の学界に誇る靈友会 — (上)]”, *Bulletin*, 12 (Winter 1982), p. 156f.

“ — (13) • *ibid.*, (2) [同上 (下)]”, *Bulletin*, 13 (Spring 1983), p. 144f.

<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 intercourse with the members of the IABS on the occasion of the CISHAAN [「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.

“ — (15) • Contribution to the success of the CIABS [「国際仏教学会」学術大会の成功に大きく貢献]”, *Bulletin*, 15 (Autumn 1983), p. 124-126, incl. 2 b/w photos.

<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)>

“ — (16) • Contribution to researches into the Tibetan Buddhist literature (1): Collecting original textual materials [チベット仏教典籍研究への貢献／一、原典資料の蒐集]”, *Bulletin*, 16 (Winter 1983), p. 134f., incl. 1 b/w ill.

<Special attention drawn to the collections of the various editions of the Tibetan Buddhist materials>

“ — (17) • *ibid.* (2): Publishing original textual research works [同上／二、原典資料の研究公刊]”, *Bulletin*, 17 (Spring 1984), p. 155.

“ — (18) • *ibid.* (3): Publishing text-critical studies [同上／三、経典研究の公刊]”, *Bulletin*, 18 (Summer 1984), p. 166.

“ — (19) • *ibid.* (4): Publishing the catalogues of the Tibetan materials kept in the U.S. Library of Congress [チベット仏教典籍研究への貢献／四、米合衆国議会図書館所蔵のチベット文献の目録作成出版]”, *Bulletin*, 19 (Autumn 1984), p. 171.

“ — (20) • IIBS – Intercourses with the scholars & researchers become active: A report for the Year 1985 [国際仏教学研究所・各国の学者、研究者との交流、活発に・昭和60年活動記録]”, *Bulletin*, 25 (Winter 1986), p. 30-32, incl. 3 b/w photos.

“ — (21) • IIBS – Intercourses with the scholars & researchers deepen further: A report for the Year 1987 [国際仏教学研究所・各国の仏教学者との交流、さらに深まる・昭和61年活動記録]”, *Bulletin*, 29 (Winter 1987), p. 32-34, incl. 3 b/w photos.

<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* Ic.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!

1. “A Report on the Göttingen Project: A Systematic Survey of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature”, *BRI*, No. 10 (1983), p. 7-13.

Based on the handout distributed to the “Buddhologen-Konferenz, Göttingen 28.11.-1.12.1975): “Ein Göttinger Projekt: Eine systematische und kritische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskritliteratur”, 5 pages.

2. “Scientific Projects in Progress in Japan”, *ibid.*, p. 14f.

3. “The Academic Activities of the International Institute for Buddhist Studies”, *ibid.*, p. 15-20.

D. *Essays for the General Public (written in Japanese):*

1. “Secondhand Bookstores in Europe [ヨーロッパの古本屋]”, *Hon: A Magazine for the Avid Lovers of Books* 読書人の雑誌『本』, Year 1978, No. 4 (Tokyo: Kōdansha, April 1978) [昭和53年第4号 (東京・講談社, 昭和53年4月), p. 26f.

2. “Introduction to the Jātaka Stories [『ジャータカ』解説]”, *The Jātaka Stories: A Comic Collection of the Pāli Jātakas*, illustrated by George YAMAUCHI under the supervision of Akira YUYAMA. 2 vols. (= *Innertrip Comic*) [湯山明監修・山内ジョージ画：まんが・ジャータカ物語 — 仏教童話集 — , 二巻 (いんなーとりっぶコミック)] (Tokyo: The Innertrip Publishing Co., 1988; *reprinted several times* [東京・いんなーとりっぶ社, 昭和63年], 6 pages appended

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]”, *The Ardent Determination: Essays to the Memory of Reverend Yehan Numata* [沼田恵範師追悼集・初一念] (Tokyo: BDK, 2000) [東京・仏教伝道協会, 2000], p. 62f.

E. Tripartite Talks for the General Public:

1. Tsugunari KUBO, Takejirō HAMA & Akira YUYAMA, “A Tripartite Talk Series ‘The Twenty-First Century & the Lotus Sutra’: Spiritual Culture – The Deep End of an Aspect”, *Human: A Monthly Magazine*, No. ?? (Tokyo: Ashita Publishing Co., late 1985?), p. 28-34; No. ?? (early 1986?), p. 40-46.

[久保継成・湯山明・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末～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:

1. “Mahāvastu-Avadāna”, *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism* (Written in ca. 1970) (Colombo).
2. “A Survey of Recent Studies of the Lotus Sutra”, *Proceedings of the XXXIII International Congress of Asian and North African Studies held in August 1990 at the University of Toronto* (Toronto), ca. 3 pages.
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. “バシヤム教授を憶いつつ [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 Busshorin.

VI. Editorships in chief of Serial Works:

Serial Publications of the IIBS (Tokyo: 1976-1995):

1. *Studia Philologica Buddhica: Monograph Series*, Volumes I-XI (1978-1995).
2. *Studia Philologica Buddhica: Occasional Paper Series*, Volumes I-VIII (1977-1994).
3. *Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica: Series Maior*, Volumes I-V (1978-1993).
4. *Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica: Series Minor*, Volumes I-V (1977-1986).
5. *Bibliographia Indica et Buddhica: Pamphlet Series*, Numbers I-II (1982-1992).
6. [Extraordinary publication (1991)] — cf. *supra* IV.B.3/3a.

VII. Advisory to some textual / philological works:

Department of Scientific Publications, The Reiyukai (Tokyo) (1976-1995):

— 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).

— otherwise on varied textual works on the *Lotus Sutra*, e.g. by Watanabe, *Gilgit Mss* (1972/1981), Lokesh Chandra, *Kashgar Ms* (1977), Kabutogi, *Tunhuang Mss/Kasuga blockprint* (1978), Nakada, *Japanese Kana Ms of the Lotus Sutra* (1988-), *Indices to the SP*, ed. Ejima (1985-1993); *Chin.-Skt. Dictionary*, ed. Hirakawa (1997).

VIII. Books published under my supervision:

湯山明監修・山内ジョー-ジ画: まんが・ジャータカ物語／仏教童話集／二巻: △人間編▽動物編△ (= いんなーとりつぷコミック) (東京・いんなーとりつぷ社, 1988).

[*The Jātaka Stories: Buddhist Tales for Children*. Illustrations by George YAMAUCHI, under the supervision of Akira YUYAMA with a supplementary comment. 2 vols.: I. *Animals*. II. *Humans* (= *Innertrip Comic Series*) (Tokyo: Innertrip Publishing Co., 1988). — ISBN 4-266-00023-5 & °-00024-0]. — cf. *supra* IV.II.D.2!

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),¹ *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, Suntō District, Shizuoka Prefecture, Japan
[静岡県駿東郡小山町菅沼].

Marital Status: Married in 1960 to Hiroko TAKADA (高田弘子: *1935).

Educational Records:

April 1940: Entered Kawamura Primary School, Municipal School of Yamakita Town, Ashigara-Kami District, Kanagawa Prefecture [神奈川県足柄上郡山北町立川村小學校].²

*As of April 1941 “Folk School · 国民學校” according to the new system under the educational reformation.*³

April 1942: Moved to Seibi Folk School, Municipal School of Oyama Town, Shizuoka Prefecture [静岡県駿東郡小山町立成美國民學校].

March 1946: Graduated Seibi Folk School.⁴

April 1946: Entered Kanagawa Prefectural Odawara Middle School, Odawara City, Kanagawa Prefecture [神奈川県立小田原中學校].

*As of April 1947 “Middle School · 中學”, attached to Odawara High School under the new reformation.*⁵

March 1949: Graduated the Middle School attached to Odawara High School [神奈川県立小田原高等學校併設中學].

April 1949: Entered Odawara High School [神奈川県立小田原高等學校].

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 [工手學校] (later Kōgakuin University [工学院大學]), 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 [成美舎] 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 · 集成館 (established in 1822)], Odawara Middle School started officially in April 1900 as the Second Middle School of Kanagawa Prefecture [神奈川県第二中學]. 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 [神奈川県立小田原中學].

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 [大阪外國語大學外国語學部インド語學科].⁷

As from October 2007 Osaka University of Foreign Studies was integrated with Osaka University as the Faculty of Foreign Studies [大阪大學外国語學部].

March 1957: Graduated Osaka University of Foreign Studies with Bachelor of Arts [文學士].

April 1957: Entered Department of Indian Philosophy and Sanskrit Philology, Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo [Majoring in Sanskrit] [東京大學文學部印度哲學梵文學科/梵語梵文學專攻].

March 1959: Graduated the University of Tokyo with Bachelor of Arts [文學士].

April 1959: Entered the Master Course of the Graduate School of Humanistic Studies, University of Tokyo, specializing in Indian Philosophy [東京大學大學院人文科學研究科印度哲學專攻課程・修士課程].

March 1961: Graduated the University of Tokyo with Master of Arts [文學修士].

April 1961: Entered the Doctoral Course in Indian Philosophy, University of Tokyo [東京大學大學院人文科學研究科印度哲學專攻課程・博士課程].

[October 1967: Left the University of Tokyo in absentia due to the expiration of the attending period and to the continuation of pursuing further research work abroad].

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學ケルン研究所 (インド學研究所)].⁸

[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) [文學士].⁹

March 1959: Bachelor of Arts (University of Tokyo) [文學士].¹⁰

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 (慶應大學言語文化研究所), in which Professor Naoshirō TSUJI [辻直四郎: 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 (語學研究所) at Keio University.

⁷ Osaka School of Foreign Languages (大阪外國語學校) 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 (外國語學校), established in Tokyo in 1897, in affiliation with the Higher Commercial School (高等商業學校). The founding principal of the School was appointed Junjirō TAKAKUSU [高楠順次郎: 1866-1945], Professor of Sanskrit at the University of Tokyo. The first principal of Osaka School of Foreign Languages was Akira NAKANOME [中目覺: 1874-1959].

⁸ 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). Instituute 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).

⁹ With a thesis on the egalitarianism in the earliest period of Buddhism.

¹⁰ With a thesis on the phonological study of the Aśokan inscriptions.

March 1961: Master of Arts (University of Tokyo) [文學修士].¹¹

April 1971: Doctor of Philosophy in South Asian and Buddhist Studies (Australian National University, Canberra).¹²

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 [ニュージー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].

June 1974-August 1976: 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／アレクサンダー・フォン・フンボルト財團・(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].

August 1976-December 1981: Director, The Reiyukai Library, Tokyo [靈友會圖書室長].

January 1982-March 1995: Director, International Institute for Buddhist Studies, Tokyo

[國際佛教學研究所・所長]. — (*As of 1 January 1982, reorganized from the Reiyukai Library*).

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 Émile Senart (Éditio 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).

¹² With a thesis of a study on the *Prajña-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-samcaya-gāthā* (in 3 parts); see *supra* ‘Bibliography’, I.3 (published by A.N.U. Press in Canberra in 1973) & I.4 (published by the Cambridge University Press in Cambridge in 1976).

Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University [創價大學・國際佛教學高等研究所・佛教梵語文獻學擔當教授] — *Inaugural Director: Professor Yūichi 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*) [西ドイツ國ハンブルク州立・ハンブルク大學・インド學(佛教學)・代任教授(西ドイツ國・學術振興會支援招聘教授/ランベルト・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) [カナダ國アルバータ州立カルガリー大學・宗教學科招聘/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.) [米國カリフォルニア州立カリフォルニア大學(バークレー校)・南東南アジア學科招聘/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 (*Gastprofessur zugunsten der Sonderunterstützung der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft, Bonn, Bundesrepublik Deutschland*) [ドイツ聯邦共和國ハンブルク州立・ハンブルク大學・インド學(佛教學)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:

Academic years 1977, 1982-1983, 1988-1990 & 1992-1993: Lecturer in Buddhist Sanskrit Philology at the University of Tokyo [東京大學(佛教梵語文獻學)].

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・アジア圏の言語・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 [広島大學(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

學佛教學研究室・配屬].

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(歸國後)].
- 1978- : Extraordinary Member, Institute for the Comprehensive Studies of the Lotus Sutra at Rissho University (Tokyo) [立正大学・法華經文化研究所・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・學術及び運営委員會・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 [パリー學佛敎文化學會] (*Administrative Office: Aichi Gakuin University, Nagoya; et alibi*).
- 1990-1995: Member on the Boards of Directors and Councilors of the Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies [日本印度學佛敎學會・理事/評議員] (*Administrative Office: University of Tokyo*).
- 1995-?: Member on the Board of Directors of the International Association of Buddhist Studies (*Administrative Offices: Freiburg/Germany – Lausanne/Switzerland*) [國際佛敎學會・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) [佛敎傳道協會・外國人獎學留學生・選考委員會委員].
- 2001-2007: Member on the Board of Councilors of the Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies [日本印度學佛敎學會・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].
- Publications: 1) *Buddhist Text Information* (Stony Brook: The Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions, 1982-1992).
- 2) *Buddhist Research Information* (Stony Brook: The Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions, 1979-?).
- 1979-? : Member on the Managing Committee of the Society for the Study of the Lotus Sutra in Sanskrit [梵文法華經研究會・幹事] (Tokyo).
- Publications: *Index to the Saddharmapundarikasūtra (Sanskrit – Tibetan – Chinese)* (Tokyo: The Reiyukai, 1985-1993).
- 1982-ca. 2010? : Member on the Standing Editorial Board of the *BDK English Tripiṭaka* (Tokyo-Berkeley: Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai [仏敎伝道協會], or Buddhist Promoting Foundation) [漢譯大藏經英譯委員會(常任委員)].
- Publications: *BDK English Tripiṭaka* (Tokyo: Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai – Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1991-).

- 1988-ca. 2003: Specialist Member on the Editorial Board of the *Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum* (Tokyo: UNESCO Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies affiliated to The Toyo Bunko, 1989-2003) [アジア稀観書叢書・専門編集委員].
Publications: *Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum* (Tokyo: UNESCO Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies affiliated to The Toyo Bunko, 1989-2001/2003).
- 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 Hinüber, and contributions by numerous other scholars (Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy) [『批判的パーリ語辞典』・編集顧問].
- 1989-1996: Member on the Editorial Advisory Board of the *Rivista de Estudios Budistas*, eds. Fernando Tola & Carmen Dragonetti (Mexico City-Buenos Aires, 1989-1999) [『佛教研究誌』・編集顧問].
- 2000- : Member on the Editorial Boards, as a Joint Editor, etc., of the *Indo-Iranian Journal*, founded in 1957 by J. W. de Jong & F. B. J. Kuiper (First by Mouton & Co., The Hague-Paris, and later Dordrecht: Reidel Publishing; et al. / now Leiden: Brill) [『インド・イラン學誌』・共同編集委員].
- 2000-?: Member of the Committee of Scientific Patronage of the *Studia Asiatica*, under the editorship of Eugen Ciurtin (Bucharest: Centre for the History of Religions, University of Bucharest, Bucharest, Rumania) [『アジア研究誌』・學術獎勵委員會委員].
- 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 Hinüber & 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).*
- 2000-?: Member on the Editorial Advisory Board of the *Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies*, ed. A. K. Narain (Sarnath, Varanasi) [『インド國際佛教學誌』・編集顧問].
Publications: बौद्ध अध्ययन की भारतीय अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय पत्रिका ॥ / *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 (三康文化研究所附屬三康圖書館).

Reference: *Annual Report of the Sanko Research Institute for the Studies of Buddhism for the Fiscal Year 2006 (April 2006-March 2007)*: No. XLIII [附^四法人三康文化研究所所報・平成19年度／第43号], p. 38-40. — cf. further *supra* “List of Writings”, II, No. 103.

❀ ❀ ❀

ब्राह्मी पुरा वाग्दैवी च संस्कृतमिति घोषितम् ।

मानुष्यपीति च पुनः पण्डिता एव जानते ॥ १ ॥

विद्वान्वदति धर्मं हि यं गृहीते जनः सुखम् ।

जानाति वाक्यमपरं कुशलं स्वं च भाणकः ॥ २ ॥

इति बौद्धसंस्कृतभाषास्तुतिः ॥

brāhmī purā vāg daivī ca
saṃskṛtam iti ghoṣitam /

mānuṣy apīti ca punaḥ
paṇḍitā eva jānate // 1 //

vidvān vadati dharmam hi
yaṃ grhṇīte janaḥ sukham /

jānāti vākyaṃ aparaṃ
kuśalaṃ svaṃ ca bhāṇakaḥ // 2 //

iti bauddhasaṃskṛtabhāṣāstutiḥ //

佛教梵語讚頌

サンスクリット語は、古來、梵天の言語であり、
また天界のものと、聲高に宣べられる。

しかし、また、人間のものでもあり、
まさに賢者たちは知る。— 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。— 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//

— See supra Article No. II.59: Watanabe Memorial Volume, II (1993), p. 83.

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（夏期・冬期休暇中を除く）で開会。
以下、主立った活動について記す

平成23年度

3月24日(土)~25日(日) 辛嶋 静志教授、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.aibl.fr/seances-et-manifestations/les-seances-du-vendredi/seances-2012/mai-2012/article/seance-du-4-mai-2012?lang=fr>に録音が公開されている)

5月8日~9日：ハンブルク大学アジア・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 Avalokitasvara 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、一闍提、大乘の本当の意味——」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「ガンダー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ダーラの仏教」にて「阿弥陀・観音・般若経—大乘仏教とガンダーラ」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) で開催された第五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：コー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 Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ: Verhaltensregeln für buddhistische Mönche der Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins*, herausgegeben, mit der chinesischen Parallelversion verglichen, übersetzt und kommentiert, unter Mitwirkung von Oskar von Hinüber, Tokyo 2012: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka

University, (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XIII.1-3), Band I. lix + 480 pages, ISBN 978-4-904234-05-1; Band II. 462 pages, ISBN 978-4-904234-06-8; Band III (Grammatik, Glossar und Anhänge). 572 pages, ISBN 978-4-904234-07-5.

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・ヒニューバー博士 (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・ヒニューバー博士 (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・ヒニューバー博士

テーマ：古代インドの碑文と画像に表された仏教の部派 (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「一闍提は誰か」“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「言葉の向こうに開ける仏教の原風景 ——経文に見える「浄土」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「ガンダ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 Leibzig)

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『長阿含十報法經』を検討する(從佛教詞語和一般詞語看〈長阿含十報法經〉)

12月16日(日) 辛嶋教授 京都出張

龍谷大学、科研「ガンダ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. Safrali 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)

国際仏教学高等研究所・所員の著作
(List of Publications of the IRIAB Fellows)

辛嶋静志 (Seishi KARASHIMA)

Die Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ: Verhaltensregeln für buddhistische Mönche der Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins, herausgegeben, mit der chinesischen Parallelversion verglichen, übersetzt und kommentiert, unter Mitwirkung von Oskar von Hinüber, Tokyo 2012: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XIII), Band I. lix + 480 pages, ISBN 978-4-904234-05-1; Band II. 462 pages, ISBN 978-4-904234-06-8; Band III (Grammatik, Glossar und Anhänge). 572 pages, ISBN 978-4-904234-07-5.

「利用「翻版」研究中古漢語演變：以《道行般若經》「異譯」與《九色鹿經》為例」(“A Study of the Evolution of Middle Chinese Using “Modified Versions”: Case Studies of the Tao-hsing Pan-jo Ching and Its Later Modifications and the Chiu-se-lu Ching”)『中正大學中文學術年刊』第十八期(2011), pp. 165~188.

“A first-century *Prajñāpāramitā* manuscript from Gandhāra – *parivarta* 1 (Text from the Split Collection 1)”, by Harry Falk and Seishi Karashima, in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University*, vol. XV, 2012.3, pp. 19-61 + plates 5~7.

工藤順之 (Noriyuki KUDO)

“The *Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa*: A Transliteration of the Nepalese Manuscript A (4),” in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2011*, vol. XV, 2012.3, pp. 105-116.

受贈受入書籍類 [Books & CD-ROMs Received]
(2012.2~2013.1)

* 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 Buddhology, is certainly by no means complete.

- GAWRONSKI, Andrzej. *Studies about the Sanskrit Buddhist Literature: Collected Papers*, (Studia Buddhica, 2), 2012, Warsaw: Research Centre of Buddhist Studies, Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Warsaw.
- Gyeongnam Development Institute, *The Millennium Tripitaka Koreana, Rediscover the Value*, 2010, Korea: Tripitaka Koreana.
- Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography, Academy of Science, Tajikistan and National Research Institute for Cultural Properties, Tokyo, Preservation of the Buddhist Monastery of Ajina Tepa, Tajikistan, *Report on the Archaeological Investigation of Ajina Tepa (2006-2008)*, (The Conservation of Cultural Heritage in Central Asia, Vol. 7; Japan-Tajikistan Joint Research of Cultural Heritage, Vol. 5), 2012, Tajikistan and Tokyo: Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography, Academy of Science, Tajikistan and National Research Institute for Cultural Properties, Tokyo.
- International Symposium in Commemoration of Millennial Anniversary of the Tripitaka Koreana, 2011*, Korea: 2011 Millennial Anniversary of the Tripitaka Koreana Symposium Office.
- IWAO, Kazushi, Sam Van SCHAİK and Tsuguhito TAKEUCHI, *Old Tibetan Texts in The Stein Collection Or. 8210: Studies in Old Tibetan Texts from Central Asia*, Volume 1, (Studia Tibetica. No. 45), 2012, Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko.
- KAWASAKI, Yutaka, Sunao KASAMATSU and Yumi OUSAKA, *Pariṣiṣṭaparvan: Pāda Index and Reverse Pāda Index*, (Philologica Asiatica, Monograph Series, 28), 2012, Tokyo: Chuo Academic Research Institute.
- MAURER, Petra and Johannes SCHNEIDER (bearb.), *Wörterbuch der tibetischen Schriftsprache / im Auftrag der Kommission für zentral- und ostasiatische Studien der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften; 15. Lieferung: na - mnon par 'phags*, 2011, München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- MAURER, Petra and Johannes SCHNEIDER (bearb.), *Wörterbuch der tibetischen Schriftsprache / im Auftrag der Kommission für zentral- und ostasiatische Studien der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften; 16. Lieferung: mnon par 'phel - gcags*, 2011, München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- MEISIG, Konrad and Marion MEISIG, *A Buddhist Chinese Glossary=Buddhistisch-Chinesisches Glossar* (CD-ROM), (East Asia Intercultural Studies, 6), 2012, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- MEJOR, Marek, Agnieszka HELMAN-WAZNY and Thupten Kunga CHASHAB, *A Preliminary Report on the Wanli Kanjur: Kept in the Jagiellonian Library, Kraków*, (Studia Buddhica, 1), 2010, Warsaw: Research Centre of Buddhist Studies, Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Warsaw.
- National Archives of India, Soka Gakkai and Institute of Oriental Philosophy, *Gilgit Lotus Sutra Manuscripts from the National Archives of India. Facsimile Edition*, (Lotus Sutra Manuscript Series 法華經写本シリーズ, 12), 2012, New Delhi and Tokyo: The National Archives of India, the Soka Gakkai, and the Institute of Oriental Philosophy.
- Tipitaka. Abhidhammapitaka. Kathāvatthu* (สยามรัฐสุตฺต เตปิฏก=Syāmaratthassa Tepitakam, 1-45), Bangkok: มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏวไลยอลงกรณ์.
- VETTER, Tilmann, *A Lexicographical Study of an Shigao's and his Circle's Chinese Translations of Buddhist Texts*, (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series, 28), Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- WILLE, Klaus. *Sanskrihandchriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil 11: Die Katalognummern 4363-5799, (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Bd. 10), 2012, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart.
- 青木隆, 方廣錡, 池田將則, 石井公成, 山口弘江著『藏外地論宗文獻集成』(금강학술총서, 8) 2012, 서울: 도서출판 씨아이알.
- 赤尾栄慶編集代表『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学研究所, 創価大学シルクロード研究センター編『ダルヴェルジンテパ仏教寺院跡』2012, 東京: 創価大学シルクロード研究センター.
- 片山一良訳『相応部(サンユッタニカーヤ)有偏篇2』(パーリ仏典, 第三期2) 2012, 東京: 大蔵出版.
- 金沢大学文化人類学研究室編『珠洲市若山町三郷地区 出田・広栗・鈴内』(金沢大学フィールド文化学, 9; 金沢大学文化人類学研究室調査実習報告書, 第27巻) 2012, 金沢: 金沢大学文学部文化人類学研究室.
- 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A)研究成果報告書, 平成18年度-20年度) 2012, 大阪: 大阪人間科学大学.
- 国立文化財機構東京文化財研究所文化遺産国際協力センター編, インド考古局編『第2窟、第9窟壁画のデジタルドキュメンテーション』(インド-日本文化遺産保護共同事業報告, 第3巻; アジアンター壁画の保存修復に関する調査研究事業) 2012, 東京: 国立文化財機構東京文化財研究所文化遺産国際協力センター.
- 金剛大学校仏教文化研究所著『화엄경문답을 둘러싼 제문제: 금강대학교 불교문화연구소』2012, ソウル: 図書出版CIR.
- 金剛大学校仏教文化研究所, 人民大学 仏教と宗教学理論研究所, 東洋大学大学院文学研究科インド哲学仏教学専攻主催『第1回韓・中・日国際仏教学術大会 東アジアにおける仏性・如来蔵思想の受容と変容』2012, ソウル: 金剛大学校仏教文化研究所.
- 三賢著『科學佛法入門』(科學佛法導論系列, 第一集), 桃園市: 台灣科學佛法研究社出版.

- 積果毅総編集『法鼓山年鑑2011 (DVD)』2012, 台北: 法鼓山文教基金會。
 대한불교조계종 불교중앙박물관=大韓仏教曹溪宗 仏教中央博物館 『천년의 지혜, 천년의 그릇=The Special Exhibition Millennium of Tripitaka Koreana』2011, 서울: 대한불교조계종 불교중앙박물관。
 台北淨法界善友文教基金會『葉阿月教授佛學論文集 (CD版)』2012, 台北: 財團法人台北淨法界善友文教基金會。
- 武田科学振興財団 杏雨書屋編『敦煌秘笈 影片冊七』2012, 大阪: 武田科学振興財団。
 武田科学振興財団 杏雨書屋編『敦煌秘笈 影片冊八』2012, 大阪: 武田科学振興財団。
 智山伝法院『智山の真言②: 金剛界念誦次第における真言の解説』(智山伝法院選書)2012, 東京: 智山伝法院。
 ツルティム・ケサン(白館戒雲), 藤仲孝司著『ダルマキールティ著『量評釈』第1章「自己のための比量」とタルマリンチェン著『同釈論解説道作明』第1章の和訳研究』(研究プロジェクト「人の生老病死と高地環境: 「高地文明」における医学生理・生態・文化的適応」2011年度研究報告書; 2011年度チベット仏教: 論理学・認識論の研究3)2012, 京都: 人間文化研究機構・総合地球環境学研究所。
 東京国立博物館パキスタン調査隊編『ザールデリー: パキスタン古代仏教遺跡の発掘調査 = Zar Dheri: Archaeological excavation of an ancient buddhist site in Pakistan』2011, 東京: 東京国立博物館。
 平勢隆郎, 塩沢裕仁編『関野貞大陸調査と現在』2012, 東京: 東京大学東洋文化研究所。
 黄釋勳著『宋代禪宗辭書《祖庭事苑》之研究』2011, 台灣: 佛光文化事業有限公司。
 船山徹編『眞諦三藏研究論集』(京都大學人文科學研究所研究報告)2012, 京都: 京都大學人文科學研究所。
 海印寺編『大藏經千年世界文化祝典=Millennial Anniversary of the Tripitaka Koreana』2012。
 ホルカン・ソナムペンパー, ホルカン・チャンバテンダー著, 星泉・大川謙作編, ゲンドウンチュンペー研究会訳『チベットの伝説の学僧と生と死: ゲンドウンチュンペー伝』2012, 東京: 東京外国語大学アジア・アフリカ言語文化研究所。
- 道元徹心編『天台: 比叡に響く仏の声』(龍谷大学仏教学叢書, 3)2012, 京都: 自照社出版。
 望月真澄著, 木村中一著『目録集』(身延山資料叢書, 2)2011, 山梨: 身延山大学東洋文化研究所。
 森章司著, 釈尊伝研究会編『原始仏教聖典資料による釈尊伝の研究【17】基礎研究篇 VII』(中央学術研究所紀要モノグラフ篇, 17)2012, 東京: 中央学術研究所。
 森雅秀著『オリッサ州カタック地区の密教美術』(Asian Iconographic Resources Monograph Series, 2)2012, Kanazawa: The Institute of Asian Iconographic Resources。
 森雅秀著『パーラ朝期の仏教美術』(Asian Iconographic Resources Monograph Series, 3)2012, Kanazawa: The Institute of Asian Iconographic Resources。
 森雅秀著 *Mathura*, (Asian Iconographic Resources Monograph Series, 4)2012, Kanazawa: The Institute of Asian Iconographic Resources。
- 望月海慧著『Tāranātha の Nbu Ma Theg Mchog 研究』(Acta Tibetica et Buddhica Beiheft, 1)2011, 山梨: 身延山大学仏教学部チベット学研究室。
- 山内和也責任編集, 鈴木環編集, 近藤洋編集『パーミヤーン遺跡資料集1 パーミヤーン谷中心部の文化的景観: 1970年代』(アフガニスタン文化遺産調査資料集, 別冊第4巻)2012, 東京: 独立行政法人国立文化財機構 東京文化財研究所文化遺産国際協力センター。
- 龍谷大学アジア仏教文化研究センター『2010年度 第2回国内シンポジウムプロシーディングス: 中央アジアにおける仏教と異宗教の交流』2011, 京都: 龍谷大学アジア仏教文化研究センター。
- 龍谷大学アジア仏教文化研究センター『2011年度「日本によるアフガニスタン仏教遺跡の調査」』2012, 京都: 龍谷大学アジア仏教文化研究センター。
- 龍谷大学アジア仏教文化研究センター『2011年度 研究報告書: アジア諸地域における仏教の多様性とその現代的可能性の総合的研究』2012, 京都: 龍谷大学アジア仏教文化研究センター。
- 龍谷大学アジア仏教文化研究センター『2011年度 全体研究会プロシーディングス』2012, 京都: 龍谷大学アジア仏教文化研究センター。
- 龍谷大学アジア仏教文化研究センター『2011年度 第1回国内シンポジウムプロシーディングス: 大谷探検隊をめぐる新研究』2012, 京都: 龍谷大学アジア仏教文化研究センター。
- 龍谷大学アジア仏教文化研究センター『2011年度 第2回国内シンポジウムプロシーディングス: アジア仏教の現在II』2012, 京都: 龍谷大学アジア仏教文化研究センター。
- 龍谷大学アジア仏教文化研究センター『2011年度 第1回国際シンポジウムプロシーディングス: 浄土教に関する特別国際シンポジウム』2011, 京都: 龍谷大学アジア仏教文化研究センター。

受贈受入雑誌 [Journals Received]
(2012.2~2013.1)

| | |
|---|---|
| Acta Asiatica: Bulletin of the Institute Eastern Culture 102-3 | Toho Gakkai |
| Archiv Orientalni 80/1 | Oriental Institute |
| Bulletin of the Nanzan Institute for Religion & Culture 36 | Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture |
| CSRJ Newsletter 22, 23 | Centre for the Studies of Japanese Religions, SOAS |
| The Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies 13 | Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap Institute of Buddhist and Asian Studies |
| IDP News = Newsletter of the International Dunghuang Project | The British Library |
| IDP: The Silk Road Online 39, 40 | |
| IIAS Newsletter 59, 61, 62 | International Institute for Asian Studies |
| Japanese Religions 日本の諸宗教 36/1-2, 37/1-2 | NCC宗教研究所 |
| The Journal of Oriental Studies 22 | The Institute of Oriental Philosophy |
| List of Publications Received 14 | 国際仏教学大学院大学附属図書館 |
| The Mahachulalongkorn Journal of Buddhist Studies 3 | MJBS Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University |
| Mahāpīṭaka. Newsletter 18 | 仏教伝道協会 |
| MINPAKU Anthropology Newsletter 34, 35 | 国立民族学博物館 |
| Mongolo- Tibetica Pragensia 1/1-2, 3/1-2, 4/1-2 | Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague |
| NCC宗教研究所ニュース 36-37 | NCC宗教研究所 |
| Newsletter: Bauddhakośa | 東京大学大学院人文社会系研究科・文学部 イン
ド哲学仏教学研究室 |
| Tobunken News 47-49 | 国立文化財機構 東京文化財研究所 |
| Tobunken News Digest 11 | 国立文化財機構 東京文化財研究所 |
| Toyo University International research Center for Philosophy
Newsletter 2-4 | 東洋大学国際哲学研究センター |
| Written Monuments of the Orient 2004(1), 2005(1-2), 2006(1-2)
2007(1-2), 2008(1-2), 2009(2), 2010(1-2), 2011(1-2), 2012(1) | Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy
of Sciences |
| Zinbun 43 | 京都大学人文科学研究所 |
| 불교학리뷰 = Critical review for Buddhist studies 10,11 | 金剛大学校仏教文化研究所 |
| 愛知学院大学文学部紀要 41 | 愛知学院大学文学部 |
| アジア流域文化論研究 8 | 東北学院大学オープン・リサーチ・センター |
| アップ・トゥー・デート31-32 | 大乘淑徳学園附置長谷川佛教文化研究所 |
| いとくら:学術フロンティア「奈良平安古写経研究拠点の形成」国際仏教学大学院大学
ニュースレター 7 | |
| インド哲学仏教学研究 19 | 東京大学文学部人文社会系研究科印度哲学研究
室 |
| インド哲学仏教学論集 1 | 北海道大学文学部印度哲学研究室 |
| 叡山学院研究紀要 34 | 叡山学院 |
| 圓光佛學學報 18 | 圓光佛學研究所 |
| 大崎学報 167-168 | 立正大学仏教学会 |
| 大谷大学研究年報 64 | 大谷大学図書館 |
| 大谷大学真宗総合研究所研究紀要 29 | 大谷大学真宗総合研究所 |
| 大谷大学大学院研究紀要 28 | 大谷大学大学院 |
| 大谷学報 90/2, 91/1-2 | 大谷大学図書館 |
| 金沢大学歴史言語文化学系論集 言語・文学篇 4 | 金沢大学歴史言語文化学系 |
| 金沢大学歴史言語文化学系論集 史学・考古学篇 4 | 金沢大学歴史言語文化学系 |
| 汲古 61-62 | 汲古書院 |
| 杏雨 KYO-U 15 | 武田科学振興財団 |
| 教化研究 150-151 | 真宗大谷派教学研究所 |
| キリスト教文化・東洋宗教研究所紀要 30 | 上智大学キリスト教文化・東洋宗教研究所 |

華嚴 95
 現代密教 23
 高野山大学密教文化研究所紀要 25
 國際哲学研究 1
 國際仏教学大学院大学研究紀要 16
 国立民族学博物館研究報告 36/2-4, 37/1
 古代オリエント博物館紀要 31
 古代オリエント博物館情報誌 オリエンテ 43-44
 駒沢女子大学研究紀要 18
 駒沢女子短期大学研究紀要 45
 駒沢大學佛教學論集 42
 三康文化研究所所報 47
 三康文化研究所年報 43
 四天王寺大学紀要 53-54
 浄土宗學研究 38
 浄土真宗総合研究 6
 シルクロード研究 7
 西山学苑研究紀要 7
 世界宗教學刊 17-18
 創価経営論集 36/1-3
 創価經濟論集 41/1-4
 創価大学人文論集 24
 大正大学綜合佛教研究所年報 34
 臺大佛學研究 22-23
 中央學術研究所紀要 41
 中華佛學學報 25
 筑紫女学園大学・筑紫女学園大学短期大学部紀要 7

 鶴見大学佛教文化研究所紀要 17
 哲学・思想論集 37
 天台学報 53
 東京文化財研究所概要 2012
 東方 27
 東方學 123-124
 東方學會報 102
 同朋大学論叢 95
 東洋學術研究 51/1-2
 東洋学論叢 東洋大学文学部紀要 65
 東洋の思想と宗教 29
 東洋大学國際哲学研究センターニューズレター 2-4
 東洋哲学研究所紀要 28
 東洋文化研究所紀要 160-161
 敦煌學輯刊 67-74
 敦煌寫本研究年報 6
 成田山仏教研究所紀要 35
 南山宗教文化研究所研究所報 22
 二松学舎大学大学院紀要・二松 26
 二松学舎大学東アジア学術総合研究所集刊 42
 二松学舎大學論集 55
 日本西藏學會々報 58
 長谷川仏教文化研究所年報 36

南都佛教研究会
 智山伝法院
 高野山大学密教文化研究所
 東洋大学國際哲学研究センター
 國際仏教学大学院大学
 国立民族学博物館
 古代オリエント博物館
 古代オリエント博物館
 駒沢女子大学・短期大学図書館
 駒沢女子大学・短期大学図書館
 駒沢大学佛教学部
 三康文化研究所
 三康文化研究所
 四天王寺大学図書館
 知恩院浄土宗學研究所
 浄土真宗本願寺派教学伝道研究センター
 創価大学シルクロード研究センター
 京都西山短期大学
 南華大学宗教学研究
 創価大学経営学会
 創価大学經濟学会
 創価大学人文学会
 大正大学綜合佛教研究所
 國立臺灣大學文學院佛學研究中心
 中央學術研究所
 中華佛學研究所
 筑紫女学園大学・筑紫女学園大学短期大学部附
 属図書館
 鶴見大学図書館
 筑波大学人文社会科学研究科哲学・思想専攻
 叡山学院
 国立文化財機構 東京文化財研究所
 東方研究会・東方学院
 東方学会
 東方学会
 同朋学園大学部附属図書館
 東洋哲学研究所
 東洋大学文学部印度哲学科研究室
 早稲田大學東洋哲學會
 東洋大学國際哲学研究センター
 東洋哲学研究所
 東京大学東洋文化研究所
 蘭州大学敦煌学研究所
 京都大學人文科學研究所
 成田山仏教研究所
 南山宗教文化研究所
 二松学舎大学附属図書館
 二松学舎大学附属図書館
 二松学舎大学附属図書館
 大谷大学真宗総合研究所内日本西藏学会
 淑徳大学長谷川仏教文化研究所

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 花園大学国際禅学研究所論叢 7 | 花園大学国際禅学研究所 |
| 比較論理学研究 1-9 | 広島大学比較論理学プロジェクト研究センター |
| 東アジア仏教研究 10 | 東アジア仏教研究会 |
| 佛教學研究 68 | 龍谷仏教学会 |
| 佛教研究 40 | 国際佛教徒協會 |
| 佛教大学総合研究所紀要 19 | 佛教大学総合研究所 |
| 佛教大学総合研究所所報 33 | 佛教大学総合研究所 |
| 佛教大学大学院紀要 教育学研究科篇 40 | 佛教大学大学院 |
| 佛教大学大学院紀要 社会福祉学研究科篇 40 | 佛教大学大学院 |
| 佛教大学大学院紀要 文学研究科篇 40 | 佛教大学大学院 |
| 佛教大学仏教学会紀要 9-17 | 佛教大学仏教学会 |
| 佛教大学文学部論集 96 | 佛教大学文学部 |
| 佛教大学歴史学部論集 2 | 佛教大学歴史学部 |
| 佛教文化 51 | 東京大学佛教青年会 |
| 佛教文化研究 55-56 | 浄土宗教学院 |
| 佛教文化研究論集 13-14 | 東京大学佛教青年会 |
| 佛教論叢 55-56 | 浄土宗教学院 |
| 法鼓佛學學報 10 | 法鼓佛教研修學院 |
| 北陸宗教文化 25 | 金沢大学文学部 北陸宗教文化学会 |
| 法華文化研究 37-38 | 立正大学 法華經文化研究所 |
| 待兼山論叢 45 | 大阪大学大学院文学研究科 |
| 南アジア古典学 7 | 九州大学インド哲学史研究室 |
| 身延山大学仏教学部紀要 12 | 身延山大学仏教学部 |
| 民博通信 135-139 | 国立民族学博物館 |
| 武蔵野大学仏教文化研究所紀要 28 | 武蔵野大学仏教文化研究所 |
| 龍谷大学 佛教学研究室年報 16 | 龍谷大学仏教学研究室 |
| 論叢 アジアの文化と思想 20 | 早稲田大学文学学術院東洋哲学研究室内
アジアの文化と思想の会 |

執筆者紹介 [Contributors to this Issue]

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Harry FALK | Professor, Free University of Berlin, GERMANY |
| Oskar von HINÜBER | Professor Emeritus, University of Freiburg, GERMANY |
| Haiyan Hu-von HINÜBER | Director of Confucius Institute, University of Freiburg, GERMANY |
| Petra KIEFFER-PÜLZ | Research Fellow, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, GERMANY |
| Isao KURITA (栗田 功) | Eurasian Art, Tokyo |
| Li Xuezhong (李 学竹) | Research Associate, China Tibetology Research Center, CHINA |
| Jundo NAGASHIMA (長島 潤道) | Lecturer, Taisho University, Tokyo |
| SAERJI (薩爾吉) | Assoc. Professor, Peking University, CHINA |
| Peter SKILLING | Maître de conférences, École française d'Extrême-Orient, Bangkok and Paris. |
| Tatsushi TAMAI (玉井 達士) | Visiting Researcher, IRIAB, Soka University, Tokyo |
| YE Shaoyong (叶 少勇) | Lecturer, Peking University, CHINA |
| Akira YUYAMA (湯山 明) | Professor Emeritus, Soka University, Tokyo |
| Seishi KARASHIMA (辛嶋 静志) | Director/Professor, IRIAB, Soka University, Tokyo |
| Noriyuki KUDO (工藤 順之) | Assoc. Professor, IRIAB, Soka University, Tokyo |

編集後記 (Editorial Postscript)

本誌第16号をお届けします。今号は英文21篇を掲載することが出来ました。まずは本研究所外国籍客員研究員である諸先生方から。フライブルク大学名誉教授、オスカー・フォン・ヒニューバー博士からは昨年発表いただいた碑文について、新たに入手された写真を基に再検討したご論攷を、ハイエン・フー・フォン・ヒニューバー博士（フライブルク大学孔子学院院长）からは第14号掲載の法顕『佛國記』に関して別視点からのご論攷を、またハリー・ファルク博士（ベルリン自由大学）には前号に引き続き本研究所辛嶋教授と共著となるガンダーラ語般若経写本の第5章のご研究をお寄せ頂きました。ピーター・スキリング博士（フランス極東学院）からは北京大学サルジ准教授と共同で二篇を、更にオスカー・フォン・ヒニューバー博士と共同で多聞部の系譜を記録した碑文についてのご論攷をいただきました。中国・西藏研究中心の李学竹博士にはチベット自治区の写本2点のご研究で、一篇は *Asaṅga, Abhidharmasamuccaya* 写本の失われていたとされていた数葉、もう一篇は大正大学・長島潤道博士と共同で *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* の新たな写本を発表していただきました。北京大学の叶少勇博士にも同様にチベット自治区から発見された龍樹の *Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti* 写本について発表していただきました。いずれの資料も今回初めてそのテキストが明らかにされたもので、本誌をその発表の場に選んで下さったことにあためてお礼申し上げます。玉井達士博士からは、トカラ語の *Udānālankāra* 写本断簡を新たに読み直したご論文をいただきました。本学名誉教授の湯山明博士にはご自身の著作目録と年譜を掲載していただくことになりました。およそ仏教文献学に携わる者にとって先生のご研究に触れずに研究がなされることはあり得ません。これまでのご論攷の全てを自註を加えて紹介していただくことは稀に見る貴重な機会ではないかと思えます。また、今号にはこれまで本誌にはなかった異色の発表を掲載することができました。欧亞美術の栗田功氏によるガンダーラ出土の種々の仏像類に関するご発表です。今も陸続と世に出てくるも、未発表である数多くの作品をいち早く紹介していただきました。あらためて、ご多忙の中、寄稿下さった諸先生方にお礼申し上げます。

次年度研究所出版物について プロジェクトの予告をした以外には、その研究叢書の出版時期について具体的にお知らせすることがなかなかできず、心苦しく思っておりますが、次年度において『大英図書館所蔵中央アジア出土梵語仏典』第3巻、『サンクトペテルブルク東洋写本研究所所蔵梵語仏典』第1巻、『インド国立公文書館所蔵ギルギット写本』（写真版）第1巻を出版すべく、多くの方々のご助力を頂戴しながら編集作業が進行中です。いずれも新たに撮影された鮮明なカラー写真を用い、既存・最新の研究成果を網羅したものとなっております。上記の各所蔵機関には仏教研究の専門機関たる本研究所への信頼の下、貴重な資料の出版をお任せいただき、ここにあらためてお礼を申し上げます。また出来るだけ早く研究者の方々のお手元にお届けし、国内外を問わず、研究の進展に幾ばくかの寄与とならんことを念願しております。

研究所より 研究所の日々の活動は、事務全般担当の学事部・松岡尚志さん、林久子さんと松井博子さん、蔵書管理の及川弘美さん、そして多くの学生・留学生諸氏の献身的な協力で支えられております。また大学学事部の飛田部長をはじめ、研究所運営委員会委員長・寺西宏友副学長、大学理事会をはじめとする関係部署・各機関からの様々な支援の下、研究所は運営されております。わずか二名の我々の研究と活動を支えて下さる多くの方々はこの場を借りて深くお礼申し上げます。

(3, 3. 2013/N.K.)

『創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報』（平成24年度）第16号

2013年3月31日発行

編集主幹 工藤 順之
発行所 創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所 (所長・辛嶋静志)
〒192-8577 東京都八王子市丹木町 1-236
Tel: 042-691-2695, Fax: 042-691-4814
E-mail: iriab@soka.ac.jp; URL: <http://iriab.soka.ac.jp/>
印刷所 明和印刷株式会社
〒113-0023 東京都文京区向丘 1-5-2 水上ビル
Tel: 03-3817-0581, Fax: 03-5684-7155

*Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism
at Soka University for the Academic Year 2012, Vol. XVI (2013)*

Editor-in-Chief: Noriyuki KUDO
Published on 31 March 2013
by The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University:
1-236 Tangi, Hachioji, Tokyo 192-8577, JAPAN
Phone: +81-42-691-2695 / Fax: +81-42-691-4814
E-mail: iriab@soka.ac.jp; URL: <http://iriab.soka.ac.jp/>

Printed by Meiwa Printing Co.Ltd., Tokyo, JAPAN

ISSN 1343-8980

Correspondence regarding all editorial matters and acknowledgements of monographs and the Annual Report, including manuscripts to be offered for publication, may be addressed to the Editor-in-Chief of this issue, in care of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University.

略号提案：

(創大)仏高研年報 = 創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報

Suggested Abbreviation:

ARIRIAB = Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism

『創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報』
第1-15号 著者名索引

Alphabetical Index of Authors (volume, pages)

*Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University [= ARIRIAB]
Vols. I-XV, 1998-2012*

*: paper written in Japanese; **: paper written partly in Japanese; ‡: paper written jointly

- ACHARYA, Diwakar
IX.33-42‡
BOUCHER, Daniel
IV.93-115
CHEN, Ming 陳 明
IX.201-230
DELEANU, Florin
III.65-113
DUAN, Qing 段 晴
VI.197-206‡; X.325-336; XIII.173-183; XIV.127-134; XV.63-69
EIMER, Helmut
XIII.185-194
FALK, Harry
XIII.13-33; XIV.13-23; XV.13-17; XV.19-61‡
FAN, Muyou 範 慕尤
XI.375-380
FANG, Guangchang 方 広鋈
XI.303-324
FUKITA, Takamichi 吹田 隆道
II.93-128‡**;
GOSHIMA, Kiyotaka 五島 清隆
XI.325-334
HARRISON, Paul
X.201-211
HARTMANN, Jens-Uwe
VII.119-137
von HINÜBER, Oskar
IX.3-31; X.39-43; XI.3-29; XI.31-35; XII.3-6; XIII.3-8; XIII.9-12; XIV.3-9; XIV.7-12‡; XV.3-10;
XV.11-12
HIRAOKA, Satoshi 平岡 聡
XII.29-72; XIII.35-74
HU-von HINÜBER, Haiyan
XIV.223-247; XV.77-85
JI, Xianlin 季 羨林
X.461-470*
JIANG, Zhongxin 蔣 忠新
III.115-123
KAJIYAMA, Yuichi 梶山 雄一
I.9-28*; II.3-19*; III.3-35*; IV.3-26*

- KANNO, Hiroshi 菅野 博史
III.125-147; VI.301-320; X.417-444
- KARASHIMA, Seishi 辛嶋 静志
I.49-68*; II.39-66*; II.93-128†**; III.37-64*; III.213-214; IV.143-179; IV.181-182; V.3-12*; V.43-66;
V.147-152; IV.85-182; VI.183-196; VI.358-360; VII.33-104; VII.105-118; VIII.81-104; VIII.105-189;
VIII.191-268; VIII.361-376†; IX.79-88; IX.89-181; X.45-56†; X.67-80; X.81-91; X.213-324;
X.337-358; X.445-460*; X.461-470*; XI.71-90; XI.91-94†; XI.177-301; XI.373-374; XV.19-61†
- KRITZER, Robert
XV.131-145
- KUDO, Noriyuki 工藤 順之
II.93-128†**; III.149-163; IV.117-141; V.13-26*; V.87-133; VI.19-84; VI.361-362; VII.225-254*;
VIII.21-45*; IX.33-42†; IX.43-60; IX.297-300; X.57-66†; X.93-116; XI.343-372*; XII.21-27;
XII.123-152*; XIII.75-85; XIV.25-33; XV.105-116
- MAGGI, Mauro
X.533-535
- MARTINI, Giuliana
XIV.135-183
- NATTIER, Jan
VI.207-250; VII.167-196; VIII.323-360; VIII.361-376†; IX.183-199; X.181-200; X.359-394;
X.529-532; XII.101-122; XIII.231-258
- PENG, Jinzhang 彭 金章
VI.197-206†
- PINAULT, Georges-Jean
XIV.73-80
- QIU, Yungqing 裘 雲青
X.461-470*
- RADICH, Michael
XIII.121-172
- SAERJI 薩爾吉
XI.95-103; XIII.111-120; XIV.35-57; XIV.185-222; XV.127-130†
- SALOMON, Richard
XII.7-19
- SILK, Jonathan A.
X.171-179; XI.61-69
- SKILLING, Peter
IV.71-92; VII.147-158; VIII.269-322; XI.37-60; XII.73-100; XIII.195-229; XIV.7-12†; XIV.59-72;
XV.117-126; XV.127-130†
- TAMAI, Tatsushi
XIV.81-125; XV.161-187
- TOURNIER, Vincent
XV.87-104
- VETTER, Tilmann
II.129-141; VII.159-166†
- VOROBYOVA-DESYATOVSKAYA, Margarita I.
IX.61-78; X.45-56†; X.57-66†; XI.91-94†; XV.189-194
- WILLE, Klaus
IV.43-52; VII.139-146; VIII.47-79
- YUYAMA, Akira 湯山 明
I.29-47*; I.69-90*; I.91-95*; II.21-38*; II.67-89*; II.90-92*; III.165-175; IV.27-42; VI.53-69; IV.70*;
V.27-41; V.135-146; V.153-157*; VI.3-17; VI.321-339; VI.340; VI.341-342; VI.343-352*;
VI.353-357*; VII.3-32; VII.255-280*; VIII.3-20*; VIII.377-394*; IX.231-276*; IX.277-296**; X.3-38;
X.471-528*; XI.335-341*; XIII.259-268*; XIII.269-277*; XIII.279-294*; XIV.249-258*; XIV.259-266*;
XV.195-200**; XV.201-208*; XV.209-234*; XV.235-236*; XV.237-240*; XV.241-248*
- YE, Shaoyong 葉 少勇
X.117-147; X.149-170; XI.105-151; XI.153-175; XIII.87-110
- ZACCHETTI, Stefano
V.67-85; V.157-158; VI.251-299; VII.159-166†; VII.197-224; VIII.395-396; X.395-416

ZHANG, Xueshan 張 雪杉

XV.71-76

ZIEME, Peter

XV.147-160

ZIMMERMANN, Michael

II.143-168; III.177-211; III.215-216

IRIAB's Monograph Series:

Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica

[= BPPB]

All Downloadable in PDF format from our Web page:

http://iriab.soka.ac.jp/orc/Publications/BPPB/index_BPPB.html

- I. Seishi Karashima
A Glossary of Dharmarakṣa's Translation of the Lotus Sutra 正法華經詞典, 1998, xxxv + 696 pages, ISBN 4-9980622-0-4.
- II. Yuichi Kajiyama
The Antaryvāptisamarthana of Ratnākaraśānti, 1999, xiv + 162 pages + 6 plates, ISBN 4-9980622-1-2.
- III. Akira Yuyama
Eugène Burnouf: The Background to his Research into the Lotus Sutra, 2000, xiv + 192 pages, ISBN 4-9980622-2-0.
- IV. Seishi Karashima
A Glossary of Kumārajīva's Translation of the Lotus Sutra 妙法蓮華經詞典, 2001, xxxix + 528 pages, ISBN4-9980622-3-9.
- V. M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya in collaboration with Seishi Karashima and Noriyuki Kudo
The Kāśyapaparivarta — Romanized Text and Facsimiles —, 2002, xiv + 61 pages + LXXX plates, ISBN 4-9980622-4-7.
- VI. Michael Zimmermann
A Buddha Within: The Tathāgatagarbhasūtra, The Earliest Exposition Of The Buddha-Nature Teaching In India, 2002, 444 pages, ISBN 4-9980622-5-5.
- VII. Noriyuki Kudo
The Karmavibhaṅga: Transliterations and Annotations of the Original Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal, 2004, xxx + 348 pages, ISBN 4-9980622-6-3.
- VIII. Stefano Zacchetti
A Critical Synoptic Edition with an Annotated Translation of Chapters 1-3 of Dharmarakṣa's Guang zan jing 光讚經, Being the Earliest Chinese Translation of the Larger Prajñāpāramitā, 2005, x + 457 pages, ISBN 4-9980622-7-1.
- IX. Daniel B. Stevenson and Hiroshi Kanno
The Meaning of the Lotus Sūtra's Course of Ease and Bliss: An Annotated Translation and Study of Nanyue Huisi's (515-577) Fahua jing anlexing yi, 2006, x + 317 pages, ISBN 4-9980622-8-X.
- X. Jan Nattier
A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods, 2008, vi + 194 pages, ISBN 978-4-904234-00-6.
- XI. Seishi Karashima
A Glossary of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā 道行般若經詞典, 2010, xlviii + 768 pages, ISBN 978-4-904234-03-7.
- XII. Seishi Karashima
A Critical Edition of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā 道行般若經校注, 2011, xxxvi + 550 pages, ISBN 978-4-904234-04-4.
- XIII. Seishi Karashima
Die Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ: Verhaltensregeln für buddhistische Mönche der Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins, herausgegeben, mit der chinesischen Parallelversion verglichen, übersetzt und kommentiert von Seishi Karashima unter Mitwirkung von Oskar von Hinüber, Band I, Band II, Band III (Grammatik und Glossar), 2012, ISBN 978-4-904234-05-1/ °-06-8/ °-07-5.

Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia:
The British Library Sanskrit Fragments
[= BLSF]

edited by Seishi KARASHIMA and Klaus WILLE

Volume I. 2006, xi + 274 pages + 133 plates, ISBN 4-9980622-9-8.

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|-----|
| Ursula SIMS-WILLIAMS | The papers of the Central Asian scholar and Sanskritist Rudolf Hoernle | 1 |
| Klaus WILLE | Some recently identified Sanskrit fragments from the Stein and Hoernle collections
in the British Library, London (2) | 27 |
| Klaus WILLE | The Sanskrit Fragments Or. 15003 in the Hoernle Collection | 65 |
| Seishi KARASHIMA | The <i>Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra</i> Manuscript from Farhād-B.,g in the Stein
Collection (1) | 155 |
| Seishi KARASHIMA | A Sanskrit Fragment of the <i>Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra</i> in the Stein Collection | 173 |
| Seishi KARASHIMA | Four Sanskrit Fragments of the <i>Ratnaketu-parivarta</i> in the Stein Collection | 177 |
| Seishi KARASHIMA and Klaus WILLE | The Sanskrit Manuscript of the <i>Sarvabuddhaviṣayāvatārajñānālokālaṃkāra</i> from
Endere in the Stein Collection | 191 |
| Noriyuki Kudo | A Sanskrit Fragment of the Larger <i>Prajñāpāramitā</i> in the Stein Collection | 255 |
| Kenta SUZUKI | A Sanskrit Fragment of the <i>Prajñāpāramitāstotra</i> in the Stein Collection | 261 |
| Noriyuki KUDO | A Sanskrit Fragment of the <i>Caitīyacuṣka-</i> and <i>Tripusabhallikasūtra</i> | 263 |
| Noriyuki KUDO | A Sanskrit Fragment of Unknown Mahāyāna Charm | 265 |
| Tatsushi TAMAI | The Tocharian Fragments in Or. 15003 of the Hoernle Collection | 267 |

Volume II.1 Texts. 2009, 668 pages, ISBN 978-4-904234-01-3.

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----|
| Ursula SIMS-WILLIAMS | The British Library Hoernle Collection, part 1 | 1 |
| Klaus WILLE | Buddhist Sanskrit Sources from Khotan | 25 |
| Klaus WILLE | The Sanskrit Fragments Or.15004 in the Hoernle Collection | 73 |
| | The Sanskrit Fragments Or.15009 in the Hoernle Collection | |
| YE Shaoyong | Or.15009.1-50 | 105 |
| Jundo NAGASHIMA | Or.15009.51-90 | 128 |
| Jiro HIRABAYASHI | Or.15009.91-100 | 160 |
| Noriyuki KUDO | Or.15009.101-150 | 169 |
| Gudrun MELZER | Or.15009.151-200 | 199 |
| YE Shaoyong | Or.15009.201-250 | 227 |
| Jundo NAGASHIMA | Or.15009.251-290 | 258 |
| Jiro HIRABAYASHI | Or.15009.291-300 | 287 |
| Takamichi FUKITA | Or.15009.301-350 | 298 |
| Seishi KARASHIMA | The Sanskrit Fragments Or.15010 in the Hoernle Collection | 335 |
| Hiroimi HABATA | The <i>Mahāparinirvāṇ-mahāsūtra</i> Manuscripts in the Stein and
Hoernle Collection (1) | 551 |
| Jens-Uwe HARTMANN and Chanwit TUDKEAO | Three Sanskrit Fragments of the <i>Ratnaketu-parivarta</i> | 589 |

| | | |
|---------------------|---|-----|
| Prods Oktor SKJÆRVØ | Fragments of the <i>Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra</i> in Or.15009 and Or.15010 | 597 |
| Paul HARRISON | Sanskrit Fragments of the <i>Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā</i> in the British Library | 637 |
| Tatsushi TAMAI | The Tocharian Fragments in Or.15004, Or.15009 and Or.15010 of
the Hoernle Collection | 659 |

Volume II.2 Facsimiles. 2009, 382 plates, ISBN 978-4-904234-02-0

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Plates 1~3 | The British Library Hoernle Collection, part 1 |
| Plates 4~18 | The Sanskrit Fragments Or.15001 |
| Plates 19~21 | Fragments of the <i>Prātimokṣasūtra</i> |
| Plates 22~62 | The Sanskrit Fragments Or.15004 |
| Plates 63~203 | The Sanskrit Fragments Or.15009 |
| Plates 204~368 | The Sanskrit Fragments Or.15010 |
| Plates 369~371 | Fragments of the <i>Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra</i> |
| Plates 372 | Fragment of the <i>Ratnaketuparivarta</i> |
| Plates 373~378 | Fragments of the <i>Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra</i> |
| Plates 379~381 | Fragments of the <i>Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā</i> |
| Plates 382 | Addenda |

モノグラフの申込み方法：

一冊につき1, 500円分の切手（送料・梱包費用等実費）同封の上、下記住所に。
（複数巻の申込可；同一巻複数冊の申込は不可）

〒192-8577 東京都八王子市丹木町1-236

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所

問い合わせは手紙、電話、ファックス、電子メールにて。

Tel: 042-691-2695; Fax: 042-691-4814; E-mail: iriab@soka.ac.jp

Monograph series:

Obtainable on request by sending twenty coupons-réponse internationals (for each copy) to cover the handling and postal expenses at cost

(We accept a request of several volumes at one time; however, a request for more than one copy of the same volume is not acceptable).

Write to: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology,

Soka University:

1-236 Tangi, Hachioji, Tokyo 192-8577, JAPAN

Tel: (+81-42)691-2695; Fax: (+81-42)691-4814; E-mail: iriab@soka.ac.jp